

**From:**  
**To:** [Hearings](#)  
**Cc:** [Edwina White](#)  
**Subject:** Notifications Consent Submission: Group 542  
**Date:** Monday, 18 May 2020 4:42:47 PM  
**Attachments:** [Bathhurst-submission.docx](#)

---

**Group ID: 542**

**Consent name:** Bathurst Coal Limited

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

**Name:** Michael Glover

**Care of:** Mike Glover

**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:** No

**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:**

The adverse effects of expanded coal mining to the environment in an already degraded catchment The interconnectedness of the Selwyn catchment and the risk of contaminating the whole catchment The likelihood of Bathurst breaching any further resource consents given The lack of accountability for any long term damage to people or the environment The absurdity of allowing coal mining and its carbon dioxide emissions in a climate emergency

---

**Consent comment:**

To refuse all the resource consents requested by Bathurst

## **Bathurst Mining Expansion Submission**

I was shocked to see that the original consent to mine coal was for 20,000T per annum and that these new consents are to retrospectively allow the 100,000T they have been extracting in breach of the original amount PLUS they want another 85,000T – to bring it to 185,000T per annum. This is a massive amount of extraction and nearly 10 times more than the original consent. To allow a business a retrospective consent in a very polluting industry sets an unbelievably bad precedent for other businesses.

The applications are seeking to discharge contaminants into the Tara and Bush Gully streams, tributaries of the Waianiwhi river which eventually join the Waikirikiri/Selwyn River near Coalgate. This is at the top of a highly degraded catchment with the Waikirikiri/Selwyn River running down into the even more polluted Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere. Much time, energy and money has been spent trying to understand, regulate and clean up the pollution and much more is needed. To allow the expansion of this mine and the real danger it poses to add acid mine pollution to the catchment seems an awfully bad folly and will only exacerbate the degradation that is already taking place.

As well as being part of the Waikirikiri/Selwyn catchment the Tara and Bush Gully streams are home to NZ's most threatened freshwater fish, the Canterbury mudfish and as such should be protected from the risks posed by these consents. In November 2019 Bathurst was convicted and fined \$18,000 after pleading guilty to an illegal discharge into the Bush Gully Stream. In the sentencing decision, the judge commented that "the offending took place in a vulnerable environment which is a highly important habitat of a nationally threatened species" and that "there is a high degree of culpability on Bathurst." What guarantees do we have that this company, which has already breached its current conditions many times and has been convicted once already, will not continue breaching its conditions?

Living as I do near the Selwyn River near Springston I know full well the effects of contaminants in our drinking water - the level of dissolved nitrate in my own drinking well has increased 1000% in the last 8 years. The Central Plains Water scheme has a consent to discharge nearly 1000T of Nitrate per annum into the Selwyn environment – this can only increase the amount of nitrate in my drinking water - but there is no accountability in their Resource Consent for the health risks and financial effects of ensuring clean water for me or my family. The same applies to these requested consents – Bathurst are not held responsible for the long- term effects of acid mine contaminants on people through their drinking water or on ecology and the environment.

Under current Ecan rules farmers have been made to limit nitrate pollution into our groundwater. This has caused financial hardship for some but is seen as a necessary action to try and limit the nitrate pollution – pollution which filters through groundwater and into our streams and rivers. So, we should also limit the pollution by this business and not allow them to increase the number of contaminants entering our environment even if it affects its business and other businesses financially in the short term. In the long term the health of the Selwyn Environment and its people is most important.

I support the Te Aromatawai Ahurea/ Cultural Impact Assessment prepared by Boffa Miskell and endorse their recommendations in Appendix A regarding the current granted consent, while still opposing the new consents request. The Ngai Tahu concept of 'Ki uta ki tai', translated as 'from the mountains to the sea' is a philosophy of interconnectedness which resonates with this Pakeha who may live 50kms from the mine site but who may yet be affected by the unforeseen negative consequences of its mining activity.



I see on the Ecan website the actions that have been taken to reduce the carbon footprint of the organisation and so in some way combat climate change for the good of the people who live here. So, it would seem implausible that Ecan would support a highly polluting industry like coal extraction/ burning in Canterbury being allowed to increase in these climate crisis times. How many tonnes of carbon dioxide will this business add to the atmosphere over the time they have requested? In May 2019, only one year ago, Ecan declared a climate emergency. Surely, it is time to start saying NO to these climate-warming industries. The long- term financial havoc of runaway climate change far outweighs the short-term monetary gains from having such businesses in an economy. The ongoing climate change rallies around NZ and the world show that people want action. I ask that these applications be declined for the good of the Canterbury people and the next generations.