

Taggart Earthmoving  
Joint Hearing  
5 May 2021

## HEARING

When close family members shifted from Canterbury to live in South Australia many years ago they asked the locals where they got their shingle from. The response they received came as a bit of a shock, "Shingle? What's shingle??" No shingle rivers anywhere near them, and needless to say no ready supply of shingle/gravel/aggregate as some call it, either. There are parts of New Zealand too where there is a serious lack of this resource.

Locally we have the Ashley River and tons of shingle, a few miles away we have the Waimakariri River with tons and tons of shingle, and there are other rivers in Canterbury where shingle is extracted. As a province we are rich in this natural resource so why is a local firm seeking consent to rip up the local racecourse to extract shingle?? Sometimes we don't realise how lucky we are to have such an abundant supply.

The applicant is required to outline the positive effects of their proposal. I maintain that they are scraping the bottom of the barrel to come up with some worthy and solid reasons which could be categorised as positive. For example, in the application, (page 27) para 3.2.2: The following has been listed:

**"Reducing the need for gravel extraction from rivers."**

Yeah, right! I think we get that!

**"Significance of positive effects" (page 28)**

Reference has been made to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2017, Objective 5.2.1, design and function of development (Entire Region),

**paragraph 1, "Development is located and designed so that it functions in a way that:**

**1. achieves consolidated, well designed and sustainable growth in and around existing urban areas as the primary focus for accommodating the region's growth;....."**

I don't think anyone would view the establishment of a quarry so close to an existing residential development as fitting the description of "well designed". Anything but "well designed" would be my interpretation.

**Paragraph 2** of Objective 5.2.1 of the Regional Policy Statement goes on to state:

**"enables people and communities, including future generations, to provide for their social, economic and cultural well being and health and safety; and which:**

**(a) maintains, and where appropriate, enhances the overall quality of the natural environment of the Canterbury region, including its coastal environment, outstanding natural features and landscapes, and natural values.”**

What exactly does ripping up the racecourse land, including in the middle of the racetrack itself, do to enhance the natural environment? Absolutely nothing. And what does it do for the cultural well being and health and safety of people - nothing, and possibly it may cause harm to people.

I note sub paragraph (i) of paragraph 2 states:

**“avoids conflicts between incompatible activities”**

What could be more incompatible than a quarry next door to an existing residential area??  
The whole thing defies any logic.

For the applicant, the positive effects, can be condensed into the three “c’s” ie “close (ie to Cones Road), convenient, and cost effective. But this should **NOT** be at a cost to the local nearby community – it is a real clash, and conflict of interests.

## **Dust**

There needs to be stringent conditions imposed about dust control. I feel that New Zealand is sometimes a slow learner when it comes to Health and Safety in mines and quarries and that we only learn lessons when something goes wrong. We should be setting the bar high, to look after people living in the area and ensuring that once conditions are set down, these are very closely monitored and follow up action is taken promptly in the event of any problem arising.

My suggestion is the adoption of the recommendations made by Mr Bruce Waddleton, Health Protection Officer, Community & Public Health, Christchurch. (Reference his memo of 11.9.20 addressed to Mr John Mather.) This includes the suggestion that the Victoria Environmental Protection Agency 2013 – Guidelines for recommended separation distances for industrial residual air emissions be applied. However, if experts giving evidence at this hearing suggest even more rigorous standards then I will readily go along with their recommendation(s).

I would like to see the establishment of a Community Liaison Committee to liaise with the company and the community, about dust control and any other concerns which may arise from the quarry – in the event of consents being granted.

## Road Safety

### Hand out the Metro map

I draw to your attention that the Blue bus route has changed since the report contained in the application. The bus now runs in a westerly direction about twice the distance along River Road and turns into West Belt, not Enverton Drive. This revised bus route has been in place for about six months.

I have marked on the map – in orange – a typical trip I take on my bike on the way out to the Ashley Bridge for a ride of a few kilometres north of the bridge. I have lived in Kensington Avenue for 18 years, noted that most of the available vacant land in River Road has now been built on, and see River Road as being the natural northern boundary of the Rangiora township. **A lot of people** exit the northern side of the town via Enverton Drive.

As you turn right onto River Road, the carriageway there is not very wide and with a heavy vehicle going in either direction there is virtually no room for a bike. I then make a left hand turn into Cones Road, and as I'm travelling in a straight line (towards the bridge), the trucks which will be entering and exiting the Taggarts yard will be "crossing my path.

With the best will in the world, the narrowness of the roads and the anticipated increase in the number of heavy vehicles if the quarry is established, it will be dangerous for cyclists in this area. This factor seems to have been completely overlooked in all the reports which appear to be focussed solely on the situation further west along River Road (ie closer to the entrance to the proposed quarry).

I note from the report by Abley that the heavy vehicles from the Taggarts proposed quarry are likely to, generally speaking, operate away from the main commuter traffic times. Well, that is just the very same time the grey brigade are on the move! So an unfortunate mix of grey headed cyclists and a Taggart heavy vehicle every 1 minute 53 seconds – according to page 16 of the Abley report.

I sincerely believe that there is a serious road safety issue here and one which needs to be addressed. There needs to be improvements to the roads and possibly a separate cycle –way for cyclists.

As mentioned earlier we are talking about residents actively travelling along the same route for recreation purposes and intermixing with the heavy traffic. This is not a route just for heavy traffic but a natural outlet from the Rangiora township itself.

By their own calculations the movement of Taggarts vehicles over the short haul distance involved will significantly increase the movement of heavy vehicles in the area so it would not seem unreasonable to me that the company be required to make some contribution towards the cost of upgrading the road(s) and providing safer areas for cyclists.

## **Equipment on site**

The applicant has stated that it is not proposed to process any of the gravel extracted at the Racecourse land and that it will all be transported to the Cones Road site to be processed. Yet I notice on page 55 that a mobile crusher is mentioned.

PDP has suggested a proposed condition (Appendix H) that would list the activities that are authorised at the Racecourse land. I believe that this condition should be extended to include the plant, machinery and vehicles authorised to be at the Racecourse site.

## **Concluding remarks.**

In my view there is little to commend this application from Taggarts but rather issues of considerable concern to many individuals.

I have only made comments on a limited number of issues but many aspects of the application concern me, including the risk of contamination of the groundwater supplies, and flooding. In 1953 there was a significant flood in the Ashley River. I was only a child when our family walked across the Ashley River Bridge from the Loburn side to the Rangiora end of the bridge. It was a frightening experience to witness the extensive floodwaters stretching from the washed out approach at the southern end of the bridge right across towards River Road. The river had breached the stop banks and it was several days before the water subsided and work could begin to reinstate the road and the approach to the bridge.

I am firmly of the opinion that the proposed quarry is the type of activity that is in total conflict with the nearby residential area which has, until now, enjoyed the peace and quiet of a normal urban development.

I note the officer's recommendation to decline all applications and I wholeheartedly concur with her view.

Pat Meyers  
5 May 2021