

# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

## HURUNUI DISTRICT COUNCIL

## HURUNUI DISTRICT PLAN

### PROPOSED CHANGE NUMBER 7: QUARRYING AND MINING

**Report and recommendations to the Council by the hearing panel:**

**Councillor J Meikle (Chair), Councillor J Coster,  
Councillor V Daly, and Councillor R Black.**

#### **Appearances**

##### *Submitters:*

**Mr A Happy** and **Mr K Bligh** for **Winstone Aggregates** (185/0812), **Mr J Hibbard** for **Kowai River Flood Protection Committee** (51), **Mr M Mullen** for **Fulton Hogan Ltd** and **Aggregate and Quarry Assoc. of NZ (Inc)** (187/0819/0802), **Mr D Good** for **Hanmer River Holiday Park** (189), **Mr P Roberts** for **Federated Farmers** (9/13), **Ms E Hiddleston** (72), **Mr M Jamieson** (60/61), **Mr D Fitzmaurice** (58), **Mr Lewis Smart** (139), **Mr Leslie Smart** (111/119), **Mr K Roche** for the **Leithfield Beach Residents Association** (183 and 167), **Mr D Walker** (46), **Ms R Littlewood** for the **Canterbury Regional Council** (186), and **Ms B Bown** (177).

##### *Section 42a reports:*

**Ms J Weaver**, reporting officer, assisted by **Mr M McCallum-Clark**, a consultant resource management planner.

#### **Procedural matters**

The late submission from **Mr R Goord** (192) was accepted as it was identical to the Federated Farmers 'form' submission. We do not consider any person will be prejudiced by waiving the time limits for receiving the submission under section 37 of the Act and accordingly do so. It was determined that **Mr D Good**, as the current owner of the Hanmer River Holiday Park, had succession rights to the **Hanmer River Holiday Park** (189) submission.

The Panel records that Councillor Black was appointed to the Hearing Panel by the Council and participated in the hearing of submissions. Councillor Black sought leave

from the Council to withdraw from the Panel because of a personal health issue which meant he was unable to participate in the Panel's deliberations. The request for leave was granted.

## **1.0 Introduction and outline of the proposed Plan Change**

1.1 Pursuant to the resolution of the Council dated 27 November 2008 the above hearing was held at the Hurunui District Library, Amberley on the 9<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> December 2008.

1.2 Proposed Plan Change No. 7 is a Council initiated plan change to the District Plan to amend the rules for quarrying and mining (Q&M) in the District. The two key amendments are:

- i. To amend quarrying and mining from being a discretionary activity to a non-complying activity within 500 metres of any Urban Zone boundary; and
- ii. To identify the beds of rivers in the District where small scale quarrying shall be a permitted activity (currently all quarrying and mining is a discretionary activity).

1.3 The Plan Change was notified in March 2005. Given the length of time that had passed since initiating the Change, and changes in property ownership, the Council resolved to re-notify the Change on 9 August 2008.

1.4 The 2005 submitters were advised by letter of the re-notification. In response to this, some submissions were withdrawn, some submitters were found to be deceased, and a number of the letters were returned "undeliverable". The following table summarises the level of support for the change as indicated by all submissions.

<b>Submissions</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>Total</b>
Support in entirety	4	14	18
Support in part	78	1	79
Unclear whether support or oppose	36	1	37
Oppose in entirety	1	1	2
Oppose in part	5	-	5
Support and oppose in part	17	-	17
Withdrawn, deceased, or cannot be contacted	39	-	39
<b>Total submissions</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>197</b>

1.5 There were 158 submissions from Leithfield Beach residents on a form that had been prepared by the Leithfield Beach Residents Association Inc. (LBRA). We noted from these submissions that there was apparently much confusion between the proposed changes to Q&M that apply to the whole district and a resource consent application by

Winstone Aggregates for sand extraction at a site in Kings Road, Leithfield Beach that was lodged and subsequently withdrawn over 9 years ago.

