

To: cameron.mcintosh@southlanddc.govt.nz, elizabeth.hovell@southlanddc.govt.nz,
rob.scott@southlanddc.govt.nz

RE: **Section 128 Review — Resource Consent RMA/2025/53212, Datagrid Hyperscale Data Centre, Makarewa**

I write as a concerned member of the public regarding the adequacy of the noise assessment for the Datagrid hyperscale data centre at Makarewa. Given the unprecedented scale of this development (New Zealand's first hyperscale facility) and the precedent it sets for future infrastructure, I believe it is imperative that a thorough and transparent process be followed from the outset. Proper assessment procedures will not only protect the rights and wellbeing of communities living adjacent to this project but also will establish meaningful safeguards for all residents near future hyperscale data centres across the country.

I ask the Council to (1) **acknowledge my submission**, (2) **initiate a Section 128 review**, (3) **undertake an appropriate and complete assessment of all noise effects**, and (4) **re-identify and engage with all affected parties**.

Because the original noise assessment was inadequate, it is currently unknown who will be affected. This uncertainty is precisely why a Section 128 review is required. The consent was granted on a non-notified basis — there was no formal process to identify and consult all affected parties. Without proper low-frequency noise and infrasound modelling, we cannot know the full extent of people that fall within the affected zone.

I request the Council initiate a Section 128 review before the statutory deadline of 5 September 2026, as the noise assessment contains critical deficiencies:

- Wrong primary noise source modelled (chillers, not free-air cooling fans which run >80% of the time);
- No low-frequency noise (LFN) or infrasound assessment;
- HV substation badly under-specified (only "2 transformers" modelled, no frequency data);
- Soil acoustic properties not assessed i.e. no Ground Factor specified under ISO 9613-2;
- Atmospheric inversions not considered;
- Baseline monitoring insufficient (7 days, one season, one position, A-weighted only);
- No assessment of how nearby homes block or transmit noise (no window/glazing data for existing dwellings);
- No independent peer review.

A rural environment with very low night background levels cannot absorb an unassessed 24/7 industrial noise source without risk to sleep, health, and quality of life. The Southland Sustainable Resource Coalition's Section 128 submission provides further detail:

https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=pfbid02K3BQssoTWXLCZ4cnWt5j8qZxvaAgUYmYcA2hGFUDct7nZptqmyoQJq7J7AeuJCwul&id=61590982592338

The integrity of the RMA process requires that consents are based on complete information and that affected persons are properly identified. These deficiencies represent a risk not only to nearby residents but to public trust in the consent system.

I ask the Council to: (1) **acknowledge my submission**; (2) **initiate the review under s 128(1)(c) of the RMA**; (3) **require independent peer-reviewed LFN/infrasound modelling and continuous monitoring**; and (4) **re-identify and notify all affected persons**.

Made in good faith, without prejudice to any rights or remedies under the RMA or at law.

Name:

Phone:

Email:

Address: