

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
6	Rodney Thomas	Abbott	FFNZ FORM (Late sub.): 'To permit all non commercial Q&M throughout the District, including in riverbeds; and to not have any rules constraining quarrying and mining activities in riverbeds. Seeks the following changes to the proposed Plan and to the operative Plan: 1. All reference to quarrying and mining to read "commercial quarrying and mining". 2. Non commercial mining, extraction of gravel and quarrying across the district in rural areas to be permitted. 3. That issue 10(b) be amended so that it recognises and provides for "'reserve sensitivity' [sic] protection to farming and intensive land uses which are located in the rural area"; and to not change Issue 10(a). 4. Delete proposed rule A1.2.21(a) volumes and time frames. 5. Delete proposed rule A1.2.21(b) schedule of rivers. 6. Delete proposed rule A1.5. 7. Amend the proposed change to the third paragraph in the chapter headed "Protection and enhancement of environmental quality" by deleting the word "unnecessary" before the words "adverse effects". 8. Amend the proposed new rule A1.4(a) so that it reads "located more t 9. "Reject proposed changes to rule A1.4". 10. "Reject the proposed changes to rule A1.5(e)". 11. Amend the definition of quarrying and mining so that it only refers to	Y	Y		N
7	Hugh Robert	Turnbull	FFNZ FORM Late sub.	Y	Y		N
8	Stewart Burnett	Gibb	FFNZ FORM Late sub.	Y	Y		N
9	Ali Undorf-Lay	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FFNZ FORM	Y	Y		Y
10	Sam	Bethell	FFNZ FORM	Y	Y		N
11	Keith Joseph	Berry	FFNZ FORM	Y	Y		N
12	Nigel	Fraser	FFNZ FORM	Y	Y		N
13	Peter Sherwood	Roberts	FFNZ FORM	Y	Y		Y
14	John	Alton-Adams	FFNZ FORM	Y	Y		N
15	Dugald Stuart Arthur	McLean	FFNZ FORM	Y	Y		N
16	William Winston	Paterson	FFNZ FORM	Y	Y		Y
17	Peter Isaac	Croft	FFNZ FORM	Y	Y		Y+J
18	Michael Robert	Hodgen	FFNZ FORM	Y	Y		N
19	Alison Claire	Meyer	FFNZ FORM	Y	Y		N

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
20	Richard Murchison	Kintail Downs Ltd	FFNZ FORM	Y	Y		N
21	Bruce	Beaton	FFNZ FORM UNSIGNED	Y	Y		N
27	Henderson	Ngaire	Submission relates to "all the changes in plan change No 7". Does not support a sand quarry in Kings Rd. Decision sought is "I suggest a separation of 1000 metres to be appropriate if this quarry must eventuate".	Y	Y	Y	Y
28	Calvert	Peter Raymond and Margaret Ruth	Submission relates to "all the changes in plan change No 7". Due to effects of activity, seeks a minimum of 1,000m separation from residential properties. Decision sought "HDC to adopt plan change no 7 in its entirety with a greater separation of 1,000m".	Y	Y	N	N
29	Thomson	Robert Bruce	Submission on " all the changes in plan change no 7", opposes Q&M, and seeks a "minimum distance between residential and mining at least 1000metres". Decision sought: "...adopt plan change no7 in its entirety or in its entirety but with a greater separation of a 1000 metres".	Y	Y	N	Y
30	Sonne	Jean Olive	Submission on all the changes in plan change 7. Opposes Q&M anywhere near a residential area, even 1,000m is too close. Decision sought "I support the Plan change no7 where a 1000 metre separation could happen but as stated above I oppose the activity entirely".	Y	Y	Y	N
31	Kirwan	Brian Francis	Supports plan change in its entirety. Seeks adoption of change 7.	Y	N	N	Y
32	Wharfe	Ronald Mervyn	Sub on all of no7. Decision sought: "Adopt plan change no.7 in entirety. That the Winstone Aggregates application to establish a sand quarry in Kings Rd be rejected and that any further applications be opposed but should one be successful that the area between quarry and residences be increased to 1000 metres".	Y	Y	N	Y
33	Holbrough	June	On all of no7. Opposes Q&M. Decision sought: "I would like the Council decision to be that we don't want it at any distance at all. We don't want it".	Y	Y	Y	Y
34	Sonne	Francis	On all of No7. Does not want dust, traffic, noise, visual effects. Decision sought: "If the Council respects the wishes of the community they would not allow quarrying and mining anywhere near Leithfield beach not 500 metres or 1000m let them find somewhere else".	Y	Y	Y	N
35	Holbrough	R G	Submission on all of Change 7. Noise and dust concerns. Decision sought: "I think there should not be a quarry anywhere near house within 2kms".	Y	Y	Y	N

