



## FORM520: SUBMISSION ON RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATIONS

SECTION 96 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT (RMA) 1991

TO: Consents Hearings  
Environment Canterbury  
PO Box 345  
Christchurch 8140

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

OR: Email: [hearings@ecan.govt.nz](mailto:hearings@ecan.govt.nz)

OR: submit by completing an on-line form at:  
<https://www.ecan.govt.nz/do-it-online/resource-consents/notifications-and-submissions/notified-consents/>.



**SUBMISSIONS CLOSE: 5.00pm FRIDAY 27 NOVEMBER 2020**

### A. PERSON/GROUP/ORGANISATION MAKING SUBMISSION

Full name of submitter:

BRETT LEA

Postal address for Service:

Postcode:

Contact Phone:

Private:

Work:

Cell:

Email Address:

Contact Person:

Information about this resource consent process, including any details relating to a hearing will be sent via email

☐: - Please tick this box if you do not wish to receive communications via email.

Name of applicant:

**TAGGART EARTHMOVING LIMITED**

Site Address:

**RANGIORA RACECOURSE, 309 WEST BELT, RANGIORA**

#### 1. Applications to: Canterbury Regional Council

☒ CRC204106 – land use to excavate

☒ CRC204107 discharge contaminants to air

☐ CRC204143 - discharge contaminants to land

☐ CRC211629 – water permit

☐ I/We support the above application

☒ I/We oppose the above application

☐ I/We are neutral to the application(neither support or oppose)

#### 2. Applications to: Waimakariri District Council

☒ RC205104 – land use to establish, maintain and operate an aggregate quarry

☐ I/We support the above application

☒ I/We oppose the above application

☐ I/We are neutral to the application(neither support or oppose)



3. The specific parts of the application that my/our submission relates to are: *(detail the specific activities or effects)*

IN RELATION TO DUST AND NOISE.

4. The reasons for making my/our submission are: *(state in summary the nature of your submission, giving reasons)*

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

5. I/we wish the consent authority to make the following decision: *(give details, including the general nature of any conditions sought.)*

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

Brett Lea

27/11/2020 15:37

## Taggart - Quarry Proposal

To

Submission 3 Specifics, In relation to Dust and Noise,

Submission 4 ,Reasons

It is wrong of Taggarts with the support of the racecourse to try to impose the operations of a quarry on the 175 homes and the holiday park ( within a 650mtr radius of the eastern end of of the racetrack ) that will be adversely affected by this proposal.

Experience has shown that the monitoring of any conditions put on the applicant , ultimately falls on local property owners , simply because when they are affected it is down to them to do something about it !!

This is recognised in one of the reports with the suggestion that ' there be a complaint register held by the quarry manager '

This is not something that we should have hoisted upon us, we have a reasonable expectation to be able to continue to enjoy our sub- division without any possible negative effects from having a Quarry next door .

As an owner of a property likely to be adversely affected by both noise and dust despite the best intentions and mitigation measures undertaken by the applicant assuming they will adopt all of the measures suggested by 1, Marshall Day Acoustics and 2 ,the PDP Air Quality Impact Assessment .

Having lived at our current address 17 Sandown Blvd ( next to Arlington shops ) for 8 years we know from experience not hypothetical calculations that in north to north west winds which occur frequently that not only can we hear quite clearly the race caller but even the horses hooves on the track !!!

We can tolerate the racecourse activity because of its relatively short duration but the continuous noise of machinery operating and the subsequent dust is not something we want or should have to contemplate .

As Grandparents and property owners we also have real concerns for both our health and that of the children attending Annabel's on the corner opposite, it is distressing to think that we may be only an oversight away from having to deal with a dust issue, and it is not ok to say there is a complaint procedure in place after the event, ie water tanker truck driver off sick so rest of the team decide they can get away with operating as per normal.

I would assume these issues are a major concern for Annabels in terms of their future viability .

Submission 5 Decisions

We would like all of the consent applications for the quarry to be declined because of the likely negative impacts it will have on the 175 neighbouring properties , mitigation measures are only as good as the people operating the quarry and over time it can be shown that people can become relaxed about applying mitigation measures, which in this case will have an immediate detrimental impact on the local population.

If the consents were to be given , I would like to see all of the mitigation procedures recommended by the consultants to be implemented and where applicable to at least match those conditions recently included at the Fulton Hogan , Roydon Quarry site in Templeton.

Additionally, if the noise from the operation proves to be greater than is anticipated south of the racecourse that bunds should also be allowed for to run from the southern end of both the east and west bunds across to the grandstand .

I wish to talk to this submission at the hearing.

Thank you

Brett Lea.



6. ☒ I/we **do** wish to be heard in support of my/our submission\*

(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 **do not** 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 Councils.)

7. ☐ I/we **am/are** a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991.

I/We am/am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that a) adversely affects the environment; and  
b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

8. I/we **request**, pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, that you delegate your functions, powers and duties to hear and decide the application to 1 or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority. ☒ Yes ☐ No

Signature

BRETT LEA

26/11/2020.

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. Please be aware that third parties may request a copy of submissions received and that request is subject to the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.
4. If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in Part 11A of the Resource Management Act 1991.
5. If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners. You may not make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991 in relation to an application for a coastal permit to carry out an activity that a regional coastal plan describes as a restricted coastal activity.
6. Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):
  - a. it is frivolous or vexatious;
  - b. it discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
  - c. it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
  - d. it contains offensive language;
  - e. it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.