

APPENDIX D

ORIGINAL SUBMISSIONS

[illegible]

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:

☒ Approve

☐ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Number of additional sheets attached

0

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐

No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐

No ☒

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐

No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Date

5-6-20

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address

PO Box 1256, Pukekohe

Postcode

2340

Email

mel350@summitthorpe.co.nz

Phone

09 23 88 900

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

Tony Clark

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form (Form I3)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 2

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Wei Chen

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

†Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

I ☐ support ☒ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are.....

We moved to Pokeno because of the natural environment surrounding the community. The application would have adverse effects on the woods, especially of which we can view from our backyard.

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:

☐ Approve

☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐

No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐

No ☒


Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐

No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

 Date 16 June 2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 38 Hitcher Road, Pokeno Postcode 2402

Email CNJERRYCW@GMAIL.COM Phone 0220340781

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Wei Chen

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1991. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form (Form 13)

For internal use only
ECM Application # LUJ0123/19
ECM # 3
SUBMISSION #
CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2nd JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name)

Neil Douglas John Butcher

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991
* Select one

I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor
‡ Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:
Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

The ability for this quarry to continue to supply aggregates to its customers - of which I am one.

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.
Give details:

The reasons for my views are... *this quarry is well situated on the southern side of the Bombay hill. As such it saves time, fuel and money when my company is working in the Tuakau - Pokeno - Maramarua areas.*

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☒ Approve ☐ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Adam Matheson Resources Ltd permission to expand and continue to operate as requested by them

Number of additional sheets attached Nil

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐ No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter or person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

N. Butcher Date 23 June 2020
A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 239 Bothwell Park Road Otara Postcode

Email neilbutcher@hotmail.com Phone 021 767677

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) N. Butcher Director: Butcher Contracts Ltd.

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngauruhia 3742
Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition any on-going communication between you and Council will be held in the information and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Access Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you wish to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 4

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Onroad Transport Ltd

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

I ☐ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☒ Approve ☐ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐ No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Date 23/6/2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 2169 Buckland Road RD 2 Pukekohe Postcode 2678

Email accounts@onroadtransport.nz Phone 09 2384016

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Don Wilson

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION #.....5.....

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Joshua Henare Phillips

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 Mcpherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

†Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are.....
Mc Pherson Resources provides important materials and resources to the surrounding

community and to local business.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☒ Approve ☐ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

.....
.....
.....
.....

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐ No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Date 23/june/2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 26 McGuire Rd, Tuakau Postcode 2121

Email drainformers@xtra.co.nz Phone 021449034

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) josh phillips

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form

(Form I3)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 6

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) P & I Pascoe Ltd

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

~~I 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~~

~~†Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor~~

~~# Select one~~

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

Mineral Extraction & Processing, ...

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are as a customer of McPherson Ltd. We do a lot of work in the Pokunua area where we require metal for the process of preparing for the floors of new houses. Our clients are reliant on us to be able to source this metal for them to complete the preparation of these house pads so they don't have any delays.

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:



Approve



Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Number of additional sheets attached

NA

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐

No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐

No ☒


Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐

No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

 (Amy Kozanic) Date 24/06/2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address Po Box 272 1267, Papakura Postcode 2244

Email amy@pascoe.co.nz Phone 09 2996213

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Amy Kozanic - Administrator

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 7

CUSTOMER #

24/6/20
8-33am

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) JOHN IAN BLACKWOOD

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

Delete

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are... a quarry is very essential for everything happening in our area would be a disaster to see this quarry shut

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:



Approve



Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

I just want to hear good news

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes



No



If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes



No



Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes



No



If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter or person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

J Blackwood

Date

24.06.20

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address

159 Baer Road, MANGATAMARU

Postcode

2471

Email

jbpauei@xtra.co.nz

Phone

021 996 329

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

JOHN BLACKWOOD

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 8

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Sonya Michelsen

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

ALL

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are The quarry has been there forever.

I see no reason to oppose an existing and successful business in our community which provides essential services and employment.

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:



Approve



Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐

No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐

No ☒

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐

No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Date

20/06/20

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address

295 Esk Road, R.O.3, Pokero

Postcode

2473

Email

sonya.michelsen@gmail.com

Phone

073 325 966

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

Sonya Michelsen

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waide.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 9

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) HIRA BHANA & Co Ltd

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

THAT MCPHERSON RESOURCES LTD CAN CONTINUE
THEIR OPERATIONS

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are.....

AS A CUSTOMER WE NEED ACCESS TO THE
PRODUCTS PRODUCED AT THE QUARRY.

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☒ Approve ☐ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

TO BE ABLE TO CONTINUE THEIR QUARRY
ACTIVITIES

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐

No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐

No ☒

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐

No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

..... Date

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address Postcode.....

Email Phone.....

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District
Council, Private Bag 544,
Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form

(Form I3)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION #.....10.....

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) CRAIG ALAN NICHOLSON

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

Aggregate / Metal

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are I am a contractor, a current customer of McPherson's and it would affect me if they were not permitted to continue operating.

.....

.....

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:



Approve



Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

I use the metal (greywacke) that the quarry supplies for alot of my customers, I am an earthmoving contractor, do alot of driveways, roading, building sites etc etc.

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐

No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐

No ☒

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐

No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter or person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

C. Nicholson

Date

24/6/2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 601 Buckland Rd, RD3, Pukekohe Postcode 2677

Email craignicholson@outlook.com Phone 021 987402

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Craig Nicholson

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent-submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 11

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Koek Services LTD

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

†Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are...

This Quarry always seems to be run very well and everything is always very tidy and grounds are well looked after.

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:



Approve



Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☒

No ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒

No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐

No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter or person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Krystal Kina

Date

24/6/20

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address

43A Lyons rd

Postcode

2471

Email

koekeadice@gmail.com

Phone

0212298822

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

Krystal Kina

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

#12
26/6/20
3.23pm

NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY SUBMISSION ON RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION – MCPHERSON RESOURCES LTD

TO: Waikato District Council

ATTENTION: Victoria Majoor

SUBMITTER: NZ Transport Agency
PO Box 973
Waikato Mail Centre
Hamilton 3240

ATTENTION Emily Hunt
Phone: 07 9587884
Email: consentsandapprovals@nzta.govt.nz

Resource Consent Application – LUC0123/19 – 47 McPherson Road, Mangatawhiri

This is a submission on Resource Consent Application LUC0123/19 on behalf of the NZ Transport Agency.

Summary

The Transport Agency is **not opposed** to the proposed expansion and continuation of the operation of mineral extraction activities at McPherson Quarry. The applicant has previously engaged with the Transport Agency and was advised that, subject to conditions, the Transport Agency was not opposed to the proposed activity.

Should the Council be of a mind to grant consent, the Transport Agency has identified the conditions it considers necessary to avoid and/or mitigate potential adverse effects of the activity on the transport network and seeks these are imposed. These conditions are the same as communicated to the applicant in its letter of 19 March 2019.

The NZ Transport Agency's Role

The NZ Transport Agency (the Transport Agency) is a Crown entity with the sole powers of control for all purposes of all state highways. The Transport Agency's objectives, functions, powers and responsibilities are derived from the Land Transport Act 2003 (LTMA), and the Government Powers Act 1989 (GRPA). The statutory objective of the Transport Agency is to undertake its functions in a way that contributes to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system in the public interest.

Background

The applicant proposes to expand their existing mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with the extraction of 490,000 tonne of quarry material for a period of up to 45 years, over three stages. The proposal includes modifying the McPherson Road intersection with State Highway 2 to include a right turn

bay, short deceleration lane for the left turn into McPherson Road and earthworks to maintain sight distances from the intersection.

The Transport Agency identifies the key issue for this proposal is achieving appropriate sight distances for westbound traffic on SH2 to slow-moving vehicles that have already turned right out of McPherson Road. Based on Austroads 2016 Part 3, the stopping sight distance for a car travelling at 90 km/h with a reaction time of 2.5 seconds is 151 metres. The applicant's initial consultation with the Transport Agency resulted in plans being provided which demonstrate the required 151 metre sight distance can be met provided earthworks are undertaken.

Following the applicant's initial consultation, the Transport Agency issued a response (19 March 2019), outlining the following conditions:

1. No works shall be undertaken within State Highway 2 without the prior approval of the NZ Transport Agency pursuant to Section 51 of the GRPA. A Traffic Management Plan and Consent to Work on the Highway shall be submitted to and approved by the Transport Agency at least seven working days prior to the commencement of any works on the state highway.
2. The annual haulage from McPherson Quarry shall be limited to 492,000 tonnes per year.
3. Detailed engineering design plans for the intersection must be submitted to the New Zealand Transport Agency for approval prior to any works associated with its construction commencing. Detailed design should consider, but not be limited to the following:
 - Superelevation and drainage for surface water on the pavement as per Austroads guidelines;
 - Heavy vehicle turning paths;
 - Cross-sectional drawings to indicate batter slopes, drainage lane width and property boundaries;
 - Traffic movement at the Intersection for calculation of right turn bay length;
 - Re-alignment of guardrail;
 - An advance warning sign for heavy vehicle crossing as per MOTSAM (sign to be located to the west of the SH2/McPherson Road intersection)
4. An independent safety audit shall be conducted during detailed design of the intersection with State Highway 2 and post construction. Each audit shall be carried out by an appropriately qualified auditor experienced with intersection design and appointed in consultation with the Transport Agency. Any recommendations made by the auditor that require changes to design and construction shall be approved by the Transport Agency.
5. Drawings provided indicate the sightlines are extending into private property. The applicant shall provide evidence that batter slopes and vegetation will not obstruct the required sight lines of 151 metres in perpetuity.

It is noted that the proposed annual haulage amount has been reduced from 492,000 to 490,000 tonnes but this does not affect the appropriateness of the Transport Agency conditions.

The applicant has incorporated the mitigation letter in Appendix O of the application and as per Sections 5.1 and 6.6.6 of the applicant's Assessment of Environmental Effects prepared by Kinetic Environmental, the applicant has agreed to the mitigation measures imposed by the Transport Agency.

The Transport Agency's Submission

The Transport Agency has reviewed the application documents associated with LUC0123/19 lodged with Waikato District Council, and notes the following:

1. The applicant has incorporated the mitigation letter into their proposal and subsequently agreed to the following mitigation measures:
 - Modification of the bank and vegetation on the southern side of the McPherson Road/SH2 intersection to provide at least 151 m forward visibility for westbound traffic to observe and respond to a right-turning truck from McPherson Road to SH2.
 - A 42 metre right turn bay on SH2 to provide sufficient stacking space for a truck and trailer unit to wait on SH2 in order to undertake safe right turning movements into McPherson Road; and
 - An Auxiliary Lane (AUL) for left turning vehicles from SH2 to McPherson Road. The AUL will be 100m long and commence at the barrier flare approximate 10 m east of Graham Bridge.
2. The application is of the same scale and intensity as that which the Transport Agency initially reviewed.

Decision Requested

Should the Council be of a mind to grant consent, the Transport Agency seeks that the conditions outlined above be Imposed.

The Transport Agency **does not** wish to be heard in support of this submission.

The Transport Agency **does not** wish to present joint evidence.

Signed by Mike Wood



Principal Planner

Consents and Approvals

Under delegated authority for The NZ Transport Agency

Date: 26 June 2020



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 13

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Bruce Douglas Moulden

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

†Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are... I regularly use the McPherson's Quarry to supply me with assortment of metal. They are local and I would like to see them remain operating in our area. They are good to deal with.

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:

☒ Approve

☐ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐

No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐

No ☒

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐

No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter or person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

 Date 29.6.20

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 288 Tukau Bridge Port Waikato Rd Postcode 2693

Email maulden@ps.govt.nz Phone 0274 981973

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Bruce Maulden

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form (Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 14

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) R.J. & S.M. Douglas Ltd.

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

* I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991
* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor
Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:
Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.
Give details:

The reasons for my views are.....

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:



Approve



Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐

No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐

No ☒

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐

No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

R. J. Douglas

Date *28/6/20*

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address *22 Windsor Drive* *Tairua* Postcode *3508*

Email *Douglas Contracting Tairua@yahoo.co.nz* Phone *027 4 951 916*

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form (Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION #.....15.....

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Aaron Baker & Emma West

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

~~I 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~~

~~†Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor~~

~~# Select one~~

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| * Visual + landscape effects | * Ecological effects |
| * Amenity + character effects | * Hours of operation |
| * Traffic effects | * Community & economic benefits |
| * Dust effects (Health) | * Duration of consent |
| * Vegetation loss | * Exit & rehabilitation |
| * Noise & Vibrations | |

I ☐ support

Give details:

☒ **Oppose**

☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

The reasons for my views are.....

- * Health concerns - Dust + Noise
- * Impact on environment - visual pollution
- * Concerns for wetlands above the development
- * Travel risks - SH2; Accident zone + gateway to Coromandel
- * Tourism impacts - Mt William walkway & Te Araroa

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:

☐ Approve



Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

- Please see supporting documentation.
- * Size + Scope of the expansion
 - * Ecological Corridor is planted now
 - * Times for operation remain unchanged
 - * Stage 2 border restriction
 - * Minimum timeframes for the development.

Number of additional sheets attached ☒

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☒

No ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒

No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐

No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter or person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter



Date 28 June 2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 267 Pinnacle Hill Rd, Mangataniwhi Postcode 2675

Email baker_wat@hotmail.co.nz Phone 021 550200

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Aaron Baker

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@walc.co.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

Submission from Aaron Baker and Emma West
247 Pinnacle Hill Rd
Mangatawhiri
2675

28 June 2020

Document supporting submission (Form 13) from Aaron Baker and Emma West, 247 Pinnacle Hill Rd, Mangatawhiri 2675, opposing the application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri.

Introduction

We are the owner and resident of 247 Pinnacle Hill Rd, purchasing the property in October 2011 for its rural outlook, location and beautiful views. We have a 6-year old boy that goes to school locally and is active in the outdoors in the general vicinity of the proposed development. Our home is 110 years old (Former Presbyterian Manse from Hawera) and is set to the views of Mt William, Pokeno, Pukekawa, and further south to Pirongia, looking directly over the top of the McPherson Quarry which currently remains hidden from view as shown below.

We OPPOSE the proposed development and ask that the Waikato District Council DECLINE the application.

The photos and latest satellite image below show the location and outlook for our property with the proposed development indicated as "Stage 2".



Submission from Aaron Baker and Emma West
247 Pinnacle Hill Rd
Mangatawhiri
2675

Google Maps location showing our property location. The wetlands that we believe have been excluded from the impact assessment in relation to the proposed development are also shown:



The following submission is aligned with the Form 13 requirements:

- Specific part of the application our submission relates to
 - The reasons for our views
 - Precise details on amendments and general nature of conditions
-

Submission from Aaron Baker and Emma West
 247 Pinnacle Hill Rd
 Mangatawhiri
 2675

The specific parts of the application that our submission to *OPPOSE* relates to are:

Part	Details
Visual and landscape effects	<p>Increased visual pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed planting throughout an 'ecological corridor' is simply starting too late and likely to be insufficient to alleviate the visual pollution for local residents and tourists to the region who walk Mt William and Te Araroa (New Zealand's Trail) - The earthworks and vegetation removal (both Restricted Discretionary Activities) are expected to significantly impact the views of residents to Mt William, Pukekawa and further south. We believe that it may open up a view into the "overburden" of the quarry for local residents despite the planting which hasn't yet started and with no start date provided.
Amenity and Character effect	<p>While the applicant and consultant has determined of their own opinion that there <u>will not be</u> a loss of rural amenity values or rural character, we cannot see how this can be maintained given the scale and location of the proposed development. At best, in our opinion which is shared by concerned residents, the impact will be significant – certainly not minor. As per 6.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"Limited clear views of the site and proposed expansion"</i> – those enjoying the Mt William walkway have not been included in the assessment - <i>"Limited fixed viewing audience"</i> – not possible given the location of local residents, especially those at higher elevation and those clearly within the buffer zone - <i>"Proposed small increases in truck movement"</i> – we expect a 50%+ increase which is not 'small'.
Traffic effects	<p>Health and safety concerns from traffic increases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic expected ~50%+ increase in haulage trucks from the quarry using SH2, an already dangerous stretch of road that is at its capacity as the key gateway to the Coromandel, with no sign of roading improvements to the best of our knowledge. - Increased CO² emissions can also be expected from additional truck movements. How will CO² impacts be measured and minimised? How will they be offset other than by planting the 'Ecological Corridor'?
Dust effects	<p>Health risks from dust increases</p> <p>Increased dust discharges and airborne silica particulates are well documented risks of such quarry expansions. There will undoubtedly be a negative impact on air quality, one of the Government's key areas of focus for improvement throughout New Zealand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These risks are compounded by regular southerlies and the blustery prevailing westerlies in the region with little in the application to ensure that operations are curtailed or restricted at these times to mitigate the impacts. - Risks will also be exacerbated by the earthworks and vegetation removal which may change the trajectory of the winds in the region, transporting

Submission from Aaron Baker and Emma West
 247 Pinnacle Hill Rd
 Mangatawhiri
 2675

	<p>dust and particulates up the valley to the wetland outlined above, farms and local homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We collect drinking water off our roof and are concerned that dust from the expansion will impact our only source of water for the home. <p>The current 500m buffer zone for the quarry also puts local residents at direct risk regarding silica particulates, with a number of homes already within the buffer zone.</p>
Vegetation loss	Removal of vegetation is expected to reduce natural carbon capture for the region and exacerbate issues regarding water run-off and erosion.
Noise and vibrations	<p>Noise pollution – increased impact resulting from blasting and general quarry works, much of which will be in close proximity to local residents. This will be exacerbated by the requested extension to the times of operations.</p> <p>Homes within and immediately surrounding the 500m buffer zone will be significantly impacted by noise and vibrations. We question the timing surrounding the noise readings taken, at a time potentially when prevailing winds were not blowing and based on the proximity and level of the current operations.</p> <p>And despite our residence being named regarding sound impacts, no one came onto our property to our knowledge or with our consent to do so, to take noise readings from the southern aspect of the property facing the proposed development which is where our living is within the home. When and where were these taken?</p>
Ecological effects	<p>Wetlands to the north east of the development (behind Stage 2) do not appear to be included in the assessment. With potential changes to the water table and tributaries, bird life may be impacted at a time when Tui, Kingfisher, Grey Heron and Clovers are all returning to the area.</p> <p>Dust deposits carried by regular southerly winds and a prevailing westerly wind are also expected to impact this wetland. These wetlands don't appear to be captured in the images used in the application.</p>
Hours of Operation	There is confusion from contradictory references regarding the requested hours of operation: 7am to 6pm(current) or 7am to 7pm (proposed)?
Community and economic benefits	There is no mention in the application of community or economic benefits. How many jobs will the expansion create?
Duration of the consent	The duration of the consent (45 years) is a concern. The quarry could be sold to a competitor with deeper pockets, with the potential to accelerate the development and aforementioned impacts. There is little commitment to ensuring that the development sticks to <u>minimum timelines</u> to ensure it is not accelerated as the result of a sale.
Exit/Rehabilitation plan	There is no clear evidence of a rehabilitation plan on which the community can determine that the area impacted will add value to the uniqueness of the region following the completion of the development.

Submission from Aaron Baker and Emma West
247 Pinnacle Hill Rd
Mangatawhiri
2675

The reasons for our views are:

- We are a concerned resident that believes greatly in preserving the beauty and ecology of this region when much around it is already being developed to support population growth
- Living in the region since 2011 we have seen a marked increase in traffic on State Highway 2 as the gateway to Coromandel and as haulage trucks have continued to support the development of Pokeno and greater Bombay region. Safety on our roads is a real concern in the region
- We have a 6-year old boy who loves the outdoors and will be directly impacted by the degraded air quality and dust deposits should this quarry be allowed to expand to the extent of the proposed application; and there has been talk of further expansion following Stage 3 which is likely to continue exacerbating the impacts outlined above
- We hold grave concerns for the wetlands and wildlife (birds and frogs) directly behind the proposed Stage 2 development with impacted water tributaries and dust deposits
- We believe that this development will hinder other community-based benefits such as increasing domestic and international tourism to walk Mt William and Te Araroa
- This region is a gem of North Waikato with breath taking views – we simply wish to protect this for current and future generations.
- We have seen and heard of the impacts of such developments on other communities. The feature piece on Fair Go aired on Monday 22 June 2020 and subsequent media covering the concerns and issues with quarry expansion in Canterbury, is a timely reminder of how these developments can impact the health and wellbeing of a community. As the story put it to viewers, this is clearly a case of big business putting “profits before the people”.

Submission from Aaron Baker and Emma West
 247 Pinnacle Hill Rd
 Mangatawhiri
 2675

We seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: *DECLINE*

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions

Size/Scope of the expansion	<p>Increase the buffer zone and reduce the scope of the proposed development to the north (Stage 2) and preserve the existing SNA on the eastern boundary to protect directly impacted residents.</p> <p>Designate low or no touch zones to preserve flora and fauna within the SNA; and minimise any potential risk to the wetlands and residential properties to the north east of Stage 2.</p>
Ecological Corridor	Planting needs to start as soon as possible to optimise the impact of the corridor including CO ² capture and visual pollution.
Times of operation	Retain the current hours and days of operation each year; i.e. 7:00am – 6:00pm. Mon to Sat.
Designated routes for haulage	Designated use of SH2 west to SH1 – not Pinnacle Hill road which is not built for heavy haulage
Stage 2 border	Remain on the southern side of the northern ridge (Stage 2) to minimise visual pollution and optimise the impact of the ecological corridor and noise impacts for those within the buffer zone and at higher elevation.
Further liaison with DOC	To ensure preservation of views from our national walkways – including Mt William which is the highest point in the region.
Wetlands protection and reduction in noise and dust impact	<p>Remain on the southern side of the northern most ridge and reassess the impacts to incorporate the wetland as shown in the updated Google Map image earlier in this submission.</p> <p>Note: the current images used in the application appear to not reflect these SNAs. They may be old images used from previous applications.</p>
Designated minimum time frames for each stage	To ensure that the proposed development does take the requested accumulated 45 years and <u>no less</u> – even under the transfer of ownership of the business and therefore of the consent. The application suggests throughout that the development will take “a long period of time” – however, this may be dramatically accelerated with a sale of the quarry to a larger competitor.
Restrict additional development	Should the development proceed, no further development following Stage 3.

Submission from Aaron Baker and Emma West
247 Pinnacle Hill Rd
Mangatawhiri
2675

Future plan for rehabilitation	An extensive rehabilitation plan needs to be developed with full community and Iwi engagement.
Further collaboration with Iwi given the site visit was in Nov 2018	To ensure that the full impact of the development on the environment and ecosystem is acknowledged, and Te Taniwha o Waikato is Included in the Cultural Values Assessment.
Neighbour engagement	Re-engage with impacted neighbours – not just those giving approval. There appear to be a number of neighbours that have not been consulted with including one off Pinnacle Hill road that sits within the 500m buffer zone to the north east of Stage 2. This is not shown on the maps as the applicant appears to have used older mapping images, possibly from earlier applications for expansion.

Signature of submitter



Aaron Baker



Emma West



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 16

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Mark and Karin Joubert: 251 Pinnacle Hill road Mangatawhiri 2675

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

I ☐ support ☒ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are: Environment will change, soil erosion, into creeks, wetlands. Protect our wetlands and wildlife.

Pollution which includes visual, dust, noise and light. Pinnacle Hill rd not built for heavy loads, more trucks on the road will put more stress on the road, unsafe to drive on, road not wide enough.

Increase in trucks, dangerous crossing on SH2, especially in the holiday seasons. Wear and tear on the roads, heavy loads.

Tourism will be affected domestic and international, protect hiking path, Mount William reserve.

Working hours too long, trucks will arrive before 7am and leave after 7pm.

Protect environment, future generations. Protect our views. Quarry expansions do affect communities and their well being.

I seek the following decision from Walkato District Council: ☐ Approve ☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission Yes ☐ No ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing Yes ☒ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority Yes ☐ No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

..... Date

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 251 Pinnacle Hill road Mangathawhari Postcode 2567

Email mark_joubert@yahoo.co.nz Phone 0278082605

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Walkato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Walkato District
Council, Private Bag 544,
Ngaruawahia 3742
Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@walc.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

Jessica Thomas

From: Joubert Mark <Mark.Joubert@wirtgen-group.com>
Sent: Monday, 29 June 2020 2:29 p.m.
To: Consent Submissions
Subject: #16 Submission - Submission from Mark and Karin Joubert: 251 Pinnacle Hill road Mangatawhiri 2675
Attachments: Submission 1.pdf
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good Afternoon

We oppose the proposed development of McPherson Quarry and ask Waikato District Council to decline the application.

Attached document.

