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EVIDENCE OF JOLENE EAGAR

Introduction

1. My full name is Jolene Eagar.

2. I am a qualified Primary School Teacher and Real Estate Agent. However, I currently hold the position of Operations Manager for two medium size, medical import and distribution companies, MedXus Ltd and Crown Dental and Medical Ltd.

3. In that role, I am responsible for management of the finances as well as the day to day running of the two companies. I am also responsible for the Quality Management Systems of those companies. I have an in depth understanding and appreciation for systems, processes, policies and procedures, as my role involves continually monitoring and managing quality across all operations.

4. I have been a resident of Templeton for 12 years.

5. I am the Treasurer of the Templeton Residents Association Incorporated (TRA), and have held that position since June 2019. I am also a member of the TRA’s No Quarry Sub-committee, which was formed in January 2018.

6. Since January 2018, a huge amount of my free time has been spent on understanding the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), considering and summarising information about Fulton Hogan Limited’s (FHL’s) resource consent applications for the proposed Roydon Quarry (Proposal/proposed quarry), and passing as much of that information on to the TRA’s members and the wider Templeton community as possible, including at various workshops and working groups I have lead on behalf of the TRA.

7. I am authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of the TRA.

Scope of evidence

8. My statement of evidence addresses the following matters:

(a) An introduction to the TRA and its No Quarry Sub-committee;

(b) Preliminary comments about the present resource consenting process;

(c) A summary of the TRA’s overall position on the Proposal;
(d) The specific concerns of members of the TRA and the Templeton community;

(e) Comments on aspects of the evidence of FHL’s witnesses; and

(f) Comments on aspects of the proposed consent conditions included in the Section 42A reports and Mr Bligh’s planning evidence for FHL.

**Introduction to the TRA and its No Quarry Sub-committee**

**The TRA and its objects**

9. The TRA was incorporated in 1986. The TRA’s objects, as outlined in its constitution and rules, include (summarily):

   (a) Facilitating communication between the community and relevant local authorities or controlling bodies, including in relation to proposed changes to public property, amenities and facilities in the area and planning matters; and

   (b) To seek to improve the area as a better place to live.

10. The TRA is run by a group of volunteer residents. It has been running events, producing a community newsletter and advocating for the people of Templeton since 1986.

11. The TRA’s membership includes residents of the Templeton township and surrounding areas, including many residents who live in close proximity to the site of FHL’s proposed quarry.

**The TRA’s No Quarry Sub-committee**

12. On 23 December 2017, a Templeton resident brought to the TRA’s attention that FHL was proposing to establish a quarry near our community and aiming to lodge associated resource consent applications in February 2018. The TRA subsequently organised a community meeting to inform local residents of this.

13. It was clear to the TRA from feedback provided at that meeting that the community did not want a quarry to be located so close to homes, local businesses and industries, and did not believe companies like FHL should benefit at the expense of others’ well-being. The TRA therefore resolved to form the No-Quarry Sub-committee (Sub-committee) to help/advocate for Templeton residents as well as residents in surrounding areas.
14. The following four goals have informed the work of the Sub-committee and the TRA since then:

(a) To inform the community of information about the Proposal;

(b) To encourage members of the community to engage in the consenting process by writing a submission;

(c) To educate members of the community on how to write a submission; and

(d) To lodge a submission opposing FHL’s resource consent applications.

15. The Sub-committee realised early on that there were a range of ways the TRA could support concerned community members to make their voices heard during the resource consent application and submission process. The TRA’s aim has been to provide as much assistance as possible to members of the community through the provision of regularly updated resources and information on the TRA’s website, flyers and through emailed newsletters, as information has become available.

16. The Sub-committee established a mailing list of community members who had advised the TRA of their wish to be kept informed about the Proposal, which includes 363 residences and businesses. The map included as Attachment 1 identifies where these residents/businesses are located in relation to the proposed quarry. These are the people/businesses that the TRA (through the Sub-committee) engaged with regularly through the application/submission process.

17. Community meetings and workshops were organised by the TRA, working groups formed, and many one-on-one meetings held at peoples’ homes to provide assistance in any way needed. A full list of the TRA and its Sub-committee’s activities during the application/submission process is set out in Attachment 2.

18. In addition to those activities, and in its role as an advocate for the community, the TRA (through its Sub-committee) lobbied members of Parliament\(^1\) and local body representatives\(^2\) to make changes to national quarry setback standards/guidelines.\(^3\) TRA members also attended Selwyn District Council

---

\(^1\) The Sub-committee has been in constant communication with local MP Amy Adams, who has been a strong supporter of the TRA’s “No Quarry” campaign (refer letter from Amy Adams to the TRA (dated 2 February 2018) included as Attachment 3). The Sub-committee has met with Megan Woods and Eugenie Sage, and contacted Jacinda Ardern and David Parker.

\(^2\) The Sub-committee has met with Lianne Dalziel, made contact with Sam Broughton.

\(^3\) Included as Attachment 4 is the subsequent joint letter to Minister Parker (dated 18 June 2018) from Environment Canterbury Chair Steve Lowndes, Christchurch Mayor Lianne Dalziel, Selwyn
(SDC) and Environment Canterbury (ECan) council meetings, local community board meetings, and meetings with SDC and ECan staff, in relation to the proposed quarry and the associated resource consenting process.

19. The TRA also presented a petition against the proposed quarry with over 4,000 signatures to the ECan leadership team as well as ECan’s council, to the Selwyn District Mayor and Minister David Parker.

Preliminary comment regarding the consent application process

20. Before addressing the TRA’s overall position on the Proposal and the community’s specific concerns, I wish to record some preliminary comments about the resource consent application process.

21. Members of the community are not experts; most work full time and have families to take care of. Due to the size of the application and the complexity of the associated technical assessments and data provided, it has been very difficult for people to review all the information and understand how they would be affected by the Proposal if consent was granted. This has not been assisted by subsequent changes being made by FHL to the Proposal through the consenting process, which has created confusion and frustration.

22. The TRA also believes that FHL’s approach to community engagement has been less than satisfactory, particularly given the nature and scale of effects of the Proposal and the implications of such effects for the well-being of the Templeton community and residents of the surrounding area. While the TRA accepts that FHL has sought to engage with its members about the Proposal on several occasions, the TRA does not have a mandate to negotiate on behalf of the Templeton community. It has therefore been the TRA’s view that any engagement by FHL should be in a community wide forum, however FHL does not appear to have shared that view.

23. This, together with various mis-communications about key elements of the proposed quarry operations, has led to a significant level of distrust within the Templeton community about FHL’s intentions.

24. It has therefore been necessary for the TRA to engage acoustic, air quality and planning consultants at considerable cost to assist the TRA fully understand the

Mayor Sam Broughton and Canterbury District Health Board chief executive David Meates, expressing the signatories’ concerns about the lack of national guidance for setback distances between quarrying activities and residential properties, the impacts of dust generated by such activities and potential health effects.

For example, at an initial meeting held by FHL, community members were advised that there would be no night-time operations. The resource consent applications subsequently lodged with SDC and ECan contemplate night-time operations.
implications for the Proposal on the community, and to obtain advice in relation FHL’s resource consent applications.

