Statement and Evidence of Cara Winks before the Independent Hearing Commissioners appointed
by the Canterbury Regional Council (ECAN) and the Waimakariri District Council (WDC)

In the Matter of the Resource Management Act 1991 and Taggart Earthmoving Limited's application for resource consents to establish a new aggregate quarry at the Rangiora Racecourse located at 309 West Belt, Rangiora.

Introduction:

My name is Cara Winks. I live at 40 Huntingdon Drive adjacent to and very close –(less than 100 meters), to the southern boundary, of the Rangiora Racecourse.

I am a mother of three children, one of whom is asthmatic. I am also a grandmother and currently work as a sales representative in the food industry. I am married to Rex Winks an Irrigation Designer who will also be speaking today.

I am very opposed to this proposal for a quarry at the Rangiora Racecourse and outlined my concerns in a submission to the notified hearing. Today I want to present my evidence in support of my concerns

I have thought very hard about my opposition to the application for a quarry at the racecourse. I have considered this statement very carefully and trust that you will weigh it prudently and responsibly in your deliberations.

My first issue is the risk of contamination of groundwater:

I am aware of the detailed information and evidence from the applicant and the subsequent follow-up reports about this issue.

My particular concern is the continually changing water table level at the proposed quarry site.

I was dismayed to read the report of Mr Taggart – section 24, submitted in response to the S42 report. Mr Taggart notes that most quarrying will be done during Summer and Autumn when the water table will be at its lowest. The land below the proposed quarry is a designated clean water zone and the emergency water supply for Rangiora if there was a failure in the existing supply from Kaiapoi.

I understand that the Ministry of Health has provided information to the NO QUARRY AT THE RACECOURSE Inc. about the need to protect secondary water supplies following recent issues in Hawkes Bay and Karitane and this evidence will be provided to this hearing.

My concern is that mining 1 metre above ground water level is both foolhardy and dangerous when variations in groundwater levels have been identified

I note agreement in the reports associated with this application that mining must be restricted to 1 meter above ground water measure.

I have also noted from reports that the risk to contamination is contested from leaching but the 1 meter above is agreed. My concern is, if at a later date or time a flood or the water table reaches into the fill what is the evidence that this will be a lesser risk for contamination than leaching. The prudent and safe ruling should be no mining below the recorded high water table.

I am also aware of a recent environmental court decision in 2019 - NZ EnvC 153 declining an application, in part, because mining should not go below 0.5 m to the highest ground water level.

I am also privy to an Email provided to John Mather, a local resident, from the Health Protection Officer, Community and Public Health of the Canterbury District health Board. (CPH CDHB) A copy of this Email is attached. The Email reports responses to Ecan from CPH CDHB in relation to a version of the current application.

Two comments are reported – the first is dated 21 December 2018 and reports concerns in relation to small community/public water supplies within 2 km along with their protection zones. CPH CDHB suggest that Figure 10 in this earlier application is incomplete. My concern is - has the CPH CDHB had the opportunity to assess this information beyond 2018 as they requested and if they have where is this referenced?

I am also aware that the CPH CDHB made additional comments to Ecan on 13 March 2019 re potential affects on the Ashley water scheme also seen as a close and potentially affected party. CPH CDHB were advised that the Hurunui District Council manages the Ashley scheme. This information occasioned a recommendation to Ecan that the applicant carries out consultation with the Hurunui District Council assets manager and provides evidence of any mitigation measures proposed as part of the consultation.

Again, I ask was this actioned? what were the outcomes and where are they referenced for my and your consideration?

Secondly - I am very concerned about the rationale for quarrying in the racecourse:

The rationale for using the racecourse as a quarry as outlined in the application is bereft of detail. It appears to be based on the fact that the land is zoned rural and is therefore available for quarrying as outlined on the Canterbury Regional Policy statement (CRPS with a qualification that district councils are directed to avoid reverse sensitivity effects from rural residential development.

That no mention is made of the adjacent urban residential development is negligent.

At the same time the fact of a pre-existing and longstanding use as a horse racing venue is dismissed when there is:

- No analysis of the compatibility of the current use of the land and quarrying;
- No consideration of the requirements of the racing clubs for the health and safety of horses detailed in any of the management plans;
- No analysis that includes the views of trainers, jockeys and drivers who regularly use the racecourse

Thirdly – I am very concerned about dust and do not accept the various assertions in the application or subsequent reports that the amount of dust that will arise beyond the boundary of the race course will be nuisance only, less than minimal and therefore negligible.

Again I refer you to the second page of the aforementioned information from CDHB CPH in relation to their advice to Ecan on this application.

CDHB CPH detail their statutory responsibilities under the Health and Disability Act 2000 and the Health Act 1956 and assert that these complement the purpose of s5 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Following this they detail their concerns about water which I have outlined previously and next focus on dust. They make two recommendations:

1. That continuous monitoring for PM 10 be made a consent requirement. In making this recommendation they cite the DPD Air Quality Assessment s5.3.3; and,
2. That the Victorian Environmental Protection Agency 2013 = Guidelines for industrial residual air emissions be applied to this application.

In relation to recommendation 2 I disagree with the interpretation of these guidelines in the evidence of Chilton and endorsed in the s42 report by Dawson. There is nothing in these guidelines that mentions size of a quarry but there is reference to material respirable crystalline silica (RCS) present. The table then refers to a range of activities including quarrying, stockpiling and conveying of rock. It also refers to two other activities crushing and screening activities.