Additional notes:

- We need to protect our environment, flora and fauna and our wetlands in the area.
- Need to protect our views, we don't want to be looking into a quarry, which will be an eye sore.
- Dust pollution will be increased, air quality will be affected.
- Loose vegetation, cause soil erosion and runoff.
- Noise pollution will increase, homes in the area will be affected by noise and vibration.
- Planting needs to start as soon as possible.
- Stay with current hours of work 7am to 6pm.
- Designated routes for trucks to be confirmed, crossing SH2 is dangerous enough, especially in holiday seasons.
- Heavy trucks not to use Pinnacle Hill road not built to take heavy loads
- There will be an increase in traffic/trucks if expansion goes ahead. Increase in CO2 emissions.
- Remain on southern side of the ridge, visual and noise/air pollution do not have an impact on people living on the northern side.
- A rehabilitation plan needs to be developed with the community and with Iwi engagement.
- Include all residents in the area that may be affected to have the opportunity to submit submission.
- Not many residents have been notified, including myself.

Hope your submission is successful.

Best regards
Mark

Mark Joubert
New Zealand Manager

Wirtgen Australia Pty Ltd
10 Oak Road, Wiri Auckland 2104
<http://www.wirtgen-group.com/newzealand>

T: 0800 947 8436
M: +64 278 082 605
mark.joubert@wirtgen-group.com



Submission form (Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION #.....17.....

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Gordon and Helen Bray, on behalf of the Trustees of the Bray

Name of submitter (full name)

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

‡Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

Refer attached submission

I ☐ support ☒ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

Refer attached submission

The reasons for my views are

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☐ Approve ☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought. Refer attached submission

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☒ No ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐ No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

B J Matheson

30 June 2020

Date

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address PO Box 1008 Shortland Street Auckland 1140

Matheson@richmondchambers.co.nz 09 600 5500

Email Phone

Barrister

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

BAL MATHESON

BARRISTER

LLB (Hons) BA (Hons)

29 June 2020

Waikato District Council
Private Bag 544
NGARUAWAHIA 3742

By email: consent.submissions@waikdc.govt.nz

MCPHERSON RESOURCES LTD - SUBMISSION BY BRAY FAMILY TRUST

Please refer to submission attached on behalf of the trustees of the Bray Family Trust. I would appreciate confirmation of receipt.

Yours faithfully



Bal Matheson

Copy: Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw, Kinetic Environmental Consulting Ltd
eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz

Submission on McPherson Resources Quarry

To: Waikato District Council

Submitter: Gordon & Helen Bray, on behalf of Trustees of the Bray Family Trust

Introduction

1. This is a submission to Waikato District Council (WDC) on an application for resource consents by McPherson Resources Ltd (Applicant) in respect of the resource consent applications (Applications) to authorise historical existing use rights and to provide for a significant expansion of the quarry (Quarry).
2. Mr and Mrs Bray live at 211 Pinnacle Hill Road, adjoining the Quarry land, and have lived in their current house for over 20 years.

Concerns about Application

3. Overall, the AEE and supporting reports are inadequate and do not fully or appropriately assess the potential adverse effects of the proposed current or future expanded operations.

Complete lack of consultation

4. Despite being an immediate neighbour to the Quarry, there was absolutely no consultation with Mr and Mrs Bray.
5. Bizarrely the AEE records at 5.1.3 "the McPhersons chose not to approach two neighbours on the basis that it was assumed that written approvals from said parties would not be achievable (largely based on their historical relationship with said parties)". The Brays were one of these listed neighbours, but do not understand the statement or what it could possibly be based on.
6. Irrespective, the comment confirms that the applicant considers that the purpose of the consultation is to obtain a written approval. That is not the purpose of consultation. The approach taken is completely contrary to best practise, and hardly represents a helpful start to a relationship between the applicant and an immediate neighbour.

Existing use rights

7. Considerable weight has been placed on the scale of operations authorised under existing use rights, however proof of existing use rights to the scale described has not been provided in any of the documentation. The Brays' advisers seriously doubt that up to 400,000 tonnes per year is authorised under existing use rights. Further the proposed importation of cleanfill is a quite separate activity that can have no existing use rights. It appears that the applicant is attempting to establish an existing use as high as possible, in order to minimise the degree of potential new effects caused by the proposed new rate of extraction. If the scale of existing uses is far less than presented in the AEE, then the nature and extent of new adverse effects on the surrounding residents will be far greater (including, for example, safety risks at the McPherson Road/SH 2 intersection).
8. If the WDC is proposing to place any weight on the existing use rights in its assessment of environmental effects, then the nature and scale of such use must be demonstrated, and then it must also be demonstrated that the current scale is authorised by existing use rights.

9. Although the AEE states that the “existing use rights/permitted baseline” has only been taken into account with respect landscape visual effects, it is evident that the policy assessment has actually taken into account the existing activities for a far wider range of assessments than just landscape and visual (see, eg, section 4.1.4, 4.2, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9 of the AEE).

Transportation effects

10. The increased truck movements will cause significant traffic safety risks at the intersection of McPherson Road and State Highway 2. It is notable that the crash record confirms that there were 6 crashes within only 250m of the intersection within only a 5 year period.
11. The sight distances are inadequate; even if there is able to be “bare compliance” with Austroads Standards, there remains very real traffic safety risks on what is already known as a very dangerous section of State Highway.
12. Contrary to the Opus Report (p 7), the New Zealand Transport Agency has not supported the application - rather, its correspondence confirms that it does not oppose the proposal, provided that certain conditions are agreed to. Because NZTA has not provided its written approval, all effects on the safety and efficiency of SH 2/McPherson Road remain relevant.
13. The traffic assessment is based on quarry operating hours of 7am to 6pm, however other parts of the AEE say that the quarry will be operating 7am to 7pm.
14. There is inadequate stacking room for quarry trucks entering the site. It is not realistic to expect that trucks will arrive “evenly spaced” and some form of platooning is inevitable. There is no justification for an exact 50/50 split in terms of turns right or left out of the intersection.
15. An independent safety audit of the current and proposed upgrade of the intersection should be required to be carried out by NZTA prior to any hearing of this application, and the outcome of that process reported back to the parties, as it is likely that such an audit would recommend further changes (and may not support the proposed increase in use).
16. There is an assumption that trucks bringing in cleanfill will leave with aggregate and while this is desirable (from an efficiency perspective), there is no guarantee that will occur or condition to that effect. Practical experience confirms that direct alignment between contractors disposing of cleanfill and demanding aggregate will seldom correlate exactly such that backloading can occur. Unless there is to be a condition requiring the backloading of cleanfill trucks with aggregate, the volume of traffic expected to the site must be increased to account for the full volume of cleanfill proposed to be allowed to be disposed of at the site.
17. While a future re-alignment of SH 2 would significantly reduce traffic flows past McPherson Road, there is no certainty about when (or even whether) such a re-alignment would occur. Accordingly, no weight can be given to that eventuality in any assessment of potential future traffic effects.
18. There has been no assessment on the effects (safety or otherwise) on other users of McPherson Road, including the residential access and recreational use of the road.

Landscape and visual effects

19. The Landscape and Visual assessment failed to fully consider the impacts from individual private properties (no site visits were made to any residences). To the extent that any effects were considered, these effects were minimised by reference to planting on the affected sites, the limited number of residences, and the gradual development of the quarry over a long time period.

20. There will be significant adverse landscape, visual and amenity effects that were not properly considered. Some of the sites are in extremely close proximity to either the quarry site, and the operations (including the overburden disposal area). There is no guarantee that the proposal will be "gradual" and over a long period of time. There are no proposed restrictions on timing that would ensure that outcome. The effects on the natural character and amenity values will be immediate and profound: they will certainly not be "low or less than minor".
21. The effects of the significant expansion of the quarry will represent significant adverse cumulative effects. This is exacerbated by the applicant's refusal to undertake any mitigation or rehabilitation until all quarrying activities have been concluded. That will be - in the applicant's view - at least 45 years, but in all likelihood will be beyond even that timeframe (which is essentially a permanent effect as far as any resident currently living in the area is concerned).
22. Nor is it appropriate to rely on planting on private properties, particularly in the absence of attending any of the sites to fully understand how those properties are used. The reliance on pine forests for screening - which may be harvested within a short period of time - highlights the weaknesses in an assessment of visual effects that fails to visit the most affected/adjacent properties.

Dust effects

23. The increased activity, including in particular the importation of cleanfill, will create a significant risk of dust effects. The proposal to control dust is based on very limited number of sprinklers, a relatively small water storage volume, a water cart to be used on an "as needed" basis, and a water pump that apparently is unable to operate more than 10 sprinklers at any one time. The historical data to assess potential water use is the period 1952-1961. It is evident that the climate has changed significantly in the 60 years since that time, and any assessment of expected weather conditions for the next 45 years must be based on up to date climate data - with an appropriate allowance for climate change.
24. The AEE notes at 6.7 that the WRC's general requirements would indicate that about 250m³ per day would be required - 200m³ more than the quarry currently uses. It is obvious that the quarry is water constrained and that there is no water available for dust suppression - but the surrounding landowners should not take the risk of that; especially given the significant increase in operations, the proposed new cleanfilling operation of 100,000m³ per year, and the fact that, as the AEE says, this quarry will be operating for at least 'half a century'.
25. Any proper assessment with up to date data is likely to demonstrate that significantly more water will be required than what has been allowed for. That will have implications for the water take applications, which are likely to need to be increased (and the effects re-assessed).
26. There is reference to avoiding any 'screening/crushing in dry, windy conditions' (AEE, 4.1.2), but there is no proposed condition to this effect, and no definition as to what constitutes a 'dry or windy' event. There can be no confidence that this commitment would actually be followed through.
27. There are some references to water storage tanks comprising two 19,000 litre tanks; other references two 20,000 litre tanks. Either way the water storage is inadequate.
28. The proposed cleanfill activity is occurring in very close proximity to property boundaries and it is difficult to understand how the applicant could comply with the stated commitment that "the operations will not result in the discharge of particulate matter" beyond the site (AEE, 4.1.3).

29. There are no proposed conditions on what types of material will be accepted as cleanfill, there is no proposed screening, or trigger levels for assessing any potentially contaminated material being accepted. To the extent that any potentially contaminated cleanfill is accepted, this would have effects on the water quality of any stormwater runoff and would require a far greater suite of monitoring to occur in the stormwater ponds prior to the discharge into the environment of any stormwater (in other words, there should be a concern about contaminants beyond simply sediment). It does not appear that these effects have been assessed by the Waikato Regional Council.
30. There was no proper basis to restrict the notification to those properties whose residences were within 500m. A proper assessment should include all those properties who have any part of their site within 500m. That is because of the obvious point that there can be effects of dust on people's property that extends beyond the immediate house, including on their outdoor recreation space and any planting or other activities within their broader curtilage.
31. The potential dust effects have not been properly considered or assessed, and there is no confidence that the proposals put forward by the applicant will mitigate the dust effects. There can be no confidence that the activity is a permitted activity with respect to dust.

Ecological effects

32. There is no justification as to why the proposed high value ecological areas need to be removed, and why any expanded quarry cannot be limited to those areas that currently do not have indigenous vegetation.
33. There appears to be confusion about where the proposed ecological corridor will be: the AEE (section 3.2.9) refers to it being "in the north", but this appears to where "Stage 4" is proposed (albeit that quarrying is not proposed as part of this application).
34. The area proposed to be planted is wholly inadequate. Compensation of 2:1 and 1:1 is far too low, and not in accordance with best practise. The 100m width should also be increased significantly. There appears to be ample room to increase this width
35. If this area is to be planted for ecological compensation then it should be planted now (to reduce any lag effects), it should be of an appropriate density and species, and it must be subject to protection in perpetuity.
36. The proposed mitigation for the removal of Tributary 1 and the effects on Stream 1 is inadequate.

Noise effects

37. Although some acoustic modelling has been undertaken of some of the activities at some of the locations around the site, there was no assessment of the potential effects on the amenity of the surrounding residents - either from the truck movements, or quarrying operations. Given the proposal to operate 12 hours a day (7am to 7pm), 6 days a week, this is very surprising and concerning.
38. There appears to be an assumption made that if compliance with noise limits can be predicted by a model, then no further assessment of amenity or other effects needs to be considered. That is insufficient.

Planning assessment

39. The planning assessment is deficient. The proposal is noted as being for a non-complying activity, however there is no assessment at all of s 104D (the primary threshold test for such activities).

40. In the assessment of effects, there is a great deal of weight placed on the existing activities, however there is a complete lack of any description of or detail as to how the current operations fall within the ambit of s 10 and can therefore represent an "existing use".
41. The information given as to annual volumes appears contradictory: the AEE says 330,000 tonnes (2017) and 320,000 tonnes (2018).
42. The proposal is to increase this to 490,000 tonnes - an increase of over 33% (assuming that the 2017 and 2018 figures are accurate). Assuming (as you must) that all cleanfill will arrive in trucks that will not be backloaded, this increases the effective truck movements to something in the order of 590,000 tonnes (nearly a doubling of current activity). This is a significant increase in activity, with a concomitant increase in offsite effects and in particular an increase in the risk occasioned by the quarry trucks' use of the SH 2/McPherson Road intersection. (As noted above, the actual level of activity would appear to be less than what is presented in the AEE, and accordingly the scale of effects - and resulting risk - from the proposed level of activity would be greater than assessed.)
43. The assessment of Part 2 of the RMA did not include an assessment of s 7(c), the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values. For the surrounding residents, this is a fundamental failing.

Relief sought

44. Mr and Mrs Bray requests that the Applications be declined in their entirety.
45. Mr and Mrs Bray are not trade competitors, and they wish to be heard in support of their submission
46. If others make a similar submission, Mr and Mrs Bray would consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Signed on behalf of Mr & Mrs Bray on behalf of the
Trustees of the Bray Family Trust by their counsel, Bal Matheson:



Date: 29 June 2020

Address for service of Submitter:

Bal Matheson

Barrister

Telephone: 09 600 5510

Email: matheson@richmondchambers.co.nz

30/6/20

11.31am

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 18

CUSTOMER #

Submission form

(Form 13)

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Mount William Limited

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

Mount William Ltd is the owner of 12 ha of land neighbouring McPhersons. We have previously communicated with both WDC and WRC outlining our opposition and concerns for (a) the continued Quarry operation post expiry of existing RC (b) a renewal of a Quarry RC into the future (c) an expansion of Quarry activities in the future.

I ☐ support

☒ oppose

☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are:

We are directly affected. We border McPherson to the south. The Stage II and Stage I elements of the application are of great concern to us. We live in a rural community. Having an industrial-scale Quarry activity does simply not fit with the ambience and development of an area in the 21st century!

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☐ Approve ☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Primary Claim; Quarry activity to cease

Alternative Claim 1; existing Quarry activity to remain. no expansion
close compliance monitoring

Alternative Claim 2; Stage II to be eliminated

Number of additional sheets attached 1

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☒ No ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing


Yes ☒ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☒ No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

 A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Date

30/06/20

Address

231 Pinnacle Hill Road

Postcode

2075

Email

flemming@mountwilliam.co.nz

Phone

021 554705

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District
Council, Private Bag 544,
Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

Jessica Thomas

From: Flemming Rasmussen <flemming@mountwilliam.co.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 30 June 2020 11:31 a.m.
To: Consent Submissions
Cc: eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz
Subject: #18 Submission - Re ECM LUC0123/19 McPherson Quarry Submission - Opposing
Attachments: Quarry Submission_page 1 of 2_fwd by email 300620.jpg; Quarry Submission_page 2 of 2_fwd by email 300620.jpg

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good morning,

Please find attached our written submission covering the pending application by McPherson Resources Limited. We opposed the RC being granted.

We have previously been in contact with WDC, WRC as well as Kinetic Environmental. There is a communications trail for both back in 2019.

With this communication being on record, it is very disappointing that we have not been notified about the application in writing by WDC. We only learned about the application and the pending deadline for submissions from another concerned neighbour.

We trust our submission is self-explanatory.

Please confirm receipt of this email.

As we do want to be heard and are in favor of a s 100A RMA process, please use this email, as well as my below mobile number, for all communication.

On behalf of Mount William Limited

--
Flemming H. Rasmussen *MBA, B.Com, MinstD*
Director
E: flemming@mountwilliam.co.nz **M:** +64(0)21594705



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 19

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Katrina and Sander Post

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

15.6.3 Vegetation Clearance
6.2.3 Natural Character
6.5 Vibration
6.7 Dust Effects
6.8.4 Effect Management
6.10 Erosion and Sediment Effects

I ☐ support ☒ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are... Please see attached.

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☐ Approve ☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Please see attached.

Number of additional sheets attached Two

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☒ No ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☒ No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

[Signature] Date 30 June 2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 70 Macks Road Rd 1 Pokeno Postcode 2471

Email katrina@carbyne.co.nz Phone 021 307 913

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Katrina Post

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

To: Waikato District Council
Submitter: Katrina and Sander Post
Date: 30 June 2020

The following is a submission made by Katrina and Sander Post **opposing** the application made by McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and significant Natural area within the rural zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road, Mangatawhiri.

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to:

- 1:** 15.6.3 Vegetation Clearance
- 2:** 6.2.3 Natural Character
- 3:** 6.5 Vibration
- 4:** 6.7 Dust Effects
- 5:** 6.8.4 Effects Management
- 6:** 6.10 Erosion and Sediment Effects

We **OPPOSE** the parts named above.

15.6.3 Vegetation Clearance

The removal of 2.45ha of indigenous forest. This has been identified as being a Significant Natural Area. It should not be removed. There is no justification in the report as to why it should be removed.

6.2.3 Natural Character

The indigenous bush will be removed as the quarry expands.

Its states this will happen slowly over time. But is not specific on the time frame. I do not consider this to be "low or less than minor". It should not be removed.

6.5 Vibration

"After undertaking field measurements of blast noise and vibration at a site distance **SIMILAR** to the distance to 231 Pinnacle Hill road."

We have an unconditional sale and purchase agreement on 231 Pinnacle Hill road. We would like the applicant to have to undertake blast noise and vibration tests **AT** 231 Pinnacle Hill road, which is inside the 500m Buffer zone, and provide a report of the effects.

6.7 Dust Effects

This should not be based on the 'general requirements' identified by Waikato Regional Council. The increased activity, including in particular the importation of cleanfill, will create a significant risk of dust effects. The proposal to control dust is based on the use of sprinklers and a water cart "as needed". The historical data used to assess potential water use is from the period 1952-1961. The climate has changed significantly since then, as it may continue to change over the next 45 years. The water usage requirements should be assessed using up to date data. Our house at 231 Pinnacle Hill road is on Tank water collected from the roof and I am concerned about water contamination from increased dust discharges and airborne silica particulates.

6.8.4 Effects Management

There is no commitment as to when the proposed offset planting corridor, will be planted. It should be of an appropriate species and density, and a maximum height should be stated and agreed to. The current shelter belt that is referred to in the report, is a very old row of pine trees that are very close to the end of their useful life. There should be a plan and design in regards to planting a corridor in anticipation for when the row of Pines are no longer viable.

6.10 Erosion and Sediment Effects

For stages 2 and 3 the report states "they contend that it is impractical to put in place detailed designs at this point in time, as the practicality and success of those plans would be too uncertain".

They go on to say the "anticipated erosion and sediment effects will be less than minor". But I don't understand how they can say that they will be less than minor when they have not put in place detailed designs yet?

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council **DECLINE**

Signed by Submitters



Sander Post



Katrina Post



Submission form (Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION #.....20

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Carey Ellison c/- Allied Petroleum

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

Consent for operations to continue.

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are.....

Allied Petroleum supply fuel to this site and the quarry has always had compliant, certified equipment which we require to supply.

The site has solid H&S conditions for this site that our drivers appreciate and we require as part of our processes.

McPherson Resources business are strong supporters of local clubs and businesses and the locals appreciate this.

The location is well suited outside of major built up areas with out the need for product to be carted long distances for local projects.

I find the site is always well planted, maintained & unobstrusive and I would welcome more family owned businesses of similar type.

I seek the following decision from Walkato District Council: ☒ Approve ☐ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐ No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Date 30/06/2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 3C/220 Tristram Street Hamilton

Postcode

Email carey.ellison@alliedpetroleum.co.nz

Phone 0278079514

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Carey Ellison

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Walkato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Walkato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaurawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@walc.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form

(Form I3)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION #.....21.....

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Charlotte B Royce McCort

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

Visual Amenity

Noise

Dust

Traffic

Tourism

Ecological Effects

please see attached

I ☐ support ☒ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are.....

Please see attached

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☐ Approve ☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

We seek the decision to Decline This application.

Number of additional sheets attached

4

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☒ No ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☒ No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter



Date 01/07/2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 217 Pirakea Hill Rd. RD 2 Mangakohiri Postcode 2675

Email charlotte@autospengineering.co.nz Phone 0210575573

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Charlotte McLachlan

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

This is a Submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri.

This submission is made by Charlotte and Royce McCort, of 217 Pinnacle Hill Road, Mangatawhiri

Our submission **Opposes** the application.

Submission and reasons why

Introduction

As residents of the Mangatawhiri, Waikato area we have a direct view from our home at 217 Pinnacle Hill Road through to land owned by McPherson and planned for quarry development under Stage 2 of the resource consent application. We are one property back from a boundary resident. As the land lies, we are perched on the west side of Pinnacle Hill Road and face out to Mt William Walkway, with southern views over McPherson land and Pokeno. Quarry activity that comes to the Northern Ridge will change our visual viewpoint.

Current quarry operations are carried out in a Rural Zone under historical existing use rights. Surrounding properties on Pinnacle Hill Road are rural homes, many of which would be closer classified as lifestyle blocks owned by families who have moved into the area to experience a country lifestyle, not impacted by commercial operations.

Had a neighbour not taken the time to inform us of this resource consent application we would have had no knowledge whatsoever of this pending development. On reading over the application, I am concerned that a resource consent application of this nature was not communicated to properties effected on the Northern Ridge.

The existing quarry may well be considered small scale and part of the local landscape for over 60 years but the local landscape has changed and is not what it was 60, 40 or even 20 years ago.

New built homes adorn Pinnacle Hill Road, with provisions for more. An extension of approx. 31 hectares of quarry operations is not '**minor or less than minor**' as so often referred to as, in this application. There are examples all through the application that do not reflect the general state of Pinnacle Hill Road residents as at 2020. Potentially impacted residents are not even included in the noise assessment, for example 215 Pinnacle Hill Road.

McPherson Resources Limited have the financial resources to weight this application for resource consent and have been working on this since at least 2018. It has been difficult and stressful to submit in response to this 2-year groundwork for application. Nevertheless, we have done our best in the timeframe provided to understand the impact, research through the scientific natured documentation and submit a subjective response.

With the repetitive referral to the quarry extensions as being minor or less than minor and the complete lack of consultation with respect to Pinnacle Hill Road residents, we feel we have no choice but to oppose this application for resource consent. Largely, the application and accompanying reports are inadequate and do not fully or appropriately assess the potential adverse effects of the proposed future expanded operations.

Further detail on our reasons for our proposal to this application are provided below.

Visual Amenity

We are concerned that our visual outlook will be impacted and we will view quarry operations and a changed landscape due to these operations. View point 2 in the Opus – McPhersons Quarry Expansion Proposal Landscape and Visual Assessment has been taken from the letter boxes and driveway entrance at 233 Pinnacle Hill Road. **See Figure 1** This is the only view point considered for residents of Pinnacle Hill Road. This does not reflect an accurate visual from my home. **See Figure 2.**

Reference is also made to a shelterbelt screening for Pinnacle Hill Road. I can assure you there is no shelter belt screening my property at this present time. The application refers to a section of pines further west which is due to be harvested in the near future.

The Northern greenbelt will eventually go some length to providing screening. There is no timeframe requirements set out in the application around this planting and we are concerned that the mature trees required to screen will take many years to achieve this goal. The greenbelt is not being implemented as mitigation to Pinnacle Hill Road views but to offset the destruction of a locally significant SNA at Stage 1. (another very concerning point)

My husband and I along with our than 2 daughters (now 3) built at our address 10 years ago. We wanted to live in the country and settle back in the region where we both grew up. We too have history with the area. We selected a lifestyle block and the views at this address were what sold us on this steep and windy piece of land. For our view to change in this manner, with zero consultation and impact assessment is at least; very distressing.

Figure 1



Figure 2 Stage 2 Quarry development shown in RED



Noise Impact

We have concerns around the Noise Assessment carried out by Hegley Acoustics. I was surprised to see our house site has been subject to Noise Level testing. We were never notified of this testing and can only assume the testing was carried out from the roadside as permission would have been required to access our property.

Of interest from the report is the information that the noise modelling was only carried out on Stage 1 and 3 of the proposed quarry extensions. Not until peer review were additional assessments carried out, which I can only assume to then cater for Stage 2, adding further weight to the lack of consideration given to Pinnacle Hill Road residents. Stage 2 is the closest stage of the development to my home and incorporates a high point on the northern ridge. The report omits several homes on Pinnacle Hill Road, 2 of which also have boundaries within the 500m buffer zone.