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
36	Beswick	Mrs MN	On all of change no7. Opposes Q&M in Kings Rd. Decision sought: "We definitely do not want a quarry or mining of any type at any distance".	N	N	Y	Y
37	Anthony	Deborah Maree	On all changes in no7. Decision sought: "No quarry".	N	N	Y	N
38	Anthony	James	On all of change 7. Does not want Q&M to occur. Decision sought: "That the quarry work will be declined".	N	N	Y	N
39	Cooper	Laurie	On all of change 7. Concerned about the negative impacts of "the activity" on Leithfield. Decision sought: "To create a minimum separation gap of 1km, but preferably to reject the Plan change and ensure that the quarrying activity does not proceed".	N	N	Y	N
40	Brown	Kelvin Douglas	On all of change 7. Objects to any plan change that allows "the quarry" to proceed; decision sought "No quarry close to holiday area".	N	N	Y	N
41	Blacklock	Ida	On all of change 7. Submission is "No compromise. No quarry". Decision sought: "As I go here on holiday I certainly do not want it. No quarry".	N	N	Y	N
42	Archer	ET and JA	On all of change 7. Opposes a quarry in Kings Rd. Believes a greater separation distance between residential areas and Q&M than 500m is needed. Decision sought: Adopt change 7, but with a greater separation distance, preferably 1,000m.	Y	Y	N	Y
43	Baker	Yvonne	On all of change 7. Opposes any Q&M.	N	N	Y	N
44	Walker	Jennifer Evelyn	On all of change 7. Is opposed to Q&M near Leithfield. Concerns about noise and dust effects. Decision sought: "Please change No.7, but I still don't want this thing on my doorstep".	N	N	Y	N
45	Walker	Ricky dean	On all of change 7. He opposes the "decision for the quarry to come to our beach". Decision sought: "Change No7, but we still don't want it on our doorstep".	Y	Y	Y	N
46	Walker	Dean Francis	On all of change 7. Opposes the decision for a quarry to come to his beach. Concerns about effects. The distance is irrelevant as he does not want a quarry. Decision sought: "Please change No7 100m but we don't want this thing on our doorstep".	Y	Y	Y	Y
47	Jesson	Gail Marcia	On all of change 7, supports the plan change, but 500m is too close. Decision sought is adopt change 7, but with a 1000m separation distance from residential areas.	Y	Y	N	N
48	Webb	Colleen Ruth	Supports change 7, but with a greater separation distance of 1000m from residential areas.	Y	Y	N	N
49	Larsen	Anne	On all of change 7. Supports a buffer between residential and Q&M. Adopt change 7 in its entirety but to extend the separation distance to 1,000m.	Y	Y	N	N

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
50	Meek	John Ernest and Judith Ann	On all of change 7. Are against a quarry in the vicinity of Leithfield Beach. If the plan goes ahead, wants a separation of 1000m or more.	N	N	Y	Y
51	Hibbard	John Edward	On all of change 7, supports it generally, but opposes permitted excavation from rivers adjacent to townships.	Y	Y	Y	Y
52	Hall	William David	On all of change 7, opposes any Q&M in the Leithfield area. Concerns with dust and traffic effects. Position any quarry at least 1000m from the beach and put any entrance to the quarry away from Kings Rd and the beach. Decision sought: adopt the changes, but with Q&M non-complying if within 1000m of a residential area; and there be no entrance to a Q or M off Kings Rd.	N	N	Y	N
53	Spencer	Stephen Joseph	On all of change 7, supports a plan change, 500m buffer zone is better than done, but queries whether that is enough, and seeks a buffer zone of 1000m.	Y	Y	N	N
54	Buchanan	Elizabeth Mary	On all of change 7, opposes Q&M in Kings Rd., due to pollution concerns. Seeks a separation distance of 1000m, but exclude from the rule aggregate extraction in the Kowai riverbed, as this is flood protection.	Y	Y	N	Y
55	Fawcett	Ian	On all of change 7, seeks a 1000m buffer zone between commercial Q&M and any existing residential dwelling; except for riverbed extraction for flood protection.	Y	Y	N	Y
56	Upritchard	Evan	On all of change 7, opposes a 500m separation between Q&M and residential areas; supports a minimum distance of 1000m between Q&M and residential areas.	Y	Y	N	Y
57	Fitzmaurice	Hamish	On all of change 7, supports the plan change with the exception that the buffer zone should be increased to 2000m; and that there be no quarry in Leithfield Beach.	Y	Y	N	Y
58	Fitzmaurice	Denis James	Supports all of change 7, except for the buffer zone. It should be 1500m from established communities; and no quarry in/off Kings Rd; and that the Plan recognise the special characteristics of towns in Hurunui.	Y	Y	N	Y
59	Fitzmaurice	Susan	On all of change 7, seeks a ban on any type of Q&M in the Leithfield Beach area; or failing a ban, that the separation distance be at least 2000m from any residential housing.	Y	Y	N	Y
60	Hamilton	Gaye Jocelyn	On all of change 7, seeks a ban on Q&M in the Leithfield Beach community; and failing that, to have a buffer separation of 2,000m from commercial enterprise.	Y	Y	N	Y

