

From:
To: [Hearings](#)
Cc: [Edwina White](#)
Subject: Notifications Consent Submission: Group 542
Date: Saturday, 16 May 2020 4:30:37 PM

Group ID: 542

Consent name: Bathurst Coal Limited

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

Name: Sharyn Barclay

Care of: Many Cantabrians

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 | WANT to be heard | WILL consider a joint hearing
- CRC200500: oppose | WANT to be heard | WILL consider a joint hearing
- CRC201366: oppose | WANT to be heard | WILL consider a joint hearing
- CRC201367: oppose | WANT to be heard | WILL consider a joint hearing
- CRC201368: oppose | WANT to be heard | WILL consider a joint hearing
- CRC203016: oppose | WANT to be heard | WILL consider a joint hearing
- RC185622: oppose | WANT to be heard | WILL consider a joint hearing

Reasons comment:

I oppose all applications for resource consents allowing expansion of operation of the

Canterbury Coal Mine. In light of the current global climate and ecological emergencies, I believe any response other than refusal of resource consents to be an immoral and harmful act. Allowing consents to Bathurst Resources would be counter to regional council commitment to act on its climate emergency declaration in all of its activities. Ignoring climate change under the provisions of the Resource Management Act (RMA) does not recognise current review by the Environment Select Committee (ESC). RMA changes recommended by the ESC are likely to be enshrined once applied for consents are in place so ignoring these changes is wilfully anti-science and does not reflect the global peril faced due to climate breakdown. It is not up for debate regarding the role of this fossil fuel as the worst contributor to global emissions per comparable unit burnt. As a developed nation esteemed for level-headed response to environmental and social inequities (think women's votes, NZ's nuclear free legislation, an anti-apartheid stance, welfare ...) NZ is morally beholden to phase out coal mining as a first-line action towards meeting our zero carbon Paris Agreement commitments. As a nation, we have already committed to the banning of all offshore oil drilling, so it seems ludicrous to be continuing, and even entertaining expansion, of the unequivocally destructive practice of coal mining. Coal per se is environmentally destructive because of global warming from carbon release. The coal from the Canterbury mine is low-grade sub-bituminous thermal coal. As such, its destiny further exacerbates its harmful effects. Use in school boilers gives this coal a plain and simple air pollutant label, effecting younger generation members without the power to say 'no'. This mine also supplies milk drying boilers at the Synlait and Fonterra factories. So, this coal is not only a pollutant in its own right, it is being used to support the industrial farming model of dairying so unsuited to the Canterbury plains. Methane emissions from dairy cows, topped off by carbon emissions from drying milk, is a dirty duo. This double emission source drastically needs redress via regenerative agriculture and other practices which do not harm the environment. I further oppose Bathurst's application on the grounds that it will endanger the kowaro (or Canterbury mudfish). The Canterbury Coal Mine have applied to discharge into water (waterways with habitat for mudfish) and at the same time are supporting intensive dairying which further pollutes our drinking water and rivers. Another double whammy that begs consent refusal. It is well known that there is now only a small percentage of natural habitat left, especially in low lying areas (see <https://www.pce.parliament.nz/media/1666/the-state-of-new-zealand-s-environment.pdf>). Aerial photography of the mine area shows starkly the negative landscape effects of the operation. This area of the Malvern Hills would be ideal for forest walkers wishing to immerse themselves in nature. The presence of the Canterbury Coal Mine removes the amenity value of this area on the doorstep of a major NZ city. Unfortunately discharge application to water and air increase the effective footprint of the mine exponentially. The interconnectedness of natural systems is especially highlighted when considering water, highly valued by Cantabrians. The mine has applied to discharge to groundwater, and, as previously said, the Canterbury Coal Mine provides continued support to industrial dairying which leaks nitrates into the aquifers below the Canterbury plains and other harmful pollutants into waterways; both of which negatively impact drinking water and swimming water in the region. Approval of consents impacts value of a resource seemingly unrelated to the core substance being extracted. Intangible amenity values (including use of forested areas for recreation, downstream effects on water quality for swimmers, clean unsullied air to breathe both locally and globally, encouraging biodiversity as a resilience factor in a changing world ... the list goes on) as well as the visual amenity effect of forested hills as opposed to a gaping open mine, are further reasons to deny the applications. Bathurst Resources chief executive Richard Tacon said rehabilitation is always ongoing, however visual aerial photography does not show this. Why would the claims of a company which has flagrantly breached resource consent conditions in the past, be believed? It is noted that SDC has identified the impact of noise and dust, pollution of local waterways, landscape effects and overall amenity values as being more than minor. Friends of mine own a small farm on Bush Gully Road and report

issues related to constant heavy truck use. Apparently, a common gripe when conversing with locals, noise and dust issues exacerbate and point the finger of causation where local waterways, once teeming with life, are now polluted and dead. Bathurst Resources has repeatedly failed to provide the required information on issues considered more than minor. I put it to you that this failure is an admission of knowledge of negative impact. Instead of spending money to expand operations, Bathurst Mining would be advised to recognise the sunset nature of their mining ventures and spend money on retraining of workforce. There is substantial commitment to land, water and air reparations as a result of past consents; ECan and SDC are urged to see to these conditions before considering further consents. For a company which has knowingly flouted discharge consents repeatedly in the past, the fulfilment of reparation commitments is questionable and requires examination. Companies such as Bathurst Resources have no place in a decarbonised economy unless their operations shift drastically from extraction to restoration and regeneration. In a political environment which across-the-board recognises the need to reduce emissions globally, beginning at a local level is imperative and need not wait for central Government mandate.

Consent comment:

As democratic representatives of the people of Canterbury (and Selwyn in particular) I urge you to refuse consents allowing expansion of the Canterbury Coal Mine