## FORM521: SUBMISSION ON AN APPLICATION FOR A RESOURCE CONSENT BY A PERSON ON WHOM NOTICE OF THE APPLICATION HAS BEEN SERVED

SECTION 96 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

TO:

Consents Hearings Environment Canterbury

PO Box 345 Christchurch 8140

Email: hearings@ecan.govt.nz

Ph: (03) 353 9007 Fax: (03) 365 3194

## FOR OFFICE USE ONLY File: CRC193743 CRC193745 CRC193748

Closing Date: 5pm Friday 17 January 2020

## I/We have been limited notified for the consent applications listed below

2901
mail
os)
r

	as per attached
	The standard to be been discounted at any to an above to the standard to the s
	✓I/we do wish to be heard in support of my/our submission*
0.5	Note: this means you wish to speak in support of your submission at the hearing)  If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing ☐ Yes ☐ No
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
[	☐ I/we <b>do not</b> wish to be heard in support of my/our submission
	Note: this means you cannot speak at the hearing, however you will retain your right to appeal any decision to the Environment Court on any decision made by the Council.)
[	☐ I/we am a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991.
1.	//////////////////////////////////////
b	o) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
	10/1/20.
	Signature of submitter or duly authorised agent on behalf of Date

## Notes to the submitter:

- 1. The person making this submission must send a copy to the applicant as soon as reasonably practicable after serving Environment Canterbury
- 2. A list of all submissions received will be provided to the applicant
- 3. Privacy: Please note that submissions are public. Your name and submission (excluding your contact details) will be included in papers that are available to the media and public which may include publication on the Council website. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the notified resource consent process.

As a family with a residential house and business located at 383 Springs Road and 347 Marshs Road we are strongly opposed to this resource consent proposal in its entirety.

We are concerned for the health and well-being of ourselves, family, staff, tenants and our business due to unknown particles being discharged into the air. We are concerned that these unknown and potentially toxic airborne particles will be carried by the prevailing winds towards our business and surrounding areas of Prebbleton, Halswell and Hornby.

- 1. We have onsite 25+ people at any one time and take great care with our health and safety on site, hence we want our staff to feel safe at work. This can be applied to the hundreds of workers at businesses in the near vicinity of the proposed toxic site who although don't live nearby but spend their life working as default sensitive receptors while this plant is operating in there near vicinity and will potentially have their lives affected on a daily/weekly basis from dangerous air particles.
- 2. Noise emissions from the proposed open-air tyre shredding plant and the impact this noise could have daily to our business and property values. The potential toxic dust to the air from this open area that could contaminate our land, thus affecting our land and ultimately the grass that our livestock feed on.
- 3. Water supply for our stock is drawn from our well on site as is our drinking water for family and staff. The potential contamination to this supply either by aerial contamination is a risk we are not prepared to endure.
- 4. Odours from this plant during the processing of toxic waste are of additional concern we have finally received the removal of the Meadow Mushroom plant from our community this additional discharge is not something we need to be subjected too.
- 5. Transport of the waste to the proposed site. We are situated at the intersection of a main thoroughfare that leads to the proposed toxic site and could face an additional risk of a major contamination from unprocessed material to the site due to a road accident.

We are concerned with the potential loss of value to our business and land due to the contamination.

Intensifying operations at an existing site for efficiency and profitability is not a good reason to increase the risk to the community.

The location is totally inappropriate. Any processing plant handling toxic waste including pesticides and herbicides should be at least well away from ANY residences and especially away from an area of growing population.

We would ask that Ecan turn down this application and the applicant look at site selection in an area that is fit for purpose.