BEFORE AN INDEPENDENT HEARING PANEL APPOINTED BY CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL AND SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL

UNDER THE Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER OF Applications by Fulton Hogan Limited for all resource consents necessary to establish, operate, maintain and close an aggregate quarry (Roydon Quarry) between Curraghs, Dawsons, Maddisons and Jones Roads, Templeton

TABLED AT HEARING

Application: ..................................................

Date: ..................................................

JENNIFER ROSS AND MEL HIMIN

Dated: 3 December 2019
1. Hi - I'm Jennifer Ross and this is Mel Himin. We both live in Templeton with our young families. We love living in Templeton. We moved here for the quiet semi-rural lifestyle that the suburb offers. We’re only 10 minutes in either direction to shops in Hornby or Rolleston, but when we’re at home, we get to enjoy a peaceful rural lifestyle – when we’re outside on clear nights, we can hear sheep bleating in the distance, the air is clear and fresh and weekend walks can be on the large grass berms overlooking fields of sheep to the Southern Alps. It’s our slice of paradise. Because we love it here and have chosen to make it our home where we will raise our children. We have invested into the community, such as starting a playgroup and being active members of the Templeton Residents' Association (TRA).

2. We have been heavily involved in the ‘No Quarry’ campaign. This started when I got a knock on my door just before Christmas on the 23rd December 2017 from a worried resident who had received a hamper and a brochure regarding the proposed Roydon quarry. This brochure stated the application was going to be submitted two months later in February. It is fair to say our lives haven’t been the same since. It is us at the end of the TRA email 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, fielding concerns from the community, responding to publicity requests, liaising and dealing with councils & ECAN, political lobbying, fundraising, booking community halls for meetings and sending out email updates. While we’re not here representing the TRA, we wanted to give you this context.

3. So much for the quarry not impacting on people’s lives. It’s not even approved, and it is already a drain on ours, and the community’s, time and energy. The main areas of concern that we are going to cover are the following; noise, dust, traffic, transparency of FH, compliance and importantly for us, the cumulative effects of these impacts. What follows is based on our understanding of the most up to date information. At this point, we want to acknowledge how overwhelming the quantity and complexity of the information involved in this application has been for lay people like us. It has been an enormous task to submit on the proposal and speak here today. Particularly when it feels like the information is constantly changing and, in some instances, where decisions on aspects of the proposal are still to be made (such as the roundabouts and entrances). Although we’re not experts with credentials on the topics being discussed, we are experts on what it is to be a Templeton resident and live in the area. We know what the roads are like, we know why we moved here and what we enjoy about the area.

4. We want to make it clear that we are not against quarrying. We are against quarrying so close to existing homes and communities. We believe that this is the wrong location and disagree with FH’s assessment that this is the most appropriate location and that there is a relative absence of sensitive users/receivers.

5. Before we address the obvious issues of noise, dust and traffic, we want to address the comments made by Mr Stewart regarding transparency and relationship with the community.

Trust and transparency:
Fulton Hogan want the community to ‘trust’ them, they state that they are committed to the community, and they care. Mr Stewart in his address stated they want to be a trusted neighbour, respectful and transparent in their interactions, and have positive relationships. He also went on to say they tried to be open and transparent with the community from the outset of this project. We believe true engagement and transparency is not turning up a few days before Christmas with a brochure stating...
the application was being filed two months later (Appendix 1). Was it their hope that it would be missed by people in the midst of what is known as the "silly season"?

The truth is true engagement only took place after the community kicked back. Only then was the complexity and scale of the impact upon those nearby and the Templeton community given due recognition.

Also, in initial brochures regarding the proposed quarry, Templeton was in the completely wrong place. We are unsure whether that was out of ignorance or if it was meant to be misleading. (Appendix 1)

In addition, by performing a very quick google search we found 26 of the submissions in support of the proposed quarry are from FH employees/and Families (Appendix 2). I would ask if this fosters the trusting and transparent relationship that FH claim they desire with our community. This makes this process and information we receive as a community hard to trust.

6. Noise:
We shifted here knowing the current noise environment - traffic, trains, aeroplanes and Ruapuna when it's running. We don't believe that because of this we should somehow become a dumping ground and accepting of any new endeavour that creates noise. The current noise environment is very intermittent; none of them are constant. But the noise generated by the quarry would be much more consistent and constant – crusher noise, average of 800 truck movements a day.

We know empty trucks rattle loudly as they bounce along the roads and we are concerned that codes of practice that may be put in place to deal with this, can easily be ignored and are not easily enforceable by Fulton Hogan. Further, while there is already truck noise existing in the area, this comes in troughs and peaks and we currently experience long lulls in that noise. Given the number of indicated truck movements we believe that this noise will become close to, if not constant.

7. Traffic:
There has been a lot of talk regarding the effects of traffic and truck movements. Everyone who lives in the area knows how treacherous the roads are. The width, the random stop signs, the speed at which road users travel, the bolshiness of truck drivers as they move about the narrow roads, and the fear as you get pushed into the uneven berms on the side of the road. An increase in truck movements on Jones Road (and the surrounding roads) will exacerbate the problem and without doubt will result in more dangerous roads. The proposed roundabout solutions, queue management plans, and codes of conduct seem insufficient in terms of the size of the problem.

Specifically, regarding the codes of conduct, I queried a Fulton Hogan employee at the White Tent as to how enforceable these would be. He told me there was very little they could do once they were signed to enforce them. We have real doubts and concerns with traffic and how it can possibly work. How can the existing Jones Road be big enough to expand and put in truck merging lanes? Especially when the road is now bound on one side with the new cycle way. An already busy route, combined with a new cycle way and 800 trucks a day - sounds like a recipe for disaster.
9. Dust:
There are two aspects of dust: nuisance and health effects. The first and more trivial is the nuisance dust. This we will have to bare day-in and day-out for forty years. Dirty washing, dirty windows, dusty surfaces. An annoyance and expense that no one would want to put up with.