We simply do not believe that enough consideration has been given to the potential noise impact to residents to the North and East of the quarry development, residing on Pinnacle Hill Road. The report does not advise what time of the day testing was undertaken and the weather conditions at this time. What was the location point considered when noise testing was carried out at my address? Due to the lay of this particular landscape on a still day I can hear laughter from my neighbour's children playing outside; who are over 500m away.

The quarry operates from 7am – 6pm (7pm depending on what document you refer to), six days a week. During the summer months we use our west facing outdoor area most evenings (5pm – 8pm) to share a family meal and enjoy our rural natural environment. We are far from convinced that these moments will not be impacted by the sounds of quarry operations.

We feel this report has grossly underestimated the testing required to accurately assess the impact to my home site and others on Pinnacle Hill Road.

Increased Traffic

We already experience a steady level of truck haulage on Pinnacle Hill Road. The road itself has a 100km speed limit and is narrow, heavily undulated, poorly maintained (more so on the Auckland Council section of the road – North of Medhurst Rd) and contains many blind spots making visibility difficult.

A bus stop for Bombay Primary School and Pukekohe High School students is located on the corner of Pinnacle Hill Road and Medhurst Road. There is also a school bus stop at the SH2 end of Pinnacle Hill Road. I have witnessed students walking this road home on a regular basis. Personally, we have never allowed our own children to walk home from this bus stop as it is just too dangerous.

In addition, Pinnacle Hill Road is part of the National Walkway and from time to time we have a high volume of hikers using the road. There is no footpath on the road and pedestrians often must leave the road (get into the ditch) for traffic to pass safely.

An increased number of trucks on this road further increases the risk of accident whether it be vehicle or pedestrian related.

The current application talks to 16 vehicle movements per hour. On exiting the quarry trucks will turn left or right onto State Highway 2. Having been a resident on Pinnacle Hill Road for 10 years we know first-hand the challenge in turning right on this road and accidents have occurred and will continue to occur. This challenge provides the driver with the option to turn left and turn left again into Pinnacle Hill Road, further increasing truck haulage traffic to this rural country road.

I would strongly challenge the applications 'assumption' to a 50/50 split between left and right turning trucks. Where is the data to support this? Section 6.6.1 references to crashes occurring between 01.01.2013 and 01.05.2018. Where is the data for any crashes that may have occurred between 02.05.2018 and 31.05.2020? which surely is more relative to the timing of this application for consent.

Dust Effects

We are also concerned about the chance of increased dust emissions and dust effects. Increased quarry activity will certainly negatively impact air quality. There are several homes identified in the 500m buffer zone which would be at higher risk of these effects. The applications proposal to control dust again seems inadequate with a limited number of sprinklers and water tanks. The climate has changed dramatically since the quarry commenced its operations and if the future development of the quarry is set to take place over the next 45 years (although there is no written guarantee around this and nothing to stop the expansion happening at a much faster pace) surely assessment should include potential future weather patterns and impacts.

Tourism Impacts

As previously written Pinnacle Hill Road is part of the National Walkway and during the summer months experiences a high volume of hikers making their way along the trail. We are also located close by to the Mt William Walkway. Mt William walkway is a popular DOC track for local, domestic and international hikers. The walkway is accessed via Puketutu Rd, Bombay or McMillian Road, Pokeno. Both Mt William Walkway and at key high points along Pinnacle Hill Road provide breath taking views. Currently these views are not broken by quarry activity and large cuts into our majestic landscape. Any extension to the quarries current operations will impact this unique New Zealand outlook.

Ecological Effects

Our final concern rests with the destruction of a Significant Natural Area in Stage 1 of the proposed quarry extension and the removal of indigenous forest. Areas of the proposed expansion site have been identified as Significant Natural Areas (SNA) largely as a result of the area acting as habitat for the king fern and forming part of the southern limit of Taraire Puriri Forest.

SNAs are an integral part of New Zealand's natural heritage and provide a range of benefits to humans and to other living things. On reading further from literature published by the Waikato Regional Council SNA's such areas of native bush or scrub **See Figure 3** with a dense understorey and few weeds have the benefits of clean air and erosion reduction. Surely these 2 benefits alone are critical to the existing quarry operations, without the added impact of expansion. We fully oppose the destruction of any natural/indigenous bush for the purpose of quarry operations.

Figure 3



Submission form

Notice of submission under the Resource Management Act 1991 (pursuant to section 96) form 13

Notes

- A signature is not required if you are lodging your submission by electronic means.
- If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) please use form 16B. Refer to the EPA website www.epa.govt.nz or call 0800 CALL EPA (22 55 372).
- The closing date for providing your submission to Waikato Regional Council is 20 working days after public notification or notice is served. You must also provide a copy of your submission to the applicant. This should be done as soon as possible.
- If you need any further help, please phone our Resource Use staff on 0800 800 402.

Office use only

File no:

Consent no:

Section 1: Application details

Applicant name: McPherson Resources Limited

Description of proposal:

(Briefly describe the type of consent, and the nature and location of the activity. If the proposal is for a change or cancellation of an existing consent condition, please detail the type and location of consent, the relevant condition and the proposed change. If the application is for a transfer of a water or discharge permit, provide details of the existing activity site and, if relevant, the part of the permit proposed to be transferred.)

RESOURCE FOR CONSENT - APP 137612

The specific parts of the application that this submission relates to are:

VISUAL AMENITY, NOISE, DUST, TRAFFIC, TOURISM
& ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS.

Section 2: Submitter details

We will use your email address as preferred address for service, unless you advise otherwise.

Name	Full name of submitter: <u>CHARLOTTE & ROYCE MCCORT</u>
	Contact person (include designation if applicable): <u>CHARLOTTE MCCORT</u>
Postal address	Street/RD/PO Box/Private Bag: <u>217 PINNACLE HILL ROAD</u>
	Suburb: <u>RD 1 MANGATAWHIRI</u>
	Town/city:
	Postcode: <u>2675</u>
Residential address If different from postal address	Street: <u>AS ABOVE</u>
	Suburb:
	Town/city:
	Postcode:
Email address	<u>charlotteandroyce@gmail.com</u> <u>charlotte@autogradeengineering.co.nz</u>

Waikato Regional Council, 401 Grey Street, Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240.
Phone our enquiries officer on 0800 800 402. www.waikatoregion.govt.nz

Waikato
REGIONAL COUNCIL

Phone number/s

Home: 0210575573

Business: 092384995

Mobile: 0210575573

Fax:

Section 3: Submission on proposal

Please detail your submission below. Attach additional pages if necessary.

I/we (tick one option only):

☐ Support the application/s

☒ Oppose the application/s

☐ Neither support nor oppose the application/s (neutral submission)

My submission:

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED

The reasons for my views are:

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED

I seek the following decision from the consent authority:

(Give precise details, including the parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.)

WE SEEK THAT THE RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION
FOR CONSENT BEING MADE BY
MCPIERSON RESOURCES LIMITED BE DECLINED IN FULL
BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL

Please tick either yes or no to the following options:

I/we wish to be heard in support of this submission

☒ Yes ☐ No

I/we will consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others make a similar submission

☒ Yes ☐ No

I/we request the functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application/s
are delegated to one or more hearing commissioners who are **not** members of
Waikato Regional Council.

☐ Yes ☐ No

(A request for delegation of hearing and decision-making authority must be made in writing no later than 5 working days after the submission closing date. You may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners. You may not make this request in relation to an application to carry out an activity that a regional plan describes as a restricted coastal activity.)

Signature of submitter:



Date: 30/06/2020

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Jessica Thomas

From: Charlotte McCort <charlotte@autospeedengineering.co.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 2 July 2020 8:25 a.m.
To: Jessica Thomas
Cc: Charlotte McCort
Subject: RE: Submission for Resource of Consent Application 137612

Hi Jessica, please note that on my submission for Waikato District Council I had ticked Yes to the third box for the application to have commissioners you are not members of the local authority. This should have been **NO**. Is this email satisfactory instruction for this amendment or should I redo the application form?

Regards

From: Jessica Thomas <Jessica.Thomas@waidc.govt.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 1 July 2020 2:13 PM
To: Charlotte McCort <charlotte@autospeedengineering.co.nz>
Subject: RE: Submission for Resource of Consent Application 137612

Good afternoon,

Thank you for your submission – we will contact you again after the closing of submissions on 2 July 2020.

Kind regards

Jessica Thomas
Senior Consents Administrator

Waikato District Council
■ P 07 824 8633 ■ F 07 824 8091 ■ Call Free 0800 492 452
Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742
www.waikatodistrict.govt.nz
www.facebook.com/WaikatoDistrictCouncil

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: Charlotte McCort [<mailto:charlotte@autospeedengineering.co.nz>]
Sent: Wednesday, 1 July 2020 2:04 p.m.
To: rcsubmissions@waikatoregion.govt.nz; Consent Submissions
Cc: Charlotte McCort; Royce McCort
Subject: Submission for Resource of Consent Application 137612

To whom it may concern,
Please find attached our completed Form 13 and supporting documentation in relation to the Application for Resource for Consent (APP137612) made by McPherson Resources Limited. As I understand there are sections of my submission pertaining to WRC and WDC as such I have emailed to both submission addresses.
Please confirm receipt of this application.

Regards



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 22

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Brittany Aker and Jason Johns

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

See attached

I ☐ support ☒ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are See attached

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☐ Approve ☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

See attached.

Number of additional sheets attached

6 pages

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☒ No ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☒ No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Sign Here

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Date 30/06/2020

Address 215 Pinnacle Hill Road

Postcode 2675

Email brittany.aker@hotmail.com

Phone 021 2655 747

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

Miss Brittany Aker

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

This is a Submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri.

This submission is made by Brittany Aker and Jason Johns, of 215 Pinnacle Hill Road, Mangatawhiri

This submission **opposes** the application.

Many of the following sections are a mirror of my next-door neighbours' submission (217 Pinnacle Hill Rd) since the points we have concern over are identical in nature. Others are of more concern to us since we are closer to the proposed quarry expansion.

As residents of the Mangatawhiri, Waikato area we have a direct view from our home at 215 Pinnacle Hill Road through to land owned by McPherson and planned for quarry development under Stage 2 of the resource consent application.

Although not marked by in the consent application as a boundary property all that lies between our property and the boundary of the land owned by the quarry is native wet lands and some of the SNA which the consent proposes to remove. Our property is approximately 50% inside the 500m buffer zone. We have southern and western views that will be greatly impacted by the proposed quarry activity that would see mining activities traverse the northern ridge of its current confinements. Our visual viewpoint will be changed in a manner that cannot be assessed as "minor or less than minor".

As a neighbour with property within the 500m zone I am surprised to find that I have not been warned about this pending development and had only heard of this several days ago from a neighbour. My property has also not been included in any noise assessment. I currently hear the quarry although it is not a nuisance however, we noticed significantly increased levels of disruption from the single digger that was carving out a path on the ridge for what seems to be the outline of the new area of mining. Our valley carries noise and it is easy to hear people speaking to each other on the other side of the valley (hundreds of metres away) I can only imagine how the how will carry if the quarry be allowed to traverse the ridge. A single digger was too much noise and could be heard inside my home through double glazing.

The application and accompanying reports are inadequate and do not fully or appropriately assess the potential adverse effects of the proposed future expanded operations.

Visual Amenity

We are concerned that our visual outlook will be seriously impacted and we will view quarry operations and a changed landscape due to these operations.

View point 2 in the Opus – McPhersons Quarry Expansion Proposal Landscape and Visual Assessment has been taken from the letter boxes and driveway entrance at 233 Pinnacle Hill Road.

See Figure 1

Figure 1



This is the only view point considered for residents of Pinnacle Hill Road. This does not reflect an accurate visual from my home. See Figure 2.

Figure 2



Reference is also made to a shelterbelt screening for Pinnacle Hill Road. I can assure you there is no shelter belt screening my property at this present time. The application refers to a section of pines further west which is due to be harvested in the near future. The Northern greenbelt will eventually go some length to providing screening. There is no timeframe requirements set out in the application around this planting and we are concerned that the mature trees required to screen will take many years to achieve this goal. The greenbelt is not being implemented as mitigation to Pinnacle Hill Road views but to offset the destruction of a locally significant SNA at Stage 1. (another very concerning point)

We are also very concerned that the removal of this ridge due to mining activities will expose us to the currently hidden from view lights of Pokeno. We deliberately went to great expense to build further down the hillside to be out of sight of these lights.

Including an obnoxious light from the dairy factory that is currently hidden from view by the Totoro trees that are planned to be removed. A significant reason for our purchasing this property was to have limited direct light pollution and rural views including native bush.

Noise impact

We have concerns around the Noise Assessment carried out by Hegley Acoustics. I was surprised to see our house site has **NOT** subject to Noise Level testing. Of interest from the report is the information that the noise modelling was only carried out on Stage 1 and 3 of the proposed quarry extensions. Not until peer review were additional assessments carried out, which I can only assume to then cater for Stage 2, adding further weight to the lack of consideration given to Pinnacle Hill Road residents. Stage 2 is the closest stage of the development to my home and incorporates a high point on the northern ridge. The report omits several homes on Pinnacle Hill Road, 2 of which also have boundaries within the 500m buffer zone, one of which is ours.

We simply do not believe that enough consideration has been given to the potential noise impact to residents to the North and East of the quarry development, residing on Pinnacle Hill Road.

See here our house location marked with a red circle and the number 1.



Increased Traffic

We already experience a steady level of truck haulage on Pinnacle Hill Road. The road itself has a 100km speed limit and is narrow, heavily undulated, poorly maintained (more so on the Auckland Council section of the road – North of Medhurst Rd) and contains many blind spots making visibility difficult and has no centre line.

A bus stop for Bombay Primary School and Pukekohe High School students is located on the corner of Pinnacle Hill Road and Medhurst Road. There is also a school bus stop at the SH2 end of Pinnacle Hill Road. I have witnessed students walking this road home on a regular basis.

In addition, Pinnacle Hill Road is part of the National Walkway and from time to time we have a high volume of hikers using the road. There is no footpath on the road and pedestrians often must leave the road (get into the ditch) for traffic to pass safely. An increased number of trucks on this road further increases the risk of accident whether it be vehicle or pedestrian related.

Having been a resident on Pinnacle Hill Road for some time we know first-hand the challenge in turning right on this road and accidents have occurred and will continue to occur. This challenge provides the driver with the option to turn left and turn left again into Pinnacle Hill Road, further increasing truck haulage traffic to this rural country road.

I would strongly challenge the applications 'assumption' to a 50/50 split between left and right turning trucks. Where is the data to support this? Section 6.6.1 references to crashes occurring between 01.01.2013 and 01.05.2018. Where is the data for any crashes that may have occurred between 02.05.2018 and 31.05.2020? which surely is more relative to the timing of this application for consent.

Amenity Value

The removal of native bush and quiet rural views to be replaced by the view of a quarry and the sound of mining activity will greatly decrease the value of all properties in and around this valley.

Dust Effects

We are also concerned about the chance of increased dust emissions and dust effects. Increased quarry activity will certainly negatively impact air quality. There are several homes identified in the 500m buffer zone which would be at higher risk of these effects, including my own. The applications proposal to control dust again seems inadequate with a limited number of sprinklers and water tanks. The climate has changed dramatically since the quarry commenced its operations and if the future development of the quarry is set to take place over the next 45 years (although there is no written guarantee around this and nothing to stop the expansion happening at a

much faster pace) surely assessment should include potential future whether patterns and impacts.

I am concerned about silica being introduced into my families drinking water which we collect from our roof.

Tourism Impacts

As previously written Pinnacle Hill Road is part of the National Walkway and during the summer months experiences a high volume of hikers making their way along the trail. We are also located close by to the Mt William Walkway. Mt William walkway is a popular DOC track for local, domestic and international hikers. The walkway is accessed via Puketutu Rd, Bombay or McMillian Road, Pokeno. Both Mt William Walkway and at key high points along Pinnacle Hill Road provide breath taking views. Currently these views are not broken by quarry activity and large cuts into our majestic landscape. Any extension to the quarries current operations will impact this unique New Zealand outlook. Ecological Effects Our final concern rests with the destruction of a Significant Natural Area in Stage 1 of the proposed quarry extension. Areas of the proposed expansion site have been identified as Significant Natural Areas (SNA) largely as a result of the area acting as habitat for the king fern and forming part of the southern limit of Taraire Puriri Forest. SNAs are an integral part of New Zealand's natural heritage and provide a range of benefits to humans and to other living things. On reading further from literature published by the Waikato Regional Council SNA's such areas of native bush or scrub.

Minimum Mitigation factors

- Modify the stage 1 boundary to include the existing native rated SNA of 2.08ha
- Retain existing border for quarry operations to the East and North East.
- Retain Stage 2 Totara plantation on hilltop to the North East corner, therefore moving stage 2 boundary to southern side of Northern and Eastern ridge.
- Establish vegetation corridor immediately IF consent has been granted
- Operating hours for earthworks and site excavation outside of main pit area reduced to 7am-5pm Monday-Friday (7am- 12pm) Saturday. Retain proposal for no earthworks or noise on Sundays, public holidays and over Christmas.
- End date of the quarry lifespan planned to protect the community and residents for future generations.
- A detailed rehabilitation plan for the end date of the quarry established in consultation with surrounding residents.
- IF quarry expansion is approved with parameters stated above consents need to be applied for and reviewed at the conclusion of each stage to understand ecological & cultural changes within the environment. To assume land, air and water usage will be the same for the next 45 years is inaccurate.

- IF quarry expansion is approved with parameters stated above stage 3 to be actioned 1st away from neighbouring properties.

In Summary, due to the above reasons we oppose this application, a full assessment and independent peer review is needed for ourselves and the residents on Pinnacle Hill Rd in the vicinity of the quarry before any further action is taken. We agree to be heard at a hearing for supporting evidence to this submission.

Jessica Thomas

From: brittany.aker@power-business.co.nz
Sent: Wednesday, 1 July 2020 3:35 p.m.
To: eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz; Rcsubmissions@waikatoregion.govt.nz; Consent Submissions
Cc: brittany.aker@hotmail.com
Subject: #22 Submission - RE: Submission Form 13 - ECM Application LUC0123/19
Attachments: Submission.pdf; Submission attachment.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello all,

Sorry I am just correcting the email address for Waikato council. Also please note: I mistakenly ticked "Yes" to the following option on the submission form.

"Pursuant to section 100A...etc" Please adjust this to be "No"

Thank you.

Brittany Aker
Manager – Implementation & Operations

Office: +64 9 950 3306 ext. 212
Web: www.power-business.co.nz



**Power
Business
Services**

The information contained in this message is privileged and intended only for the recipient names. If the reader is not a representative of the intended recipient, any review, dissemination or copying of this message or the information it contains is prohibited. Views expressed in this message may not necessarily be those of Power Business Services Limited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender, and delete the original message and attachments.

From: brittany.aker@power-business.co.nz <brittany.aker@power-business.co.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 1 July 2020 10:48 AM
To: 'eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz' <eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz>;
'Rcsubmissions@waikatoregion.govt.nz' <Rcsubmissions@waikatoregion.govt.nz>;
'consentt.submissions@waidc.govt.nz' <consentt.submissions@waidc.govt.nz>
Cc: 'brittany.aker@hotmail.com' <brittany.aker@hotmail.com>
Subject: Submission Form 13 - ECM Application LUC0123/19

To Whom it may concern,

Please find attached my submission form and attachments to that form.

Kind regards,

Brittany Aker
Manager – Implementation & Operations



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 23

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Megan Clotworthy

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

†Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

All the key elements -
- the days of operation
- truck movements
- earthworks
- removal of vegetation
- earthworks

I ☐ support ☒ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are that this impacts on us as homeowners
in the district (Pinnacle Hill Road). There will be increased
noise pollution, dust pollution and heavy haulage
traffic.
It is very likely that this could also impact on the
value of the properties in the area and the ability
for re-sale.

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:

☐ Approve

☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

I would like the entire application withdrawn.

Number of additional sheets attached

N/A

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐

No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒

No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☒

No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Megan Clotworthy

Date

1.7.2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address

262 G Pinnacle Hill Rd.

Postcode

2675

Email

Mangatawhiri
megan.c@rops.school.nz

Phone

021 2576193

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

Megan Clotworthy

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form (Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # 11841111

ECM #

SUBMISSION # 24

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 93A and 94 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name)

JASON & SHELBY KEMBLE

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatāwhiri

I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

I am ☒ am not ☐ if 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

‡ Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

6.5 VIBRATION

6.7 DUST EFFECTS

6.8.4 EFFECT MANAGEMENT
NOISE

I ☐ support

☒ oppose

☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are

on attached documents

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:

☐ Approve

☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

on attached.

Number of additional sheets attached

1

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☒

No ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒

No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☒

No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so no later than 3 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter



Date

1/7/20

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address

231 B PINNACLE HILL ROAD

Postcode

2675

Email

jgkemble@hotmail.com

Phone

0275584233

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

JASON KEMBLE

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 10th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Fiona Lorenberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email flores@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council.

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.

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 504, Ngaurunui 3741

Telephone 0800 497 461

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@wdc.govt.nz

The information you have provided for this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your submission will be made available to the public. This information will be entered on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any incoming correspondence between you and Council will be held on Council's website and may also be made available to the public on a public register. Council's information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Access Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 2000. If you have any concerns about this please discuss with a Council Officer prior to lodging your submission. Please note that requests for access to or correction of your details please contact the Council.

Waikato District Council

Submitter: Jason and Shelby Kemble

Date: 1-Jul-2020

SUBMISSION

Our property is located at 231B Pinnacle Hill Road and we were not consulted at all about this resource consent. We have owned the property since July 2018 and find it very disappointing that we had to find out about the expansion through word of mouth from one of our neighbours. We found out 5 days ago giving us hardly any time to educate ourselves with all the documentation. How were we not included in any correspondence as we are one of, if not the next closest property on the northern side of the quarry next to 231 Pinnacle Hill Road (Flemming Raussmusen).

Not only will this expansion severely impact our view and outlook from the property – it is also a high possibility this will seriously affect any future sale and property value.

We oppose the expansion for the following reasons

6.5 VIBRATION

The consent application states that there were field measurements taken at a site in a similar distance to 231 Pinnacle Hill Road, but it doesn't state what that distance was. How can they guarantee the noise/vibrations won't travel any further up (especially with strong winds which we are prone to get regularly)

6.7 DUST EFFECTS

As I'm sure you are aware all properties located around the quarry are on tank water including ours that is collected from our roof. How can the quarry guarantee the dust won't travel further up towards neighbouring properties, especially with the strong winds we get in Bombay (our house is classed as being in a very high wind-zone).

6.8.4 EFFECTS MANAGEMENT

There are no specific times/dates for the planting corridor to commence or any specific plans of what that planting will be or look like. There is a row of very mature pine trees (stated as the current shelter belt) which obstructs half of the McPherson's boundary. We've heard there are plans to cut these down – is there any chance of a compromise to leave some of these up and any plans for additional planting either side. Details of specimens of planting/heights should be provided to neighbours.



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 25

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) COASTAL READING CONTRACTORS LTD

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

†Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are.....

TO ENABLE US TO CONTINUE WITH OUR BUSINESS
WE NEED A GOOD QUALITY SUPPLY OF METAL WITHIN
REASONABLE DISTANCE TO OUR JOBS AND MCPHERSON.
CAN PROVIDE THAT.

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☒ Approve ☐ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐ No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐ No ☒

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

[Signature]

Date

25/6/20

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address

133 Kaitiaki Road

Postcode

2473

Email

Coastal.reading.contractors.ltd@gmail.com

Phone

0274595847

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council



Submission form (Form I3)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 26

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Paul Francis Oliver

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

†Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

Extraction of quarry material

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are

McPhersons are a quality operator and we have a long association with them. They play a vital role in the supply of materials to the trucking and construction industry, and also in market competitiveness around cost to supply.

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:



Approve



Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

.....
.....
.....
.....

Number of additional sheets attached

N/A

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐

No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐

No ☒

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐

No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Date

1/7/2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address

28 Collingwood Road, Waiuku

Postcode

2123

Email

paul.oliver@kdltd.co.nz

Phone

021-446071

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

Paul Oliver - Operations Manager

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

File No: 25 05 02
Document No: 16618398
Enquiries to: Matthew Vare



30 June 2020

Waikato District Council
Private Bag 544
Ngaruawahia 3742

Private Bag 3038
Waikato Mail Centre
Hamilton 3240, NZ

waikatoregion.govt.nz
0800 800 401

Email: Victoria.Majoor@waidc.govt.nz

Dear Sir/Madam

Waikato Regional Council Submission to Resource Consent Application LUC0123/19 McPherson Resources Limited Quarry Expansion

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on Resource Consent Application LUC0123/19 McPherson Resources Limited Quarry Expansion. Please find attached the Waikato Regional Council's submission regarding this resource consent application. It is our view that the Consent should only be approved subject to the robust, science-based conditions to avoid, remedy, and mitigate adverse ecological effects of the proposal and to protect surround kauri from infection from Karui Dieback disease. We would welcome further discussion regarding the development of robust, science-based conditions of consent on these matters.

