

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED AND SUBMITTER LOCALITY PLAN

Appendix C: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Submitter	Support /Oppose	To be heard	Reasons
1	Tony & Melissa	Support	No	
2	Wei Chen	Oppose	No	<u>Visual Landscape Effects</u> - Adverse effects on natural environment- indigenous vegetation
3	Neil Douglas John Butcher	Support	No	
4	Onroad Transport Ltd Don Wilson	Support	No	
5	Drainformers Ltd Josh Phillips	Support	No	
6	P & I Pascoe Ltd Barry Smith / Amy Kozanic	Support	No	
7	John Blackwood	Support	Yes	
8	Sonya Michelsen	Support	No	
9	Hira Bhana & Co Ltd	Support	No	
10	Craig Alan Nicholson	Support	No	
11	Koek Services Ltd	Support	Yes	
12	NZTA - Emily Hunt	Neutral	No	<u>Traffic Safety</u> - NZTA does not oppose application on the proviso that recommendation conditions outlined in the response letter dated 19 March 2019 and submission be agreed to and imposed should consent be granted. This includes upgrades to the McPherson Road/Sh2 intersection and limits on annual haulage.
13	Bruce Moulden	Support	No	
14	RJ & SM Douglas Ltd	Support	No	
15	Aaron Baker and Emma West	Oppose	Yes	<u>Visual landscape effects</u> - visual pollution – timing of planting ecological corridor, earthworks and vegetation removal opening up views towards overburden area. <u>Rural Amenity and Character Effects</u> - Loss of rural amenity due to scale and location of proposal.

Submission Number	Submitter	Support /Oppose	To be heard	Reasons
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Long hours of operation. <p><u>Traffic effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - health and safety- increase in traffic on SH2 which is already a dangerous stretch of road; <p><u>Dust Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Health risk for dust increases- specifically airborne silica particulates; - Risks exacerbated with earthworks and vegetation removal. <p><u>Vegetation Loss</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removal of vegetation reducing carbon capture for region and exacerbation of stormwater effects and erosion <p><u>Noise and vibration effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased impact from noise and vibrations (including blasting); - Timing and location of noise measurements undertaken; <p><u>Ecological effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No consideration of effects on wetlands to the north of the quarry; - Impacts from quarry operation on these wetlands. <p><u>Rehabilitation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No rehabilitation plan so the community cannot determine whether this will add value to the uniqueness of the region. <p><u>Other Matters</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased CO² emissions. - Community and economic benefits not clear; - Duration of the consent and potential it is on sold and acceleration of the activity.
16	Mark and Karin Joubert	Oppose	No / Yes if others	<p><u>Amenity and Character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noise, visual and dust pollution; - Long hours of operation. <p><u>Traffic effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - health and safety- increase in traffic on SH2 which is already a dangerous stretch of road; - Use of Pinnacle Hill Road which isn't built for heavy traffic; <p><u>Erosion and Sedimentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of vegetation causing erosion and runoff <p><u>Rehabilitation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No rehabilitation plan. Seeks input from community and iwi.

Submission Number	Submitter	Support /Oppose	To be heard	Reasons
				<u>Other Matters</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts on tourism on Mt William Walkway; - Increased CO² emissions; - Removal of ridge line.
17	Gordon & Helen Bray on behalf of Trustees of the Bray Family Trust	Oppose	Yes	<u>Rural Amenity and Character Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of rural amenity due to scale and location of proposal. - Hours of operation 7am-6pm or 7pm to 7pm <u>Traffic effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase in traffic on SH2 which is already a dangerous stretch of road and at McPherson Road intersection; - Inadequate sight distances; - NZTA approval- this has not been given- rather they confirm they do not oppose the application; - Queuing of trucks; - 50/50 split of truck movements at intersection; - Independent safety audit should be carried out prior to hearing; - Assumption that trucks importing cleanfill will leave with aggregate; - No safety effects assessment on users of McPherson Road. <u>Visual Landscape Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consideration of visual landscape effects on individual properties; - Consideration of significant adverse visual landscape effects; - Adverse cumulative effects from the expansion of quarry activities; - Reliance given on pine forest for mitigation; <u>Dust Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dust mitigation proposed not sufficient; - Proximity of cleanfill to property boundaries and concern with being able to manage dust effects within the site boundary; - Management around acceptance of cleanfill and concern with about contaminants beyond sediment; - Effects on properties outside the 500m – concern there was no basis to restrict notification only to properties within 500m. <u>Ecological effects</u>