- 1.6 The Panel is very mindful of the residents' concerns regarding sand mining at Leithfield Beach. However, due to the fact that many of these submissions relate only to the Winstone proposal, we are obliged to recommend the rejection of those parts that are outside the scope of the Plan Change. We endeavoured to clarify this distinction for those Leithfield Beach residents who appeared. We also explained that there is no current application for this site and should one be made it would be assessed against the District Plan rules as they exist at the time of application.

## **2.0 Resource management issues raised**

### *Different Q&M activities produce different levels of effects*

- 2.1 We heard from a number of submitters that there are differences in the duration, scale and nature of effects from different types of Q&M operations and that hard rock quarrying in particular, which involves blasting and crushing, should be classified separately from other Q&M.
- 2.2 Mr Happy's, (Winstone Aggregates), evidence stated that rock blasting and crushing can generate intrusive noise and vibration effects that cannot always be internalised.
- 2.3 The evidence of Mr Roberts from Federated Farmers notes that sand and shingle extraction for on-farm use is a traditional practice that is small in scale and occurs intermittently. This was supported by the 17 'form' submissions received from Federated Farmers' members requesting that 'non commercial' Q&M be permitted.
- 2.4 Similarly, Mr Mullen's evidence states that riverbed extraction is usually short term and intermittent. However, we heard from Mr Good that riverbed extraction operations can be intensive, particularly in respect of hours of operation and noise, while the riverbed is occupied, and can involve portable plant for on-site crushing and screening.
- 2.5 The Crown Minerals (188) submission seeks the exclusion of prospecting and exploration from the Q&M definition as these are "low environmental impact activities and warrant permitted status". We note that these activities would still be subject to the permitted activity standards and terms.
- 2.6 Several submitters and the reporting officer noted that references in the Change to "commercial Q&M" and "gravel extraction" are confusing because these are not defined and otherwise referenced to rules.

2.7 From the above it was apparent to the Panel that there is a need to differentiate between:

- hard rock quarrying;
- on-farm extraction;
- riverbed extraction; and
- prospecting and exploration activities,

and to provide for different levels of control to manage the effects of each activity. We are therefore recommending amendments to the policy framework, definitions, and rules that were proposed by the Change to reflect different management regimes for specific Q&M activities.

#### *Objectives and policies*

2.8 The Panel recommends amending the policy framework to clearly differentiate between “hard rock” Q&M and other Q&M activities as follows:

- to replace references to “commercial” Q&M with “hard rock quarrying”; and
- clarifying that “hard rock quarrying” is considered an intensive land use; and
- replacing lists of activities such as “quarrying and mining, intensive farming and sewage treatment facilities” with the term “intensive land uses”.

#### *Interpretation*

2.9 In support of the above policy changes and the interpretation of the subsequent rules we also recommend amendments to the definitions that:

- clarify that “hard rock quarrying” is any Q&M involving blasting or crushing; and
- exclude “prospecting and exploration” from “mining” (but still subject to the standards.

#### *Quarrying and mining/residential buffer*

2.10 The current activity status for all Q&M throughout the district is fully discretionary and the Plan provides extensive specific criteria for assessing Q&M activities including an assessment for:

“Adequate provision of a buffer area between urban management areas and quarrying and mining activities. It is considered that a minimum buffer zone of 500 metres would be created between any mining activity and any urban zone in which no quarrying or mining would be undertaken”.