**Summary of the TRA’s overall position**

25. It was very clear from the TRA’s first community meeting about the Proposal in January 2018 that the Templeton community and residents of the surrounding area felt very strongly that the proposed quarry site was an inappropriate location and the Proposal was something the TRA needed to stand against. Hundreds of residents attended the TRA’s community meetings.\(^5\)

26. As I have explained, while the TRA represents the Templeton community, it does not have a mandate to negotiate on behalf of the community; it cannot make decisions or agree to things on their behalf. However, the TRA received a very strong message from the residents and businesses of Templeton and its surrounding area that they were here first, and they have worked hard to build happy, peaceful lives for themselves and their families, and that they do not want the proposed quarry. Templeton and the surrounding area has a special and unique character that we all love dearly and need to protect.

27. The TRA believes that if resource consents were granted for the Proposal, this would set a very dangerous precedent for the future. The negative impacts of quarries in the area west of Christchurch on the neighbouring communities is no secret.\(^6\) Experts can argue the fine points, however, the TRA is certain that FHL’s proposed quarry will impact the lives of those who call this area their home.

28. Lives have already been turned upside down by the mere possibility that a proposed quarry might establish in our community, and no stones have even been turned. It is for this reason that the TRA submitted in opposition to the Proposal and continues to seek that FHL’s resource consent applications to the SDC and ECan be refused.

**Specific concerns of the TRA and the Templeton Community**

29. The TRA conducted a survey in August 2018 as a formal way of canvassing the Templeton community and their concerns regarding the proposed quarry. One hundred and twenty four people completed the survey (which I believe is likely to represent many more due to respondents providing the views of entire families)\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) Refer article included as Attachment 5 as well as video recording of our meeting in January 2018. https://i.stuff.co.nz/the-press/101003460/templeton-residents-take-up-arms-in-battle-against-planned-quarry?m=m

\(^6\) Refer article in Attachment 6 https://i.stuff.co.nz/business/90874908/rapid-quarry-expansion-leaves-christchurch-neighbours-feeling-surrounded?m=m.
that had a range of questions for determining residents' concerns with the Proposal to why individuals lived in or had shifted to the area.

30. For those that choose to live in Templeton or the surrounding area, the main reasons recorded by survey respondents were to enjoy the surroundings and semi-rural area, to be part of a community, to enjoy the lifestyle (urban-rural fringe), and that it was a nice place to live, work and/or retire.

31. An analysis of the survey results in relation to concerns about the Proposal is included in Attachment 7. In the following paragraphs I provide a summary of the concerns raised in the survey responses, and also the feedback that the TRA has otherwise received from members of the community (i.e. at community meetings, workshops and via email), which relate to:

(a) Noise effects and impacts on health, including mental health;

(b) Dust and associated effects;

(c) Impacts on water quality;

(d) Effects on landscape and amenity;

(e) Traffic effects;

(f) Impacts on property value;

(g) Impacts on the Samadhi Buddhist Vihara;

(h) Consent condition monitoring and compliance; and

(i) Future consent variations.

Noise effects and impacts on health

32. Since the community became aware of the Proposal, the TRA has fielded a number of emails from residents concerned about their health, mental health, and the impact the proposed quarry will have on them. Residents are stressed, overwhelmed, feel a sense of hopelessness when up against a large corporate, and are concerned about the negative effects the proposed quarry will have on them.

33. I have included as Attachment 8 a summary of the comments provided by 11 residents that live closest to the proposed quarry site as part of the TRA’s community survey. They are seriously concerned about the impact noise from
the quarry activities and heavy vehicle movements will have on them. Many spend time outside, working from home, farming, and enjoy entertaining outside their homes.

34. There are major concerns regarding mental health and wellbeing from those living the closest. They are concerned that low volume noise (nuisance or otherwise) in the background constantly during the day would impact how they enjoy their properties and the lifestyle they have made for themselves in this area. In addition, there are concerns regarding how early mornings, evenings and nights will be impacted, how this will affect sleep, and then in turn mental wellbeing.

35. When individuals purchased their properties in the area, they knew about noise effects from aeroplanes, trains, traffic, and occasionally Ruapuna Raceway. However, these noise sources are sporadic and people are concerned that they do not have the same impact as constant noise in the background impacting their daily lives that will be the case if the proposed quarry is allowed to proceed.

Dust effects

36. Over ninety percent of the survey respondents raised concerns around the impact of dust emissions generated by the proposed quarry on their everyday lives and also the impact of dust on their health. This is a very contentious issue and one that needs to be carefully examined. The health and wellbeing of around 2500 people could be impacted if consent decisions are made incorrectly.

37. In addition, some residents are concerned about the impact the proposed quarry and associated truck movements will have on their livelihood. For example, this is of great concerns to:

(a) Those who train horses in the area, something the region is proud of and has the potential to harm the industry and those with a proven track record.7

(b) Residents whose horticultural crops will be affected by dust through reduction in fruit setting, fruit size and sugar levels, with the potential for rejection or downgrading of produce.

38. With the proposed quarry site being in a rural area, most sensitive receivers tend to spend a lot of time outside. Members of the community have therefore expressed concern that their exposure to the more than minor dust effects will affect their tranquil and healthy lifestyle. In addition, there is concern that dust

---

conditions will affect people's ability to enjoy their outdoor environment, making activities such as BBQ’s and playing on the lawn unpleasant and unappealing.

39. Many people have also raised concerns about dust buildup on properties. There is no invisible shield around the boundary of the proposed quarry site that will keep dust within the boundary on dry, windy days. Concerns by residents relate to the following effects:

(a) The visual soiling of clean surfaces, such as cars, windows, window ledges and household washing.

(b) Dust deposits on flowers and plants, fruit and vegetables and the potential for contamination of roof-collected water supplies.

(c) Dust deposits inside the house, coupled with the annoyance of increased requirements for cleaning. Residents have also raised concerns about related financial implications, through the increased use of cleaning materials, water and possibly paid labour.

40. The effects of airborne dust on visibility in the immediate vicinity of the proposed quarry site has also been raised as a concern. Visibility is one of the main ways by which people judge air quality. Loss of visibility is also a safety concern under extreme conditions, especially for road traffic and has been raised by many people.

**Impacts on water quality**

41. The protection of groundwater is a large concern for many in our community. It is a sensitive issue given the chlorination issues Christchurch City has had to deal with over recent years.

42. FHL’s evidence suggests that there is no threat to groundwater quality. However, concerned residents have contacted the TRA regarding the proposed 1m buffer between recorded groundwater levels and quarrying, and believe this is not large enough.

43. This concern is supported by comments recorded in the Joint Decision of the Independent Hearings Panel dated 31 August 2016 in relation resource consent applications by Canterbury Aggregates Producers Group (CAPG) to authorise increased excavation depths across ten existing quarry sites located at McLeans
Island, Miners Road and Selwyn. In that decision (which was to decline the applications sought), the Hearings Panel stated (at paragraph 212):

“…we agree with Ms Chapman and record that had we decided to grant these consents, we would most likely have adopted the HRGL [Highest Recorded Groundwater Level] plus a 1m buffer, as well as a 1m allowance for CPW [Central Plains Water], as she suggested.” (at 212).

44. This comment suggests that a 1m buffer is not sufficient to account for future fluctuations in the water table.

45. The proposed mitigation for a rising water table to raise the level of the quarry floor with backfill, becomes more and more unrealistic as the size of the quarry increases and remediation is complete. Residents are concerned that no mitigation is proposed or possible, once the quarry is complete and the water table rises.