Should you have any queries regarding the content of this document please contact Matthew Vare, Senior Policy Advisor, Policy Implementation Team directly on (07) 859 0545 or by email Matthew.Vare@waikatoregion.govt.nz.

Regards,



Mark Tamura
Manager Integration and Infrastructure

**Submission from Waikato Regional Council on Resource Consent Application LUC0123/19
McPherson Resources Limited Quarry Expansion**

30 June 2020

Introduction

1. Waikato Regional Council (WRC) appreciates the opportunity to make a submission to Resource Consent Application LUC0123/19 McPherson Resources Limited Quarry Expansion. WRC's primary interest is in relation to the earthworks and removal of indigenous vegetation within an identified Significant Natural Area (SNA) and to provide information to inform appropriate, science-based consent conditions relating to terrestrial and aquatic ecology.
2. With respect to works within the SNA, the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (Objective 3.19, Policy 11.2) addresses the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, which reflects s6(c) RMA. Additionally, SNA's have a role in protecting natural heritage. We are of the opinion that the loss of 2.08 ha of kanuka dominated forest within the SNA could have more than minor adverse effects in achieving the objectives of the RPS and to the interests of the Department of Conservation, the Waikato Regional Council and the Waikato District Council in discharging their relevant functions under the RMA.
3. We also wish to bring to your attention the presence of kauri in close proximity to the site. We currently understand this area to be free from Kauri Dieback disease. For this to remain the case, appropriate hygiene measures will need to be in place.

Relevant Matters: Integration of AECOM ecological review recommendations

4. Many of the potential adverse effects to ecology within the applicants' site can be effectively avoided, remedied or mitigated through application of the recommendations outlined by AECOM in "Ecological Review - McPherson Quarry Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) and Ecological Management Plan (EMP)", dated 31 January 2020. WRC technical staff have assessed and largely concur with the recommendations from this report. The recommendations should be used as the basis for developing appropriate resource consent conditions.
5. When turning the recommendations from the AECOM Ecological Review and the Ecological Management Plan (V5) EclA by Ecology NZ into consent conditions, further certainty of outcome for ecology is required, for example in terms of lizard management:
 - Lizard Management – As detailed above, additional lizard surveys ~~should~~ will be undertaken prior to clearance of the kākūka-dominant forest within the site. This will involve 2 nights of spotlighting and 3 checks of artificial cover objects within the Stage 1 bush block. If lizards are found to be present, a lizard management plan ~~should~~ will be prepared by a Department of Conservation-recognised herpetologist and implemented across the high-valued habitat to ensure native lizards are relocated into retained vegetation of equal or greater quality on-site. Lizard

management ~~should~~ will be undertaken before and during vegetation removal by an appropriately qualified and experienced ecologist.

6. The consent conditions need to translate these requirements clearly so that adverse effects are indeed avoided, remedied, or mitigated. The same approach needs to be applied to the following matters from section 6.3 Recommendations:
 - bat, bird, and fish management
 - planting plan, pest animal management plan
 - Wetland creation/enhancement and planting plan
 - Sediment and erosion control plan

Presence of kauri and kauri dieback

7. In addition to the above, we understand that Kauri are present within 50m of the proposed phase 1 clearance site (see attachment 1). Kauri (*Agathis australis*) are classified as a nationally vulnerable threatened species under the New Zealand Threat Classification System, because of the threat posed to it by Kauri Dieback disease (*Phytophthora agathidicida*).
8. As far as we are aware there is no kauri dieback in the Hunua Ranges and the only sites in the Waikato are limited to the eastern Coromandel. Hygiene therefore of equipment and during operations is very important – especially if machinery is coming onto site from other areas (Northland/Auckland) where there is Kauri Dieback and when operating near kauri.
9. Measures may include strict hygiene protocols where soil samples be taken in proximity of kauri, and for machinery entering the site.
10. We welcome further investigation and consultation with our biosecurity staff, regarding appropriate conditions that if well implemented, will stop transmission of this pathogen and control its spread.

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Submitter details

Waikato Regional Council
Contact person: Matthew Vare (Policy Implementation Team)
Email: Matthew.Vare@waikatoregion.govt.nz
Phone: (07) 859 0545

Post: Private Bag 3038
Waikato Mail Centre
Hamilton 3240

I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission
I am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- (a) does not adversely affect the environment; and
- (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Attachment 1: Location of Kauri in relation to quarry site



Attachment 2: List of useful documents, references and links

The [kauri dieback website](#) has a number of [hygiene guidelines](#) that will also be relevant for quarry operations that are near kauri including:

Quarry hygiene - https://www.kauridieback.co.nz/media/2018/bpg-quarry-hygiene_v14_final-signed2.pdf

WRC Staff and Contractors Hygiene SOP:

https://discover.wairc.govt.nz/otcs/lisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=12766845&logSto pConditionID=3278183_880394154_1 open

DRAFT Rural Kauri Hygiene Guidelines (note still in track changes):

https://discover.wairc.govt.nz/otcs/lisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=14428724&logSto pConditionID=3278193_881075117_3 open



Submission form

(Form 13)

2/7/20
9.13am
For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 28

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Andrew Cameron Browne

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

I support McPherson Resources application to expand & continue to extract minerals.

The reasons for my views are

They are a local business that are respected in the community & provide jobs.

I have done work for McPhersons & used their products I wish to continue to do so.

.....

.....

.....

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☒ Approve ☐ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐ No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Date 2/7/2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 197 Kohanga Road RD3

Postcode 2693

Email brownecontractingservices@outlook.com

Phone 021507012

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Andrew C Browne

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 29

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) *see attached submission document with list of names of submitters*

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

we are
* I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

we are
† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

See attached submission

we
† ☐ support ☒ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are.....

See attached submission

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☐ Approve ☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

See attached submission

Number of additional sheets attached 21

I wish to be heard in support of ^{our}my submission

Yes ☒ No ☐

If others make a similar submission, ^{we}I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act ^{we}I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☒ No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

David W. Phillips Date 02/07/2020
A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address HEARTLAND FARM 219 State Highway 2 Postcode 2471
Pakowai Irish Rd

Email david.w.2009@protonmail.com Phone 021 060429

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) David W. Phillips

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

Submission form

Notice of submission under the Resource Management Act 1991 (pursuant to section 96) form 13

Notes

- A signature is not required if you are lodging your submission by electronic means.
- If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) please use form 16B. Refer to the EPA website www.epa.govt.nz or call 0800 CALL EPA (22 55 372).
- The closing date for providing your submission to Waikato Regional Council is 20 working days after public notification or notice is served. You must also provide a copy of your submission to the applicant. This should be done as soon as possible.
- If you need any further help, please phone our Resource Use staff on 0800 800 402.

Office use only

File no:

Consent no:

Section 1: Application details

Applicant name: *See attached submission document with list of names*

Description of proposal:

(Briefly describe the type of consent, and the nature and location of the activity. If the proposal is for a change or cancellation of an existing consent condition, please detail the type and location of consent, the relevant condition and the proposed change. If the application is for a transfer of a water or discharge permit, provide details of the existing activity site and, if relevant, the part of the permit proposed to be transferred.)

McPherson Quarry L4C 0123/119 & APP 137612

The specific parts of the application that this submission relates to are:

To overrule application.

Section 2: Submitter details

We will use your email address as preferred address for service, unless you advise otherwise.

Name	Full name of submitter:	<i>Various - see attached submission</i>
	Contact person (include designation if applicable):	<i>David W Phillips</i>
Postal address	Street/RD/PO Box/Private Bag:	<i>219 STATE HIGHWAY TWO</i>
	Suburb:	<i>POKENO</i>
	Town/city:	
	Postcode:	<i>2471</i>
Residential address If different from postal address	Street:	<i>as above</i>
	Suburb:	
	Town/city:	
	Postcode:	
Email address	<i>DavidW2009@protonmail.com</i>	

Phone number/s	Home: <i>N/A</i>	Business: <i>N/A</i>
	Mobile: <i>021 0604219</i>	Fax: <i>N/A</i>

Section 3: Submission on proposal

Please detail your submission below. Attach additional pages if necessary.

I/we (tick one option only):

☐ Support the application/s

☒ Oppose the application/s

☐ Neither support nor oppose the application/s (neutral submission)

My submission:

See attached submission of 21 pages

The reasons for my views are:

see attached submission of 21 pages

I seek the following decision from the consent authority:

(Give precise details, including the parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.)

That the application for any expansion of
the quarry proposal be declined and set aside
as set out in attached submission
including requests to mitigate past and future
damages and risks

Please tick either yes or no to the following options:

I/we wish to be heard in support of this submission

☒ Yes ☐ No

I/we will consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others make a similar submission

☒ Yes ☐ No

I/we request the functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application/s
are delegated to one or more hearing commissioners who are **not** members of
Waikato Regional Council.

☒ Yes ☐ No

(A request for delegation of hearing and decision-making authority must be made in writing no later than 5 working days after the submission closing date. You may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners. You may not make this request in relation to an application to carry out an activity that a regional plan describes as a restricted coastal activity.)

Signature of submitter:

pp David Phillips

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Date:

02.07.2020

McPherson Resources Limited & Waikato District Council & Waikato Regional Council

Re: LU C0123/19 and APP137612

Location: McPherson Quarry, 47 McPherson Rd, Pokeno-Mangatawhiri, 2471.

These submissions are sent by email to each of:

Consent.submissions@waidc.govt.nz

RCsubmissions@waikatoregion.govt.nz and Teresa.Gibbison@waikatoregion.govt.nz
eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz

Additional Information to Support Submitters' Opposition to the Application

These submissions accompany the Submission forms supplied by the Waikato District Council & Waikato Regional Council. Under the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act') the Waikato District Council & Waikato Regional Council ('the Councils') have each determined we must be served with the notice of Resource Consent Application, as we live nearby and are and become affected parties.

We also each confirm that we are affected parties. We confirm we are not trade competitors of the applicant.

These submissions in opposition to the application are presented and supported by a number of parties/entities/people living or located at or occupying Heartland Farm, State Highway 2, Pokeno-Mangatawhiri, 2471, being the property owner and/or occupiers affected by the application. Those supporting this submission in opposition in part or in whole include, but are not limited to:

David W Phillips

Isaac D Phillips

Stephen Pool

Sara Giles

Graham White

Ian Furse

Lily Nofoagatotoa

Mount William Spring Water Limited

Hambletonian Limited

Heartland Family Trust (prior named Pokeno Farm Family Trust)

Heartland Charitable Trust

Pokeno Quarry Protection Society Inc (yet to be formed)

The address for service of each opposer is: Heartland Farm, 219 SH2, Pokeno-Mangatawhiri, 2471

DISCLAIMER & OBJECTION & WARNING

These submissions are sent without prejudice to all these submitters rights to claim under common law, equity, tort and/or negligence and/or criminal behavior and/or under any statute or any other lawful remedy, in regard to all and any claims arising due to the past, present and future activities by any people and/or by the operations of the said quarry, against any involved party; including all the persons, entities, parties prior involved with the quarry or land thereon, and/or each of those approving and/or supporting the quarry and its expansion over past 6 years and its now proposed further expansions.

Each such quarry participant thereby is hereby given notice that each are knowingly doing or to become contributors in common law and/or in equity (including but not limited to tort and/or negligence) to the various economic and tortuous losses we and our property and all involved thereon have been subjected to and/or face; including but not limited to the human and animal (including racehorses) and bird health effects and/or damage; the impact on the spring water quality and flow in the surrounding area including on Heartland Farm; the effects on all buildings on our property, and amenity, economic and environmental effects on all or any of these persons or people or beings or assets or trees and/or other matters in/on these submitters and their kin and kind and associations and/or on other occupiers (past, present and future) of/on Heartland Farm.

All rights are absolutely reserved. Nothing within these submissions and/or any action or non-action by these submitters are to in any manner belittle or water-down all and any rights (past, present and future) now reserved.

The applicant is responsible for completing a thorough and competent and reasonable technical assessment of effects or likely effects on the environment and on neighbors, like on all life forms occupying Heartland Farm and assets thereon. Both the Councils are responsible and have jurisdiction to ensure this is completed pre application. An over-riding obligation rests with each of the applicant and each Council.

Any responsible approach must involve prior discussions with all affected neighbors and affected other parties, before any application (and/or its assessment of effects) can at all be fairly considered fair, reasonable and/or thorough. To date no one from within the applicant group has EVER bothered to arrange meetings and meet with anyone occupying Heartland Farm.

This lack and/or oversight and/or arrogance by the applicant toward a seriously affected neighbor must be considered and be given weight by Council and their 'to be appointed' Commissioners and if need be later by the Environment Court in regard to the present application.

It is not the affected neighbors' primary responsibility to spend considerable private funds addressing the risk of this application. This is the responsibility of first the applicant (and their assessment of effects experts, which simply must be completed with serious consultation with these submitters) and second the Councils (and their experts). If Council approves the application and it then progresses to the Environmental Court, by then it becomes a joint responsibility of the applicant and the Councils.

Both the Councils are urged to involve, at their initial costs (perhaps passed back to applicant) independent experts, to address and peer review the many real and potential effects of this application which are not yet canvassed or which are canvassed by the applicant in a grossly inadequate manner.

In the meantime, both Councils should immediately put into force an order, comparative to an injunction, stopping all and any extensions to the quarry until the application has been heard and reheard and all appeals exhausted.

In the meantime, both Councils should immediately begin an investigation into all actions the quarry owner/operators have taken in past 10 years, which amount to quarry extensions, and to which no formal application nor approvals were ever made or heard, and where we as an affected neighbor were never consulted. We seek to receive a copy of such investigation; and/or copies of any earlier investigations which either Council instituted.

Due to the size and potential impact of this application and its purposes, and due to the Councils' prior 'deaf-ears' to complaints about the quarry (including various complaints from this submitting property owner and manager), we say it is essential that the Councils delegate their functions and duties to more than one hearing commissioner who are not members of the local authority and who are 100% independent of both the applicant and the industry of the applicant and to any entities who might in the future have any interest in buying the quarry or property from the applicant. Under common law and equity, we reject all and any liability for any such extra hearing costs, and say all hearing costs must be met by the applicant and/or the Councils.

We also reserve our rights to add to our objection/submission summary during the overall hearing process, as once the applicant improves/upgrades its own technical assessment of effects, and begins neighborly dialogue, other matters may arise that we seek to provide input into.

We also say that the applicant's technical assessment supplied to Council and via Council to us, is at this stage grossly deficient. We say Councils' are co-responsible for the deficiencies, and also are co-negligent in accepting a proposal from the applicant when they knew the applicant had not even discussed its proposal with all affected neighbors.

It is further noted that the Regional Council was given the wrong address for ourselves (we presume by the applicant, albeit the Regional Council would hold our correct address) and thereby their notice did not arrive when it should have arrived. These were words within an email we received from Regional Council on 24 June 2020, being the first date of notification of this application from this source:

".....As discussed please find attached a copy of the letter I posted to you earlier this month that was returned with an incorrect address.

Apologies for this, I have corrected your address on my notification list to 219 State Highway 2, RD 1, Pokeno 2471."

Thereby the last date for our lodging the Regional Council submission, if 20 working days is to apply, would become about 22 July 2020. We have rushed our submissions and tried to get all in by the earlier required/stated date of 1 July 2020, but we have not had time to prepare ourselves in the manner we would have preferred had we been provided proper notice; and we thereby apologize for typo or grammar or other errors herein; and we exclude considerations of errors and note there may be omissions.

HISTORY

When the quarry was operated by the McRobbie family, it operated under an existing use right, as a very small quarry. It was then also the clear intent for the quarry to be and remain a very small operation. The McRobbie family demonstrated a concern and respect for its neighbors and toward protecting the native bush bordering the quarry site.

Since the McRobbie family were dismissed as quarry operators, the new operators have taken a different and we say arrogant stance to their purported rights and toward us as neighbors. They have never visited us as neighbors. They have never written to us as neighbors. They have demonstrated not one ounce of care or concern toward their effects and risks on us and all life on Heartland Farm. They have expanded the size of the quarry well outside any existing use rights, without neighbor nor Council formal approvals.

We have complained several times to the Councils', and at least some of those complaints are on the record. At one time of a verbal complaint, Council staff told us they (Council) had not enough staff nor time to investigate or oversee environmental damage or risk arising from the quarry and its unauthorised extensions.

We continued to complain about the expanding and increased use on the quarry site and some of the negative effects on us. We complained it was unlawfully expanding without any formal approvals or consultation. It seems that a wink and a nod by some Council staff may have co-enabled the unauthorised quarry extensions and mass native tree destruction over recent years to begin and then proliferate.

The destruction and mess to what was once beautiful native bush on the hillside facing SH2 can be seen by all from SH2 and from our property; yet this was permitted by the Councils, we understand without formal objection by Councils. We say this is a gross damage and negligence by all contributors, including the applicants and their operators and the land owners and Councils, beyond any lawful process or right.

We say the quarry operates today well beyond any existing use right. We say such historical actions and environmental abuse and rape of mother nature create existing breaches of the Resource Management Act 1991; and if this is proven then these same operators should not be granted any permission to even continue with any quarry, net alone formerly expand it.

We complained to Councils about the unlawful loss of native bush native trees. We complained about the resultant eyesore; and the impact on birds etc. We complained also about excessive quarry blasts/explosions and effects, including those severely shaking our house and buildings and living beings on our property; we complained about the risk to our spring water supply; we complained about the risk to our horse breeding operation; we complained about the impact of dust nuisance; we reiterated we operate an organic farm, depending on subtle energies and peace.

All the above complaints proved to no practical avail; save for the present required public notification/hearing (to which the Regional Council decided not to correctly-time-wise notify us) and for a Council inspector visiting our property while one of our main persons was overseas (because Council did not make an appointment pre-visit with owner's rep). We understand that Council inspector tried to down-play the real complained-of impacts, when discussing matters with a tenant on our property. We

attach only some of the letters we wrote to the Waikato District Council about the quarry. We note we also reported other complaints by phone progressively to both Councils.

We have applied our own time in prior periods, to address other applications to Councils in our neighborhood, in our on-going endeavors to try to protect the organic nature of our property, the ecological diversity thereon, the historical and current water springs, the river transiting our property, the birds (our property is a bird sanctuary, being home to about 35 different species of birds) and those beings living close by in the Mt William Conservation Reserve, and the horses (we breed racehorses), and the bees we are home to, and the people occupying Heartland Farm, several for many years, one for 30+ years to date.

We have had some serious successes environmentally with our approaches. These successes have assisted our desire and practice to farm organically, which we have been adopting for some 30 years. Over this time period we have planted at high expense well over 11,000 trees and bushes plus many additional large shrubs and many herbs on our property. Some of the trees were boundary trees, to try to protect our property from outside pollutants; but protection from all the effects of the quarry and its recent expansion now seems incredibly difficult. The cost and implementation of such protections should not fall on our shoulders, but rather on the shoulders of all the permitting and sustaining the pollutants from the quarry and its multitude of negative effects. Six figure sums have also been expended to protect the spring water source and supply systems on Heartland Farm.

We rely on the technical data and expert opinions submitted by each side in each of the following named prior applications; and we rely also on the court decisions in regard to the first 3 matters listed; as each of these 3 found their way beyond Councils and into Courts. The names on the files in Councils' storage might have slightly different headlines to these now stated herein:

- (i) Hopper Bros v David W Phillips and others re huge commercial fertiliser storage and distribution facility proposed in Irish Rd.
The outcome of this application, which both the Councils had prior approved, was that the Environment Court added such limiting and necessary conditions to it (including that NO dust particles were to fall on our property, due to its impact on peoples and horses breathing and lungs, and its impact on our organic operations), that the applicant did not proceed with the proposal. Subsequently David W Phillips co-approved a much smaller organic fertiliser use, on like Court imposed strict conditions that all loading and unloading was completed inside closed buildings, and that is how the site is used/operates today; and
- (ii) Ahead Timber (prior Aitkenhead Timber) v David W Phillips and others re polluted timber site and pollution to stream and parts of neighborhood. Aitkenhead Timber had proved to be arrogant and very uncaring neighbors. Councils of that time had turned blind eyes away from this disgusting polluted site and challenge. After Aitkenhead's commercial demise the business was taken over by Ahead Timber. After much negotiation and a case in the High Court, Ahead Timber agreed to in part compensate Heartland Farm and to improve dramatically their environmental impact, and in time they become one of the cleaner timber mill operations in NZ. The stream flowing through Heartland Farm became clean again, with the re-appearance today of abundant native water life including eels and fresh cray; and

- (iii) Winstone Aggregates Limited v David W Phillips and Pokeno Protection Society Inc and others in regard to a large quarry proposed on Pokeno Hill. The outcome of this application which both Councils approved, was that the Environment Court added limiting conditions to it. It was also discovered that the rock from this quarry was not hard enough to supply Transit for motorways (despite that being one of the proposed buyers of that rock), and that the main client (Transit) once this was discovered publicly, could not proceed with its proposed purchase of this rock. It was discovered the then CEO of Franklin District Council had sided unfairly and unprofessionally, giving his support to the applicant. Later he resigned. It was also discovered that the then CEO of Winstones had misled some people about aspects of this quarry. Later he resigned. The applicant did not, in the event, ever proceed with this quarry; and
- (iv) Max Birt Timber Mill v David W Phillips and others. Ahead Timber went into receivership and closed. The assets were sold by the bank to Max Birt. Max Birt soon thereafter was required to apply to the Councils to extend operations. Initially Max Birt's experts tried to get the Councils to decide without our Heartland Farm property and occupiers being consulted nor notified. Council then required we be notified. Once we were notified we objected. Council in this case showed an unusual but welcomed initiative, initially encouraging the differing parties to meet to try to solve the challenges between themselves. This happened AFTER the Council CEO had intimated Max Birt and his team should meet and consult with us. The Council aim seemed to be for both differing sides to meet and to try to come back to Council with a settlement of differences. The Council logic seemed to be that, if this was to work, it would save Council and all parties huge costs and huge time delays, otherwise spent on hearings, then litigation. But a risk was, could both sides act responsibly as adults and with compassion toward each other. The proposed operator (Max Birt) and the primarily affected neighbor (D W Phillips) meet many times one to one to discuss possible solutions. In the end (and much quicker than the time it would have taken for 1 hearing) an amicable out of court settlement was reached, which Council co-approved, and which is still operative today. This became an example of what could become a future constructive method of settling neighborhood disputes amicably, by way of meaningful arbitration (albeit in this case the parties met without an outside arbitrator – but the Council took an informal semi-arbitration/referee role). A key in that case was Max Birt accepting without prejudice that he was to operate a business with side effects, and asking what the opposer wanted and how those wants of the opposer could fairly mitigate the operator's effects. Max Birt, in our opinion, acted very responsibly.

In respect to this present submission by McPherson Quarry we assume and rely on the Councils retrieving the above stated prior applications and submissions and Court decisions named 1 to 3 above, and using as guidelines the expert opinions therein and Court decisions relating thereto. It would seem foolish to ignore the matters already canvassed and/or Council and/or Court decisions, especially given the like or inter-related nature of several significant matters.

In addition to relying on our rights under the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act') we also rely on other NZ legislation, common law and equity law, and also on rights attributed to us under the English

version of Treaty of Waitangi (see final Littlewood English copy), and/or the maori translated copy, both of which provided equal rights and protection to all NZers. We also rely on the Declaration of Independence of 1835, which provided Sovereignty to maori NZers. Given this, we rely on the kaitiaki of our property and spring water source being passed by Waitaha and maori NZers to David W Phillips in a spiritual ceremony held on Heartland Farm in the presence of Waitaha, local maori hapu and iwi and Native American Indians invited to this international event.

SPECIFIC ADDITIONAL OBJECTIONS

We repeat all we say above and include those matters above within our submissions to each Council, and we now further address additional objections in the order and under the subject matters listed in the Summary of Application sent to us by the Councils, with some added subject matters, some specific to our property.