- 2.11 We noted the 500 metre buffer distance as expressed through the above assessment criteria is supported by the Leithfield Beach Residents Association. It was accepted by the Association as “a reasonable compromise between not unduly restricting the capacity of the private sector to engage in quarrying and mining activity and the need to protect residential areas from adverse effects”
- 2.12 We have reviewed the current structure of the Plan. We confirmed that the 500 metre buffer promoted through the current assessment criteria for Q&M, as a discretionary activity, is consistent with current Plan provisions for separation between other intensive land uses that may create adverse effects, for example buffer distances between sewerage and residential activities. . We have concluded the non complying activity status for Q&M adjacent urban zones as proposed through Plan Change 7 is unnecessary and that the impacts of such activity can be managed as a discretionary activity. The Panel expectation is that any activity promoted under this provision will result in a buffer of 500 metres being established between any urban management area and the area been mined. The Panel does accept hard rock quarrying requires a different approach and we discuss how this should be dealt with below.
- 2.14 With reference to point 2.7, we recognise that different forms of Q&M have differing intensity of effects. It follows that a 500 metre separation to any urban management area via a non-complying activity status is appropriate for hard rock quarrying.
- 2.15 Mr Bligh brought to our attention other sensitive land use activities such as childcare centres that may be seeking to establish in proximity to existing hard rock quarries and would require buffering from these. From a reverse sensitivity perspective we believe a complementary set of discretionary and non-complying activity rules should be established, inclusive of educational institutions, where they wish to establish within 500 metres of an existing quarrying and mining operation.
- 2.16 Therefore, we are recommending maintaining internal consistency through the Plan by:
- retaining the discretionary activity status for Q&M (other than hard rock quarrying) with the retention of a 500 metre separation buffer in the assessment criteria;
  - establishing a non-complying activity status requirement for hard rock quarrying within 500 metres of an existing urban area; and
  - adding to and introducing complementary reverse sensitivity rules inclusive of educational facilities to ensure consistency in the treatment of sensitive land use activities wanting to establish in close proximity to existing mining and quarrying activities.

### *Riverbed extraction*

- 2.17 The control of rivers, particularly in respect of water quality, is a function of regional councils under Section 30(1) of the RMA, whereas the control of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including the margins and beds of rivers, is a function of district councils under Section 31(1). Therefore, both the Canterbury Regional Council and the Hurunui District Council have responsibilities for Q&M in riverbeds.
- 2.18 Submitters, both in support and opposition to the proposed change, emphasised the significant benefit to the District that the extraction of gravel from riverbeds has on mitigating flood risk.
- 2.19 The Canterbury Regional Council supports riverbed gravel extraction as part of engineering works and other Q&M in riverbeds where adverse effects would be minor or less than minor as permitted activities.
- 2.20 Mr Bligh submits that the existing Q&M rules and the proposed small permitted volumes would continue to duplicate the Regional Council consenting process. He suggests, that riverbed extraction should be a permitted activity subject to a regional consent being obtained and meeting standards for effects such as noise, heavy traffic, and hours of operation that are within the control of the District Council, and some of which are already provided for in the Plan.
- 2.21 We noted that some of the largest riverbed extractions occur in rivers that are scheduled as Significant Natural Areas for their entire run e.g. Waiau River. Current consents for these rivers show that gravel extraction usually takes place in areas where there is a build up of gravel and therefore has only minimal effects on those areas of indigenous vegetation and eco-systems which the District Plan seeks to protect. However we believe, it would be prudent to reference riverbed extraction activities to the applicable rules for indigenous vegetation clearance and Significant Natural Areas.
- 2.22 To recognise the benefits of gravel extraction from riverbeds, to clarify the separate roles of the Canterbury Regional Council and the Hurunui District Council in the management of riverbeds and for efficiency and effectiveness reasons we are recommending that gravel extraction that is consented to by the Regional Council be permitted if it meets standards and terms to control the land use effects, including:
- duration;
  - operating hours
  - heavy traffic movements;

- access;
- notice of works;
- noise;
- earthworks; and
- indigenous vegetation clearance.

### *Section 32 analysis*

- 2.23 The Council is required to re-evaluate the Plan Change in terms of section 32 prior to making a decision on the Plan Change. Section 32 requires an examination of “whether, having regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, the policies, rules, or other methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objectives.”
- 2.24 As the objectives of the Hurunui District Plan are not altered by this plan change, the most relevant objectives against which to examine the plan change are Objective 10 which states “A healthy and safe environment within the District and maintenance and/or enhancement of amenity values which the community wishes to protect” and Objective 12 which states “An environmentally sustainable infrastructure and pattern of development, meeting both the needs of today’s community and the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.”
- 2.25 It was noted that the submissions from Winstone Aggregates (0812) and Forest and Bird (184) specifically challenged the adequacy of the 2005 section 32 report. These issues were canvassed at the hearing and as a result we are able to recommend new solutions through amendments to the plan change. The submissions to the plan change and the presentations by submitters varied across the full spectrum from seeking more relaxed rules than were in the District Plan prior to the plan change through to significantly greater controls than were proposed. In arriving at the new solutions, we have considered those matters required under section 32 and the full range of alternatives available to us, and have concluded that the amended plan change, as detailed herein, is the most appropriate policy and rule framework to achieve the objectives of the District Plan.