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
61	Jamieson	Murray Joseph	On all of change 7, supports the change, except: that Q&M be banned from the Leithfield Beach/Pukeko Junction and Leithfield area; and that any of these activities be 2000m from this environment.	Y	Y	N	Y
62	Teika	Raymond Uenuku	"No quarry. Don't destroy natural beauty. Leave for future generations to enjoy as do locals and visitors".	N	N	Y	N
63	Cooper	Jennie	On all of change 7, opposes the changes as there should be no quarry. The changes are not enough to prevent damages to the environment and community.	N	N	Y	Y
64	Anthony	Paul Stuart	Opposes all of change 7 due to effects. Decision: "No quarry at Leithfield Beach".	N	Y	Y	N
65	McKenzie	Ann	On all of change 7, "I oppose the quarry" due to effects.	N	N	Y	N
66	Field	James trevor	Supports all of change 7, except with a 1000m buffer zone, due to adverse effects.	Y	Y	N	N
67	Buchanan	Daniel Roy	On all of change 7, opposes a quarry at Leithfield Beach, due to effects; seeks a 2000m buffer between houses and "the quarry".	Y	Y	N	N
68	Ellis	Lesley Alexia	"I wish the HDC to adopt plan change in its entirety preferably with a 1000m separation distance".	Y	Y	N	N
69	McGeoch	James and Vanessa	Adopt plan change 7 in its entirety with a separation distance of 1000m.	Y	Y	N	Y
70	Riley	Richard Arnold	Supports all the change because of the quiet community and adverse effects of quarrying; decision : "The onlt acceptable outcome as an alternative to plan change No7 is to increase the separation distance to 1000m".	Y	N	Y	N
71	Honey	Debra Lee	Supports all of the change; decision: "The onlt acceptable outcome as an alternative to plan change No7 is to increase the separation distance to 1000m".	Y	N	N	N
72	Hiddleston	Elizabeth	On all of change 7, opposes Q&M at Leithfield Beach due to effects. Seeks Q&M "at least 2kms away from nearest property".	N	N	Y	Y
73	Hiddleston	Kane	Opposes Q&M at Leithfield beach due to effects.	N	N	Y	N
74	Smith	Bethany Jane	On all of change 7, seeks adoption of the proposed change only if there is a greater separation distance of 1km between Q&M and residential areas.	Y	Y	N	N
75	Smith	Jonathan David	Submission is confined to the buffer zone size. Seeks adoption of all of the change, except that, due to adverse effects of Q&M, the buffer zone be extended to at least 1km.	Y	Y	N	N
76	Smith	David	Submission is confined to buffer zone size. Due to concerns over effects at Leithfield, that the change be adopted but with a greater separation distance eg 1000m.	Y	Y	N	N

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
77	Smith	Maureen Patricia	Submission confined to buffer zone size between Q&M and residential areas. Due to adverse effects, seeks adoption of change 7 but with a buffer zone of at least 1km.	Y	Y	N	Y
78	Felgate	Kylie	On all of change 7, opposes the separation distance as inadequate due to adverse effects. Seeks increased separation distance for Q&M to 2.5kms at least.	Y	Y	N	N
79	Dwyer	Valaria	On all of change 7, due to concerns over adverse effects, seeks adoption of the change in its entirety but with a greater separation distance of 1km.	Y	Y	N	Y
80	Mills	Colin Flaxman	On all of change 7, seeks adoption of the change, but with a greater separation distance of 1000m.	Y	Y	N	Y
81	Smith	Megan-Jane Ellen	On all of change 7, supports the change in its entirety.	Y	N	N	Y
82	Harper	Philip and Barbara	Opposes Q&M in the Leithfield area due to adverse effects. Submits "Also that gravel extraction be separate exercise from Q&M". Decision: :If Q&M did eventuate the buffer zone must be at least 1000m".	Y	Y	Y	N
83	Redshaw	Damon	On all of change 7, "I wish to have it amended to no less than 1000m" and "and have no mining and quarrying at Leithfield Beach".	N	N	Y	N
84	Butler	Scott	On all of change 7, wants to see the buffer zone increased to 1000m.	Y	Y	Y	N
86	Painter	Jesse	On all of change 7, supports a separation zone of at least 1000m from any residential area.	Y	Y	Y	N
87	Thomas-Rose	Aaron Leigh	On all of change 7, "I would like to see it amended to 1000m from any housing and residential areas".	Y	Y	Y	N
88	James	John Edward	"I would like to see it amended to 1000 metres from any housing and residential areas".	Y	Y	Y	N
89	Rasbatch	Dianna	On all of change 7, "I would like to see it amended to 1000 metres from houses".	N	N	Y	N
90	Archbold	Kristina	On all of change 7, seeks a 1000m buffer zone from any residential area.	Y	Y	Y	N
91	Isherwood	Hugh Oswald	On all of change 7, "The thought of having this operation anywhere within 1000m would be a hazard to health. Money means more".	N	N	Y	N
92	Redshaw	Vinessa	On all of change 7, "I'm in support of a separation zone of at least 1000m".	Y	Y	Y	N
93	Cooper	Levi John	On all of change 7, "I support a separation zone of at least 1000m from any residential area".	Y	Y	Y	N
94	Redshaw	Heather	On all of change 7, "I would like to see it amended to no less than 1000 metres".	Y	Y	Y	N