10. The second, and of course more concerning are the health impacts. There is unacceptable uncertainty around this. We are told that Templeton is a sufficient distance away from being affected. However, when we see headlines on the news regarding dust travelling to NZ from the Australian bushfires, we can’t understand. We are not dust experts but we do know that dust just does not fall out of the sky at boundaries of properties or 500m. What we think is pertinent to this whole argument are the final comments Alistair Humphreys made in Week 1 of the hearing regarding the unknown public health risk of PM10 and the impact that dust is having on Yaldhurst residents. If the medical officer of health is stating that there is uncertainty, are we to trust the applicants dust expert over him? If there is any doubt surely a conservative decision should be made. This is an application for forty years.

11. Compliance:
If the proposed quarry is consented, our understanding is that concerns that have been raised will be dealt with through conditions. This brings us to our next concern: Will these conditions be complied with and how will compliance be monitored?

12. As our submissions state, our concerns are heightened when we hear ECAN’s Tania Harris saying ECAN does not have sufficient resources to actively monitor the actions of quarries and therefore will rely on the community to act as watch dogs; we have Mark Alexander, a Selwyn District Councillor, saying that Quarry operators are a law unto their own; and MP Amy Adams saying she has no faith in ECAN to monitor conditions. This show both local and central government expressing doubt over the ability of this to be effectively monitored. This does not fill us with confidence that conditions imposed will be adhered to. We haven’t moved to Templeton to monitor quarry operators - this certainly impinges on our and others quality and enjoyment of this area.

The implications of conditions not being adhered to are too large and too risky: water contamination, health implications, traffic accidents, decrease in wellbeing due to noise disturbance, amongst other things.

13. Cumulative Effect:
Throughout the application, we feel that the effects of the quarry have been dealt with on a case by case basis. It seems the experts have simply been box ticking. Checking that the effect will meet the required standards (sometimes they are only just meeting them. We thought a quarry that is going to exceed industry standards would easily blow these requirements out of the water). Regardless, the effects on those surrounding the quarry are being viewed in silos, when in reality that is not how they will be experienced. By the time you take the combined effect of:

- Extra trucks on the roads and the increased danger and stress that poses every time we’re wanting to leave our homes. Congestion, tailbacks and queuing as trucks try to move onto the main road;
- The inconvenience of roads damaged by heavy vehicles using them constantly;
- Potholes, broken roads and then of course the detours while these are fixed over and over again;
- Fear of water contamination;
- Noise from the increased traffic movements;
- Noise from empty rattling trucks;
Lack of compliance and being obliged to help police the compliance;
The ambient dust wreaking havoc, covering our plants, windows, washing and home services;
Eyesore of bunds obscuring the beautiful natural landscape;
Dust impacting our health - potential for bleeding noses, conjunctivitis, persistent coughs, sore throats;
The relentlessness of operations - running from 7am to 8pm, Monday to Saturday.
And of course, the impact of all of these things on our mental health as we process them and their impacts on us and our loved ones.

Individually dealing with one of these things may be OK. However, that’s not what it will be like. This will be constant. Every day and all together. That’s enough to do your head in. And tell me again how this quarry isn’t going to have a significant impact on us? We refute the notion that the cumulative effect of this proposal should not be taken into consideration.

We believe that this is the wrong location. FH gain at the expense of the community, and local businesses.

When I came to listen to the hearing two weeks ago, I was really struck by the lawyer’s files sitting out on the desk. For the lawyers, for Fulton Hogan and the experts, this quarry is just that. It’s something that can be labelled as “Roydon Quarry” and popped back on the shelf at 5pm every day. It can be forgotten about at weekend and heck if you’ve had enough of it for one week, just don’t open the file. For us and those living around it, it’s not like that. This is our lives, there is no 8.30am to 5pm for us. This is what we will live and quite literally breathe for the next forty years – even on our weekends and time to relax. Even if the quarry isn’t running for a day the roads will still be broken, there will still be piles of aggregate and open areas for the wind to come in and whip the dust around. The economic assessment in Fulton Hogan’s initial application commented that FH bear all the risk, not true. Everything we have is tied up in this - our health, our wellbeing and our homes which we’ve worked for. If dust can’t be stopped at the boundary, if all the related noise is not somehow silenced, this will impact our lives. We’re not a diversified business like FH who if this doesn’t work out for, there’s something else they can fall back on. We only have one home and one go at keeping our mental health and well-being intact.

This is why we ask that this application is declined. This is not the right location.
Appendix 1.

Figure 1
Map as shown in brochure (top)
Map showing where Templeton is located (bottom)
Applications and submissions
We are aiming to have an application drafted to submit to the Selwyn District Council and Environment Canterbury in February 2018.

The councils will decide if the resource consents will be publicly notified, which means anyone can make a submission on them.

If the councils then decide a hearing should take place, commissioners will consider the application, listen to evidence for and against it, and hear from people who have made submissions.

If you are making a submission and wish to be able to speak at any potential hearing, you should indicate on your submission that you wish to have the opportunity to present.

If a hearing is to take place, all parties will receive notice at least 10 working days in advance.

Commissioners will consider all information, including written submissions, in making their decision about whether to grant consents.

They will also consider whether any conditions need to be applied to the consents.

For more information on this process, visit
www.selwyn.govt.nz
www.ecan.govt.nz

Figure 2
Information taken from the brochure given to neighbours