46. In rural areas, people rely on having access to pure, clean drinking water from groundwater. Maintaining water quality is a very serious concern that has been raised by every single person I have spoken to over the last 22 months regarding the proposed quarry.

Landscape and amenity effects

47. I was absolutely overwhelmed by the strong sense of community we have in Templeton. My 12 years as a resident seem short against the majority of residents that I have spent time with over the last 22 months. There is a reason people choose to make Templeton their home and have lived there for many years. It is this sense of belonging that is being threatened by the Proposal. People want to protect what they have as it is something special and rare in today's world.

48. It is very clear to me that Templeton and the surrounding residents do not only see their individual property as where they live. The surrounding area plays a very large role in their everyday lives. Being on the outskirts of Christchurch City, Templeton offers a ‘rural feel’. People leave their busy, stressed lives behind when they come home to a safe, quiet and peaceful environment.

49. One of the main reasons that people choose to live in Templeton and the surrounding areas is to appreciate the rural feeling of the area; the views of the

---

8 A copy of the decision can be found on ECan’s website at: 
mountains, the large open space for walking or cycling in the fresh air. Living on the rural/urban fringe give residents the opportunity to enjoy the best of both worlds. The proposed quarry threatens this, and the very reason that people chose to live here.

50. Members of the community are concerned that FHL has made no attempt to assess what is valued in the community and how this proposal will impact its members. No consideration has been given to how and why people enjoy the area and its recreational values. The TRA recognises the challenge in conducting such an assessment, and acknowledges that some things are harder to measure, such as why people choose to live in a specific area. For some it might be an emotional decision while others chose the area because it is quiet, calm and peaceful or even for soft science-based reasons. However, these are very important attributes for the community, which would be impacted as a result of the proposed activity.

51. The importance of the surrounding landscape for the community does appear, however, to have been acknowledged by FHL through its proposal of creating a walkway around the proposed quarry site perimeter. This is in recognition of the same message I get from residents who have been walking, jogging and biking the surrounding roads for years; it is their backyard.

52. Not one person has said to me that the proposed walkway is a good idea, even though they regularly walk these roads. They feel very strongly that the change in landscape, losing the beautiful open views of the rural area, would significantly affect their enjoyment of what they consider as part of their home.

53. The idea of walking next to a 3m high bund and sometimes a hedge on your other side does not sound appealing to people. It sounds dangerous, cold and tunnel vision.

54. FHL is saying that there will be a change in what people hear at the site boundary. That noise from the proposed quarry activities will be audible at the site boundary. This is exactly where people walk and run to get away from all the stresses of everyday life. They want to get closer to nature, not be exposed to dust and noise when taking the dog for a walk.

55. There will also be a significant increase in heavy vehicle movements. The noise, dust and stones coming from these trucks will make it unbearable for people to walk or bike all the way down Jones road.

Traffic effects

56. Congestion and the state of our roads are a huge concern to residents.
57. If the new motorway eases the flow of traffic past Templeton, it will bring a welcome relief. However, there are mixed feelings in the community around the effect the new motorway will actually have considering the huge and continued growth we are seeing to the west of Christchurch. Should the new motorway ease congestion there is a very real possibility that the volume of traffic that the proposed quarry will introduce will undo all the good intentions of the new motorway. On the other hand, we have a very real risk of the motorway not easing the traffic flow past Templeton and by adding the increased vehicle movements resulting from the proposed quarry, we will be adding to what is already an unsustainable traffic load on our roads.

58. Members of the community have expressed particular concerns about the comments made in the SDC reporting officer’s report regarding queueing of quarry trucks at the railway crossing, as they access State Highway 1 (SH1) from Dawsons Road. The TRA believes this is a serious safety issue, and recent changes to speed limits in the Templeton area highlight the on-going safety issues that the area already has. The TRA believes that the increase in heavy traffic movements associated that would be generated by the proposed quarry would exacerbate these existing safety issues.

59. Concerns have also been raised about the high likelihood of trucks shortcutting on Jones Road when there is a queue onto SH1 or when a train is crossing. Any increase in heavy vehicle movements though Templeton would increase the direct impact on residents with associated noise, dust and safety issues.

60. There is a genuine concern that the proposed mitigation measures - a code of conduct document and sign at the gate - but no consequence of non-compliance would have a very low probability of being effective, and less so over time. The traffic reports all state truck numbers through Templeton assume 100% compliance by drivers; which the TRA believes is unrealistic. Even one truck traveling via Jones Road though Templeton during the 60 nights proposed for night working will significant impact on people all along the route being woken.

Impacts on the Samadhi Buddhist Vihara

61. It has been a privilege to get to know the people from the Samadhi Buddhist Vihara at 358 Maddisons Road. The land was bought in 2017 and through donations and hard work they have been able to create a very special environment for the Sri Lankan Buddhist community.

62. It is my understanding that there is currently two full time residents (Monks) on the site with visitors coming and going. Meditation plays a big role in the Buddhist religion and as such a meditation garden with over 1,000 plants has been created
with 3 meditation huts for solitary meditation. The purpose is to give people an opportunity to practice meditation in a quiet, natural setting. Whether indoors or outside. It should not make a difference if it is only the monks that practice their religion on the site or whether they share their space with others and also share their teachings. The facts don’t change whether it is one person significantly affected or hundreds. The focus should be on how they will be affected and the impact it will have on them and their ability to perform their religious activities uninterrupted.

63. It is a human right to practice your religion and beliefs in New Zealand uninterrupted. Section 13 of the Human Rights Act 1990 confirms that everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. In the TRA’s view, that right would be compromised if the proposed quarry is able to go ahead.

Impacts on property values

64. Although the TRA understands that the RMA does not take into consideration the potential impact on property values, this is a common major concern in our community, causing stress and anxiety. This impacts health and wellbeing and overall quality of life. People have expressed concern that a company is benefiting financially at the expense of those in the community - not just financially, but also people's wellbeing.

Monitoring and compliance

65. There are major concerns regarding the monitoring/compliance of FHL’s proposed measures for effects mitigation and conditions if the proposed quarry goes ahead.

66. The TRA is aware that there have been a number of cases in nearby quarries where quarry operators have not complied with the conditions imposed by their resource consents. At a public meeting about the proposed quarry in January 2018, an ECan representative advised that there are not enough compliance officers to handle all current quarries and the community would need to be the ‘eyes and ears’ for ECan. This was reinforced by an email from a local Selwyn District Councillor that was read out at a public meeting stating that “Quarries companies are a law unto their own…” These comments heighten the concerns in the Templeton community about the impacts that the proposed quarry would have on them.

67. A meeting was held at SDC’s offices and attended by Garry Kilday (TRA chair at the time) and myself representing the TRA, Steve Lowndes (ECan Council chair) and Katherine Trought (ECan Leadership team) in June 2018 to discuss the community’s concerns regarding the complaints procedure and what people
perceive as the ‘inability’ of ECan to respond and act on complaints. It was encouraging to know that Mr Lowndes and Ms Trought were genuine in wanting to hear the TRA’s concerns, and Mr Lowndes admitted that enforcement has been a challenge in the past with quarries.

68. The TRA is genuinely concerned about ECan’s limited resourcing, and its implications for reliable compliance monitoring and enforcement of resource consent conditions, and consequently, the well-being of the residents of Templeton and those living in close proximity to the proposed quarry site.