### *RMA considerations*

- 2.27 In accordance with section 74 of the Act we have had regard to the range of matters specified in so far as they are relevant in this case.
- 2.28 Having considered the range of resource management issues outlined above we conclude that subject to modifications and additions to the wording of rules as shown in Appendix A to this report, the proposed Change should be adopted by the Council. The amendments

we recommend are intended to provide certainty for Q&M operators and secure an equitable level of protection from adverse effects for both the industry and residents.

### **3.0 Conclusions and recommendations**

3.1 For all of the foregoing reasons we therefore **recommend** to the Hurunui District Council as follows:

1. **That the Council proceed to incorporate Proposed Change 7 into the Hurunui District Plan subject to the recommended modifications and consequential changes (shown as double underlines) as set out to the text of the Proposed Change in Appendix A to this report.**
2. **That for the reasons set out in the above report the Council either accept, accept in part or reject accordingly the submissions as recommended and listed in Appendix B to this report.**

**Councillor J Meikle**

**Councillor J Coster**

**Councillor V Daly**

Hearing Panel for Proposed Plan Change 7

22 April 2009

## APPENDIX A

### HURUNUI DISTRICT PLAN – PROPOSED CHANGE 7

Amend the Hurunui District Plan as follows:

#### 1.0 Part I – Significant resource management issues for the Hurunui District

##### 1.1 Amend the Explanation to Policy 1.7 and Policy 1.8 (p.8)

###### Explanation

...

Commercial quarries and mines can, however, due to the nature of the activity, have adverse effects on users of other properties. Residential uses are particularly sensitive to them. The cause of this is that not all of their adverse effects can be internalized: that is, they cannot all be mitigated to the extent that they have no effect outside the property boundary. The potential conflict between quarrying and mining and residential areas and residential activities is dealt with at policies 10.6 and 10.6(a).

##### 1.2 Amend Protection & enhancement of environmental quality (p.59)

The key issues for the District in relation to protecting and enhancing environmental quality is are:

(a) The quality of life for residents in the District is dependent on a number of aspects about our environment which, together, contribute to that quality – without adequate management to maintain or enhance a level of amenity appropriate to each area, the environmental quality of the District could be reduced.

(b) Proximity of residential activities to certain intensive land uses – in particular, ~~commercial hard rock~~ quarrying ~~and mining~~, sewage treatment, and intensive farming – can lead to either ~~unnecessary~~ adverse effects on residential activity, or “reverse sensitivity” effects producing complaints and constraints around economically beneficial land uses.

##### 1.3 Amend Issue 10 – Environmental amenity (p.59)

~~Environmental amenity varies across the District according to a combination of factors, including differing levels of existing amenity and differing levels of acceptability to the local community. The rural environment has characteristics and amenity values that differ from the acceptable amenity values in urban areas. In rural areas, the environment is both a working resource, in terms of land based activities such as farming, forestry and other rural industries, and a living environment for its residents. In areas of intensive use, such as vicinities around intensive farming activities, or vineyards in the Waipara Wine Growing Area, there is potential for significant cross-boundary effects between those activities and residential activities. Issues of “reverse sensitivity”, such as higher expectations of amenity standards held by new rural residential dwellers, could place unreasonable constraints on existing rural activities which have otherwise acceptable cross-boundary effects.~~

