

**From:**  
**To:** [Hearings](#)  
**Cc:** [Edwina White](#)  
**Subject:** Notifications Consent Submission: Group 542  
**Date:** Monday, 18 May 2020 11:36:57 AM

---

**Group ID: 542**

**Consent name:** Bathurst Coal Limited

**Consent number:** CRC184166, CRC200500, CRC201366, CRC201367, CRC201368, CRC203016, RC185622

**Name:** Matthew Adams-Richardson

**Care of:** Matthew Adams-Richardson

**Mailing address 1:**

**Mailing address 2:**

**Suburb:**

**Town/City:**

**Post-code**

**Country:**

**Mobile phone:**

**Work phone:**

**Home phone:**

**Email**

**Contact by email:** Yes

**Is a trade competitor:** No

**Directly affected:** Yes

**Consent support/hearing details**

- CRC184166: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing
- CRC200500: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing
- CRC201366: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing
- CRC201367: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing
- CRC201368: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing
- CRC203016: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing
- RC185622: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing

---

**Reasons comment:**

The reasons why I oppose this project are many fold. The emissions produced by digging

up this coal will be substantial and the economic benefit from forward projections for coal are shaky at best. Many financial institutions no longer lend to coal producers on the basis of the uncertainty of the commodity prices heading into the future and given the plummeting costs of oil and gas and their likely suppression for the coming decade as major players attempt to pin off parts of the market against other major producers, the viability of the project will be questionable. Many of these projects tend to overpromise and under deliver when referring to how many jobs it will directly and indirectly create and there is a long line of mining projects which have fallen into this category here in New Zealand and abroad in places like Australia. The carbon emissions from this project will be large, with proven and accepted science suggesting real environmental damage resulting from these emissions. The coal that produces these emissions is unnecessary and inefficient, even when compared to other forms of fossil fuels and works directly against our international obligations to reduce our carbon output. All of this, while offering no actual substitute to offset the actual emissions, offering instead small token gestures of partially reducing the carbon footprint as a means of trying to sweeten a deal they cannot actually viably offset. Then there are further issues such as public safety with extra trucks and traffic on these roads, additional road wear and usage from these activities, the site being an eyesore, potential issues that could happen with soil contamination or run off, pit flooding issues, increased propensity for work health and safety related issues if the pit proceeds and numerous other activities. All of these come at a cost for the local ratepayers and taxpayers of New Zealand. I am not against mining. Indeed, I understand that mining is a necessary requirement for modern civilization to have many of the nice things it has. But coal mining, by just about all measures is an obsolete and dying industry and one which will in the long term likely cost more for the citizens and taxpayers of New Zealand to offset the damages from than it shall ever receive in short term gains. We as a society will be forced to pay for the larger costs down stream and trading pennies up front in economic benefits for pounds downstream in economic costs. I urge ECAN to decline this application. It serves no great purpose and the costs involved are simply not worth it for the average Kiwi.

---

**Consent comment:**

Decline all applications and make all environmental bonds in future reflect the true market cost of fully offsetting the carbon emissions for the coal industry so that citizens, ratepayers and taxpayers are not left with this burden to pay for themselves once the site rehabilitation is done and the company have walked away from it all.