Future consent variations

69. The TRA is aware that there is a history of applications being made to change existing conditions following the grant of a resource consent for other quarries in our area. For example, applications have been made for additional truck movements. This is a real concern for our community and it creates the sense that the goal post will keep moving.

Comment on community concerns

70. People are reacting and responding to the Proposal as a result of past experiences with other quarries that have been operating in our area. These past experiences cannot be ignored as they form the foundation of people’s concerns.

71. The reaction from residents opposing the applications is not coming from a place of fearing the unknown or standing in the way of progress. It is honest, raw emotions of currently sharing their roads with quarry trucks and already finding it a challenge with significant safety concerns, damage to vehicles from rocks flung from trucks or driving through potholes created by these trucks. It is people who know what it is like when the wind is blowing and there is no invisible shield on the boundary of a quarry to keep the dust in. It is people who are realistic enough to know that the landscape assessments do not depict what the proposed quarry will look like in reality.

Comments on FHL’s Evidence

72. I wish to respond to the following comment made by Mr Donald Chittock at paragraph 120 of his evidence statement dated 23 September 2019:

“As a general comment, Fulton Hogan appreciates that some stakeholders do not wish to engage on the Proposal or wish to have very limited involvement. As an example, Fulton Hogan is actively seeking to reengage with the Templeton Residents’ Association (TRA), the first meeting with
representatives of this group occurred 19 February 2018. As a key submitter, Fulton Hogan has contacted the TRA via their submission planner to offer to meet, as we have done with other submitters.’’

73. I wish to clarify that the TRA declined an invitation by FHL to be on a Community Advisory/Liaison Group established (by FHL) in 2018 as it believed that the best form of community engagement about the Proposal was for FHL to meet with our whole community rather than one or two representatives from the TRA. The TRA believes that the concern and anxiety felt by our community about the Proposal was too much for one or two of our members to burden and carry the weight of responsibility in these meetings.

74. The TRA is concerned that FHL has not undertaken full community engagement about the Proposal. The TRA has always been very firm in its stance that true community engagement would involve facing the entire community, given the nature and scale of the impacts of the proposed quarry. The TRA has offered on numerous occasions to hold a community meeting for FHL where it could engage with the community in a forum that the TRA had confidence large numbers of the community would attend. It has been very disappointing for the TRA that FHL did not wish to pursue this option, which the TRA considers would have constituted true community engagement.

Comments on Officer’s Reports and Proposed Conditions

75. Given the nature and scale of the effects of the proposed quarry, and the implications this would have for the well-being of the Templeton community and residents closest to the proposed quarry site, the TRA supports the recommendations of the SDC and ECan reporting officers that FHL’s resource consent applications be refused. The technical and planning aspects of the reporting officers reports are addressed in the evidence of the TRA’s consultants, Mr Kirkby (air quality), Mr Smith (acoustics) and Ms Conlon (planning).

76. On the advice of its consultants, the TRA has given consideration to potential conditions should the Hearings Panel determine that the resource consents should be granted.

77. For the reasons I have traversed in my evidence, the TRA strongly opposes such an outcome. However, the TRA believes the following matters would need to be incorporated in any consent conditions:

(a) Complete prohibition on use of local roads by quarry trucks (i.e. all quarry trucks to utilise SH1 via Jones Road between the proposed quarry access and Dawsons Road). The TRA believes this is essential to preserve the amenity of Templeton and the surrounding areas.
(b) No night-time, weekend or public holiday operations. FHL’s recent changes to limit operations to 60 days of the year is not satisfactory to the TRA. In consideration of the high number of residents and businesses in close proximity to the proposed quarry site and the fact that the noise will be at maximum levels for most of the time that the quarry operates, the TRA strongly suggests that no activity should be able to occur at the proposed quarry site before 8am or continue after 5pm, and on weekdays only.

(c) No mobile processing plant is allowed to be operated at the proposed quarry site. FHL has indicated that it has 3 mobile processing plants that they want to use on the site as required, which under the proposed conditions could be located as close as 250m from the site boundary. The TRA is concerned that dust mitigation measures for fixed processing plant has been the primary focus of FHL’s evidence, with little detail on how the mobile processing plants (and effects from them) will be managed. The TRA is concerned that the mobile processing plants will create significant dust and noise closer to the boundary than the fixed processing plants (from not only the operation of the mobile processing plant but also related stockpiles), impacting on those living closest to the proposed quarry.

(d) The provision for real time TSP and PM$_{10}$ monitoring data to be made publicly available. In the TRA’s view this is necessary to ensure transparency and accountability. Having the data available in real time provides public confidence that the monitoring is actually working, as well as an ‘honesty check’ on the consent holder.

(e) Provision be made for a mandatory maintenance plan/schedule to ensure ongoing maintenance of equipment and vehicles occurs so that dust management measures are effective. The TRA believes it is essential that such a plan/schedule be publicly available.

(f) Cessation of operations when water carts are unable to operate for whatever reason.

(g) Reduced excavation depth to ensure preservation of groundwater quality.

(h) To provide greater community confidence in and transparency about FHL’s operations, stronger/tighter conditions relating to:

- the Community Liaison Group, including its role and how it will operate;
- the intended “code of practice” that is to be developed by FHL for its contractors/operators;
• monitoring.

(i) All other matters addressed in the evidence of the TRA’s consultants, Mr Kirkby, Mr Smith and Ms Conlon.

**Conclusion**

78. The TRA knows that the mere possibility of the proposed quarry being established by FHL has impacted those in the community, that people are anxious, and that the uncertainty around the long term effects the proposed quarry could have is anxiety provoking and overwhelming.

79. The TRA therefore requests that the Commissioners focus their considerations on what is the best outcome for the physical and mental health and well-being of the community. In the TRA’s view, that outcome would be to refuse the resource consent applications made by FHL.

**Jolene Eagar**  
14 October 2019
Attachment 1 – Map showing location of those residents/businesses on the TRA’s mailing list
## Attachment 2 – TRA Activity and Timeline of Events