Submission Number	Submitter	Support /Oppose	To be heard	Reasons
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Justification for removal of indigenous vegetation; - Locate of the proposed ecological corridor shown where stage 4 is (not subject to this application); - Compensation of 2:1 and 1:1 insufficient; - Mitigation for removal of tributary 1 and effects on stream 1 inadequate. <p><u>Noise Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No assessment of potential amenity effects on surrounding residents; - Assumption that compliance with noise limits predicted by a model mean no amenity or other effects need to be considered; <p><u>Other Matters</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of consultation; - Reliance on existing use rights in application; - Planning assessment in AEE deficient and no assessment against s104D matters; - Level of effects greater than what has been assessed in application; - No assessment of s7(c) matters;
18	Mount William Limited Flemming Rasmussen	Oppose	Yes	<p><u>Rural Character Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scale of proposal does not fit in with the ambience and development in the area
19	Katrina and Sander Post	Oppose	Yes	<p><u>Ecological effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Justification for removal of indigenous vegetation; - Timing on removal of indigenous vegetation- no timeframe on removal; - Timing on planting of ecological corridor; - Old pine trees referred to as 'shelter belt'. Considers these are near the end of their useful life. <p><u>Vibration Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Location of measurements near 231 Pinnacle hill road. Considers measurements should be at 231 Pinnacle Hill Road. <p><u>Dust Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned that increased activity and importation of cleanfill creating significant dust effects; - No consideration from climate change and further climate change; - Contamination from increased dust discharges and airborne silica particulates getting into tank water;

Submission Number	Submitter	Support /Oppose	To be heard	Reasons
				<u>Erosion and sediment Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No detail design provided for stages 2 and 3.
20	Carey Ellison C/- Allied Petroleum	Support	No	
21	Charlotte & Royce McCort	Oppose	Yes	<u>Visual Amenity Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts on visual impacts on residences; - Reference to shelter belt screen planting - Timing on planting of ecological corridor to achieve visual mitigation; <u>Noise Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Location of noise measurements; - Concern with consideration on noise effects given to properties to the north; - Hours of operation <u>Traffic Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern with increase in trucks on Pinnacle Hill Road - Proposal with 50/50 split of traffic turning out of McPherson Road. <u>Dust Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased dust emissions and dust effects - Proposed dust mitigation considered inadequate; - No consideration from climate change and further climate change in assessment of dust effects; <u>Ecological Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Destruction of any indigenous vegetation. <u>Other Matters</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts on tourism on Mt William Walkway;
22	Brittany Aker and Jason Johns	Oppose	Yes	<u>Visual Amenity Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts on visual impacts on residences; - Reference to shelter belt screen planting - Timing on planting of ecological corridor to achieve visual mitigation; - Removal of ridge exposing lights of pokeno/light pollution <u>Noise Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Location of noise measurements; - Concern with consideration on noise effects given to properties to the north;

Submission Number	Submitter	Support /Oppose	To be heard	Reasons
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hours of operation <u>Traffic Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern with increase in trucks on Pinnacle Hill Road - Proposal with 50/50 split of traffic turning out of McPherson Road. <u>Dust Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased dust emissions and dust effects - Proposed dust mitigation considered inadequate; - No consideration from climate change and further climate change in assessment of dust effects; - Silica contamination in water tanks <u>Ecological Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Destruction of any indigenous vegetation. <u>Other Matters</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts on tourism on Mt William Walkway; - Decrease in property values due to the activity and removal of indigenous vegetation
23	Megan Clotworthy	Oppose	No	<u>Traffic Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts on residences along pinnacle hill road from heavy traffic <u>Amenity Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noise pollution, dust pollution and heavy traffic <u>Other matters</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts on property values
24	Jason & Shelby Kemble	Oppose	Yes	<u>Noise and Vibration effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern with location of measures (being similar to 231 Pinnacle Hill Road but not distance stated; - Concern with noise and vibration effects to the north <u>Dust effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dust from quarry getting into water tanks <u>Visual Amenity Effects</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reference to shelter belt screen planting;

Submission Number	Submitter	Support /Oppose	To be heard	Reasons
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Timing on planting of ecological corridor to achieve visual mitigation;
25	Coastal Roding Contractors Ltd	Support	No	
26	Paul Francis Oliver	Support	No	
27	Waikato Regional Council Matthew Vare	Neutral	Yes	<u>Ecological</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need for robust scientific conditions - Measures implemented to manage effects on Kauri dieback
28	Andrew Cameron Browne	Support	No / Yes if others	
29	David W Phillips on behalf of 12	Oppose	Yes	<u>Visual Landscape</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Historic destruction of indigenous vegetation; - Additional planting to mitigate south facing visual effects <u>Ecological</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removal of indigenous vegetation resulting in reduction in oxygen, erosion, increase noise and loss of bird habitats. - Further destruction of indigenous vegetation. - Effects of quarrying activities on habitats; - Kauri dieback <u>Traffic</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tracking onto the road - Concern with large volume of truck movements proposed <u>Noise and vibration</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noise from trucks including engine breaking; - Effects from blasting on fault lines - Blasting on weekends - Long hours of operation <u>Amenity</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adverse amenity impacts from the proposal from noise, dust, vibrations, truck movements