Some intensive land uses have effects that can be seldom wholly internalized on the site. These include ~~commercial hard rock~~ quarrying ~~and mining~~, intensive farming, sewage treatment facilities, or vineyards in the Waipara Winegrowing Area. ~~Quarrying and mining, intensive farming and sewage treatment facilities~~ Intensive land uses can have significant adverse effects on residential activities. “Reverse sensitivity” issues can also arise. The term “reverse sensitivity” refers to the

effects of the existence of sensitive activities on other activities in their vicinity, particularly by leading to restraints in the carrying on of those activities. This is of particular concern where rural and/or residential dwellers move to sites close to intensive land uses such as quarries and mines or the Waipara Winegrowing Area and seek to place restraints on the existing lawfully established activity”.

#### 1.4 Amend Policy 10.6 (p.64)

~~To manage subdivision, residential and other development adjacent to intensive productive rural activities in a way that avoids or mitigates significant potential cross-boundary adverse effects on amenity values, without unreasonably inhibiting the continued use and development of existing productive rural land uses.~~

~~To manage quarrying and mining, intensive farming, sewage treatment facilities and other intensive rural land uses so that:~~

- ~~(a) The activity avoids or mitigates cross-boundary adverse effects on amenity values;~~
- ~~(b) A separation between those activities and residential type activities is maintained in most cases;~~
- ~~(c) The continued use and development of existing productive rural land uses is not unreasonably inhibited.~~

#### 1.5 Add Policy 10.6(a)

~~So as to avoid reverse sensitivity effects, residential activities should not locate close to quarrying and mining, intensive farming, sewage facilities or other intensive rural land uses activities.~~

#### 1.6 Amend the Methods and Explanation to policies 10.6 and 10.6(a) (p.64)

##### **Methods**

~~Policy-Policies 10.6 and 10.6(a)~~ shall be implemented through:

- District Plan rules including standards for separation distances between residential activities and other potentially incompatible activities
- Resource consent decision-making consistent with the above policy
- Monitoring the effects of intensification of rural land uses
- On-going education about potential effects with landowners and other relevant groups
- Promotion of the development and use of guidelines and industry codes of practice in managing effects of rural use
- District Plan changes

##### **Explanation**

~~Policy 10.6 addresses the problems that can arise from the siting of residential activities and other environmentally sensitive activities in close proximity to existing intensive rural land uses that have the potential to create significant adverse effects on amenity values. Circumstances in which such “reverse sensitivity” can occur include the location of residences close to intensive farming activities, which may create odour nuisances, or close to vineyards in the Waipara Wine Growing Area, where there may be adverse cross-boundary effects such as noise and spray drift. In such situations, some provision should be given to avoiding the creation of nuisance situations which may inhibit the continued use and development of existing rural activities. Policies 10.6 and 10.6(a) address two situations.~~

~~The first is the extent to which the environment should be protected from the adverse effects of particular intensive uses. Hard rock quarrying Quarrying and mining, intensive farming and sewage facility operators are expected to make all reasonable efforts to contain the adverse effects of their activities on site. What is reasonable depends on careful consideration of the practicality and economics of the mitigation measures available. But due to the special nature of those activities, those reasonable efforts are unlikely to internalize all effects.~~

~~Commercial qQuarrying and mining, for example, generally creates adverse traffic, dust, noise, vibration and visual effects that are more than minor. All reasonably practical mitigation measures intended to internalize the effects may still fail to stop those effects from being experienced outside the boundary of the property. Those effects are experienced most acutely in residential areas. The location and operation of quarrying and mining therefore must be controlled throughout the district by resource consent procedures, and in particular it should generally be kept separated from residential areas. The adverse effects of hard rock quarrying include blasting, noise, vibration, and explosive sounds of rocks being crushed. These effects are generally qualitatively worse than the effects of quarrying and mining that is limited to sand extraction activities. The separation distance from residential areas for hard rock quarrying should generally be greater than that required for sand and gravel extraction activities.~~

~~An exception to this is small scale gravel extraction from riverbeds. That extraction in many places has positive effects as it removes gravel buildup and mitigates a potential flood hazard. The adverse effects are generally no more than minimal if it is occasional extraction of relatively small quantities.~~