Nowhere does this table or the text within which it sits indicate that the set back distance recommended requires all the listed activities.

The key issue is the presence of RCS not the size of the quarry or the need for 5 activities. This table should be interpreted in the way it is written as any one (1) or combination of the activities will require a setback of 500 meters.

Finally I want to make a few comments on the way this application was developed with complete disregard for local residents. It made me laugh to read what Mr Taggart said in response to the s42 report about "working together". Having a core value of "working together" is wonderful.

Unfortunately these values are not communicated by words but by actions and our neighbourhood is very angry about the lack of working together or even consideration that has been shown to them in regard to this quarry proposal.

Mr Taggart's assertion that they have good relationships with the community is sadly not reflected in discussions I have been part of recently. Mr Taggart has in fact failed in having any relationship with the community this proposed quarry will affect.

We have been consistently saying that we are not against Taggart's or the Racing Clubs and that we should and must value the contribution they make to our community. This doesn't mean. however, we should support an idea if we think it is wrong and that is exactly what we think this proposal is.

More recently I have read in the North Canterbury News – March 18, 2021 that the proposal for a quarry began with the signing of confidentiality agreement in 2015.

Is this responsible or ethical behaviour when you have a new subdivision being developed? My husband and I would never have contemplated living near a quarry and are angry about not being aware that this could be a possibility when we purchased our property 18 months ago. We were happy with a racecourse and it never entered our thinking that such a recreational amenity could be imagined for a racecourse.

Setting aside the anxiety that has been caused in the North West Rangiora Community about property values, noise and dust I would like to know if anyone can site a 15 year extraction quarry at an operational horse racing venue anywhere else in the world? Not likely. This application is not rational, prudent or sensible.

In closing I ask that you reject this proposal.

Cara Winks

Bruce Waddleton <Bruce.Waddleton@cdhb.health.nz> Fri, Sep 11, 2020 at 8:45 AM

To: "jandhmather@gmail.com" <jandhmather@gmail.com>

Kia Ora John

Further to your letter dated 11 August 2020 and our subsequent discussion on the afternoon of 09 September 2020, regarding the Taggart proposal to quarry the Rangiora Racecourse, I have included below the comments made to Ecan by the CDHB. This hopefully gives you an understanding of the CDHBs position on the matter. I have been informed by Incite that they will be processing the application on behalf of ECan and are expecting to see it by the end of the month. At this point the CDHB will hopefully get the chance to have another look and review the revised application against our original comments made below.

Please let me know if you require any further information.

Regards

Bruce Waddleton

Health Protection Officer

Community & Public Health

310 Manchester Street, PO Box 1475

Tel: 378 6740 Fax: 379 6484

The following comment was made to ECan on the 21 December 2018

> The CDHB has concerns that the current proposal does not adequately assess the potential impacts on the identified small community/public water supplies. In particular, the application seems to be incomplete in that it does not contain figure 10 which should identify all bores within 2 km, along with their protection zones. The CDHB would like the opportunity to assess figure 10 prior to making comment.

Additional comments were then made to ECan on 13 March 2019.

The Canterbury District Health Board's responsibility is to promote the reduction of adverse environmental effects on the health of people and communities and to improve, promote and protect their health pursuant to the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 and the Health Act 1956. This complements the purpose (s5) of the Resource Management Act 1991, to promote the sustainable management of resources in a way which enables communities to provide for their health and safety.

Quarrying has the potential to cause a number of health effects if not managed effectively. The most common symptoms experienced during a period of high dust exposure are irritation to the eyes, ear, nose, throat and upper airways. Small or fine particles (i.e. particles less than 10 µm), can get deeper into the respiratory tract and lungs and may cause breathing-related problems.

The Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB) has a number of concerns in relation to the current application. These are as follows:

Community and Public Health have contacted the Waimakariri District Council assets manager to discuss potential affects on the water supply identified. WDC informed us that Hurunui District Council manage the Ashley scheme.

Recommendation: That the applicant carries out consultation with the Hurunui District Council assets manager and provides evidence of any mitigation measures proposed as part of this consultation.

From the application it is understood that no crushing or screening will take place as part of this activity. The DPD Air Quality Assessment states, under S5.3.3 "Consider undertaking dust deposition monitoring or continuous real time monitoring around the site (as a dust management tool), inthe unlikely event of dust nuisance complaints or visible dust plumes beyond the site boundary.

Recommendation: That continuous monitoring for PM10 be made a consent requirement.

The setbacks from residential properties proposed by the applicant are not consistent with international best practice including the 'Ministry for the Environment, 2016 Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing Dust' (MfE, 2016) and the 'Victoria Environmental Protection Agency, 2013 – Guideline for recommended separation distances for industrial residual air emissions'. Both of these documents recommend minimum setback distances from sensitive receptors in addition to good on-site management practices. These include (but are not limited to) the methods as outlined by MfE, 2016.

Recommendation: That the Victoria Environmental Protection Agency, 2013 – Guideline for recommended separation distances for industrial residual air emissions' be applied to this application.

Associated offsite activities including traffic may have the potential to affect more than just adjoining properties in a manner that is more than minor.

Recommendation: That the application be publicly notified to ensure that the community is given the opportunity to raise any concerns.