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

7 of 16

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
95	Giddens	David William	On all of change 7, "I would like to see it extended to 1kms from any residential area".	Y	Y	Y	N
96	(Illegible)	Chris	On all of change 7, "I would like to see it amended to 1000 metres from any residential areas".	Y	Y	Y	N
97	Luff	Rosita	On all of change 7, "I support a separation zone of at least 1000 metres from any residential area", due to effects.	Y	Y	Y	N
98	Painter	Bridget Charmain	On all of change 7, decision sought is first that the Council "does not let the quarry here at all, that if it has to be here then no closer than 1000m to the closest house, and a paper road through the paddock to give independent access to the quarry other than the existing intersection at SH1".	Y	Y	Y	Y
99	Shepherd	Neil Campbell	On all of change 7, "I would like to see it amended to 1000 metres from any residential areas".	Y	Y	Y	Y
100	Harrison	Terry	On all of change 7, "I would like to see it amended to 1000 metres from any residential areas", and decision sought "To stop the Q&M at Leithfield Beach".	Y	Y	Y	N
101	Campbell	Nesse	on all of change 7, submission is "I would like to see it amended to 1000 metres from any residential areas", and decision sought "I would like to see the Council stop any mining and quarrying at our tranquil Leithfield Beach".	Y	Y	Y	N
102	Black	John Raymond	On all of change 7, due to adverse effects, seeks adoption of the change in its entirety, but with a greater separation distance of 1,000m.	Y	Y	N	N
103	Thorne	Joy	On all of change 7, due to adverse effects, supports change 7 entirely but with a greater separation distance of 1000m.	Y	Y	N	N
104	Summers	John Edward and Dorothy Joan	On all of change 7 "We oppose the distance of the buffer zone and would rather it be 1000m from residential area. We also oppose the noise and dust etc in the area".	Y	Y	Y	N
106	McAnally	Kevin	On all of change 7, due to concerns over effects, to adopt the change but with a separation distance between Q&M and any residence of 1000m.	Y	Y	Y	Y
107	Anthony	Alfred	Concerns over effects of Q&M, 500m is too close, seeks that the change be adopted but with a separation distance of 1000m from the nearest residence, and 2000m from the nearest residential grouping.	Y	Y	N	N
108	Dunlop	Virginia	Concerns over specified adverse effects of Q&M on the leithfield area. Decision "Adopt change 7 in its entirety but with particular consideration to a greater separation distance".	Y	Y	N	Y

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
109	Davidson	Lindsay	On all of change 7, seeks no truck of any kind down the Beach Rd area, no closer than 2kms from housing. Decision sought "get a plan minimum distance of 2kms. At the least limit truck movements around residential areas".	N	N	Y	Y
110	Ross	Jean	On all of change 7, sub is that does not want a shingle quarry any closer than 2kms. Decisions sought: Adopt the Plan change with a separation distance of 2kms; and limit truck movements through residential areas.	Y	Y	Y	Y
111	Smart	Leslie	On all of change 7, submission refers to the differing types or activity, and differing levels of effects - good and bad - of activity within the rubric of Q&M; decision sought is adopt the plan change, but with a separation distance of at least 1km.	Y	Y	Y	N
113	Davies	Ann	On all of change 7, subs "I am against the Q&M distance".	N	N	Y	N
114	Joli	Peter H	On all of change 7, subs and decision sought: that supports the plan change with a larger separation distance of 2kms, and to limit truck movements through residential areas.	Y	Y	Y	Y
115	Hamilton	F N	On all of change 7, sub is that "Happy with existing arrangement as originally agreed when quarrying first started". No decision sought.	N	N	Y	N
116	Atkins	Tom	On all of change 7, sub is that "I am happy with where they are, but any closer would result in too much noise. No closer please".	N	N	Y	N
117	van der Stap	T H	On all of change 7, subs that "The shingle plant should not be any closer than 500m to where people live, so noise levels stay at a minimum as well as dust".	N	N	Y	Y
118	Salmon	Shaun	Subs that opposes trucks travelling down beach and any earlier than 7am as they don't keep the time given to them now". Decision sought: I oppose quarrying close to the beach.	N	N	Y	N
120	Smart	Fiona	Subs and decision sought is support the change but with a separation distance from residential areas of 1km, so as to mitigate adverse effects.	Y	Y	N	Y
121	Smart	Sam	Subs and decision support change 7, but with separation distance of 1.5kms from a residential area.	Y	Y	N	N
122	Smart	"Saraya" Elizabeth Mary	Subs 500m not enough separation distance due to effects; seeks adoption of the change, but with separation distance of 2kms.	Y	Y	Y	N
123	McLellan	Jan	500m not enough separation due to effects. Seeks adopt the change, but with a 2km separation distance.	Y	Y	Y	N