District Council

1. Landscape and Visual Assessment

- (i) The quarry had minimal visual effect on our property when operated by McRobbies; and
- (ii) In very recent times the new operator has destroyed large areas of native bush to expand the quarry without any consultation with us and with no prior notification; and
- (iii) The effect already on the enviro and visions is disturbing and disastrous, with a large area recently exposed to all who drive along SH2, and also from our property; and
- (iv) We have been in negotiation for some time with a potential buyer of a 'to be subdivided' site on our property; but the site looks directly to the quarry, and this negative visual quarry effect might cause our sale to be lost, or if not lost cause loss in value to the site; and
- (v) We are absolutely opposed to any further striping or degradation of the native bush on the side of the hill opposite our property; and
- (vi) We rely on the bush opposite our property for visual effect, and for bird life habitat and for cleaner air and for nature to be respected and preserved; and
- (vii) No further removal of indigenous vegetation or trees to be permitted; and
- (viii) Begin immediately a compensation tree planting program to replace nearby, every tree destroyed during the 5 year period prior to the this application and every tree removed hereinafter (but this submitter says no trees should be permitted to be removed); and
- (ix) Loss of trees cause a reduction in oxygen and an unstable hill and lost bird habitat and increase noise, and contribute to the serious climate changes now being experienced. If the applicant disagrees with any of these just stated positions, we seek to see expert opinions by applicant countering this and then be granted time to reply; and
- (x) We agree compensation planting should be directed on the quarry site and its surrounds, including as proposed to form a 4.53 ha planted ecological corridor to the north of the existing quarry boundary (but not to the north of any future expansion, as that expansion should be prohibited); and this planting should be implemented forthwith to compensate for the eyesore and plant/tree loss already actioned in a non-

notified manner; AND we say additional substantive planting should be directed to compensate for the south facing eyesore and plant/tree loss, and to encircle the quarry, to enable visual and dust and some sound mitigation barriers; and

- (xi) We say all trees planted must be natives, and be over 1 meter high at time of planting, and be regularly maintained and watered to ensure steady growth, and to include a range of species to ensure useful food and habitat for native birds and associated life forms; and

2. Traffic Impact Assessment

- (i) We have observed dust and dirt being moved from the existing quarry operation onto SH2, as it joins McPherson road, and this creates slippery and dangerous conditions both on McPherson Road and especially on SH 2. This must be prohibited and with specific penalties if breached; and
- (ii) We require a more restrictive limit to the truck movements, to reduce the danger and effects on SH2; and
- (iii) Truck Movements - we seek trucks be fitted with sound silencers; and
- (iv) We seek no trucks be permitted to use the noisy engine breaking system on SH2 outside our property and 1 klm either side; and
- (v) We seek daily truck movement be reduced to a total of 60, 30 arriving and 30 leaving and no more. This was and was always to be a small quarry with minimal impact, and this is the understanding of all residents who have bought their home properties nearby; and

3. Noise Assessment

- (i) Noise can be a physical pollutant, that is a fact; and
- (ii) We are very disturbed by operation sounds flowing to our property from the operations in the quarry. This negatively impacts our right to live in peace and harmony, and affects our minds and spirit. We seek to see an assessment of these effects and how they are proposed to be mitigated; and
- (iii) We are very disturbed by blasting sounds flowing to our property from the explosions in/on the quarry. This negatively impacts our right to live in peace and harmony, and affects our minds and spirit. We seek to see an assessment of these effects and how they are proposed to be mitigated; and
- (iv) We are disturbed by relatively high level of truck movements per day flowing to our property from the truck movements in/on the quarry. We seek to see an assessment of these effects on us and on our property and how they are proposed to be mitigated; and
- (v) We seek a set decibel level to imposed that is never exceeded on the perimeter of the quarry property. This should be set by experts after carrying out various assessments with neighborhood involvement; and

4. Contamination and Ecological Reports

- (i) We are told that some seriously polluted soils and/or metal might have been removed from the Ahead-Aitkenhead Timber polluted site, to be secretly buried on the quarry site; and
- (ii) We seek that Councils urgently investigate this; and

- (iii) We seek that Councils' require from the quarry applicant and their directorate and management and land owners, sworn statements (punishable by perjury if untrue) that says either this never happened, or if it did happen then for all detail of dates and quantum and locale be identified and reported to Councils and to all neighbors; and
 - (iv) If it is true, we seek that a criminal investigation be commenced; and
 - (v) If it is true, we require that all polluted soils (which would include PCB's, polluted metal and polluted particles to be dug up and removed to an authorised polluted site; and
 - (vi) We refer to and rely on the information on the web site:
<https://www.veolia.com/anz/our-services/our-services/hazardous-waste/solid-hazardous-waste/contaminated-soils>
 - (vii) The above web site states: *"Contaminated soil is soil polluted with organic and inorganic contaminants, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), heavy metals, PAHs, TPH, acid sulphate or pesticides. Contaminated soil needs to be remediated to remove contaminants. This involves the soil being excavated and treated on site or transported and treated at a licensed facility. Thermal treatment can be used to destroy or remove organic contaminants within soil reducing waste to landfill" ; and*
 - (viii) If it is true, and If the existing operators of the quarry and/or land owners were a party to any such secretive and damming actions, which could pollute all underground water and soils, then they should be banned from operating the quarry forthwith; and
5. Ecological Management Plan – we seek to have meaningful input into this, but cannot when the applicant refuses to communicate with us; and
 6. Hydraulic Assessment- – we seek to have meaningful input into this, but cannot when the applicant refuses to communicate with us; and
 7. Earthfill Methodology
 - (i) The outcome of investigations as described in clause 4 above must be clarified and settled first; and
 - (ii) No deposition right to clean fill at 100,000 cubic metres per annum over 45 years; indeed NO fill to be deposited back on quarry site, until quarry is closed, and then only after expert technical impact assessment fully approves such action without negative impacts; and
 - (iii) No new fill should be permitted on the quarry site, due in part to the threat of polluting or inhibiting underground waters and due to other potential negative effects; and
 - (iv) If any new fill should be permitted, then it must be subjected to many tests for a wide range of pollutants with every separate source contemplated for moving on site, prior to any move, being tested and the test reports as to it being contamination free must be distributed to each neighbor, including to our property; and
 8. Earthworks. We say no approval should be granted to any earthworks for stage 1 or stage 11 or stage 111. We also object to the quantum proposed of discharge of overburden to land; and
 9. No earthworks to be permitted at any time on any Significant Natural Area or any area now treed, including NO removal of 2.45 ha of indigenous vegetation; and

10. Erosion And Sediment Control Plan- this is a serious matter and not sufficient assessment of effects has been entered into. We seek to be guaranteed that the stream running through our farm will not have its flow in any manner slowed due to the quarry and its operations and/or any side effects such as erosion or sediment or otherwise; and
11. Draft Quarry Management Plan – we seek to have meaningful input into this, but cannot when the applicant refuses to communicate with us; and
12. Blasting/Explosives/Vibrations and Frequency Effects:
 - (i) ‘Pokeno’ can mean in English, ‘underground railway station’. This can refer to the fact that there are geological fault lines right beside the quarry which run to Coromandel and north to Cape Colville; and run back to SH1 and up north and down south. Thereby any impact or explosions happening on this important fault line and quarry site get carried far and wide, with impacts vibrationally on earth and earth movement and earth quake. We seek to see expert opinions and impact assessment reports by applicant about the geology and fault lines of or by this site and its environs and how the applicant plans to mitigate effects and risks, and then we seek to be granted time to reply; and
 - (ii) Right beside the quarry and into Pokeno are what some call ‘ley lines’, these being energetic lines under/in the earth carrying energies far and wide. We have had these confirmed by an expert in this field called Frank Moody (now the late Frank). These ley lines and their energy absorbed, emitted and transmitted can be seriously disrupted and disturbed by quarry activities. We seek to see expert opinions and impact assessment reports by applicant about the ley lines of or by this site and its environs and how the applicant plans to mitigate effects and risks, and then we seek to be granted time to reply; and
 - (iii) We seek all neighbors be advised in writing or by email of each proposed blasting and the exact timing and the explosive force/power being used on each occasion; and
 - (iv) Full and detailed records to be maintained in register of each explosion and with right of public access to that register during any work hours; and
 - (v) A strict limit be capped on every explosion force, and to be far lower (at least no more than half the minimum force used at any time in past 5 years) than the present practice, which unfairly and irresponsibly and carelessly shakes our houses on their foundations and causes more damage. We seek to see expert opinions and impact assessment reports by applicant about the shaking of our homes and buildings (no applicant expert in any form has even visited us to date) and how the applicant plans to mitigate effects and risks and to compensate us for all damage and/or accelerated depreciation caused by their quarry and activities thereon, including but not limited to blasting, and then we seek to be granted time to reply; and
 - (vi) A cash fund to be required to be established and as well insurance to be entered into and maintained (with neighbors’ rights stated on the insurance policy, where neighbors can claim via insurance without need to go through applicant) which will reimburse without delay any damage caused by any explosion in the quarry and/or or any other damaging quarry act; and

- (vii) Many of the explosions over recent years have frightened and caused upset to both people and birds and horses living on our property. We should not expect this in a rural living zone. We seek compensation for this disturbance to both our lifestyle and to our minds and nerves and for any damage that horses suffer during blasts/explosions; and
- (viii) If we are working with horses during an explosion, then they can react with fright and can cause damage to both themselves and to the person then handling them. This is one of several reasons why it is absolutely essential to be pre-warned several days prior to every explosion. By example, it is imperative we do not have horses in for feet trimming or for worming or for weaning or for much other one to one tasks during blasts/explosions; and
- (ix) We have on our property several buildings, each constructed around 1871, and of some historical significance; in that they are likely to be some of the oldest buildings remaining in this area. They each have existing use rights pre-dating even the establishment of both Councils. Today we name some of these buildings as follows: The Villa; The Attic; The Stables; The Red Cottage (the latter being home to property staff). We hold grave concerns that the extensive vibrational shaking we have had to endure to our historical buildings from the higher force of blasts/explosions since Mc Robbies were dismissed, is damaging them both at foundation level and structurally and also with other damaging side effects. The quarry blasts/explosions in recent years have an earthquake type of effect on us and our buildings. By example, we say each of the following damages are due to the blast/explosions effects and physical shaking and vibrations on our older buildings. We seek an assessment of effects to be completed and mitigated by the applicant to each of these specifics and to other like damage:
 - (a) over past approximately 9 years we have had to spend about \$5,000 (about \$4000 in last 6 years) replacing multiple glass panes in windows. These have cracked or broken with no one being seen to cause the damage. These have occurred in the Villa, its garage, The Stables and The Red Cottage; and
 - (b) over past few years several of our window frames in Villa have had parts vibrationally move and collapse. This has or will cost about \$2,000 to repair; and
 - (c) over past year we have had to endure our front steps of Villa collapsing. A tenant escaped serious injury. This will cost about \$2,500 to repair; and
 - (d) The railings on our Attic and Villa decks have also been shaken loose and need re-supporting. These will cost about \$5,000 to repair; and

13. We also require no explosives to be permitted all of Saturday and Sunday. It is noted that some visitors to our property regard Saturday as their bible's day of Sabbath (see Ten Commandments), while others say it is Sunday. Each are entitled under the NZ Bill of Rights 1990 to their respective beliefs; and neither should be upset or made scared by explosions on a Sabbath day. As well, all our tenants are usually living all day on our property on Saturday and Sunday, and to mitigate blasting/explosion effects on them, any explosions that may be permitted must be only on Monday to Friday during operating hours; and

14. Operating Hours – subject to our clause 11 above, we seek operations be limited to 8am start

and 5 pm close Monday to Friday and from 8am start and 1 pm close every Saturday...and that no quarry works whatsoever, including no truck or vehicle movements on site whatsoever, outside of operating hours; and

15. No right of transfer of consent to any quarry activities from this applying party. Any consent only to apply to present applicant and be non-transferrable; and
16. Use of consent never to be transferred in any title or lease or operational manner to any entity controlled outside NZ; and
17. Economic effects and impact on Amenity Values:
 - (i) The quarry since being expanded in recent years (without specific formal approvals from Council nor any neighbour consultation nor approval) has had a detrimental impact on the value of our property. We seek to stop further devaluation. We seek to hear how the applicant proposes to mitigate this effect, as it is not in the application to date; and
 - (ii) We plan to subdivide our property into 2 extra titles, using the TDR system for subdivision. The quarry since being expanded has had a detrimental impact on the value of each new title planned for our property. We seek to stop further devaluation. We seek to hear how the applicant proposes to mitigate this effect as it is not in the application to date; and
 - (iii) One of our existing two titles now faces due north and looks directly onto the quarry site. This is seriously impacted by the quarry as to visual, noise, dust and more effects. We seek to stop further devaluation of this existing title. We seek to hear how the applicant proposes to mitigate this effect as it is not in the application to date; and
 - (iv) To meet our mortgage payments we rely on tenants occupying buildings on our property. The quarry has effects which discourage tenants occupying buildings on our property, including but not limited to quarry dust affecting people and their cars and washing drying on line and guttering growth and the explosions upsetting and frightening people and birds and more; and
 - (v) Require expert assessments be completed to show the potential economic losses of/to neighbors and how applicant proposes to mitigate these effect; and
 - (vi) Given the significant effect of this quarry on the neighborhood, it would not be unfair for applicant to set aside a minor percentage of turnover (e.g. 20%), with say half of this to be distributed each six months on a 'to be agreed basis' to all neighbors (to cover some damages arising from operating the quarry), including our property, and with say half of this 20% to be held back in Council's care for mitigating serious damage the quarry may cause; and
 - (vii) Seek to see some fixed pre-agreed penalties to apply in event the applicant does not meet or adhere to any of the conditions of any approval; and
18. Completion and Remediation: Require a set date when quarry would be closed and not thereafter extended. With the growing residential uses in the neighborhood, it is paramount that the quarry have a restricted life and a termination date set for all quarry and quarry related

activities; and no extensions be renegotiable. We say this should be a maximum of 21 years. We say part of the gross income from the quarry (say about 10%) should be required to be set aside for future remediation works, including remediation earlier than the 21 year end period; such that at the end of the quarry life there is no ugly eyesore from SH2 or from a neighbors property, and that all natural features are re-sited, with much re-planting and top soil replacement and water remediation; and

19. Hydrological effects – see Regional Council submission; and

20. Climate Change effects

(i) While there exists some considerable debate as to what are the causes of recent climate changes, not one could reasonably argue that there are no significant climate changes now upon us; and

(ii) See this NZ Govt web site <https://www.mfe.govt.nz/climate-change/likely-impacts-of-climate-change/likely-climate-change-impacts-nz> It says, inter alia:

(a) Our changing climate will affect our economy, environment and way of life; and

(b) More frequent extreme weather events

aa. droughts (especially in the east of New Zealand) - Warmer temperatures will alter habitats that are critical to some species, increasing the risk of localised extinction. Hotter summers may damage elements of transport infrastructure, causing buckled railway lines and damaged roads, with disruption and repair costs; and

bb. floods - More frequent intense winter rainfalls. These are expected to increase the likelihood of rivers flooding, and flash flooding when urban drainage systems become overwhelmed; and

(c) A change in rainfall patterns

aa. increased summer rainfall in north and east of the North Island; and

bb. increased winter rainfall in many parts of the South Island; and

cc. Water demand will increase during hot, dry summers. Longer summers with higher temperatures and lower rainfall will reduce soil moisture and groundwater supplies. Drought intensity will likely increase over time. Drier conditions in some areas are likely to be coupled with more frequent droughts; and

(iii) We seek to see the applicant's assessment of effects coupled with the above referred to climate changes over the term of the project. We see no useful study in this regard to date; and

(iv) The area of the quarry and of Heartland Farm and their surrounds suffered in 2020 the worst drought in recordable history. This followed 2 prior serious drought in the prior 7 years. Water supply on Heartland Farm reduced significantly as the drought progressed; and

- (v) In the past month we have suffered 2 flash floods, the most recent being the worst effect wise, blocking the stream exiting our property, and flooding with thick liquid mud the area near our back gate where spring water is collected and sold. The area was so caked in mud and had been flooded up to waist height, that clients could not get to the spring water supply tank. This was around 24-25 June 2020. This required a day to clean up, at our expense; and
- (vi) One fact about climate change is that one of several of the primary causes is the destruction of trees and habitat on the surface of planet earth by humans and usually at the direct of corporations, such as we have seen recently executed by the applicant; and
- (vii) Today, NZ has only about 7% of the forests and native trees it once had, pre the British-European invasion- suggesting about 93% has been destroyed; and
- (viii) Today, NZ and future generations have a huge task of re-planting and re-foresting NZ. One small example is the initiative in Auckland Region which has seen about 1 million trees planted with the help of the Council and school children. Thankfully this example is not alone; but the task is massive. An international example of 'massive', can be seen by the project in Ethiopia to plant one billion new trees in one year; and
- (ix) Sometime in the future, when human minds collectively can grasp that fact that trees produce oxygen that humans' and others breath; and that the living tree has a life and during that life it absorbs carbon dioxide (and some absorb carbon monoxide) - then when that day arrives maybe it will become a crime to cut down any tree without a permit granted by the community. The facts are that trees have a form of breathing, where their respiration is comparable to humans inhaling air (needing oxygen) into the lungs, and their photosynthesis is comparable to exhaling air by humans (exhale including carbon dioxide). Trees respiration absorbs far more harmful carbon dioxide than they release, thanks to the process of photosynthesis. Photosynthesis is a unique chemical process that trees and plants use to turn light energy from the sun into oxygen. "Photosynthesis" is a Greek word meaning "light" and "putting together." During this process, trees harness the sun's energy, using it to put carbon dioxide gas together with water to produce oxygen; and
- (x) When human minds collectively can also grasp that fact that trees are a critical part of the hydrological cycle (refer to Viktor Schauberger's excellent work on this fact), then the destruction of living native trees, without any prior consultation, such as we have witnessed on the hillside facing SH2 by this applicant, might be sealed in the future to become a crime; and
- (xi) Rudolph Steiner is another researcher and writer we rely on in our submissions. He lived for part of the time Hitler was ascending in Germany. To stay alive, given Hitler's threats, Steiner moved to Switzerland. I regard these two intelligent men as similar souls, but coming from opposite energies and using the opposite force of spirit; and

- (xii) Hitler used explosion and hate and division and darkness/secrets and death as key parts of his armory. Steiner used implosion and love and unity and light and life within his approaches; and
 - (xiii) Steiner emphasized, correctly we say, that everything is connected. We see nothing in the applicant's proposal to investigate the effects, given this connectivity of all life in our neighborhood. We seek such expert assessment and mitigation; and
 - (xiv) We say this applicant is taking the old -style Hitler approach to tasks. In that it/he is using explosion and division and secrets and death as key parts of its/his armory. It is time for Councils to consider such application from an enlightened Steiner perspective; which would ensure community inclusive involvement, ensure non-explosive approaches; require planting trees not killing them, begin caring for top-soils and not stripping them, treating streams with respect, not as a dump for their wastes, becoming a natural caretaker and restorer, not a rapist of earths treasures' and having high regard to the water cycle under earth and above earth in everything they do. It is time to honor or creator/God and all co-creation, and not to continue to insult our very source of creation; and
 - (xv) Today the NZ environment is protected (supposedly) from the rape by commercial interests by the Resource Management Act 1919, and by caring Councilors and their expert staff. While today destroying trees and the oxygen they create and the carbon dioxide they dissolve and the water they send back to the sky, is not necessarily today a crime; but the effect on the trees and thereby on us neighboring humans and horses who will have (a) less oxygen to breath, and (b) more pollutants to dissolve within, and (c) a lower rainfall, each have to be assessed and the effects mitigated. We see nothing useful in the applicant's proposal to carry out its obligations to assess and then mitigate effects on trees, oxygen, carbon dioxide, water/rainfall hydrology under the NZ law. We seek (and then have time to respond) an expert assessment report and mitigation report on these critical effects and serious matters; and
 - (xvi) As well as the request in (iii) above, we seek (and then have time to respond) a full climate impact report by the applicant's experts on all the effects of its proposal (including the blasting/explosives) having regard to today's climate and our future climate over the life time of quarry proposal; and
21. Other effects – our property is a bird sanctuary, and has been for some 20 years. About 35 different species of bird live here (including many native to NZ). It took us 10 years before we attracted our second pair of Kereru. We have been told by experts that the birds need various areas of native bush nearby to provide complementary use as secondary homes and as places to rest in flight to/from differing food sources. We seek to see an impact report by bird experts in respect to impacts of stripping or killing of native trees that has taken place around the quarry in past 6 years, and all native tree felling now proposed within in the present application; and

22. We seek to have the Mt William Conservation Reserve bolstered, not dissolved by the quarry sliding closer and closer to a much used and much needed Conservation Reserve. Also in this Mt William Reserve there is a home to many native birds and some majestic huge kauri, some kauri perhaps 800 years of age which would take 4 people to stretch their arms around their girth. The quarry and its proposed growth, simply has to be a seriously negative threat to the life of native birds and these giant kauri trees of nature; and
23. We refer and rely on information on the web site: <https://www.forestandbird.org.nz/> This NZ web site includes the warning words:
- (i) **In forgotten corners of New Zealand, nature is disappearing. Government agencies are failing to protect nature on public land. We have to turn this around, or we will lose more species forever; and**
 - (ii) Our native plants, animals and wild places are like no others on this planet. Yet it has taken humans less than a thousand years to wipe out a significant amount of this natural heritage; and
 - (iii) The draining of wetlands and loss of habitat through development are just some of the major factors that have contributed to more than 50 extinctions; and
 - (iv) Nature on land is still in crisis, despite a growing number of initiatives to expand pest control and restore habitats. Our native plants and animals are continuing to decline across the country, with over 80% of our land-based birds, bats, reptiles and frogs in trouble and
 - (v) A third of New Zealand's land is public conservation land, managed by the Department of Conservation. In these areas, nature appears superficially intact, but in many places wildlife is still disappearing; and
 - (vi) On private land, native habitat is also continuing to disappear due to pressure from development, leaving tiny, disconnected fragments; and
 - (vii) Our soils are deteriorating due to erosion and intensive farming. Diseases such as kauri dieback and myrtle rust threaten our magnificent native tree species; and
24. Have the NZ Conservation Department and NZ Forest and Bird Society each been consulted by the applicant? If not, why not? If yes, what have they said? We seek to a serious assessment and then mitigation of effects on birds and the magnificent mid-aged kauri in the Mt William Reserve, and we say no further native tree destruction should be permitted; and
25. Other effects – we operate an organic farm, and we have 5 different organic orchards on our property, each using several principles including those enunciated by Rudolph Steiner (biodynamics) and Viktor Schauberger (water specialist and forester and naturalist) and Bill Mollison (permaculture and sustainability). We also follow the teachings of Jacques Fresco and his Venus project <https://www.thevenusproject.com> . None of these principals we adopt support the blasts and explosions and vibrations of/to our physical property and our bodies, minds and spirits, or also of/to the subtle energies and other unseen life forms that such explosive behavior causes damage to and creates havoc amidst; and

26. Other effects – some submitters within this proposal have specific religious beliefs and we seek these be honored and protected by the NZ Bill of Rights 1990, and by international legislation and treaties and conventions and other agreements. We can supply a summary of the religious beliefs of two submitters to this proposal on request; and
27. Other effects – we require that all matters addressed and determined by the District Council and /or by the Courts in the Winstone Limited v David Phillips and Pokeno Protection Society and others in regard to a large quarry proposed on Pokeno Hill, be distributed to the applicant and available to objectors, and each matter therein be also addressed by this applicant and be each considered when assessing conditions of operations by the McPherson Quarry; and
28. We seek to be advised of each step which has been taken in past 15 years to grow the quarry from its small existing use right that had effect under McRobbie management. By this we seek a time-line chart showing each step taken to expand or grow the quarry, including but not limited to (i) disclosing the exact dates of each native tree destruction; and (ii) the exact date the top area of quarry expanded; and (iii) the tonnage of each type of rock or metal quarried in each of last 15 years; and (iv) the cash sales turnover in each of last 15 years; and (v) the distribution of sales/turnover by customers (not name of customers, but their locations) in each of last 15 years; (vi) the stats sought in (v) above, but shown for the future budgets to whom increased turnover is proposed to be sold, showing if this is to be used locally or outside our local area and if any is proposed to be use on motorways locally or outside the area. As a part of this information we also seek to be shown records of all communications Council to applicant in the past 10 years, and to be told why the Councils let this quarry grow as it has, without management nor controls being imposed by Councils.