Below is a list of some of the activity undertaken by the TRA since January 2018. This list does not include the many TRA email updates (over 30), the TRA subcommittee meetings (over 25), the media requests and articles, the numerous emails sent to the TRA with concerns or questions, or the political lobbying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2017</td>
<td>FH visited the closest neighbours to introduce themselves with a hamper for Christmas and a handout stating that they will be applying for resource consent in Feb 2018 - with holidays occurring this provided huge stress to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2017</td>
<td>Neighbour contacted TRA to see if we were aware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10 Jan 2018| 1st Community Meeting  
TRA did a letter box drop with urgency given the timeline provided by FH and called a community meeting at St Saviour's Hall. Several hundred in attendance. People standing outside and this was the middle of the Christmas holidays. Mailing list started |
| 21 Jan 2018| First Update Email                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 25 Jan 2018| First TRA Subcommittee meeting                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 25 Jan 2018| 2nd Community Meeting in Templeton Community Centre With CCC, SDC, ECan in attendance                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|            | TRA Chair (Garry) and Narelle Chand meeting with Amy Adams                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 31 Jan     | No Quarry Signs available                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 2 Feb 2018 | Meeting response from Amy Adams                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 17 Feb 2018| Joined meeting of Yaldhurst Residents with Megan Woods and Eugenie Sage                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 19 Feb 2018| Meeting with FH  
Minutes inaccurate - did not represent what actually happened  
Correspondence between FH and TRA  
TRA stood by No Quarry stance and attendance at community meeting by FH declined  
TRA declines one person on Community Advisory Group |
| 25 Feb 2018| Email to residents regarding house evaluations  
A number of residents replied - all ready to push go then the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Correspondence with FH regarding minutes inaccurate and invitation to attend community meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Feb 2018</td>
<td>Meeting with Tim Harris (SDC) Megan McKay, Jolene Eagar, Martin Flanagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 March 2018</td>
<td>Billboard on State Highway 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 March 2018</td>
<td>“Texit” - Media publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 March 2018</td>
<td>Lianne Dalziel met with TRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2018</td>
<td>Give - a little page set up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 April 2018</td>
<td>Workshop 1 - Understanding the RMA (Presented by staff from SDC &amp; ECan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 April 2018</td>
<td>Fundraising Event- Laughter is the best medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 May 2018</td>
<td>Workshop 1 (Repeat) Understanding the RMA (Presented by staff from SDC &amp; ECan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 2018</td>
<td>Update #10 sent out - getting like minded people together if they have concerns regarding wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 May 2018</td>
<td>Three weeks of communication with Amy Adams office regarding local members bill - offering to sponsor a bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May 2018</td>
<td>Bumper Stickers available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Communication and meetings with PR company on campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 June 2018</td>
<td>3rd Community Meeting in Templeton Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amy Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lianne Dalziel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Broughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garry &amp; Jolene Meeting with ECan expressing concerns (Katherine Trought &amp; Council Chair Steve Lowndes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 June 2018</td>
<td>Invited FH to a community meeting - declined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 18, 23 June</td>
<td>Workshop 2 - How to write a submission (Marie Bryne CCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Completion of submission SDC District Plan Review - Quarrying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 August 2018</td>
<td>Survey Monkey - 124 submissions from the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September 2018</td>
<td>Workshop repeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 October 2018</td>
<td>Fundraising Event - Quiz&lt;br&gt;Two raffles to aid in fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>Petition with over 4000 signatures presented to SDC, ECan, and send to Minister Parker. ECan - First met with members of Leadership Team and Council then presented petition to Ecan Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct/Nov 2018</td>
<td>Attendance at Community Board Meetings to get Community Board to make progress with submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November 2018</td>
<td>Emailed academics from around NZ to ask them to submit on the proposed application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 November 2018</td>
<td>Community notified that consent documents have been received&lt;br&gt;Community and important groups in the community notified&lt;br&gt;Flyer delivered to community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 November 2018</td>
<td>Complete application accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 December 2018</td>
<td>Attended meeting with ECan to understand response process to reported consent breaches. Jolene and Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 December 2018</td>
<td>Meeting with local PR company to discuss website plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 April 2019</td>
<td>Public notification - flyer delivered to the community to advise them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 April 2019</td>
<td>4th Community Meeting in Templeton Community Centre. Over 100 people attended. TRA giving update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 April 2019</td>
<td>First submission writing groups to assist our community&lt;br&gt;With understanding the application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 April 2019</td>
<td>Jolene - one-on-one meeting with Buddhist Temple representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April - May 2019</td>
<td>TRA subcommittee meetings to finalise TRA submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April - May 2019</td>
<td>Pharmacy drop box made available for residents to drop off their submissions, for Jolene to scan and email on behalf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 May 2019</td>
<td>Repeat workshop on how to write a submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May 2019</td>
<td>Second submission writing workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 May 2019</td>
<td>Third submission writing workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 May 2019</td>
<td>Forth submission writing workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June 2019</td>
<td>Submissions close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 June 2019</td>
<td>Some submissions not received - last minute scan, copy, send to ECan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 June 2019</td>
<td>Submissions made public - TRA fielding many emails from concerned residents regarding their submissions not being present - emailed ECan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 June 2019</td>
<td>Jolene met with Friend of the Submitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June - October 2019</td>
<td>Engagement of experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 August 2019</td>
<td>Meetings with acoustic experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Flanagan and Jolene Eagar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 August 2019</td>
<td>Email to community advising of changes to application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter to ECan regarding changes to application and how submitters that did not ‘tick’ speak at the hearing can be heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>Engaging of lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jolene and Martin meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September - October 2019</td>
<td>Follow up contact with experts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2nd February 2018

Mel Himin
Templeton.ra@gmail.com

Dear Mel,

Thank you for contacting me regarding the proposed Dawson Road quarry in Templeton.

I have met with representatives from the Templeton Residents’ Association and listened to their concerns regarding the proposed use of this site as a quarry.

I have been advocating on behalf of Yaldhurst residents who have been badly affected by silica dust from quarrying activities in their neighbourhood so I can fully appreciate why Templeton residents would not want a quarry nearby. While the consent conditions for this sort of activity normally contain requirements around dust mitigation, we have found that in practice very little, if any, regular monitoring takes place to ensure consent conditions are being met and it has taken significant work to get appropriate monitoring of dust levels occurring.

The decision whether to grant consent for a quarry is one made by the local authority (ie the Council) and not by the Government. I firmly believe, however, that such consents should always be notified so that residents can have their say and I am relieved that Fulton Hogan has indicated that this will be the case for this proposed quarry.

I will continue to advocate on behalf of affected local residents and support them in having their concerns on this matter heard.

Yours sincerely,

HON AMY ADAMS
MP for Selwyn
Attachment 4 – Joint ECan, CCC, SDC and CDHB letter to Minister Parker
18 June 2018

Hon David Parker
Minister for the Environment
Parliament Buildings
Wellington 6160

Dear Minister Parker,

**Effectively Managing Gravel Extraction**

We are writing to you as a result of concerns we have about the lack of national guidance for setback distances between quarrying activities and residential properties, and the impact of the dust that is generated as well as its potential health effects. We acknowledge that aggregate extraction is important for the ongoing development of greater Christchurch. Since the Canterbury Earthquake sequence the demand for aggregate has increased and terrestrial based quarries have become a more important aggregate source.

There are comprehensive rules in the Canterbury Land and Water Plan, the Canterbury Air Regional Plan, the Christchurch District Plan and the Selwyn District Plan (currently being reviewed). These plans have recently been reviewed and quarrying was a focus of submissions through the statutory hearings.

As a result of changes over the years and a more permissive environment for development, the buffer between residential properties and quarrying activities in rural zones has diminished. This necessarily creates a tension between neighbours and the quarry companies. There is strong community concern about the nuisance nature of dust from quarries.

Both Environment Canterbury and Christchurch City Council have explored setback distances between residential activities and quarries through the planning process. We have found:

- There is no current national guidance;
- Setbacks have proved hard to justify due to the strong evidence base required, making it difficult to define a fixed setback threshold;
- Internationally a setback distance of between 250m to 500m has been used effectively for different elements of quarrying activities; and
- There are no standards, other than for workplace exposure, around respirable crystalline silica.

In order to provide reassurance to communities that they do not have to provide their own evidence for every application and to provide consistency across the country, national guidelines or standards would provide certainty.
The Canterbury District Health Board, Selwyn District Council, Environment Canterbury and Christchurch City Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss these concerns and the appropriate management of quarrying activity with the Minister.

Yours sincerely,

Environment Canterbury chair Steve Lowndes          Christchurch Mayor Lianne Dalziel

Selwyn Mayor Sam Broughton                   Canterbury District Health Board chief executive David Meates
Templeton residents take up arms in battle against planned quarry

Dominic Harris 21:03, Jan 30 2018

They arrived in their hundreds. Dust-coated farmers straight from the fields, parents who popped out after feeding their children, workers who had rushed back from the office - all came together, united by their concern about the impact a proposed quarry at Templeton could have on their lives.