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
124	Smith	Gary Alan	Adopt change 7, but with a 1000m separation distance between Q&M and residential areas; and that quarrying companies meet the cost of roading upgrades to support new activity.	Y	Y	N	N
125	Smith	Darleen Helen	Adopt change 7 but with a minimum separation distance of 1km.	Y	Y	Y	Y
126	Clarke	Kirsty	Sub: Supports separation between Q&M and residential areas, but should be 1000m to limit adverse effects. Decision: supports change 7, but with 1000m separation between Q&M and residential areas.	Y	Y	N	N
127	Conrad	Lyndi	Supports the change, except that seeks separation distance between Q&M and residential areas of 1000m.	Y	Y	N	N
128	Hill	Shaun	Supports the change, but seeks a separation distance of 1.5kms.	Y	Y	Y	N
129	Smith	Andrew	Supports all the change but seeks adoption of the change with a separation distance of at least 1km between Q&M and residential areas.	Y	Y	N	N
130	Thomson	Daniel	Seeks adoption of change 7 but with a separation distance of 2kms between Q&M and residential areas	Y	Y	N	N
131	Bailey	Chris	Supports the change, but wants the separation distance between Q&M and residential areas increased to 1000m.	Y	Y	N	N
132	Chan	Anthony	Supports increasing the separation distance between Q&M and residential areas, seeks adoption of the change but with a separation gap of 1000m.	Y	Y	N	N
133	MacKenzie	Chloe	Supports separation of Q&M from residential areas, seeks adoption of the plan change but with a separation distance of 1000m.	Y	Y	N	N
134	Bransfield	Michael James	Supports separation of Q&M from residential areas due to adverse effects; supports change 7 but suggests an amendment to a separation distance of 1000m.	Y	Y	N	N
135	Watts	Brent	Supports separation of Q&M from residential areas. Seeks adoption of change 7 in its entirety, with a separation distance of 1000m.	Y	Y	N	N
136	Gin	Jeffrey	Supports separation of Q&M from residence due to adverse effects. Wants adoption of change 7 but with a separation distance of at least 1000m.	Y	Y	Y	N
137	Sealey	Courteney Amber	Is in favour of the quarry but feels that a separation distance of at least 1km is needed; decision sought is all of change 7, but with a greater distance, such as 1000m.	Y	Y	Y	N

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
138	Smart	Mary J	Supports the change, but for the safety of Leithfield beach residents the separation distance should be at least 1km. Decision sought is adopt the change, but a greater separation is required from a long established residential area.	Y	Y	Y	N
139	Smart	Lewis A	Supports the change. But for the safety of Leithfield Beach residents the distance should be increased to 1km. Seeks adoption of change 7 however a greater separation distance is required.	Y	Y	Y	N
140	Nixon	Peter Brian	Supports the changes but seeks amendments - separation of 1000m; a sound/dust barrier between Q&M and residential areas; regulation concerning disposal of flood water; resolve traffic problems. Decision sought: That the Plan change occur, but preferably with the above amendments.	Y	Y	N	N
141	McLean	Veronica	Opposes change 7. Opposes the 500m buffer zone as it would prevent river protection work in Leithfield Village. 500m is too great a buffer zone. No decision sought.	Y	Y	Y	N
142	Hofman	Thomas	Supports change 7 due to concerns over adverse effects of Q&M close to Leithfield beach. Decision sought: Wants adoption of change 7 but thinks that the separation distance should be at least 1000m.	Y	Y	Y	N
143	Hofman	Ella Francesca	Supports the change but wants it increased to 1000m, concerns about heavy MVs, dust and noise. Decision: supports change 7 but would feel better if it was at least 1000m away from houses.	Y	Y	Y	N
144	Croucher	Ryan Christopher James	Supports change 7, concerned about effects esp MV, but would be fine with Q&M if it was at least 1000m away. Decision sought: Supports the change but would rather the quarry be at least 1000m away.	Y	Y	Y	N
145	Croucher	Julia Elizabeth Joyce	Supports the change but suggests 1000m separation would be more appropriate., due to traffic, dust and noise. Decision sought: Supports the Q&M issue but would prefer Q&M to be at least 1000m away from Leithfield Beach residential.	Y	Y	Y	N
146	Croucher	Hannah Jayne	Supports change 7 but proposes that the quarry be put further away due to noise, dust, traffic, abnd those problems are solved if the quarry is 1000m away. Decision: Supports change 7 but would like the quarry to be put at least 1000m away from the houses.	Y	Y	Y	N
147	Hofman	Suzanne	Supports change 7 but suggests that a distance of 1000m is more appropriate, due to noise, traffic, special character of Leithfield Beach. Decision: Adopt change 7, but would like the separation distance to be 1000m.	Y	Y	Y	N