~~Intensive farming and sewage treatment facilities, while not controlled for the whole district, must also be generally kept separated from residential type uses.~~

~~The second situation addressed by these policies concerns the extent to which quarrying and mining, intensive farming, sewage facilities and other intensive uses should be protected from the adverse “reverse sensitivity” effects of incompatible activities. This is reinforced also at Policy 1.8 of this Plan, which ~~is to~~ provides for the extraction of land resources in a manner that avoids or mitigates any adverse environmental effects. Those intensive uses produce resources of importance to the community, are valuable economic activities, or perform important functions. It is important to avoid unnecessary conflict between operators and people who live nearby, where that conflict could interfere with a lawfully established economic activity. Policy 10.6(a) relates to these “reverse sensitivity” circumstances, which can include: the location of residences close to intensive farming activities, which may create odour nuisances; or the location of residences close to quarries and mines, which may create noise, vibration and dust effects; or close to vineyards in the Waipara Wine Growing Area, where there may be adverse cross-boundary effects such as noise and spray drift. In such situations, some provision should be given to avoiding the creation of nuisance situations which may inhibit the continued use and development of existing rural activities.~~

~~A method to implement ~~this policy~~ these policies is a Plan rule that requires, as a permitted activity standard, a separation distance between residential and other activities that are known to be potentially environmentally incompatible. This requirement acts as a threshold, which, if it cannot be met, will trigger a resource consent application for the siting of the proposed residence or other~~

specified activities. The decision making process will provide a means of assessing the potential for adverse effects on either activity, and determining appropriate standards through conditions. Another method is to assess such issues in making decisions on the creation of new lots adjacent to potentially environmentally incompatible activities.

#### 1.7 Amend Policy 10.9 (p.66)

To control noise emissions at levels acceptable to the community and where they exceed those levels, generally maintain a separation distance between those noise-emitting activities and sensitive activities.

#### 1.8 Amend the Explanation to Policy 10.9 (p.67)

##### **Explanation**

...

The noise (including vibration) emitted by quarries and mines and some other activities does at times exceed levels acceptable to the community even if it is below the standards referred to above. Rules that implement this policy therefore seek to ensure that in most cases there is a separation distance between **hard rock** quarrying **and mining** and residential activities, especially in townships. As noise and vibration effects are generally greater for hard rock quarrying than they are for sand and gravel extraction activities the separation distances required for sand and gravel extraction activities will – subject to all other matters including the scale of the activity – generally be less than those required for hard rock quarrying. The purpose of that separation distance is to ensure that, first, the noise and vibration effects of quarrying and mining are dissipated by distance to residential activities; and secondly, to ensure that lawfully established quarrying and mining activity is not put at risk by the reverse sensitivity effects of residential users moving to sites proximate to it.

#### 1.9 Amend Anticipated environmental results (p.69)

The implementation of these policies and methods is anticipated to have the following environmental results:

- Increased implementation of community-based environmental health initiatives
- Development of public services and facilities to contribute to environmental health
- A built environment which supports the health and safety of the District's residents
- The maintenance of amenity values as appropriate to particular areas of the District
- The provision of open space and a range of different purpose reserves throughout the District
- An acceptable level of noise and air quality throughout the District
- A separation distance, in most cases, between residential activities, **visitor accommodation and educational facilities** and **hard rock** quarries, **mines**, intensive farming and sewage facilities.

#### 2.0 Rule A1.2 Conditions for permitted activities

## 2.1 Amend Rule A1.2.15 Earthworks (p.10)

- (b) Earthworks (but excluding tracks providing foot access) shall not be carried out within 20 metres of any river, 50 metres of any wetland, or 100 metres of any lake with the following exemptions:
- (i) Earthworks associated with water and soil conservation activities or if carried out under the authority of Environment Canterbury or a resource consent.
  - (ii) Earthworks carried out for reasons of public or personal safety.
  - (iii) Maintenance of existing fence-lines, vehicle tracks, firebreaks, drains, ponds, dams or crossings.
  - (iv) Gravel extraction in accordance with Rule A1.2.21.