Around 500 people packed into the small town's community centre on Monday to hear the latest news on Fulton Hogan's plans to develop a site adjacent to Dawsons Rd.

As politicians, council representatives and community leaders explained how the battle against the quarry will unfold over the coming months, many will no doubt have been daunted by the scale of the challenge ahead.

STACY SQUIRES/STUFF

Resident Tracey Gaskell, who has just moved to the area, says the quarry will throw her future into question.

That trepidation evaporated in the face of the community's resolve that the development will not happen without a fight.

The construction company wants to use the 170ha parcel of land for up to 40 years so it can supply aggregate for Christchurch infrastructure projects, arguing a new quarry is needed to replace other depleted sites and that Templeton is the ideal location.
Construction company Fulton Hogan plans to develop a quarry on the age of Templeton.

Residents are horrified at having it right on their doorsteps, worried about the health implications of dust and noise, the effect on water supplies, an increase in traffic and the potential impact on house prices.

Many spoke at the meeting to vent their concerns, some angry and others on the verge of tears.

John Gale, who lives on Roydon Drive, said: "The reason we don't want the quarry is not that we don't want the business and commerce activity on our doorstep, we are concerned about our health, our children's health, our older persons' health."
Around 500 residents gathered at a meeting in Templeton on Monday to discuss plans for how they will fight the proposal. Many are worried about the potential impact on health, traffic, water quality and house prices.

Denis and Dorothy Alfeld, 87 and 85, possibly Templeton’s oldest residents, have spent all of their 64 years of marriage in the town.

Denis, who worked the nearby fields his whole life, said: “I think all this good ground that they’re going to dig up, why don’t they go to Mcleans Island or somewhere like that, instead of ruining a great little township.”

Tracey Gaskell, who is moving with her family to a Maddisons Rd home they have spent four years planning, said the quarry has upended their future.
Denis and Dorothy Alfeld, who have lived in the area for more than 70 years, say the quarry would ruin a 'great little township'.

She said: "It's taken us quite a bit to get our head around, which is why we're so passionate about putting in a submission against it - for our children and their future."

Another woman, a horse trainer who has lived on Dawsons Rd for 60 years, said Fulton Hogan's resources and sustainability manager Don Chittock advised her to "plant trees" around her track to protect against dust. She said: "For us it means the end of our business."

Some were concerned quarrying activity could contaminate water and leave residents having to buy bottled water, others worried about noise and danger from traffic, with fears 500 trucks could rumble around nearby roads every day.

Proposed quarry site a concern for Templeton residents.
Residents are concerned about the health implications of a proposed new quarry to be developed on the outskirts of Templeton. Construction firm Fulton Hogan says it is essential to have a supply of aggregate close to the city to keep costs low.
Mel Himin, secretary of the Templeton Residents Association (TRA), which is leading the campaign against the development, said: "We are half-country, half-city (in Templeton), and that's really special. We don't want to be half-city, quarry."

There was a small victory when Fulton Hogan informed the TRA it has agreed for its application to be publicly notified, meaning residents can lodge objections and have their say.

Confirming the plan in a letter to the TRA, Chittock said: "We would like to sit down with you and representatives from the community to listen to your concerns and to share some of our early thinking about our plans for the proposed quarry site."

Squires / Stuff
Residents queued to air their concerns to Environment Canterbury, Selwyn District Council and Christchurch City Council officials.

That relief was immediately thrown into doubt when it emerged the day after the letter was sent to the TRA, Fulton Hogan managers told community leaders in neighbouring Weedons they had not made a decision on the issue of public notification.

The developer says it will not submit its application until at least May, giving residents time to marshal their crusade.

Once the application is lodged with Environment Canterbury and Selwyn District Council (SDC), interested parties will have a month to lodge submissions in support or objection.

Megen McKay, a lawyer and TRA committee member, said: "The main things we will be putting into our submission are how does the Dawsons Rd quarry site affect our health, our safety and our current way of living."
A panel of commissioners - independent experts - will consider the submissions and application and either grant it with a range of conditions or decline it.

Officials patiently explained the process to residents and attempted to allay fears over the process.

Tim Harris, environmental services manager at SDC, said if the quarry at Templeton is approved it would likely open in stages, while ECan consents adviser Dr Philip Burge said Fulton Hogan would have to provide assessments on any potential impact on groundwater.

There were mutterings of discontent when people were told that, despite ECan being legally obliged to monitor any possible breaches of consent conditions, residents would be asked to help police Fulton Hogan's activities themselves - though McKay said the developer should pay for monitoring from its reported $168.3m profit last year.

There were boos and jeers when it was alleged the Christchurch City Council owns a tranche of land opposite the site and has granted Fulton Hogan exploration rights, something resource consents manager John Higgins promised to get to the bottom of.

The TRA will now ask representatives from the company to attend a community meeting and explain their plans directly to residents.

McKay said: "Our preference would be to ask Fulton Hogan to come here and give full disclosure of their application and all of their expert information before they submit it to council.

"It's a big ask, but we will ask."

Residents are now being asked to dig into their pockets to help fund their campaign, which could stretch to at least tens of thousands of dollars.

TRA chairman Garry Kilday said: "Six months ago we were worried about dog poop in the park."

"The health effect of this quarry I don't believe can be underestimated. Nobody so far has been able to give us an absolutely conclusive guarantee that silica dust does not harm you.

"If they can't give us that guarantee, I don't believe Fulton Hogan morally put it there.

"But there's nothing legally to stop them, so right now we are the only dam in the works."

Stuff
Rapid quarry expansion leaves Christchurch neighbours feeling surrounded

Charlie Mitchell18:10, Mar 28 2017

A flurry of consents granted for quarrying beside homes northwest of Christchurch has been described as "ludicrous" and unlike anywhere else in the world.

It reflects tension between authorities and residents about the growing presence of quarries on the city’s fringe, fuelled by high demand for aggregate to use in the rebuild.

Half a dozen quarries have been rubber-stamped in three years in one area alone, effectively surrounding a group of houses.
Quarries will soon surround homes near McLeans Island. Nearly all have been consented since 2013.

In some cases, proposed quarries are within 40 metres of a neighbouring property’s boundary. The Ministry for the Environment recommends a setback distance of 250m as best practice.

A group of Old West Coast Rd residents have for several years complained about dust from a nearby quarry.

The same area in 2010, where one quarry was consented.
Recent tests showed the dust contained crystalline silica, a substance which over a long term can cause silicosis, a fatal disease.

Some of the residents have since opted to wear masks while outside on their properties.

The long term levels of silica will be monitored by Environment Canterbury (ECan). While doing that testing, ECan has told the quarry that no dust at all may leave the boundary as a precautionary measure.

Anna and Neil Youngman wear face masks when moving around their Christchurch property because of dust from a nearby quarry.

It is far from the only situation in Christchurch where homeowners have battled a neighbour quarry.

In one area near McLeans Island, at least seven quarries have been granted resource consent since 2010, covering a combined area of around 350ha – twice the size of Hagley Park.

Some houses will be all but surrounded by the quarries, which are in various stages of completion. At least one has been appealed to the Environment Court.

In 2010, before the earthquakes, there was just one quarry in the area.