Submission Number	Submitter	Support /Oppose	To be heard	Reasons
				<p><u>Contamination</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern that contaminated fill has been deposited on the site; - Concern that depositing fill on the site will result in polluting ground water <p><u>Rehabilitation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Closure date/ seeks earlier remediation date <p><u>Hydrology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts on water quality in streams and water table <p><u>Other Matters</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transfer of consent - Property values - Impacts of the quarry on future subdivision - Climate change effects - Previous monitoring and enforcement over last 15years; - Impacts on religious beliefs
30	Marilyn Thompson & Nigel Cowan	Oppose	Yes	<p><u>Rural Character and Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of amenity value and rural ambiance from the proposed activity. <p><u>Dust</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contamination of house drinking water <p><u>Noise and vibration</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vibration from blasting damaging house; - Concern with noise impacts from trucks, crushers, drilling, tipping; - No consideration of prevailing winds and 'ballooning' of noise over property <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Heavy traffic along McPherson Road - Traffic safety effects along SH2 and intersection with McPherson Road <p><u>Visual Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visual impacts from residence to quarry activities; - Visual distortion of rural landscape. <p><u>Ecological</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removal of SNA and impacts of this removal on neighbouring sites. <p><u>Other Matters</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing use rights- question the legality of the operation over the last 20 years.

Submission Number	Submitter	Support /Oppose	To be heard	Reasons
31	Pinnacle Hill Road Residents x18 C/- Charlotte McCort	Oppose	Yes	<p><u>Visual Amenity Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts on visual impacts on residences; - Reference to shelter belt screen planting - Timing on planting of ecological corridor to achieve visual mitigation; <p><u>Noise Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Location of noise measurements; - Concern with consideration on noise effects given to properties to the north; - Hours of operation <p><u>Traffic Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern with increase in trucks on Pinnacle Hill Road - Proposal with 50/50 split of traffic turning out of McPherson Road. <p><u>Dust Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased dust emissions and dust effects - Proposed dust mitigation considered inadequate; - No consideration from climate change and further climate change in assessment of dust effects; <p><u>Ecological Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oppose any destruction of any indigenous vegetation. <p><u>Rehabilitation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No rehabilitation plan provided with application-concern that there is no way for Council to be sure the application is intending to undertake rehabilitation. <p><u>Other Matters</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts on tourism on Mt William Walkway; - Lack of consultation with neighbouring sites
32	Auckland/Waikato Fish & Game	Oppose	Yes	<p><u>Ecological</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - impacts on game bird and trout habitat within the catchment - cumulative effects on downstream environments - No proffered consent conditions to determine whether effects will be avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Submission Number	Submitter	Support /Oppose	To be heard	Reasons
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in sediment and impacts downstream - Potential for contamination in waterways due to proximity of cleanfill areas to streams.
33	Marya Spencer & Jamie McKinstry	Oppose	Yes	<p><u>Visual Landscape</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Negative visual impacts from residence; - Visual impacts at night with removal of ridgeline exposing lights of pokeno; - Significant change in outlook from residence (from indigenous vegetation and rural paddocks to industrial site) <p><u>Ecological</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removal of SNA setting a precedent; - Timing of planting of ecological corridor; - Concern that there are additional mature native trees not been considered that will be impacted. - Impacts on flora and fauna from operation; - <p><u>Rural Character and Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Negative impacts on amenity, and loss of rural ambience <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional truck movements on SH2 which is already a dangerous stretch of road - 50/50 split of traffic and how this would be enforced. <p><u>Noise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - noise pollution - long hours of operation - Concern that acoustic modelling does not account for increase in machinery <p><u>Dust</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discharge of dust to air include PM10 dust and respirable crystalline silica. <p><u>Other matters</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Future development - Impacts on property values
34	John William Malam	Support	No	
35	Belinda Duggan & Andrew James	Oppose	Yes	<p><u>Rural Character and Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Negative impacts on amenity, and loss of rural ambience; <p><u>Noise</u></p>

Submission Number	Submitter	Support /Oppose	To be heard	Reasons
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in noise pollution <u>Dust</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in dust pollution <u>Ecological</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removal of SNA <u>Traffic</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional truck movements on SH2 and Pinnacle Hill Road <u>Other matters</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts on property values - Lack of consideration given to northern properties in application
36	Jocelyn Scott	Oppose	No / Yes if others	<u>Traffic</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional truck movements on SH2 <u>Ecological</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removal of SNA <u>Noise</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noise of operation <u>Dust</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dust pollution <u>Visual</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visual pollution
37	Dowling Contractors Limited Robert Lewis Dowling	Support	No	