Regional Council (we say that any matters now addressed under this sub-heading are to be also read as though they also apply to the District Council submissions above as well, if they in any manner so apply. We repeat as well, for all Regional Council submissions all the above submissions and prelude raised above under District Council submissions apply where it is relevant they apply)

29. Dust Effects

- (i) The most damming dust effect (of many) is fact it creates dust particles in air, which are then forcibly breathed into lungs by people and horses on our property. This effect was one of reason why the Environment Court required any dust causing operations on the site west of our farm (then Hoppers - including all truck loading and unloading) to be actioned inside strictly closed premises, and with those premises having air ventilation with filters, so no dust escaped. We require the applicant to do no less that the same, and in interim we require applicant to provide expert assessments showing exactly what is in dust particles (including any arising from blasts/explosions and/or truck movements and or any other cause) and an assessment of these dust effects and how applicant proposes to mitigate these effects, and then we seek to be granted time to reply; and

- (ii) We presented in the Hopper case specific expert opinions from a leading veterinary expert about dust effects on the breathing passages and lungs of horses - when forced to breath such dust as the quarry creates when operating unprotected. This expert opinion outlined how such exposure can create negative impact their race ability as they mature. We rely on the same expert opinion, and ask Councils to retrieve it from their records, and add it to this file. The vet concerned was Dr Patrick Casey who is based in Kumeu, west Auckland; and
- (iii) We thereby specifically seek all truck movements on site to take place inside a large contained space/building constructed for this purpose and with those premises having air ventilation with filters, so no dust escaped – this being to minimise all dust and noise of filling of trucks and movement of trucks on site to be contained inside the quarry property; and
- (iv) This still leaves the wider quarry being a dust causer – to mitigate this we seek boundary fences or secure screens be constructed at a height of 10 meters around the quarry operating site areas, to ensure most dust is captured on site and to reduce noise effects. An example of such screens being required and provided to mitigate sound and dust effects can be seen internationally on the sides of many motorways. Examples I can show pictures of, are around the new ring road in St Petersburg Russia, and to a lesser extent along part of the sides of the motorway Auckland to Papakura. The example I quote in Russia is more effective, as the sides of walls/screens have inward curves at top to limit exposure of pollutants and dust to outside environ; and
- (v) We seek 8 x daily watering of quarry operational areas with clean water, to minimise dust becoming airborne; and
- (vi) The quarry has dust effects which discourage tenants occupying buildings on our property, including but not limited to quarry dust affecting people and their cars and washing drying on line. We seek the applicant to pay for the lost rents during vacant tenancies and also for all re-advertising of vacant tenancies; and to reimburse us for this cost over past 5 years; and
- (vii) The quarry has dust effects which cause dust depositing on our home and roof causing roof water to be not usable. We seek the applicant to pay for and effect the steam cleaning/water blasting of all our property's buildings once every 6 months; and to reimburse us for this cost over past 5 years; and
- (viii) The quarry has dust effects which cause guttering around roof to have much faster vegetation growth (which in turn if not cleared at a cost every 3 months causes leaks inside house and leaks outside house, as it has sometimes done on our property). We seek the applicant to pay for and effect the cleaning of all gutterings on our property's buildings once every 3 months; and to reimburse us for this cost over past 5 years; and

- (ix) The quarry has dust effects which cause dust depositing on our home and roof and gutterings which has already caused accelerated depreciation and repair needs of these items in/on our buildings, especially the gutterings' and rooves. We seek contribution by applicant to each of these repairs, as have been effected over past 5 years and as will be impacted by the quarry continuing at present unauthorised and uncaring and irresponsible activity levels; and

30. Water table effects

- (i) We seek to be guaranteed that the water tables under our property, will not have their volume in any manner reduced due to the quarry and its blasting/explosions and/or operations or otherwise; and
- (ii) We seek to be guaranteed that the water tables under our property, will not have their water quality negatively impacted in any manner due to the quarry and its operations or otherwise; and
- (iii) We have concerns that the water surface take or any other water take right and/or any water diversion project and/or any high risk erosion areas within quarry property or adjoining, may impact negatively on our property and/or on our springs and/or our 5 different organic orchards and/or farm animals and birds and bees, especially in times of drought as we suffered in 2020; and
- (iv) We require a guarantee that no fracking will ever be permitted; and

31. Effects on springs Heartland Farm

- (i) We refer all parties to our spring water web site at:
www.heartlandsprings.com
- (ii) Heartland Farm relies on the continuing supply of top quality spring water from this long-standing spring source; and
- (iii) We repeat our concerns in clause 30 above, and the spring flow is dependent on a water table level to provide weight to push up naturally the spring from its aquifer source; and
- (iv) This spring source has existing use rights dating back to at least the 1800's; but Waitaha (the Ruka family) tells us this spring and its use by humans' dates back to pre-maori; and
- (v) Mount William Spring Water Limited has water take rights provided by the Waikato Regional Council set at 200,000 liters per day. The formal resource consent was granted by the Waikato Regional Council to the Right Holder by way of the written agreement sent by them to the Right Holder (with the knowledge and consent of the land owner) around 7 October 2011, this following applications made by the Right Holder (with the knowledge and consent of the land owner) around 1 July 2011 and 22 August 2011, and

each Resource Consent being numbered .123205, 122977 and 122976 respectively The water take rights are numbered 123205, 122977 and 122976 respectively; and

- (vi) We seek to be guaranteed (with set in stone serious financial penalties if this guarantee is not honored) that the aquifer supplying spring water to our property will not have its quantum or flow or quality in any manner negatively impacted nor slowed due to the quarry and its operations and its blasting/explosions and/or any side effects from erosion or sediment and/or otherwise; and
- (vii) We seek to be guaranteed (with set in stone serious financial penalties if this guarantee is not honored) that the channel in rocks delivering spring water to the surface of our property from the aquifer supplying spring water to our property will not have its flow nor directions in any manner negatively impacted nor slowed due to the quarry and its operations and its blasting/explosions and/or any side effects from erosion or sediment and/or otherwise; and
- (v) We sell spring water also from our property back gate in Irish Rd. We seek to be assured that the quarry will never impact on the amenity and/or facility presently enjoyed by our property and our customers who drive to collect and buy spring water; and
- (viii) We remain seriously concerned the applicant enlarged its quarry and increase the force of its explosions, without even consulting us about a likely impact on our exiting spring source; and
- (ix) In 2020 we had the most reduction ever seen in our spring flow over 31 years of living on Heartland Farm. We demand that the blasting and explosive force at the quarry be reduced substantively from its present practice and that it also cease during any times of prolonged summer droughts; and
- (x) We require the applicant to complete a detailed assessment of effects of all aspects of their existing operation and proposed operation on our aquifer and its rock channel and the spring flow and quality of spring water. This needs to include geological, geo tech, to identify exactly where the source aquifer is located and its depth and the age of water therein and to assess the effects of the blasts/explosions and their vibrations on all aspects of our spring water source; and
- (xi) We require water quality and flow tests to become a regular exercise paid for by the quarry operator; and

32. Effects on stream Heartland Farm

- (i) We seek to be guaranteed that the stream running through our property will not have its volume in any manner reduced due to the quarry and its operations or otherwise; and

- (ii) We seek to be guaranteed that the flow rate of the stream running through our property will not have its flow rate in any manner impeded nor reduced due to the quarry and its operations or otherwise; and
- (iii) We have concerns that the storm-water discharge applied for may impact negatively the stream flow through our property, especially in times of flash floods. If our stream flow is halted or impacted, it could cause damage to the source and protections around our spring source and/or cause damage to our back gate spring water collection tank and facilities; the latter being evident in June 2020; and

33. Other effects - – we require that all matters addressed and determined by the Regional Council and /or by the Courts in the Winstone Limited v David Phillips and Pokeno Protection Society and others in regard to a large quarry proposed on Pokeno Hill, be distributed to the applicant and available to objectors, and each matter therein be also addressed by this applicant and be each considered when assessing conditions of operations by the McPherson Quarry.



D W Phillips, autographed on behalf of himself as :david-william: from house of phillips and on behalf of all submitters

NZ Address:
c/- Heartland Farm
219 State Highway 2 (SH2),
Pokeno, 2471,
New Zealand (NZ).
NZ Mobile: (64) 021 0604219

ATTACHMENT TO SUBMISSIONS re McPherson's Quarry LU C0123/19 and AAP137612

2 July 2020

Please affix this correspondence to the submissions made today by persons associated with Heartland Farm.

Some communications (but not all) about complaints to Council re Quarry are tabulated herein. The record shows there were also complaints re quarry recorded by Heartland Farm in 2015 and also back in 1998. These are some of the more recent complaints and Council responses:

1 July 2018 (Waikato District Council)

From: davidmvh@gmail.com

Sent: Sunday, 1 July 2018 6:20:44 a.m.

To: "Rates" <rates@waidc.govt.nz>; info@waidc.govt.nz

CC: "Rachel Williams" <interachel@gmail.com>; "Stephen Pool" <sjpool8c@gmail.com>

Subject: Complaints to District Council re Pokeno Quarry

Hi Catherine and Julie,

Can you please pass this email and the quarry complaints herein, onto your relevant complaint service people and inspectorate in the District Council.

The Pokeno Quarry I refer to is located on south side of Bombay Hills, facing our farm and SH2.

Quarry entrance possibly from McPhersons Road.

This complaint is sent by each of the following entities, each authorising this emailed letter of complaint:

David W Phillips

as resident of Heartland Farm &
Pokeno Farm Family Trust as owner of Heartland Farm &
Hambletonian Limited, as lessor of Heartland Farm &
Heartland Farm Charitable Trust based at Heartland Farm &
Wai Ora New Zealand Limited &
Mount William Spring Water Limited

Rachel Williams, a resident at Heartland Farm, and other residents might also soon join this complaint. I have copied this email to Rachel and her NZ mobile phone is:

021 0501589

Please note our land line at farm is no longer connected.

I am out of NZ at present, but this complaint should be dealt with urgency. You can phone Rachel and email me, or I can attend to skype communications

Please advise me by email who will deal with this in Council; and when.

In that earlier complaint/event (about 2 years or so ago) a lady in the District Council did phone me and said she was very busy and had difficulty to following up complaints. She also criticised me for not complaining earlier? She said she would visit quarry site and come back to me. I never heard back from her. This earlier complaint and its context, should be recorded in your files.

Since that complaint negative effects on us from quarry have recently escalated.

The matters of specific complaint are now listed:

1. Recently this quarry has STRIPPED from the landscape and hillside what seems to us as observers, acres of native bush or other greenery (including some sizable native trees being felled), causing a huge increase in bare land scars now seen visually from our farm and from SH2.
2. As a result of above actions, our farm now faces much increase in dust being blown from both quarry and increase bare land around it being blown, all over our organic farm and house and washing and cars and animals on the farm - and over our spring water operation; and of course over us humans.
3. We have no idea what other pollutants are in the quarry dust, especially after heavy machinery use on its land/rocks, and explosives being used on quarry site.
4. Our farm is organic and has been operated in this manner for some 28 years. We strenuously object to this dust nuisance and potential pollutants.
5. We have complained before about the extensive detonation carried out on quarry site; and ask this cease immediately. It not only shakes out homestead, but frightens our animals (which include quality pregnant bloodstock). The dust can damage bloodstock's delicate breathing passages. These are racehorses, and such effects can be catastrophic.
6. As well our farm is a protected site for birds, with about 35 different species now living in our thousands of trees-most trees planted by us. The birds scream each time there is a blast from the quarry, as I am sure they also do in the nearby Mt William conservation reserve.

7. The recent blasts from quarry seem to have increased in intensity; and may well have some detrimental affect on the spring water which has been flowing on our farm at least since 1860's, probably for thousand of years prior.

We depend on this spring for our livelihood, and we have rights to extract up to 200,000 litres per day.

We object to this risk from the quarry, and ask you to ensure you advise the quarry in writing of this risk, and that we hold both Council and them jointly liable in event of damage to our spring supply.

8. We have had complaints from spring water customers, who collect spring water at our back gate; and from tenants at Heartland Farm, who rent space from us.

These complaints to us have included the visual eyesore of quarry, as it has widened its own footprint/landscape significantly in recent times; and the dust and the noise and the blasts.

9. We can now hear much more noise from the quarry, even on Sundays, as the heavy machinery cuts into landscape and rocks get pulverised. This noise has increased what seems to be 5-fold in past year; due either to increased operating times or lack of surrounding green bush/treed borders, or some other unidentified reasons. We seek the increased noise to stop, including to stop altogether on Sundays.

10. Other matters to be advised.

It is also noted we recently had a Regional Council person at our farm, and we did not need to point out to him the ever-growing landscape abuse by this quarry. He knew of it (indeed anyone travelling along SH2 can see the ever-growing area of desolation-what is happening and who approved its recent extension?) and he indicated to me he was disgusted this recent extension to quarry area and bush/native trees/site clearance was permitted by council; but it was outside his area of council operations.

In addition to this complaint begin taken seriously by Council, and follow-up being advised to us in writing as soon as possible, we seek to have sent to us also the following:

11. The name and address of the quarry owner today, and their contacts. If the operator today is different to the entity receiving approvals from council, then also the name and contacts of that earlier entity.

12. The name and address of the land owner and their contacts.

13. A copy of any council approvals and conditions (resource consent) of operation, and the latest date thereof; including all conditions to mitigate damage and noise and dust and spread of pollutants and blasts and the limit to operating times.

14. The next date any council approval is required.

15. Reasons why, as affected neighbors, we have never been consulted (in any manner whatsoever) about this quarry, by either the quarry operator, land owner or either of the Councils.

16. What rights we have to further our complaints, and how, especially if Council decides once again not to act to protect us as affected neighbors.

PLEASE NOTE ON THIS QUARRY FILE, WE SEEK TO BE CONSULTED AND HEARD ON EVERY APPLICATION OR CHANGE OR USE OR OTHER MATTER RE THIS SITE AND THIS QUARRY - in addition to this complaint begin followed up and also with questions herein being answered.

sincerely,
David

David W Phillips

& Pokeno Farm Family Trust as owner of Heartland Farm
& Hambletonian Limited, as lessor of Heartland Farm
& Heartland Farm Charitable Trust based at Heartland Farm
& Wai Ora New Zealand Limited
& Mount William Spring Water Limited

NZ Address:

Heartland Farm
219 State Highway 2 (SH2), Pokeno, 2471,
New Zealand (NZ).

NZ Mobile: (64) 021 0604219 (not connected)

Web Site: www.heartlandsprings.com

3 July 2018 (Waikato District Council)

from: **Ian Boddington** <Ian.Boddington@waikato.govt.nz>
to: "davidmvh@gmail.com"
<davidmvh@gmail.com>

cc: Tania Mulder <Tania.Mulder@waidc.govt.nz>,
"interachel@gmail.com"
<interachel@gmail.com>,
Craig Birkett <Craig.Birkett@waidc.govt.nz>

date: 3 Jul 2018, 14:04
subject: Com0005/19
mailed- waidc.govt.nz
by:

Mr Phillips

Your complaint has been received by WDC. Com0 005/19 refers:

I was up in Maramarua this morning so called into your address and spoke with Rachel. I explained the current situation regarding McPhersons Quarry with her and informed her of the following:

- 1: The quarry was under operating under existing rights which allowed the mining to continue after the RMA was introduced in 1991. The quarry site was in the old Franklin District
- 2: In or around 1995 Franklin requested the quarry apply for a Land Use Consent to continue their operation. Shortly thereafter the request was reversed and existing use rights reinstated.
- 3: Maramarua came into the Waikato District in 2010.
- 4: The quarry did not register in any of our consent checks until a complaint from yourself was received in late 2015 in relation to blasting activities.
- 5: Although the blasting records showed no breeches it was determined that the intensity of the operation had increased and the tonnage from the site plus the bench clearing undertaken over the years triggered the need for a Land Use consent
- 6: Since that time McPhersons Quarry have been working with a consent planner consultant to prepare and present the requested application to WDC.
- 7: The vast majority of that time was in discussions with NZTA
- 8: Waikato District Council are expecting this application to be made some time in the next two to three weeks.
- 9: A decision was made to allow the quarry operation to continue while Resource Application was being prepared.
- 10: I will place your complaint on the property file so that when a WDC planner is allocated this application when received, the planner will be aware of your interest in this property.
- 11: It will be up to the WDC planner to determine who and who is not an affected party.

12: If as expected you are identified as an affected party you will then have an opportunity to make submissions in relation to the application.

13: Waikato Regional Council are aware of the quarry and do have discharge consents relating to storm water treatment and control in place.

I have closed off this complaint in lieu of the pending application but it will remain on Council records.

If you have any other questions please ask.

Regards

Ian Boddington

Monitoring Officer

Waikato District Council

3 July 2018 (Waikato District Council)

from: **David Phillips** <davidmvh@gmail.com>

to: Ian Boddington
<Ian.Boddington@waide.govt.nz>

cc: Tania Mulder
<Tania.Mulder@waide.govt.nz>,
"interachel@gmail.com"
<interachel@gmail.com>,
Craig Birkett
<Craig.Birkett@waide.govt.nz>

date: 3 Jul 2018, 18:23

subject: Re: Com0005/19

Hello Ian,

Thanks for your email.

I think it is unfortunate that your visit was made without a pre arranged time.

I also think it is not good (nor probably legal) that WDC has sat on my complaint re blasting 2015; and never once come back to me nor made any step to limit or control or mitigate that complained of damage between 2015 and today.

I also do not accept that this complaint be closed off by you/Council, as you write you have so actioned.

Rachel wrote to me about your visit, and added:

"First questions upon entrance into the attic office from him (ian) were could the quarry be seen from where we stood and looked out the window. It could not, second questions was reasserting the points of concern in your email were recognised and understood by me, which they were."

Ian, the fact is my attic office has one small window facing north.

What is not recorded by Rachel or you, is the fact my attic bedroom has french doors facing north to quarry and the quarry can be seen and heard from these doors.

Further, my attic deck is a part of my home, and standing on my deck outside the attic one can see near all of the quarry,,,,and the quarry sounds (and some dust) comes direct across from quarry to my deck, as it is a straight line between each; such that I cannot do anything peaceful there on days quarry is working. I often in summer close the attic doors due to quarry sound and/or dust coming inside.

One other matter i raised with Council in my recent complaint you do not address at all, this being the the very recent stripping and destroying by quarry management of acres of native bush/native trees prior on and around quarry site.

I do accept quarry can operate, as it now is, on existing use rights. It seems on this point Council and i are now in agreement, but it begs the question as to how it has operated for some years (espec 2015-2018) in a near uncontrolled manner.

You write (in your point 5) that the quarry blasting records in 2015 showed no breaches - but what was there to beach, if there were no Council imposed conditions of land use to mitigate environmental effects? The blasts physically shake our home! Is that fair and lawful?

You write in your point 13 that WRC has some conditions of use. What are these exact conditions (please send them to me, as I requested in my earlier letter); and please advise do they cover mitigating the dust and sound pollutants. If not, why not?

It is URGENT that limits within many conditions are imposed urgently, which are requested and required by me and all other named parties in my letters of complaint - mitigating conditions to blasts, to dust, to noise, to operating hours, to the eyesore being created, to many operating pollutants. As well, native bush on site should be protected, should it not?

Why were the land and air applications not required by Councils to be filed and notified to affected parties by quarry operators in early 2016?

Once before this quarry was tiny; in comparison with its much larger scope today. This point is also one that I and council seem to be in agreement on.

Prior use rights were that it worked a few days a week, with responsible McRobbie operators. Today it has different operators (I say now with irresponsible operators, who show not the lawful concern required of them to environment, nor neighbors) and the scope today is far far bigger than ever before- expanding operations much in 2016 -2018, in front of Council eyes, while Council awaited lodging of a consent application.

This is a terrible indictment of Councils, given you each allowed 'permitted' uncontrolled quarry growth in late 2015-mid 2018, knowing an application was required, but had not been lodged; while the unlawful expansion of the quarry hurt the environment and affected parties, and probably broke environmental laws in the process of the hurried recent late 2015-mid 2018 quarry expansions.

Now the quarry also seems to work any of the 7 days in a week.

I say all blasting and all works to destroy native bush and dust and noise hazards should be stopped forthwith, until land use and air quality applications are made and all affected parties are heard.

Should Council not be prepared to follow proper process, then I will take my complaints to Environment Court, seeking orders therefrom. Should council not involve my interests in all applications before it, and permit us to submit and be heard, then the Environment Court will certainly be asked to become involved to protect our and our environments interests, should Councils ignore them.

Could you also please answer in writing, and one by one please, each of the 16 questions i raised before.

Some remain unanswered by you, in your letter of today. By example I must be sent name and address of quarry operator, so I can also put them on notice.

I also now seek from you/Council, a copy of the all the council papers which record the matter you raise in your point 9, viz:

"

A decision was made to allow the quarry operation to continue while Resource Application was being prepared.

"

For ease of answering my earlier unanswered questions, I repeat the questions herein:

The matters of specific complaint are now listed:

1. Recently this quarry has STRIPPED from the landscape and hillside what seems to us as observers, acres of native bush or other greenery (including some sizable native trees being felled), causing a huge increase in bare land scars now seen visually from our farm and from SH2.
2. As a result of above actions, our farm now faces much increase in dust being blown from both quarry and increase bare land around it being blown, all over our organic farm and house and washing and cars and animals on the farm - and over our spring water operation; and of course over us humans.
3. We have no idea what other pollutants are in the quarry dust, especially after heavy machinery use on its land/rocks, and explosives being used on quarry site.
4. Our farm is organic and has been operated in this manner for some 28 years. We strenuously object to this dust nuisance and potential pollutants.
5. We have complained before about the extensive detonation carried out on quarry site; and ask this cease immediately. It not only shakes out homestead, but frightens our animals (which include quality pregnant bloodstock). The dust can damage bloodstock's delicate breathing passages. These are racehorses, and such effects can be catastrophic.
6. As well our farm is a protected site for birds, with about 35 different species now living in our thousands of trees-most trees planted by us. The birds scream each time there is a blast from the quarry, as I am sure they also do in the nearby Mt William conservation reserve.
7. The recent blasts from quarry seem to have increased in intensity; and may well have some detrimental affect on the spring water which has been flowing on our farm at least since 1860's, probably for thousand of years prior.

We depend on this spring for our livelihood, and we have rights to extract up to 200,000 litres per day.

We object to this risk from the quarry, and ask you to ensure you advise the quarry in writing of this risk, and that we hold both Council and them jointly liable in event of damage to our spring supply.

8. We have had complaints from spring water customers, who collect spring water at our back gate; and from tenants at Heartland Farm, who rent space from us.

These complaints to us have included the visual eyesore of quarry, as it has widened its own footprint/landscape significantly in recent times; and the dust and the noise and the blasts.

9. We can now hear much more noise from the quarry, even on Sundays, as the heavy machinery cuts into landscape and rocks get pulverised. This noise has increased what seems to be 5-fold in past year; due either to increased operating times or lack of surrounding green bush/treed

borders, or some other unidentified reasons. We seek the increased noise to stop, including to stop altogether on Sundays.

10. Other matters to be advised.

It is also noted we recently had a Regional Council person at our farm, and we did not need to point out to him the ever-growing landscape abuse by this quarry. He knew of it (indeed anyone travelling along SH2 can see the ever-growing area of desolation-what is happening and who approved its recent extension?) and he indicated to me he was disgusted this recent extension to quarry area and bush/native trees/site clearance was permitted by council; but it was outside his area of council operations.

In addition to this complaint begin taken seriously by Council, and follow-up being advised to us in writing as soon as possible, we seek to have sent to us also the following:

11. The name and address of the quarry owner today, and their contacts. If the operator today is different to the entity receiving approvals from council, then also the name and contacts of that earlier entity.

12. The name and address of the land owner and their contacts.

13. A copy of any council approvals and conditions (resource consent) of operation, and the latest date thereof; including all conditions to mitigate damage and noise and dust and spread of pollutants and blasts and the limit to operating times.

14. The next date any council approval is required.

15. Reasons why, as affected neighbors, we have never been consulted (in any manner whatsoever) about this quarry, by either the quarry operator, land owner or either of the Councils.

16. What rights we have to further our complaints, and how, especially if Council decides once again not to act to protect us as affected neighbors.

sincerely,
David

David W Phillips

NZ Address:

Heartland Farm
219 State Highway 2 (SH2), Pokeno, 2471,

9 July 2018 (Waikato District Council)

Thanks David for your reply.

The issues you have raised will be addressed in the Land Use Application that is due to be presented to WDC within the next week or two.

I also indicated in my previous email it will be a WDC planner that will decide who will be affected parties.

I indicated that your concerns will be placed on the quarry file held by WDC and I will ensure that the WDC planner allocated this application when submitted is aware of your concerns.

Monitoring blasts relates to noise and vibration neither of which breached District Plan rules by way of explanation.

Regional Council deals with storm water and any other water concerns and largely lay outside WDC's concerns relating to quarry management.

McPhersons own the quarry and have for a long time. McRobbies used to run the quarry under agreement until a few years back when full management reverted back to the property owners. The two brothers now operating the Quarry are Michael and Stephen with a registered address of 47 McPherson Road Pokeno 2471 NZ and have been the operators since 2009.

There are letters dating back to 1998 on WDC file recovered from ex Franklin showing your written concerns relating to noise and blasting. These will also be available and part of the planners determinations.

Com0133/16 related to your last complaint and you were contacted by monitoring officer Tania Mulder from our Tuakau office. The thread of that conversation is noted and resulted in the complaint being closed which is where I came into the picture. As a result of my visit, McPhersons were advised that a consent was necessary. That is where we now are currently.

I will advise you when the consent application is received and the consent number allocated to it and who the planner is.

Regards

Ian

17 Sep 2018 (Waikato District Council)

Hi Ian,

I recall on 9 July 2018 you wrote to me about the next door quarry, vis a vis my complaints. Your reply included words now repeated herein in italics:

"The issues you have raised will be addressed in the Land Use Application that is due to be presented to WDC within the next week or two.

