



CUSTOMER SERVICES	
EC - CHCH	
FILE REF:	
DOCUMENT No.:	
27 NOV 2020	
TIME RECEIVED:	

- ☒ 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)*

Rangiora Racecourse Quarry: Main Application and Assessment of Environmental Effects

Rangiora Racecourse Quarry Appendix B: Quarry and Backfill Management Plan

Rangiora Racecourse Quarry Appendix D: Air Quality Impact Assessment

Rangiora Racecourse Quarry Appendix H: Suggested Resource Consent Conditions

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

4.1 Exposure of suburban Rangiora residents to persistent visible and invisible dust generated by the presence of the quarry and the operational activities. With particular concern for those living in the North West of Rangiora.

4.2 Personal proximity (Belmont Ave) and sensitivity to dust that can lead to asthma attacks. Asthma has been part of my life since childhood triggered by dust and hay-fever. Attacks are less frequent now but I always carry a Ventolin inhaler to avoid a chronic response.

4.3 We have had personal experience of intense dust clouds arising from the construction of the Huntingdon/Sandown subdivision under NW conditions. The area of exposed soil and substrate stockpiles in these constructions would be similar to that of a 2ha quarry excavation. The subdivision was a one-time event, quarry activities are proposed for 15 years. Strong, dry NW winds are a feature of Rangiora climate and can occur at any time of year, particularly in Oct/Nov.

4.4 PDP presented windrose data for the Rangiora Racecourse is suspect as it fails to show any wind in excess of 5m/s from the NE, ENE or E. NIWA data presented by other submissions confirms this is an omission. Winds from this direction are particularly concerning for Lehman's Rd residents and the Rangiora camping ground.

4.5 The PDP documents repeatedly rate the proposed Racecourse Quarry as a 'small' or 'minor' operation, an empiric statement from the authors. A 2ha excavation within 250m of urban housing generating dust, noise and silt-laden groundwater is neither small nor minor. The quarry is a gross imposition on the entire township of Rangiora and extreme to those who innocently and legitimately chose to live in the NW. The prospect of 15 years of operation is abhorrent.

4.6 The principal health risk is from dust that cannot be detected by the human eye, ie, crystalline silica <PM5 micron. These particles cannot be contained by bunds or vegetation and float in the atmosphere like pollen. Breathed into lungs, animal or human, these are not excreted but lodge permanently in tissues. Concentration accrues over time and health consequences are severe and can be life threatening. Worksafe requirements for workers subject to exposure are extreme and this quarry would create respirable crystalline silica continuously for 15 years in close proximity to thousands of Rangiora residents. The wearing of protective equipment around home and property is beyond ridiculous.

4.7 Rest homes, hospital and dementia units and "lifestyle cottages" for the aged are in close proximity to the Rangiora Racecourse. Quarry activities will negatively impact the quality of life for residents of these facilities who had no forewarning of the possibility before taking up residence.

4.8 The proposed bunds and planting would be ineffective in containing dust. NW conditions would effortlessly carry dust particles over 3m or 5m bunds and the proposed extent of the bunds do not offer any protection to any properties in the Arlington subdivision.

4.9 Of particular concern is the sourcing of VENM for backfilling. This material will be required in considerable bulk (2000 tons per day removal requires 2000 tons VENM replacement). Where is this material to be sourced in the volume required and how will Taggart monitor source, purity and dumping conditions.

4.10 The amenity value of racecourse for community activities will be diminished virtually to zero by the excavation and operation of a quarry in the centre and perimeter of the trotting track. It will be both dangerous and unsightly as well as being a persistent source of dust and noise for 15 years.

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

5.1 The only acceptable mitigation is to not operate a quarry in Rangiora Racecourse. The decision of where to quarry for these essential products should ensure it is well away from centres of population and in accord with best international practice backed by science.

5.2 Environment Canterbury does not have a good record of consultation with local residents, (Vis a vis the Cones Rd poplar woodland) and cannot provide constant oversight of quarry operations. The proposal for only periodic review of complaints and data arising for monitoring equipment is totally inadequate.

5.3 The PDP report fails to acknowledge the population of Rangiora, residents are treated as "receptors" for one off events and the duration and recurrence of these events that would persist for at least 15 years is glossed over lightly. We may be seen by engineers as "receptors" but we are fellow human beings.

5.4 The least the Consenting Authority should insist on is a Rangiora Citizens group with oversight of all environmental monitoring data and complaints relevant to the site and quarry operations. To have effect this group should have authority to insist on cessation of operations if agreed conditions are exceeded and for control measures to be activated as and when climatic conditions demand including outside normal hours of quarry operations .

5.5 Would PDP staff purchase and live in a property adjoining Rangiora Racecourse if it was operating a quarry ?

Please attach additional pages if required.

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

Date

23.11.2020