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
148	Field	Stanley James	Opposes mining closer than 2kms to a built up area. Mining operators breach consents. Concerns about traffic, visual and other effects. Decision sought: No mining within a 2km radius of any built up area.	Y	Y	Y	Y
149	Field	Linda	Opposes any changes that would bring mining any closer than 1000m within a residential area, due to traffic, noise, health, ecological effects. Decision sought: Halt the mining full stop or at the very least 1000m from housing-residential area.	Y	Y	Y	N
150	Dunlop	Grant Colin	Submits that the provision be amended to a minimum distance of 1000m, due to traffic, noise,dust, water effects. Decision sought: Adopt change 7 with an amended distance of 1000m.	Y	Y	Y	N
151	Dunlop	Clare	Supports the change, would like to see greater separation distance eg1000m, due to adverse effects. Decision sought: That the proposed Q&M in the Leithfield area does not proceed.	N	N	Y	N
152	Wilsea-Smith	Robert	Supports the plan to extend the separation to 500m. Concerns over safety of schoolchildren in Leithfield area. If separation distance is increased to 1km, access would have to be built further down the highway, solving the problems. Decision: Adopt the change with an increased separation of 1km.	Y	Y	N	N
153	Patton	Derek and Martha	Seeks an increase to a 1.5km gap; and making operators make their own accessway onto SH1 from the Leithfield Beach area.	Y	Y	Y	Y
154	Ross	Christine A	Concerns about loss of peace and tranquility of L.Beach if Q&M was in the area. Decision sought: Plan change 7 should be for a greater separation distance of at least 1000m.	Y	Y	Y	Y
155	Benton	Claudette	Supports a separation gap of at least 1000m due to concerns about effects in leithfield beach. Decision sought: Submitter believes that the Plan change should be for a distance of at least 1000m.	Y	Y	Y	Y
156	Logan	Ian	Opposes Q&M anywhere near a residential area, due to effects, including on property values. Decision sought: Wants the separation distance to be at least 1km from any residential area.	N	N	Y	Y
157	Walker	Susie and Bert	Doesn't support quarrying anywhere near Leithfield beach., safety/traffic issues. Quarry would drive residents away, house prices fall. Decision sought: To not make a bad decision.	N	N	Y	N
158	Schist	Mike	Opposes a quarry in Liethfield Beach. Would ruin the peace and quiet. Noise, dust, pollution effects. Decision sought: That HDC not consider a gap at Leithfield Beach of anything less than 5kms.	N	N	Y	N
159	Nelson	Karol	Submits for a separation of at least 1000m due to pollution, noise, traffic/roading, safety, tourism effects. Decision: Adopt change 7 in its entirety but with a separation distance of at least 1000m.	Y	Y	Y	N

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
160	Spragg	Gretchen	Seeks at least a mile between Q&M and residential areas due to effects. Decision: Adopt change 7 but with a separation distance of at least 1000m.	Y	Y	Y	N
161	Olds	Debbie Patricia	Concerns about MV, road, dust, dirt, visual effects. Seeks adoption of change 7, but with a "barrier" of 1000m strictly imposed.	Y	Y	Y	Y
162	Bovey	Paul	Supports all the change, and strongly opposes any Q&M due to the adverse effects. Decision sought is adopting change 7 in its entirety.	Y	N	N	N
163	Schist	Sara	Opposes 500m separation between Q&M and residential areas, it should be nothing less than 5kms; concerns with effects of Q&M near Leithfield Beach, decision sought: HDC to think about the 500m buffer zone, if there is to be Q&M it should be with a buffer between 1-5kms.	N	N	Y	Y
164	Roche	Matthew	Supports the change to introduce a non-complying zone, due to effects. The zone should be 1000m. Decision sought: Adopt change 7 but with a 1000m non-complying zone.	Y	Y	N	N
165	Roche	Sean	Supports the change to introduce a non-complying zone, due to effects. The zone should be 1000m. Decision sought: Adopt change 7 but with a 1000m non-complying zone.	Y	Y	N	N
166	Roche	Faith Rachel	Supports the change to introduce a non-complying zone, due to effects, especially schoolchildren safety on the road. The zone should be 1000m. Decision sought: Adopt change 7 but with a 1000m non-complying zone; and leaving gravel extraction from riverbeds for flood protection purposes a discretionary activity.	Y	Y	N	N
167	Roche	Kevin Francis	Supports the change to introduce a non-complying zone, due to effects. The zone should be 1000m. Decision sought: Adopt change 7 but with a 1000m non-complying zone; and leaving gravel extraction from riverbeds for flood protection purposes a discretionary activity; and increase the volume/times for gravel extraction as a permitted activity.	Y	Y	N	Y
168	Smith	Allan	Supports a buffer between Q&M and residential activity, but seeks 1000m. Decision: Adopt change 7 but with a 1000m separation distance.	Y	Y	Y	Y
169	Smith	Nanette	Supports a buffer zone, but 1000m or more is far more realistic, due to dust/pollution effects. Decision: Adopt change 7 but with a 1000m separation distance.	Y	Y	Y	Y
170	Mulligan	Clare Elizabeth	Supports 500m or more buffer between Q&M and "our community", due to adverse effects, including safety risks. Decision sought: Adopt change 7 in its entirety and even consider a larger separation area.	Y	Y	Y	Y