## 2.2 Add Rule A1.2.21 Quarrying and mining in riverbeds

### **A1.2.21 Quarrying and mining in riverbeds**

~~Quarrying that is g~~ Gravel extraction from riverbeds shall provided that:

- (a) The activity is the subject of a current resource consent issued by the Regional Council;
- (b) The duration of extraction at any one site does not exceed 60 days per annum;
- (c) Operations are limited to the hours of 7am – 6pm Monday to Friday, and 8am – 1pm Saturday;
- (d) Any associated heavy vehicle movements do not exceed 36 per day;
- (e) There is no direct access to the site from a State Highway;
- (f) 48 hours notice of the commencement of works is to be given to the Council; and
- (g) The operational noise emissions of each piece of plant proposed to be operated within 500 metres of an existing dwelling or educational facility are to be provide to the Council prior to work commencing.

Note: Refer also to rules A1.2.9 Noise, A1.2.15 Earthworks, A7.2.1(a) Indigenous vegetation clearance, and A7.2.2 Significant natural areas.

- (a) Not exceed 100 cubic metres in any consecutive twelve month period extracted by or on behalf of any person, organisation or corporation;
- (b) Not exceed 500 cubic metres in any consecutive 12 month period extracted by or on behalf of any person, organisation or corporation, if it is extracted from one of the following rivers in the period between the first day of February and the thirty first day of September:

Lottery River from the Sherwood Road crossing (where the road reverts to a walking track(at or about N32:1574:5224) to the confluence with the Mason River (at or about N32:1780:4286);

Chatterton River from the Rogerson River confluence (at or about N32:9455:5487) downstream to the confluence with the Percival River (at or about N32:9407:5050);

- ~~Percival River from the Switchback Stream confluence (at or about N32:9773:5290) downstream to the confluence with the Waiau River (at or about N32:9204:4772).~~
- ~~Hamner River from immediately downstream of The Hossack homestead (at or about N32:0629:5178), downstream to the confluence with the Waiau River (at or about N32:9216:4750).~~
- ~~Pahau River from the Top Ford Road/Top Pahau Road crossing (at or about N33:9218:2703), downstream to the confluence with the Hurunui River (at or about N33:0204:1919).~~
- ~~Leamington Stream from Leamington Road crossing (at or about N33:2297:2380) downstream to the confluence with the Waiau River (at or about O32:3277:3128).~~
- ~~Lyndon Stream from the Lyndon Road bridge (at or about N32:0802:4269) downstream to the confluence with the Home Stream (at or about N32:0953:4132).~~
- ~~Home Stream from the confluence with Lyndon Stream (at or about N32:0953:4132) to the confluence with the Waiau River (at or about N32:1043:4094).~~
- ~~Waikari River from McRaes Road crossing (at or about M33:8899:0679), downstream to the confluence with the Hurunui River (at or about N33:1422:1379).~~
- ~~Kowai River, North Branch, Leithfield, from Douglas Road bridge (at or about M34:8424:8662), downstream to the coastal marine area (at or about N34:9079:7875).~~
- ~~Kowai River, South Branch, from Marshmans Road crossing (at or about M34:8269:7942), downstream to the confluence with the North Branch of the Kowai River (at or about M34:8935:7961).~~
- ~~Conway River from Fernichurst bridge (at or about O32:3762:4225), downstream to the coastal marine area (at or about O32:4835:4348).~~
- ~~Waiau River from the Hope River confluence (at or about M32:7378:4601), downstream to the coastal marine area (at or about O33:4040:2555).~~
- ~~Leader River from the Mendip Road bridge (at or about O32:3262:4044), downstream to the confluence with the Waiau River (at or about O32:3553:3066).~~
- ~~Hurunui River from the Mandamus River confluence (at or about M33:7362:2381), downstream to the coastal marine area (at or about O33:3301:1061).~~
- ~~Waitohi River from Barkers Road crossing (at or about M33:7989:1540), downstream to the confluence with the Hurunui River (at or about N33:9091:1482).~~
- ~~Waipara River from Stringers Road bridge (at or about M34:8297:9383), downstream to the coastal marine area (at or about N34:9347:8378).~~