I also indicated in my previous email it will be a WDC planner that will decide who will be affected parties.

I indicated that your concerns will be placed on the quarry file held by WDC and I will ensure that the WDC planner allocated this application when submitted is aware of your concerns."

I am still overseas, and have not received any update by email nor any copy of any application or submissions the quarry owners may have filed with Council.

Can you please update me.

Is Council yet in receipt of any application? If 'no', when is it expected? If 'yes', when was it received?

If Council is in receipt of any application please send to me a copy by email.

Has the WDC planner yet decided who might be or are affected parties.?

If 'yes' who are the affected parties, and do they include our farm?

If our farm is excluded please advise the reasons; and also advise how the farm can appeal such decision.

My letter emailed of 3 July 2018 put Council on notice of our farm being affected by the quarry, and listed specific complaints.

Our position as an affected party remains, I repeat the points 1 to 16 I listed and sent to you on 3 July 2018, and ask Council to take heed of those 16 points then listed; and I also repeat:

"Should council not involve my interests in all applications before it, and permit us to submit and be heard, then the Environment Court will certainly be asked to become involved to protect our and our environments interests, should Councils ignore them."

Please at all times make sure all matters sent to our farm are also copied to me by email.

sincerely,
David

David W Phillips/ Hambletonian Limited

NZ Address:

Heartland Farm
219 State Highway 2 (SH2), Pokeno, 2471,

19 July 2018 (Waikato Regional Council)

On Thu, 19 Jul 2018 at 16:03, Jennie Cox <Jennie.Cox@waikatoregion.govt.nz> wrote:
19 July 2018

Mr David Phillips

I write in response to your request for information relating to the Quarry situated on McPhersons Road, Pokeno.

You sought the following information:

0.1. The name and address of the quarry owner today, and their contacts. If the operator today is different to the entity receiving approvals from council, then also the name and contacts of that earlier entity.

0.2. The name and address of the land owner and their contacts.

The current owner of the quarry is listed with Council as McPherson Resources Limited. A search on the Companies Register confirms the details for the company as:

McPherson Resources Limited

C/-Michael McPherson, 47 McPherson Road, RD 1, Pokeno 2471

The earlier entity who owned the Quarry/consents prior to McPherson Resources Limited was McRobbie Dowling Ltd. A search of the Companies Register confirms the details for that company as:

McRobbie Dowling Limited

Bhw Limited, Suite 3, 27 Bath Street, Parnell, Auckland, 1052

0.3. A copy of any council approvals and conditions (resource consent) of operation, and the latest date thereof; including all conditions to mitigate damage and noise and dust and spread of pollutants and blasts and the limit to operating times. Email File(s) attached

The original consents were granted to McRobbie Dowling Ltd. Please find attached the Consent Evaluation reports relating to the Water Consent - Surface Water Take (RC116085) and the Discharge Permit – Discharge to water (RC116015).

These consents were transferred by request to McPherson Resources Limited in 2010 – Refer the attached letter Transfer of Resource Consent.

There is a new application in process and the Resource Officer responsible for this is Emma Cowan.

I have been advised by the Resource Officer Martin Keep that he will be carrying out the 2018/19 Financial year audit in a period of heavy rainfall and will be taking water samples of any discharges off site to ensure compliance with the Waikato Regional Council minimum requirements and old consent conditions.

Once the new consent is granted a further compliance audit will be carried out.

Jennie Cox Democracy Advisor | Democracy, Community and Services

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato

P: +6478590897

F: [facebook.com/waikatoregion](https://www.facebook.com/waikatoregion)

Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240

17 Sep 2018 (Waikato Regional Council)

from: **David Phillips** <davidmvh@gmail.com>

to: Jennie.Cox@waikatoregion.govt.nz

cc: **Rachel Williams**
<interachel@gmail.com>

date: 17 Sep 2018, 02:18

subject: **Re: Response REQ135884 -**
Quarry situated on McPhersons
Road, Pokeno

Hi Jennie,

Thanks for replying.

I was away from all email contact when your reply came in.

I ask, why is our farm owner, as a very close neighbor to the quarry, and certainly being an affected party, not given any opportunity to consider and submit to any application now before Council?

Please advise Council's Emma Cowan that we seek to see all present/new applications, and to have opportunity to be consulted before Council finalises any new quarry conditions or approval.

Please advise Council's Martin Keep that we seek a copy of his Audit findings re water samples to be sent to us each time such audit is undertaken.

Who is responsible for enabling the quarry owners over the past year, to strip off native forest/trees off part of their site - causing, as it must, major increase in storm water run off and pollutants from the quarry site? As well it has wrecked bird life-homes, and caused a major eye-sore from SH2 and from our farm decks.

What is quarry being asked to do to mitigate and to re-plant?

Does Regional Council have any control over blasting from the quarry and/or dust nuisances?

If 'no' please advise; if 'yes' please advise what controls you have imposed by way of specific conditions.

Why are you not doing things to require mitigation of effects, and why not co-involving affected parties like our farm?

No one from the quarry owners has EVER come to consult with us about their proposed destructive works in and around the quarry. No one from quarry owners have ever bothered to come ask us about the effects on us as neighbors - and nether has Council. Why?

I await Council's replies. Please send replies to me by email.

sincerely,
David

David W Phillips/Hambletonian Limited

NZ Address:

Heartland Farm
219 State Highway 2 (SH2), Pokeno, 2471,

New Zealand (NZ).

NZ Mobile: (64) 021 0604219 (connected)

Web Site: www.heartlandsprings.com

Russian Address:

Rubensteiner 2/45, Apartment 10,

St Petersburg, 191025,
Russia.

Russian Mobile: +7 981 936 4323 (connected)

We Chat: david2268nz
Skype: davidwilliam2009

11 October 2018 (Waikato Regional Council)

TO D Phillips

davidmvh@gmail.com

Tēnā koe David

REQ138608 – request for information – McPherson Road quarry

Thank you for your request for information received by Council on 17 September 2017 (current request).

By way of background I have included below a copy of your previous related request (previous request) and Council's response emailed to you on 19 July 2018. A number of documents were provided to you at that time as described in the copy of the response below.

Your current request and Council response in each case is recorded as follows:

Request 1:

Why is our farm owner, as a very close neighbor to the quarry, and certainly being an affected party, not given any opportunity to consider and submit to any application now before Council?

Council's response:

Waikato Regional Council has received resource consent application APP137612 relating to a suite of activities associated with the operation of McPherson Quarry. The processing of the application was initially placed on hold awaiting further information and application for additional activities. The additional information was provided on 28 September 2018 and accordingly processing of the application recommenced on this date. The applicant is in the process of undertaking consultation with potentially affected parties and the notification decision has not yet been made. A copy of the application is enclosed. If you wish to discuss the proposal, you may do so with the Processing Officer Emma Cowan (07 858 6073, emma.cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz) or direct with the applicant's consultant Christian McDean (Kinetic Environmental, 021 383 404, christian@kineticenvironmental.co.nz).

Request 2:

Please advise Council's Emma Cowan that we seek to see all present/new applications, and to have opportunity to be consulted before Council finalises any new quarry conditions or approval.

Council's response:

A copy of the application is enclosed. Refer to comments above.

Request 3:

Please advise Council's Martin Keep that we seek a copy of his Audit findings re water samples to be sent to us each time such audit is undertaken.

Council's response:

Martin has indicated that compliance audit reports will be provided to you when they are carried out. He will visit the site when it's raining and do a sample run the next time, the results will be incorporated into his compliance audit report.

Request 4:

Who is responsible for enabling the quarry owners over the past year, to strip off native forest/trees off part of their site - causing, as it must, major increase in storm water run off and pollutants from the quarry site? As well it has wrecked bird life-homes, and caused a major eye-sore from SH2 and from our farm decks.

Council's response:

Waikato Regional Council will investigate your claims. However it would be helpful if you could provide any supporting evidence.

Request 5:

What is quarry being asked to do to mitigate and to re-plant?

Council's response:

In relation to the current application, the environmental effects assessment has not yet been undertaken by Waikato Regional Council. The level of effect and corresponding ecological mitigation (if required) will be considered during the effects assessment.

Request 6:

Does Regional Council have any control over blasting from the quarry and/or dust nuisances? If 'no' please advise; if 'yes' please advise what controls you have imposed by way of specific conditions.

Council's response:

Blasting and vibration are controlled under District Council regulation. Waikato Regional Council does monitor dust discharges. The current application if granted will have a suite of conditions to monitor and control dust. The conditions schedule has not yet been drafted.

Request 7:

Why are you not doing things to require mitigation of effects, and why not co-involving affected parties like our farm?

Council's response:

As discussed in the above responses, with regard to the current application, the effects assessment and notification decision have not yet been made as the application has been, until recently, on hold.

Request 8:

No one from the quarry owners has EVER come to consult with us about their proposed destructive works in and around the quarry. No one from quarry owners have ever bothered to come ask us about the effects on us as neighbors - and nether has Council. Why?

Council's response:

The assessment of potentially affected parties has not been made with regard to the current application. The level of consultation required will be assessed during the notification decision. Please

don't hesitate to contact Council's Processing Officer or the applicant's consultant direct if you would like to discuss the proposal and any concerns that you may have.

Please contact me if you have any further queries.

Nāku, nā

Sarah McLeay

Statutory Processes Advisor

Waikato Regional Council

Doc # 13083631 Page 3

Your previous request responded to by Council is set out below (Council's reference REQ135884):

On Thu, 19 Jul 2018 at 16:03, Jennie Cox <Jennie.Cox@waikatoregion.govt.nz> wrote:

19 July 2018

Mr David Phillips

I write in response to your request for information relating to the Quarry situated on McPhersons Road, Pokeno. You sought the following information:

0.1. The name and address of the quarry owner today, and their contacts. If the operator today is different to the entity receiving approvals from council, then also the name and contacts of that earlier entity.

0.2. The name and address of the land owner and their contacts.

The current owner of the quarry is listed with Council as McPherson Resources Limited. A search on the Companies Register confirms the details for the company as:

McPherson Resources Limited

C/-Michael McPherson, 47 McPherson Road, RD 1, Pokeno 2471

The earlier entity who owned the Quarry/consents prior to McPherson Resources Limited was

McRobbie Dowling Ltd. A search of the Companies Register confirms the details for that company as:

McRobbie Dowling Limited

Bhw Limited, Suite 3, 27 Bath Street, Parnell, Auckland, 1052

0.3. A copy of any council approvals and conditions (resource consent) of operation, and the latest date thereof; including all conditions to mitigate damage and noise and dust and spread of pollutants and blasts and the limit to operating times. Email File(s) attached

The original consents were granted to McRobbie Dowling Ltd. Please find attached the Consent Evaluation reports relating to the Water Consent - Surface Water Take (RC116085) and the Discharge Permit – Discharge to water (RC116015). These consents were transferred by request to McPherson Resources Limited in 2010 – Refer the attached letter Transfer of Resource Consent.

There is a new application in process and the Resource Officer responsible for this is Emma Cowan. I have been advised by the Resource Officer Martin Keep that he will be carrying out the 2018/19 Financial year audit in a period of heavy rainfall and will be taking water samples of any discharges off site to ensure compliance with the Waikato Regional Council minimum requirements and old consent conditions. Once the new consent is granted a further compliance audit will be carried out.

Jennie Cox Democracy Advisor | Democracy, Community and Services

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato

P: +6478590897

F: [facebook.com/waikatoregion](https://www.facebook.com/waikatoregion)

Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 30

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Marilyn Thompson & Nigel Cowan

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

See attached sheets

I ☐ support ☒ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are:

See attached sheets

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:

☐

Approve

☒

Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

See attached sheets

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes

☒

No

☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes

☒

No

☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes

☒

No

☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter or person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Date 2 July 2020

Address 40 McPherson Road, RD1, Pokeno

Postcode

2471

Email marilyn.thompson@xtra.co.nz

Phone

021 905088 (Nigel)

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable)

Nigel Cowan

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

Thompson & Cowan Submission
To



McPherson Resources Limited Consent Application
Public Notification



2 July 2020

Submission form (Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION #.....

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991 SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) **Marilyn Thompson and Nigel Cowan**

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 Mcpherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

- | |
|---|
| <p>▪ We are not a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991</p> |
|---|

The specific parts of the application that our submission relates to are:

We oppose the Development and Expansion Plans for the McPherson Quarry including:

- Mineral extraction of 490,000 tonne of weathered greywacke annually for a period of up to 45 years over three stages.
- Hours of operation- 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday to Saturday.
- 165 daily truck movements (approx. 82 arriving to the site and approximately 82 trucks departing from the site including importation of cleanfill)
- Earthworks with a volume of approx. 18,784,018 m³ over approx. 28.77 ha (Stage 1 = 8.72 ha, Stage 2 = 8.39 ha, Stage 3 = 11.66 ha) and vertical faces with a maximum of 15m high with 7.5m wide benches.
- The deposition of cleanfill with a maximum volume of 100,000m³ per annum over a period of 45 years.
- Removal of 2.45ha (In Stage 1 and Stage 3) of indigenous vegetation within an Identified Significant Natural Feature and Schedule 5A area (policy overlay area under the ODP)
- All expansion of the Quarry Operations since 1999, that exceed the legally defined consents. We suggest that present day quarry operations are well in excess of the current consent limits and would now appear to be already aligned with a significant part of Stage 1, prior to the Consent process being completed.

- | |
|---|
| <p>▪ We oppose the part/s named above.</p> |
|---|

The reasons for our views are...

Summary

The proposed expansion of the quarry operation will have catastrophic impact in the following ways:

- detrimental impact on peaceful and quiet rural lifestyle, and natural surroundings including native birds and animals
- reduces the amenity value of our property to us
- reduces the commercial value of our lifetime asset
- potential health issues related to effects of quarry dust in the air and gathering in our house water supply
- increased risk to public road safety

Built in 1999 when the quarry was a contained and managed operation under McRobbie Dowling Ltd, our home is adjacent to the McPherson property. More recent and rapid expansion has resulted in considerable impact on our visual landscape.

Listed below are factors already having a detrimental impact on our lifestyle. **ANY** further increase in quarry operations will exacerbate these.

1. Dust
2. Contamination of house drinking water
3. Vibration and shock waves from blasting, resulting in house damage
4. Heavy Traffic on McPherson Rd, and safety at State Highway 2 intersection
5. Noise
6. Visual distortion of rural landscape
7. Loss of amenity value

Detail

1. Dust

a. Dust & Clean Air Contamination (Pollution)

Over recent years we have witnessed the increasing level of Dust pollution and the effect this is having on our ability to live normal lives.

In dry conditions we experience large clouds of dust coming off the quarry roads, the loading area and the overburden areas (which is already rising from the valley floor). Dust hovers and blows around the corner of the quarry face, streaking across the valley on the predominant Westerly/North-westerly and South Westerly winds. Trucks exiting the quarry gate on McPherson Road are often enveloped in dust and are very regularly lost from site in the dust cloud before passing the Graham property gate halfway down McPherson Road. McPherson Road becomes coated in grey dust down to the SH2 corner and beyond.

On wet days or occasions when the sprinkler system is activated there is reduced dust levels. (Note the sprinkler system does not appear to include the quarry loading and crushing areas.) On these occasions the dust (in the form of mud) will often "cake" on the trucks and is dropped on McPherson Road in a thick slippery slurry, often running from the Quarry gate down McPherson Rd towards and on to SH2.

The absence of wheel wash facilities for dust mitigation is obvious, and all internal quarry roads should be sealed.

b. Dust Coating the house

Our house and any outside equipment are very quickly coated with thick fine dust which finds its way into the house, coating everything. Vehicles in the enclosed garage are also coated.

The dust also collects in the house guttering turning into a dark sludge that sprouts weeds and various grasses requiring regular cleaning and flushing. We have found ourselves with no option but to contract a local supplier to complete regular six-monthly flushing using a mobile platform and water blaster. In between his visits we are using ladders and water hoses to attempt to keep it clear.

2. House Water Supply contamination - Dust

Our water tank supply system takes the rainwater from the roof (contaminated with dust and sludge) and stores it in a 20,000-litre tank. We now have to have this emptied and flushed using water blasters on an annual basis. In Dec 2019 we noticed our water tank supply had a very strong smell and a test confirmed we had e-coli present in the supply. This required us to dump the water tank supply and have the tank cleaned and treated. We have recently installed an expensive multi filtering and UV light system to attempt to control the contamination of the house water supply from the roof of our house. The roof sludge continues to enter the tank and we are experimenting with a manual "first flush" system as a way to reduce the quarry dust entering into our house water system.

Given our experience with the extreme levels of dust generated at the McPherson Quarry and the known effects of Respirable Crystalline Silica dust (RCS) we are extremely concerned about the effect of dust on our health.

As the dust pollution effects for us are one of our main problems already, and the quarry development activity according to the consent documentation has not yet kicked off, we have to expect the problem will become more critical for us with the quarry expansion.

3. Vibration and Shock Waves from Blasting

a. Blasting

The noise from blasting has been less obtrusive in recent times since the recent blasting is inside the quarry pit and the eastern current pit face is sheltered from our house. Clearly this will change during the quarry expansion and is of concern.

b. Vibration effect on house structure

The greater immediate concern is the vibration and ground acceleration movement during blasting. The shock waves created run through our house rattling windows loudly and have caused damage to our house structure. The concrete tiles on the floor of our house have developed long fracture cracks in both the foyer and downstairs bathroom.

Also, on several occasions the concrete roof tile caps have become insecure and had to be re-cemented back on the roof ridge lines. We continue to find roof cement chunks in the guttering and on the concrete deck around the house and cracks in the cap cement can be seen confirming this is ongoing.

4. Heavy Traffic

The McPherson Quarry is only around 300 metres from the SH2 intersection. This is already a busy intersection with poor visibility along SH2 at the corner.

The proposed growth of traffic, many being truck and trailer units, is a major public safety concern as trucks attempt to manoeuvre slowly out on to SH2. Also, trucks turning right from SH2 into McPherson Rd can wait for some time to have sufficient clearance to turn right.

We note in the consent application a mitigation plan that will create:

- "at least 151 m forward visibility for westbound traffic to observe and respond to a right turning truck from McPherson Road to SH2 "
- "A 42m right turn bay on SH2 to provide sufficient stacking space for a truck and trailer unit to wait on SH2 in order to undertake safe right turning movements into McPherson Road"
- "An Auxiliary Lane for left turning vehicles from SH2 to McPherson Road. The auxiliary lane will be 100m long and commence at the barrier flare approximate 10m east of Graham Bridge. It is recognised that it will be shorter than the MOTSAM requirements for a standard auxiliary lane"

The Graham Bridge traffic constriction is a complicating factor that does not appear to be addressed.

Also, due to traffic volumes on SH2 the proposed 42m turning bay accommodating only one truck and trailer will be insufficient and tails of heavy traffic will regularly occur on SH2.

We cannot see how a safe solution can be achieved as traffic is squeezed back into narrow single lanes on the bridge. We have had a discussion with NZTA and they confirmed we should include these concerns in our response to the Public Notification process. It is our opinion that a wider bridge can be the only solution to keep the traffic flowing.

We see this as reason alone to rescind the previously "qualified" approval of the McPhersons Quarry Traffic Plan, by NZTA.

5. Noise

a. Levels

We note significant variation in noise levels at our house. Levels of noise vary according to wind direction, equipment in use in the quarry and level of quarry activity. Our hand-held noise meter indicates high levels of noise on occasions, normally associated with increased activity and wind direction.

It seems the influence of prevailing winds directly over the quarry operation channelling directly over our property has not been addressed in any of the "expert" (consultant) documentation. It is well known in the area that even when you cannot detect the wind in the Pokeno Valley it is always present, from the west travelling down the valley. This prevailing wind influence has equal impact on both Dust and Noise pollution given our obvious downwind position.

If the true influence of this was recognised in Fig 12 (Pg 26) as a "pollution indicator", then the diagram would show a "ballooning" in the eastern direction over our property and other eastern properties.

b. Trucks

Truck noise is evident from empty rattling on metal roads and full trucks exiting the quarry pit on engine/exhaust breaking, taking away the pleasure of quiet rural living.

c. Crushing plant

The operation of rock crushing and the sounds of steel machinery grinding against hard rock becomes a background cacophony of noises, often for long periods at a time, taking away the pleasure of quiet rural living.

d. Drilling

The high-pitched background (screaming/whining) during drilling of bore holes for blasting, often runs day and night as holes are bored over a period varying up to 2 weeks or more in duration.

e. Tipping Deluge

Tipping noises echo across the site and valley when large quantities of metal are dropped into trucks or down a metal screening face, often accompanied with large clouds of dust. This is a significant level of noise which drowns out all other operational noise during the event.

6. Visual Effects

Given our proximity to the Quarry (approx 300 metres) and the quarry has expanded into our view in recent years, the visual impact of the development of the quarry is of significant concern. The valley floor is now already covered with dusty metal tracks, derelict and rusty machinery and most previous pasture has been stripped and replaced with dusty overburden, replacing the rural outlook of green space and bush. During extended periods of rain, the tracks and existing water courses become braided ribbons of brown mud running down into streams. Ponds flood over and cover the main access track (adjacent to the main dwelling) again flooding into the water table and down to the natural streams flowing into the Pokeno Swamp and Waikato river.

People live in this area as a choice to enjoy a semi-rural lifestyle. Quarry expansion will only serve to reduce the enjoyment of rural living. Notably, our location and proximity to the quarry appear to have been omitted by WSP Opus in their LVA report of August 2018, where they claim expansion of the quarry will not result in a loss of rural amenity values or rural character. We strongly challenge this opinion and disagree with this point of view.

We also oppose the clearance of indigenous vegetation on identified SNA's. As stated, there is 2.45 ha due to be removed in the current Resource Consent quarry expansion plans. Mitigation of additional planting takes no accounting of the impact this has on neighbouring properties or future generations.

7. Amenity Value

The Proposed Quarry expansion plans will have a devastating effect on the amenity value of our property. Growth to date, that appears to be well outside current consent levels, has already had significant impact in many ways as mentioned in this submission. All these contribute to the value of our property asset, as well as the value of our lifestyle at 40 McPherson Road.

We have lived on our property since 1993, and in the current house since 2000. While we respect the right for neighbours to live and use their own land, we do not feel this should be done with the disrespect for and in a manner that affects others in the neighbourhood.

We seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: Decline
--

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

1. Any Expansion of the quarry beyond the operational level of 1999/2000 being the time we built our house.

We see no way of amending the application that will address our key issues of dust, damage to our property and concerns for a healthy living environment. Already these are at significant levels of concern and further growth will only worsen the situation. Additionally, we note several of the reports in the consent application are up to 2 years old, and impact measurements taken then are much less than we are experiencing now.

2. We question the assumption that McPherson's have the right to operate the quarry as it is currently operating.

By their own admission McPherson's advise extraction rates as 330k tonnes (2018) and 320k tonnes (2017). We need to see copies of current Consents that clearly state they have been legally entitled to operate at this level.

3. The "qualified" approval of the McPherson Traffic Plan by NZTA to be reviewed

We seek confirmation that suitable changes can be made to Graham's Bridge to enable free and safe traffic flow and mitigate public safety risk. Our concern is the complication of the constriction of traffic flows across the bridge, and the resulting congestion and increased risk of serious accidents.

The letter dated 19 March 2019 from NZTA to Kinetic consulting appears to omit the influence of Graham's Bridge constriction on passing traffic.

4. Lack of dynamic modern day (24x7) pollution monitoring across the Quarry and neighbouring properties in the QMP

The discussion lacks consideration of modern concerns and lacks modern technological approach to controls, the McPherson plan attempts to minimise the level of dust contamination and refers to some 1960's type practises to address the issue, with no form of checks and balances.

This section includes the recommendation for recognition of the influence of climatic conditions on the impact and levels of dust and noise pollution, we recommend the implementation of weather station technology in the quarry that alerts quarry management and surrounding neighbours when certain activities should be restricted or ceased for reasons of compliance.

We request detailed clarification of the monitoring and controls of all environmental factors within the quarry perimeter and surrounding areas, the details to include the minimum standards for a healthy environment, the measurement technique and sampling protocols, the built in "trigger" points when compliance is not maintained, the alarm and notification mechanisms, expected compliance recovery time frames, remedial activity details and shutdown thresholds for unsuccessful attempts to remediate. We believe these management techniques would be expected in any modern quarry environment where the risk of pollution influences the lives of workers on site and in the neighbouring vicinity.