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
171	Cracraft-Wilson	Michael	Supports the need for separation; seeks adoption of change 7 in its entirety.	Y	N	N	Y
172	Williams	Howard	Opposes Q&M on Kings Rd due to adverse effects. Q&M should be at least 1000m from residential property. Decision sought: That the HDC "oppose the application in total", and that change 7 should be at least 2000m.	Y	Y	Y	Y
173	Skjoldebrand	Stephanie	Submission is on Q&M of sand at Kings Rd, leithfield Beach. Opposes that quarrying due to adverse effects, aspecially fumes. Decision sought: Submitter suggests that sand be mined from Ashworths beach, as that is far enough away.	N	N	Y	N
174	Williams	Gail Lesley	Submits that she does not support quarrying at all, distance is not the issue. Decision sought: No quarrying and mining.	N	N	Y	Y
175	Hullah	Grant Ronald	Supports the change in entirety, as buffer zone is needed to protect the quality of life of the Leithfield residents. Decision: Adoption of the change with a 500m buffer zone.	Y	N	N	N
176	Hullah	Pamela	Supports the change, but with a 1000m buffer zone, due to adverse effects on residents and visitors. Seeks adoption of change 7, but with a 1000m buffer zone.	Y	Y	Y	N
177	Bown	Braidie and John	Supports the change and a separation between Q&M and residential areas. Concerns about traffic, safety, dust, noise effects. Decision sought: Adopt change 7 but with separation of 1000m for sand extraction, and 2000m for hard rock quarrying.	Y	Y	Y	Y
178	Watt	Michael A	Supports a separation zone, mainly for Kings Rd residents, due to effects. But it should be 1000m separation. Decision: Adopt change 7 in its entirety, but with a separation distance of not less than 1000m.	Y	Y	Y	Y
179	Stenberg	Bryce	Submission concerns with noise, traffic, safety, dust, salt water contamination, property value effects. Decisions sought: 1. Q&M non-complying activity within 2,500m of residential dwellings. 2. Quarrying and sand/gravel extraction be non-complying activity 4kms in a NW-W direction from established communities. 3. Special attention and protection to be given to any area within 3kms of the coast with regard to safeguarding ground water from salt water contamination caused by extraction of soils/sand/gravel etc within this zone. 4. Transport of the extracted resource is included as part of the activity to which the non-complying zone applies.	Y	Y	N	Y

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
180	Amberley Beach Residents & Ratepayers Assoc.	Anne M. McWhinnie	Submission re all the change sin plan change no7, "We are totally opposed to any changes in the District Plan in relation to quarrying and mining at Amberley Beach by Readymix and Sand and Shingle".	N	Y	N	N
181	Whitby	Melvyn	Submission: "The laws should not be altered at all, to provide a smaller buffer zone between housing and mining operations. Once you give in they just keep on plugging at it til they are on top of you. The Council seems to lose interest in monitoring the specifications as soon as consent is approved. No more mining for Amberley and Leithfield". Decision sought: "Not to consent to any quarrying".	N	N	Y	Y
182	Joslen	John Charles	Opposes any change to the lack of industry, and holiday atmosphere, of Leithfield Beach. Concerns with adverse effects of Q&M. Decision sought: Amendment to change 7 to provide an enlarged separation of 2,000m.	Y	Y	Y	N
183	Leithfield Beach Residents Assoc.	Kevin Roche	Supports the change due to the adverse effects of Q&M, but should be 1000m non-complying zone; disputes consultation submissions by Crown Minerals and Winstones; and gravel extraction from riverbeds for flood mitigation work should remain a discretionary activity within the 1000m, and the permitted activity extraction limits increased. Decision sought: Adopt change 7 in its entirety but with a 1000m non-complying zone between Q&M and residential areas, and the above changes for gravel extraction from rivers.	Y	Y	N	Y
184	Forest and Bird	Eugenie Sage	Opposes the new rule A1.1.21. There is no analysis or s32 assessment of the need for the rule. No analysis of the effects of the takes that would be permitted. Conflicts with the NRRP rule, creating confusion. Gravel extraction has adverse ecological effects. Decision sought is either: 1. Delete the proposed rule, leaving control of gravel atraction in riverbeds to the NRRP/Ecan; or (2) provide a full s32 report after consultation with all relevant parties, leading to identified specific sites (rather than stretches of river) from which gravel can be extracted, and introduce a new rule for a controlled or restricted discretionary activity at those places.	N	Y	N	Y