The Yaldhurst Rural Residents Association is calling for a moratorium on new quarry consents until issues with residents can be sorted out.

The Old West Coast Rd residents had gained acknowledgment for their plight because they had been persistent, but similar issues happened elsewhere, chairwoman Sara Harnett Kikstra said.

"Because that group of residents has been so persistent as far as ECan and council goes, they've got something done," she said.

"It's just ludicrous the way they are allowing quarries to be so close to residents, which is contrary to anywhere else."

Rules in the Christchurch district plan allow for quarrying in the rural urban fringe zone around Yaldhurst, which largely comprises lifestyle blocks and small farms.
They can be given resource consent on the condition they mitigate their effects, but neighbours closest to quarries say mitigation is impossible when they are so close.

Quarries have long resisted moving further away from urban areas, arguing it would increase costs.

The Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) said ECan's decision to more strictly restrict dust from the Winstone quarry was unnecessary.

It acknowledged that respirable crystalline silica was a risk, but one that was well regulated.

"For ECan to now announce a 'no tolerance' approach to any dust of any kind beyond a quarry boundary just beggars belief," AQA chairman Brian Roche said.

"We welcome a comprehensive air monitoring programme to determine what is in any dust. We are also more than happy to work with the authorities to improve dust control.

"But a sudden blanket ban on any dust could have enormous ramifications for our economy and society if it is allowed to develop."

The greatest risk of substances such as silica was to quarry staff, and he was not aware of any particular health concerns among quarries.

ECan said that limiting dust beyond the boundary of the Winstone quarry was a precautionary measure while testing was undertaken.

It would take up to a year for the testing to be completed, and likely involve testing around other quarries.

The results would show if the dust's silica levels posed a long term health risk to residents, and any action taken after that would depend on the results, senior manager service delivery Brett Aldridge said.

"The aim of the monitoring is to determine if there's a quantity of crystalline silica crossing the boundary that is likely to be harmful to health," he said.

"Because the Winstone quarry is known to be dusty and because the the residents nearby have been complaining [about the dust] for so long, the testing will be done there."

Any long term implications for the quarries could not be known until the results of the tests were determined.

New quarries near McLeans Island:

Harewood Gravels: 45ha, granted July 2010.

Fulton Hogan and KB Contracting & Quarries: 165ha, granted October 2013.


Isaac Conservation Trustees: 92ha, granted May 2016.

Frews Quarries: 27ha, granted August 2016.

Stuff
Attachment 7 - Community survey results

Q6 What are your major concerns? Tick all those that apply

Answered: 124   Skipped: 0

- Dust
- Health and Wellbeing
- House Values
- Traffic
- Noise
- Effects on business
- Safety of Roads
- Water contamination
- Well contamination
- Amenity value (The quality
  of life)
- Other (please specify)
Summary Analysis of Survey Monkey

Q1. Where do you live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Templeton</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of Templeton but affected by the proposed quarry</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two “Other” responses:
“Newtons Road, West Melton”
“Outer Chch - Drive past your awful anti-quarry signs daily”

Q2. If you live in Templeton, how long have you lived here?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>29.03%</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please state in years:</td>
<td>70.97%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 88 responses that stated how many years, the average was 13.5 and the median was 10 years.
Q3. If you live in Templeton, why did you choose to live here?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please state your reasons:</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 89 who stated a reason,

About two-thirds included comments about living near the country/semi-rural location/quiet
About one-third included comments about nice community/people/place to raise children or retire

Others reasons included:
House price
Born here
Moved here for work
Amenities
Less polluted than in town
Close to work
Affordable/nice housing
Safety
Friends/family in the area

Q4 If you live outside of Templeton but are affected by the proposed quarry, how long have you been living here?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please state in years:</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 36 responses that stated how many years, the average was 13.9 and the median was 12.5 years.
Q5. If you live outside of Templeton but affected by the proposed quarry, why did you choose to live in this area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please State your reasons:</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 36 respondents, the most common answers are:

- Quiet, semi-rural or rural lifestyle
- Community
- To have a farm/lifestyle block
- Schools
Q6. What are your major concerns? Tick all those that apply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dust</td>
<td>92.74% 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>90.32% 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Values</td>
<td>79.03%  98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>91.13% 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>81.45% 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on business</td>
<td>25.81%  32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Roads</td>
<td>87.10% 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water contamination</td>
<td>73.39%  91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well contamination</td>
<td>45.97%  57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity value (The qualities and attributes people value about a place that contribute to 'quality of life' in that place)</td>
<td>75.81%  94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>18.55%  23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses in the “Other” category include:

- Roading (3 responses), destroying a community (3), general disruption (1), child safety (1), being disrespectful to FH, noise (2), amenity, water, stifling future growth, environmental damage, profits over people (2), reducing house prices, the thought of it, the RMA is flawed, community mental state, and response unclear (2).

Q7. With respect to the areas ticked above - please state your concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dust</td>
<td>95.58% 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>92.04% 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Value</td>
<td>83.19%  94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>95.58% 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>89.38% 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on business</td>
<td>43.36%  49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Roads</td>
<td>81.42%  92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water contamination</td>
<td>70.80%  80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well contamination</td>
<td>54.87%  62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity value</td>
<td>49.56%  56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Please state</td>
<td>29.20%  33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full commentary is available however comments have been summarised

Summary comments

Dust:
Dust leaving boundaries of quarry and lack of monitoring and compliance
Dust impacting staff, children, and animals and plants – health impacts on already compromised people
Dust containing Silica
Amenity affected due to dust – nuisance dust

Health and Wellbeing:

Mental health affects – whole proposal depressing, effects of stress due to noise, traffic, and decreased quality of life.
Impact/concerns re silica dust as a known carcinogen
Safety on roads
Traffic noise – vibrations impacting those in areas. Sleep disruption due to traffic and thus impacting health of individuals.
Individuals not able to exercise in the area which has been used for recreation
Pollution

House Value:

Property values affected
Peoples investment for the future
Concerns regarding difficulty to see in future
People purchased when no quarry, if quarry goes ahead, residents house value will drop while quarry make millions
Perceived lower attractiveness of area
People are worried regarding price impacts this is of major concern

Traffic:
Safety of the community
Safety of staff, horses, and kids
Damage to roads and loss of rural amenity
Roads not designed for high volume traffic
Roads in area already dangerous
Congestion in the area
Trucks not keeping to designated routes
Increased noise
Roads not wide enough
Increase in trucks will affect how people use area
FH can’t control route of truck drivers

Noise:
Noise related to quarrying activity – crushers, trucks, constant noise an issue
24/hr 7 days week – concerns
Constant noise leading to impact of mental health
People chose to live out of town to escape noise
Impacts on how people use property – eg. Entertaining, enjoyment of outside
Traffic noise a big issue

Effects on Business:
Uncertainty for horse trainers and customers
Produce grown in area -uncertainty for consumers
Effect on livestock
Effects on farming – animals and produce
Organic businesses – still hold organics?