- **I wish to be heard in support of my submission Yes**
- **If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing. Yes**
- **Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority. Yes**

Additional Considerations for our submission

1. We have never been visited by or had any contact from any of the McPherson Resources experts or consultants for the purpose of consultation or consideration during the last 5 years...
2. McPherson Bros have never consulted with us for the purpose considering their plans and possible impact on us. They did give us envelope with an initial request for us to advise if we were happy to provide written approval of the expansion plans. This document was in our opinion a very poor attempt to gain our approval with no assurances of meaningful and technical mitigation plans to protect our peaceful lifestyle.
3. The McPherson Bros continue to show disregard for any resulting impact on the amenity value or commercial value for our peaceful lifestyle and lifetime asset.
4. We require an assurance from WDC & WRC that the resource consent (in any form) will not include the right of transfer of ownership unless another full public consent notification process is conducted for any new owners.
5. Any resource consent should not include a full 45-year, 3 stage plan end to end. Stages 2 and 3 should be subject to full compliance of resource conditions in prior stages (i.e. stages 1, and 2) as measured by council.
This would provide neighbourhood stakeholders a level of ongoing assurances that the quarry continues to meet its compliance obligations.
6. Given the lack of consultation with us, and outdated consulting reports in the application documentation, we feel incredibly pressured to make key judgements without having all the current facts. We need more time and expert assistance to bring this together.
7. Given our submission re the pollution effect of the quarry on our house property we challenge the Kinetic conclusion (9.0) of the environmental effects (of the expansion proposal) will be less than minor.
8. Our description of the numerous impacts of the quarry operation are real life experiential based observations as witnessed continually from approximately 300 meters from the quarry. These observations are genuine and based over several years, during all seasons, 365 days a year and 24 hours every day. We note that the Consultants reports are predominately derived from desktop or "calculated" exercises with some additional brief observations and equally brief conclusions from an office desk. As an exception, the Ecological Impact Assessment and Vegetation Report while admitting to a desk top review appears to have included some worthwhile on-site activities.
9. From our observations all of the water that ends up in the Pokeno Valley (where the quarry is) must travel out of the valley through one exit point, the Grahams stream Bridge under SH2. During heavy rains over the upper section of the valley (as witnessed recently) the Grahams stream is substantially polluted by the various quarry road dust and mud silt ending up across the road in the Pokeno Swamp and Waikato river. Flood control at the quarry needs attention in our view.

Supporting photos

1. Tile cracks in downstairs bathroom



2. Tile cracks in house foyer entrance



3. Impact of traffic carrying mud and dust onto road




Corner SH2 and McPherson Rd



Corner SH2 and McPherson Rd



Quarry exit onto McPherson Rd



Quarry exit onto McPherson Rd

Dust



Flood Control?









Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 31

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Phnick Hill Rd Residents as per 4 of the attached document

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

lack of consultation

Visual Impacts

Noise / Traffic Impacts

Dust

Ecological Issues

we ☐ support

☒ oppose

☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are

See attached

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:

☐ Approve

☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought

The residents who join in these submissions request that the applications are DECLINED by the WDC / WRC

Number of additional sheets attached

4

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☒

No ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒

No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐

No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

See attached [Signature]

Date 2/7/2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 217 Pinnacle Hill Rd, RD 1 Mangakino Postcode 2675

Email charlotte@autospeedengineering.co.nz Phone 0210575573

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Charlotte McCort

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742
Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

APPENDIX A: SUBMISSIONS CONTINUED

To:

Waikato District Council and Waikato Regional Council
Private Bag 544
Ngaruawahia 3742

RE: SUBMISSION ON RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION MADE BY MCPHERSON RESOURCES LIMITED to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri.

Description of Proposal

1. This is a community submission made to the Waikato District Council (**WDC**) and Waikato Regional Council (**WRC**) on behalf of the below mentioned residents of Pinnacle Hill Road (**Residents**) with respect to the following applications made by McPhersons Resources Limited (**Applicant**):
 - a. **ECM Application LUC0123/19**
2. The above applications (**Application**) relate to the significant expansion of the Quarry belonging to the Applicant (**Quarry**).
3. This submission **opposes** the Application.
4. The Residents note that this submission comprises a brief report outlining concerns and as such the Residents are prepared to speak to same and elaborate at hearing.

Submissions on Proposal

Lack of Consultation

5. Of particular concern shared by the Residents is the significant lack of consultation with those who own properties which neighbor the Quarry.
6. Page 2 of the Resource Consent Application and Assessment (**AEE**) suggests that the area surrounding the quarry is primarily used for farming "with some lifestyle blocks located around the site."

7. Contrary to the AEE, Pinnacle Hill Road which borders the proposed expansion is mostly residential in nature.
8. The Residents were only made aware of the Application by word of mouth less than 5 days prior to the deadline for submissions. This is completely unacceptable.

Visual Impacts

9. Despite the assertions made in the AEE suggesting that there will be no visual impact as a result of the proposed expansion, several properties on Pinnacle Hill Road face directly towards the expansion. The existing shelter belt is not adequate to screen the expansion as suggested in the AEE and comprises a single row of historic and aging pine trees.
10. If the quarry expands not only will the residents in the neighboring lifestyle blocks lose their exceptional view thus devaluing their properties, they will also be faced with an increase in noise, dust and heavy vehicle traffic as further discussed below.
11. Additionally, the Mount William Walkway also neighbors the Quarry and the visual impacts with respect to same will be significant.
12. There is no guarantee that the expansion will be 'gradual,' and over a long period of time as suggested in the AEE due to the lack of proposed actual restrictions.

Noise/Traffic Impacts

13. The increased truck movements as a result of the expansion will cause significant traffic safety risks at the intersection of McPherson Road and State Highway 2 which the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) and the Applicant have recorded as not being equipped to deal with heavy traffic movements.
14. The AEE also fails to take into account the increased heavy haulage traffic on Pinnacle Hill Road.
15. Pinnacle Hill Road does not have a footpath for walkers and for the most part is blind to oncoming vehicles within 100m. The road is inappropriate for a large volume of heavy haulage trucks but is the preferred route for trucks coming from the Quarry as they are able to turn left out of the Quarry thus avoiding the busy T intersection.
16. The AEE also suggests that cleanfill be dumped at site, but that this will cause not additional traffic based on the assumption that all trucks bringing in cleanfill will leave with aggregate. While this would be effective, there is no guarantee that this will occur and from a practical perspective it is naïve to presume that all contractors disposing of cleanfill will also require further aggregate at the same time.

17. The AEE provides a report with regards to the impact the noise will have on surrounding properties. No information was provided as to the time of day or the weather conditions as at the time of the testing.

Dust

18. The AEE accepts and confirms that the expansion will result in increased activity both with regards to quarry activity and also cleanfill disposal which will cause an increase to dust.
19. Reference in the AEE is made with regards to water storage and a sprinkler system, which, based on the historical data provided, appears inadequate to properly control dust if the expansion is to proceed.
20. The AEE also notes that there is no risk to human health or fauna but no data to confirm same has been provided.
21. The current system to mitigate dust is also largely ineffective with residents of the neighboring properties complaining of a fine layer of dust collecting on windows and vehicles. This will only increase if the expansion goes ahead.

Ecological issues

22. Areas of the proposed expansion site have been identified as Significant Natural Areas (SNA). The AEE has identified 13 native bird species as inhabiting same with 2 being at risk as well as native fish species also present with some listed as at risk and in decline.
23. The risk in losing these species and the destruction of their habitat to make way for the expansion is simply unacceptable.
24. The AEE also does not provide any landscape mitigation or rehabilitation plan and states that this will only be put forward when stage 3 is put in place, which could be in excess of 10 years away. There is accordingly no way for the WDC to be sure that the Applicant is even intending to attend to same.

Decision sought from the Consent Authority

25. The Residents who join in these submissions request that the applications are **DECLINED** by the WDC and are prepared to expand on these submissions at hearing.
26. The below Residents by writing their names and addresses electronically intend that same be taken as an electronic signature and their approval of these submissions.

Residents in support:

Names and addresses

Mark Steward and Nikki Chambers	149b Pinnacle Hill Road
Marja Spencer and Jamie McKinstry	209 Pinnacle Hill Road
Helen and Gordan Bray	211 Pinnacle Hill Road
Cliff and Natalie Jones	213 Pinnacle Hill Road
Brittany Aker and Jason Johns	215 Pinnacle Hill Road
Charlotte and Royce McCort	217 Pinnacle Hill Road
Mark and Karin Joubert	251 Pinnacle Hill Road
Richard, Tom and Andre Jane	223 Pinnacle Hill Road
Giovanna and Alistair Reay	233A Pinnacle Hill Road
Jason and Shelby Kemble	231B Pinnacle Hill Road
Hamish Parker and Amy Lovisa	233D Pinnacle Hill Road
Aaron Baker and Emma West	247 Pinnacle Hill Road
Katrina and Sander Post	231 Pinnacle Hill Road
Belinda Duggan and Andrew James	233B Pinnacle Hill Road
Mike and Carina Gore	231A Pinnacle Hill Road
Petrea and Joe Ardagh	258 Pinnacle Hill Road
Nishi and Wayne Parkhill	258 Pinnacle Hill Road
Josh and Michelle Neale	235 Pinnacle Hill Road
Tod and Nicola Kirker	233C Pinnacle Hill Road



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 32

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Auckland/ Waikato Fish & Game

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

Please see attached submission 'AWFG McPherson Submission WDC'

I ☐ support ☒ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are.....

Please see attached submission 'AWFG McPherson Submission WDC'

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☐ Approve ☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Please see attached submission 'AWFG McPherson Submission WDC'

Number of additional sheets attached 3

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☒ No ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐ No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Jane Shaw Date 02.07.2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 156 Brymer Road, Hamilton Postcode 3289

Email jshaw@fishandgame.org.nz Phone 0210 250 6861

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Jane Shaw

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Statutory managers of freshwater sports fish, gamebirds and their habitats.

To: Waikato District Council

Submitter: Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game (AWFG)

Submission on: LUC0123/19 McPherson Quarry

Applicant: McPherson Resources Limited

I am not a trade competitor for the purposes of s 30B of the Resource Management Act 1991

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are;

- The application to:
 - To expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone (LUC0123/19)
- The AEE and s 92 responses.

My submission is that;

I oppose the application.

1. Fish and Game is a statutory body established under the Conservation Act (1987): to manage, maintain and enhance the sports fish and game bird habitat resource in the recreational interests of anglers and hunters (s26Q(1)); to assess and monitor the conditions and trend of ecosystems as habitats for sports fish and game (s26Q(1)(a)(iii)); to represent the interests and aspirations of anglers and hunters in the statutory planning process (s26Q(1)(e)(i)); and to advocate the interests of the Council, including its interests in habitats (s26Q(1)(e)(vii)).
2. There is insufficient information to assess land use impacts upon the receiving waterways. The AEE provides no data relating to the impact upon surface water released from the site currently or projections of what the impact is likely to be in future with the proposed changes to the site's operation.

Auckland/Waikato Region
156 Brymer Rd, RD 9, Hamilton 3289, New Zealand. Telephone (07) 849 1666 Facsimile (07) 849 1648
Email: admin@awfg.org.nz www.fishandgame.org.nz

- 3.** The application does not contain any proffered consent conditions and in the absence of such we are unable to determine whether the effects of the application will be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated
- 4.** Many of the technical investigations required to determine the effects are currently lacking. The hydrological assessments highlight several potential risks that require further investigation. Customarily these would be included as part of an application.
- 5.** Fish and Game are concerned about the potential effects on game bird and trout habitat within the catchment and cumulative effects on downstream environments.
- 6.** The site contains ecologically significant freshwater habitat and vegetation that will be impacted by the proposal and the application fails to adequately avoid, remedy or mitigate those effects.
- 7.** Any increase in sediment due to the proposal would exacerbate sedimentation occurring in downstream Fish & Game wetlands during flood events.
- 8.** The reports indicate that there will be considerable movement and storage of soil and cleanfill near waterways. This activity has the potential to release significant quantities of contaminants into the environment, including but not limited to sediment, arsenic, mercury, zinc, lead and copper and cause changes to pH. There is insufficient information on how this risk will be avoided remedied or mitigated.
- 9.** The tributaries downstream are already overallocated in terms of N, P and suspended solids due to the impact of substantial existing stressors.
- 10.** The discharge occurs into the Waikato River Catchment which is contaminated beyond its assimilative capacity and this is recognised in the Vision and Strategy. Improvements to the Waikato River are required, and applications should reflect actual and meaningful reductions of contaminants. These outcomes are not secured by the terms of the current application. The proposal enables degradation, at odds with relevant policies, and gives no security that the policy direction will be actioned. Relevant policy documents should be appropriately implemented. These include:
- 11.** Any consent conditions should require improvements consistent with the requirements of the Vision and Strategy, operative NPS Freshwater Management RPS, NZCPS and PC1 and should ensure the life supporting capacity of water will be safeguarded consistent with Part 2 RMA.

Relief sought:

12. Decline the application.

I wish to be heard in support of this submission.

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Dated at Hamilton, this 30th June 2020.



**Jane Shaw
Environmental Officer
Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game**



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 33

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Maja Spencer & Jamie McKinstry

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

* I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

please see attached separate document

I ☐ support ☒ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are please see attached separate document

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☐ Approve ☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

please see attached separate document

Number of additional sheets attached

6

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☒ No ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐ No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

[Signature] Date *1/07/20*
A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address *209 Pinnacle Hill Rd, Bawby* Postcode *7675*

Email *spencermarya@hotmail.co.uk* Phone *0274 896350*

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) *Maria Spencer*

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

SUBMISSION TO WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL

RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION FOR MCPHERSON RESOURCES LTD

Marja Spencer & Jamie McKinstry

209 Pinnacle Hill Rd, Mangatawhiri, R.D.1 Bombay, 2675

01.07.20

MCPHERSON RESOURCES LTD in the matter of resource consent applications
AUTH137612.01.01 – AUTH137612.06.01

This submission to the Waikato District Council is to confirm that we **oppose** the application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand their quarry operations and subsequent removal of the Significant Natural Areas (SNA). The following document seeks to explain and demonstrate our grounds for opposition.

Introduction

The property at 209 Pinnacle Hill Rd, Bombay has been in our family for a period of 22 years. My husband Jamie and I now own this property and have had the privilege of living there since 2007, building a house and starting a family with our now 2-year-old twin girls.

We have enjoyed a longstanding positive relationship with the McPherson brothers (Mike and Steve) as neighbours and consider them to be friends, with both neighbours helping to lend a hand when in need.

Both Jamie and I would like to make it clear we are not opposed to the quarry operations in its current state as *'the quarry is a relatively small operation which is largely unseen from beyond its existing site'* (pg. 4**).

However, due to the size and scale of the proposal, as well as the significant impact to the amenity value of our property and surrounding community, we are forced to oppose this application for further quarry expansion under the current consent application.

Our house is located on the South Western corner of our property boundary. It is perfectly positioned to maximise views to the west across the McPherson farm towards Mt William. As per figure 1 it is well within 500m buffer zone from quarry operations.




Figure 1: 209 Pinnacle Hill Rd, house location and buffer zone

We oppose the resource consent application for the following reasons:

- **Negative visual impact**
- **Removal of Significant Natural Area (SNA)**
- **Environmental (Flora & Fauna) impact**
- **Negative impact on amenity, property values & loss of rural ambience**
- **Noise pollution**
- **Discharge of dust to air, on both environmental and health grounds, and including (but not limited to) PM10 dust and respirable crystalline silica.**
- **Truck Movements**
- **Future Development**

Visual

- There will be a significant impact to our existing views from both stage 1 & 2 developments.
- The visual impact from our outlook at night has not been considered. It will dramatically increase the light pollution from the newly developed Pokeno subdivisions and industrial area. Our house was designed and built specifically to avoid these views and to take advantage of the bush and rural outlook.
- Instead of looking over native bush and rural views, we will be exposed to the workings of an open quarry. (Fig 2 & 3)
All rooms on the west facing side of our home will be impacted, particularly the master bedroom, children's bedroom and main living areas.
- The proposed expansion alters the visual perception of the activity considerably. It will change our outlook from one of rural paddocks and bushland to that of an industrial site.
- Within the application** or ecological assessment* There has been no mention of the impact this expansion will have of the Mt William Walkway (DOC).




Figure 2: Current landscape, photo taken from our boundary 10m from house




Figure 3: Altered landscape with proposed quarry expansion

** Resource Consent Application & Assessment of Environmental Effects – Updated post lodgement

**Significant
Natural Area
(SNA)**

- An area of Significant Natural Area (SNA) is to be removed on the eastern edge of Stage 1 (2.08ha). This area has been identified as an SNA for sound ecological reasons and it must be protected for future generations.
- If SNAs are permitted to be removed, it will set a precedent for future development across the Waikato Region.
- The proposed plantings to the North of the property to offset the removal and destruction of the SNA needs to be planted regardless as an environmental duty of care for the quarry operation and to establish a forest corridor where currently, none exists.
- We consider that preservation of indigenous flora should be mandatory as again, a site environmental duty of care and not swept aside to suit mining interests.

Flora & Fauna

- The planned vegetation corridor on the northern boundary has no time frame for establishment. Planting needs to be undertaken immediately to allow for establishment and regeneration of native bush.
- There are additional mature native trees not recorded as impacted within the consent application. These trees will be eliminated if the planned excavation is permitted.
- Our property at 209 Pinnacle Hill Rd is set on 11.5 acres, the majority of which is covenanted native bush. It has an abundance of indigenous tree species, notably Kauri, Rimu & Totara which we treasure and endeavor to protect. Such an environment is a habitat for birdlife including but not limited to tui, kereru, fantail and morepork.
The proposed quarry expansion and operation, with its dust, noise pollution and ecological issues will threaten this habitat by significantly reducing the current buffer zone to the quarry.

Amenity Value

- My husband and I have put everything we have into the building of our home, monetarily, emotionally, and physically in order to continue our family legacy on this property and provide a uniquely New Zealand environment for our young family to grow. To have the intrusion of an industrial facility on our rural lifestyle with all the accompanying consequences (visual, noise, dust, light pollution) is devastating to us.
- Our architecturally designed home has a wide appeal for a prospective buyers' market who seek a rural/natural lifestyle. Should the resource consent be granted it will negatively impact on our property value.

Noise

- Inconclusive noise level tests have been undertaken. Considering the fact that the quarry will operate for 12 hours a day, 6 days a week this is of considerable concern to us.
- The application is also not clear about exactly what the hours of operation will be. Clarification needs to be given for what business hours of operation are.
- Additionally, the acoustic modelling has not taken into account any expansion of quarry activities. When production is increased either by the existing owner or after sale to a company that increases capital expenditure, it is reasonable to expect that the number of crushers and other machinery will increase along with an increase in noise and dust.

Dust

- Quarry expansion will invariably have increased airborne dust and silica particulates affecting air quality.
- Reference is made to avoiding screening/crushing in dry, windy conditions (4.1.2) but we are concerned this requirement will be hard to police.
- Our property (209 Pinnacle Hill Road) is within the 500 metre buffer zone as per Fig 12** and we will be at direct risk.

** Resource Consent Application & Assessment of Environmental Effects – Updated post lodgement

Traffic

- It is widely known that SH2 and in particular the section between SH1 and Maramarua is a dangerous section of road for motorists. 6.6.2** To rely on the proposed Section A improvements by the NZTA is incorrect as there is no immediate plan for this upgrade.
- The assumption of a 50/50 split between left and right turning trucks has been made, evidence needs to be created to support this assumption. The mitigating factors planned are not enough to limit the risks for motorists along SH2.

Future Development

- As per the application the proposed expansion plan is to cover a 45-year timeframe. There is no intended end plan for this quarry and restoration of the natural landscape, no planting is planned until the end of stage 1&2. Even though the proposal states that a replanting plan will be made, no structured timeframe for rehabilitation is provided. For a proposal with such significant ecological impact, the absence of a timeframe is a failing of the application.
- The suggested timeframes for each stage do not have limitations. If the quarry was to be purchased by a larger organization with additional resources, this timeframe will be dramatically decreased. To state there will be a gradual change is incorrect, as it cannot be guaranteed.

Conclusion

Due to the above reasons we **oppose** this application. We request that this application is **declined** by the Waikato District Council. We require a full assessment and independent peer review for ourselves and the residents on Pinnacle Hill Rd in the vicinity of the quarry before any further action is taken.

We agree to be heard at a hearing for supporting evidence to this submission.

We will be presenting a comprehensive submission at the hearing, and will expand on all the above points.

Signed by Submitters:



Marja Spencer (owner)



Jamie McKinstry (owner)



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 34

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) John William Milam

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991
* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor
Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.
Give details:

The reasons for my views are.....
The quarry material provided to me, is planned for access to Kauri die back areas

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council:

☒ Approve

☐ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐

No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐

No ☒

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐

No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Date

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 543A WEST COAST ROAD ORATUA Postcode

Email gordon.trenching@xtra.co.nz Phone

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) JOHN MORAN

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 35

CUSTOMER #

Submission form

(Form 13)

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) BEUNDA DUGGAN & ANDREW JAMES

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

†Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

6.2 Visual and landscape effects

6.4 Noise

6.6 Traffic effects

6.7 Dust effects

6.8 Vegetation loss effects

also impact on those ^{living} above the quarry not adequately considered in R.C. application

I ☐ support ☒ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are: Impact on views & rural ambience, impact on property values, increase in noise pollution, increase in dust pollution and its effects on health and environment, removal of indigenous forest in an SNA, other environmental factors, increase in truck movements on SH2 & Pinnacle Hill Rd, and ^{the impact on} those living north and north-east of quarry not adequately considered in the resource consent application

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☐ Approve ☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

We will be presenting a submission at the hearing and where we will expand on all the above points.

Number of additional sheets attached —

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☒ No ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐ No ☒

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Belinda Duggan

Date 1/7/20

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 233B Pinnacle Hill Rd R.D.1. Bombay Postcode 2675

Email bduggan@sta.co.nz Phone 021 692 5929

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Belinda Duggan

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.

Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 36

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) JOCELYN SCOTT

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

- Hours of operation Mon-Sat 0700 - 1900
- Number of truck movements a day = 165 = 14/hour
= ONE TRUCK EVERY 4 MINUTES
- Length of time = 45 years
- Removal of 2.45ha of indigenous vegetation
- Earthworks within a Significant Natural Area

I ☐ support ☒ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are Noise of operation, ~~business~~ increased heavy traffic on highway 2, dust pollution, visual pollution loss of native vegetation are all unacceptable features to be brought into an area with a significant number of dwellings in close proximity

I seek the following decision from Waikato District Council: ☐ Approve ☒ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Decline all of the application

Number of additional sheets attached 0

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐ No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☒ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☒ No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter or person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Jocelyn Scott Date 2/7/2020

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 433 Pinnacle Hill Road Postcode 2675

Email jocelyndscott@gmail.com Phone 0226780034

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Jocelyn Scott

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Waikato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngauruwahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@waikato.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.



Submission form

(Form 13)

For internal use only

ECM Application # LUC0123/19

ECM

SUBMISSION # 37

CUSTOMER #

Submission on an application concerning resource consent that is subject to public notification by consent authority Sections 95A and 96 of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL NO LATER THAN 5PM ON THURSDAY 2ND JULY 2020

To: Waikato District Council

Name of submitter (full name) Dowling Contractors Limited - Robert Lewis Dowling

This is a submission on an application from McPherson Resources Limited to expand and continue to operate the mineral extraction activities at the McPherson Quarry with associated overburden removal and placement, deposition of cleanfill and vegetation clearance of an Identified Significant Natural Area Schedule 5A area and Significant Natural Area within the Rural Zone at 47 McPherson Road and 93 Irish Road Mangatawhiri

*I am ☐ am not ☒ a trade competitor for the purpose of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991

* Select one

† I 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~~

† Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor

Select one

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

Give details (attach separate sheets if necessary):

Continuation of normal quarrying activities

I ☒ support ☐ oppose ☐ am neutral to the part/s named above.

Give details:

The reasons for my views are.....

I seek the following decision from Walkato District Council: ☒ Approve ☐ Decline

Give precise details, including any parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.

Number of additional sheets attached

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

Yes ☐ No ☒

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

Yes ☐ No ☐

Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act I request that you delegate your functions, powers and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act, you must do so 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.

Signature of submitter of person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter

Date 24/06/20

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

Address 48 Baird Rd, Pokeno

Postcode 2471

Email admin@dowlingcontractors.co.nz

Phone 0212487141

Contact person's name (name and designation if applicable) Robert Lewis Dowling

This is the person and the address to which all communications from the Council about the submission will be sent

Note to Submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant whose address for service is Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw - Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited, PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 or email eloise@kineticenvironmental.co.nz as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Walkato District Council

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

Written Submission

Postal Address Walkato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742

Telephone 0800 492 452

Email Submission

Consent.submissions@walc.govt.nz

The information you have provided on this form is required so that your submission can be processed under the RMA, and your name and address will be publicly available. The information will be stored on a public register and held by the Council, and may also be made available to the public on the Council's website. In addition, any on-going communications between you and Council will be held at Council's offices and may also be accessed upon request by a third party. Access to this information is administered in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. If you have any concerns about this, please discuss with a Council Planner prior to lodging your submission. If you would like to request access to, or correction of your details, please contact the Council.