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
185	Winstone Aggregates	Alex Gray	<p>1. There is no justification for the activity status change. It will impact on course sand extraction for concrete blocks. It may impact on ability to do flood mitigation work. Discretionary status is most appropriate. Decision sought: No change to the District Plan.</p> <p>2. Amend assessment criteria C1.2.4(x) so that it differentiates between hard rock mining, and sand and gravel extraction; decision: specified changes to C1.2.4(x) so that it gives, as a guide, distances of 200m for hard rock, and 500m for other quarrying.</p> <p>3. Supports introduction of a reverse sensitivity rule, but the discretionary activity distance should be 500m for hard rock mining, and 200m for commercial quarrying and mining. 4. The s32 report and wording of proposed new explanatory comments is unbalanced, and overly negative, re the effects of Q&M. Decision: Specified rewording to introduce more qualifiers to the explanatory statements regarding the effects of Q&M, at policies 1.7 and 1.8, issue 10, 10.6, 10.6(a), 10.9.</p> <p>5. Re rule A1.4(b), it is unclear how the separation distance is measured in relation to Q&M operating under existing use rights, decision</p>	Y	Y	N	Y
186	Environment Canterbury	Hamish Barrell	<p>The threshold levels for permitted gravel extraction from riverbeds be amended to be the same as the equivalent rule in the Regional Council's Proposed Natural Resources Regional Plan, and explanatory comments be added referring to the respective functions and roles for the HDC and Ecan re rivers, and any consequential changes.</p>	N	Y	N	Y
187	Fulton Hogan	Gregory Slaughter	<p>1. Make proposed new policy 10.6 effects-based by adding the words "the effects of" before the words "quarrying and mining". 2. The new explanation to policy 10.6(a) is unduly negative and biased. Decision: Specified changes to that explanation. 3. Delete</p>	N	N	N	N

Plan Change 7 - Quarrying Mining: Summary of Submissions

Submission Number	Surname	First name	Plan Change	Support	Oppose	Unsure	Wish to be Heard?
188	Crown Minerals	Rob Robson	1. Make proposed new policy 10.6 effects-based by adding the words "the effects of" before the words "quarrying and mining". 2. The new explanation to policy10.6(a) is unduly negative and biased. Decision sought: Specified changes to that explanation. 3. Delete the first sentence to the new sixth paragraph of Policy 10.9, as it is inherently contradictory, implying that the noise levels set by the Plan may be insufficient environmental safeguard. 4. There should be a permitted activity status for Q&M in small quantities on land and in riverbeds, and it is inappropriate for the HDC to impose a rule dealing with the same sort of effects as the PNRRP rule. Therefore delete the proposed riverbed rule, and introduce a specified rule permitting Q&M of up to 5000m3 in any consecutive 12 mth period, on conditions that noise standards by met, there are no objectionable or offensive dust effects, and the site is rehabilitated. 5. Amend the proposed new rule A1.4(b) to recognise that the separation distance applies to historical quarrying or mining operations which do not have a "resource consent area"; and 6.	N	N	Y	Y
189	Aitchison	Peter E	Supports Q&M being set back 500m from residential and visitor accommodation, provided that his existing activity is permitted to expand. Neighbouring Q&M has been moving closer to his business, and scale and intensity has increased, affecting the business. Seeks a minimum of 500m separation between Q&M involving crushing/blasting and a residential boundary; and specified conditions re hours, days, noise shields and duration on all Q&M consents.	Y	Y	N	Y
190	Hurunui District Council	Andrew Feierabend	1. Supports having a permitted activity status for some quarrying from riverbeds. Ecan's rule deals adequately with ecological effects, the HDC rule should be concerned only with amenity effects. Proposes amendment to proposed rule A1.2.21 that permits taking of 400m3 per month, up to 1000 m3 in a 12 month period. 2. A specied addition is needed to new rule A1.4(b) so that the rule applies to the extraction area for an activity relying on existing use rights.	Y	Y	N	Y