**Safety of Roads:**
Roads not constructed for heavy traffic
Roads are narrow
Cyclist safety
Dangerous intersections already
Unkept roads
Roads already congested
Speed of traffic already an issue
Roads not designed for this amount of heavy trucks
Concerns for children in the area

**Water Contamination:**
Concerns regarding private wells and contamination
Chemicals getting into water table
Dust/dirt into water
Large concern for many
Water overuse causing issues for the area
Seen what has happened in Yaldhurst – no regard for water or reacting to issues there
Leaching
Lack of natural filtering system
Lack of compliance to depth of excavation

**Amenity Value:**
Heavy industrial activity incompatible with rural environment
Homes will not be a great place to live dust, not being able to appreciate the outdoor environment of house
Rural feel destroyed
Special character of area lost
Live in Templeton due to rural amenity – will be lost
Recreational use of area affected

**Other:**
Inappropriate location next to local community
Destroying long established community
Short sighted given growth in the area
Obvious breaches to Treaty of Waitangi

Q8. Will your business/livelihood be affected by the proposed quarry? If yes, please explain
Of the 33 responses, 22 were to do with *lifestyle* rather than *livelihood*.

Of the remaining 11, most were to do with loss of value of property, wells, impacts on farming and horse training.
Attachment 8 - Noise Feedback (Sensitive Receivers)

Do you have concerns regarding noise generated by the proposed quarry and associated activities. If so, what are your concerns and why?

Yes, we have major concerns. Noise from crushing plants, trucks, loaders, diggers, and other machines, including increased road traffic.

My home is 25 metres from the proposed quarry boundary, obviously I am going to be affected by increased noise, in every facet of everyday life. Noise from crushing plants, trucks and other machines, will be unbearable, and constant, which could have negative affects on my health.

I have major concerns about the noise from the quarrying and associated activities. We are only 380 metres from the quarry boundary. That noise is going to have a major affect on our lives. As a directly affected person I do not give my permission for this intrusive activity. There is a major cumulative effect on other noise at our home, and an invasive and unwanted effect on our peaceful rural home in the early mornings and evenings, when our home normally has a peaceful rural environment. The noise level of quarrying activities is well documented and living so close we would be unable to escape that noise. It would affect our whole lives especially our peaceful evenings and nights. We leave our window open for fresh air at night and I am very worried about what lack of sleep would do to my personal wellbeing.

Yes, I work from home and believe the noise will be continuous and unavoidable day and night, It will destroy the ability to enjoy our home.

We are concerned about the noise and the carry across the farmland, in certain wind patterns we can clearly hear the activity on the motorway and the trainline running on the west side of the man south rd. When we add quarry activity, quarry truck movements, lighting etc it has the potential to severely upset the current enjoyment of our property today.

Empty Trucks. The number of trucks, empty trucks rattle and rumble down the road at 80km/hr - this is going to be all day.
Yes, I am expecting the noise levels to increase considerably if the quarry goes ahead. Digging, crushing, trucks coming and going at the quarry - to name a few of the activities that would significantly increase the noise level at our place.

The low volume noise (nuisance or otherwise) that will be in background all the time. This is a lifestyle area and it will no longer be designated as that because of the Quarry operations. We can hear the trains going but this is occasional. We get a lot of traffic noise but hoping this will reduce somewhat with the new Motor Way opening soon. But with the quarry traffic, we may as well forget about noise reduction.

We strongly object any further noise re-quarry especially any more truck movements.

It will disturb my daily routing of meditation practice and will break silence of my property by machines and trucks which will be annoying my ears. I am suffering from hay fever 3-4 months through the year, so, I extremely concern on dust.

Yes - noise from 500 trucks coming and going every day. The noise from making the bunding. The noise from the crushing machines -. The quarry will be operating for half a year full time (or 24 hours a day). We can hear the train at our house.

**Given the proposed quarry is applying for a 7 day a week/24 hr operation (at times), please inform us when you think noise will be a problem for you, and what you would be doing during those times e.g. shift workers that sleep at different times, if you are working at home or are at home most of the day, if your activities at home mean you spend time outdoors, if you have BBQ's/gatherings and socialise outdoors etc..**

We farm the land on 2 sides of the proposed quarry, surely we are entitled to some peace and quiet. Not only us, but our stock...sheep and horses, would be affected, especially around lambing time. We spend most of our time on our property, so to have constant noise next door, would take its toll both mentally and physically.
At 87 years old, and having lived on Maddisons Road for nearly 60 years, I feel I have the right to some peace and quiet in retirement, when outside in my garden, or just everyday activities. When my family, or friends come to visit, surely we have the right to some quiet time.

As above the quarry noise will have a severe detrimental affect on our lives. We enjoy a peaceful rural environment especially in the early mornings, evenings and nights. We enjoy our summer outdoor BBQs with friends and family. We also enjoy sleeping peacefully sleeping with our window open for fresh air. The quarry noise will have a major effect on our wellbeing.

The noise from the crushers, conveyors, loaders, trucks and other associated noise is more than minor. As a directly affected person I do not give my permission for this quarry to go ahead.

All the time, as I work from home and home most of the time. Additionally we are close proximity and bedrooms are located on the quarry side of our property this will most definitely damage our sleep and ability to work.

As we work from home and spend considerable time outside on the property noise and truck movements are a serious concern. Ruapuna Raceway is an example of unacceptable levels of noise, and this only operates spasmodically.

We farm. So we are outside most days. In the weekend we are always outside and we love to garden in the tranquillity of the countryside. My husband works from home. I study from home during the day and in the weekend. We would like to have deer on our farm, but we could not enter that idea with truck noise. We have a large outside area and we love to entertain looking out to the Alps and the Porthills from outside our house, which is piece, relaxing and quiet and our friends and family enjoying visiting us for this reason.

Noise will be an issue all of the time. We live in a single glazed home within 500 metres of the proposed quarry site. I work from home mostly so am at home alot. When not working, I am usually outside maintaining our property and tending to our animals.
Definitely, any gathering we have will be impacted by noise from the quarry. The noise will be a problem all the time. There will be no peace and quite. The only option we will have is to get used to the noise, like residents beside a motor way or train station have to do. But is this the reason for us to choose 342 Maddisons Road as our home? The answer is a definite NO. We opted for our proposed home for peace and quite and this quarry proposal has been very unsettling for the whole family. Our home and all the residents in the area have been here for a long time and Quarry coming in and disturbing all our peace and quite is absolutely unreasonable. We, the community being the residents of the area FIRST, our concerns should be heard and given priority over the proposal for the quarry.

Noise will be a problem 24/7

I work at home. I spend most of my time in my garden by doing many different activities such as planting and tidy up the garden.

At those times that if operates at night we won’t be able to sleep. I am a horticulturalist so I work on the property during the day. I work in nursery production.
The company is concerned no one will want to buy their property. (Photo / Getty) A proposed Templeton Quarry would cost a racing stables their life-long business.

Construction giant Fulton Hogan has plans to build a 170 hectare quarry on Dawsons Road in the Selwyn District. More than 25 horse owners, breeders and trainers would be directly affected.

Racing stable owner Sandi Curtin says their training track runs right along the road and there's no way owners could leave their horses to be trained if they can't guarantee their safety.

She says with 500 trucks a day down the road, it would just be a matter of when - not if - there was an accident that killed or injured a horse or trainer.

Curtin says Fulton Hogan agree it would be the end of their business if the quarry goes ahead.
They are worried that, with safety and dust issues, their property wouldn't be worth anything and no one will want to train there or buy it.

"Incredibly stressful. Just constantly it's something you think of from the minute you wake up till when you try and sleep at night. My husband and his family, 55 years they've trained here and at our age where do you go from here? How do you start a new business."

Curtain says they have staff and families relying on them for their income too.