

Before the Hearings Panel

**Appointed by Environment Canterbury
and Waimakariri District Council**

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of an application by **Taggarts Earthmoving Limited**
for various resource consents for a quarry at Rangiora
Racecourse (**Racecourse quarry**) under section 88 of
the Act

And the submission of **The Rangiora Ashley Community
Board**

Brief comments on submissions

Dated: 26 May 2021

Solicitor Acting: Andrew Schulte – andrew.schulte@cavell.co.nz

AJS-895078-1-95-V1-e



Level 3, BNZ Centre
111 Cashel Street
PO Box 799
Christchurch 8140
T: +64 3 379 9940
F: +64 3 379 2408
www.cavell.co.nz

AJS-895078-1-122-V2-e

Introduction

1. The Rangiora-Ashley Community Board (**Board** or **RACB**) is a submitter to the applications by Taggart Earthmoving Limited (**Taggarts**) to the Canterbury Regional Council (**Ecan**) and the Waimakariri District Council (**WDC**, collectively **the Councils**) for resource consents to establish and operate an aggregate quarry at Rangiora Racecourse, Rangiora (**proposal**).
2. The following are some brief comments from the Board on conditions that were circulated on 12 May for that purpose.
3. The Board notes its primary position that it would prefer that the quarry not proceed but makes the suggestions here and in the draft conditions document to hopefully assist if consent is granted.

Conditions

General conditions

4. As a general comment, the Board is mostly supportive of the comments made by the council officers in the section 42A report, in some cases particular matters of agreement. Or where that is not the case, it is noted below or in the attached draft conditions as comments or track changes.
5. The general conditions that apply across the consents are mostly supported.
6. The Board, in keeping with the air quality focus of its evidence to the panel would rather that the grass cover be greater than 80% and that watering not be seen as the only method of water suppression, though clearly a predominant one.
7. The Board would also prefer that "other vegetative cover" be defined. For example, weed species generally should not be considered acceptable vegetative cover.
8. The Board considers that for matter requiring certification, that should be the sole trigger for commencement. There should be no "deemed" acceptance.
9. As for the review condition the Board would prefer that this be kept as broad as possible, while specifying what can trigger a review. That approach is allowed under section 128. There is no requirement that the review condition must be pared back. It does not mean that reviews will

be required for all listed matters, but it enables that this *can* occur if required and prevents future arguments regarding whether a review can be instigated to deal with effects of the quarry.

Dust/Air Quality:

10. Air quality became a focus of the Boards submission, in line with its expert evidence.
11. The conditions in the draft do seem to be the same as those the Board has been provided by Mr Van Kekem that were the product of further discussion between the experts.
12. I do not intend to attempt to summarise the contents of the experts draft, it is attached for the Panels information and review.
13. The Board naturally supports the view of its expert Mr Van Kekem.

Discharge of backfill material:

14. The Board has commented that the time for responding to water in the quarry and the response by way of backfilling, and giving notice of the same, should be truncated to be either as soon as possible (but with a maximum time) or immediately.

Noise:

15. The Board does notes that actual noise monitoring had been agreed.

Conclusion

16. The conditions are considered comprehensive and better than when the application was lodged, but concerns linger.
17. Accordingly, the Boards overall position remains unchanged.

Date: 26 May 2021

Andrew J Schulte
Counsel for the Rangiora Ashley Community Board