### 2.3 Add Rule A1.2.22 Quarrying and mining on farms

#### **A1.2.22 Quarrying and mining on farms**

Quarrying and mining in the General Management Area provided that:

- (a) The extracted volume from any site is less than 500m<sup>3</sup> per annum; and

(b) The duration of any crushing and screening operations does not exceed 7 days per annum.

Note: Refer also to rules A1.2.9 Noise, A1.2.15 Earthworks, and A1.2.19 Vehicle movements.

### 3.0 Rule A1.4 Discretionary activities (unrestricted)

#### 3.1 Amend Rule A1.4(a) (p.16)

(a) Quarrying and mining in which all aspects of the activity other than transport of the extracted resource to another property are located more than 500 from a residential zone boundary that is not provided for as a permitted activity.

(aa) Hard rock quarrying and mining where the operational area is located more than 500 metres from an urban area.

Note: Refer to Policies 1.1, 1.7, 1.8 and 17.7

#### 3.2 Add Rule A1.4(b)

(b) ~~New residential activities, or visitor accommodation, and educational facilities~~ located less than 500 metres from the ~~resource consent operational~~ area for a ~~commercial~~ quarry or mine ~~other than riverbed gravel extraction, on farm, or hard rock quarry site, except for:~~

~~(i) Existing residential activity within the property on which the quarry or mine is located; and~~

~~(ii) residential activity within urban zones.~~

#### 3.3 Renumber subsequent rules A1.4(b) to (f) as (c) to (g)

### 4.0 Rule A1.5 Non-complying activities

#### 4.1 Add Rule A1.5(e)

(e) Quarrying and mining which is not provided for as a permitted or discretionary activity.

#### 4.2 Add Rule A1.5(f)

(f) New residential activities, visitor accommodation, and educational facilities within 500 metres of the operational area of a lawfully established hard rock quarry.

### 5.0 Section D Interpretation

#### 5.1 Add a definition for Hard rock quarrying

Hard rock quarrying

a type of means quarrying or mining in which the mineral extracted is rock or stone and or in which the activity involves rock blasting or rock crushing.

## 5.2 Amend the definition for Mining

Mining

means the use of land and buildings for the primary purpose of the extraction, winning, quarrying, excavation and/or associated processing of minerals; ~~and includes~~ but excludes prospecting and exploration.

**APPENDIX B**

**HURUNUI DISTRICT PLAN – PROPOSED CHANGE 7**

**Recommendations on Submissions**

Submitter	Sub #	Type	Decision requested	Decision
R T Abbott, H R Turnbull, S B Gibb, Federated Farmers of New Zealand, S Bethell, K J Berry, N Fraser, P S Roberts, J Alton-Adams, D S A Mclean, W W Paterson, P I Croft, M R Hodgen, A C Meyer, Kintail Downs Ltd, B Eaton, and R Goord	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 192	Support and oppose in part	.01 All references to quarrying and mining to read 'commercial quarrying and mining'	Reject
			.02 Non commercial mining, extraction of gravel and quarrying across the district in rural areas to be permitted	Accept in part
			.03 Issue 10(b) be amended so that it recognises and provides for 'reverse sensitivity' protection to farming and intensive land uses which are located in the rural area. No change to Issue 10(a).	Reject
			.04 Delete proposed Rule A1.2.21(a) volumes and times.	Accept
			.05 Delete proposed Rule A1.2.21(b) schedule of rivers.	Accept
			.06 Activities not listed in the plan should be permitted, delete proposed Rule A1.5	Reject
			.07 Amend 'Protection and enhancement of environmental quality' issue (b) by deleting the word 'unnecessary' before adverse effects.	Accept
			.08 Amend proposed Rule A1.4(a) so that it reads '... located more than 500 metres from a residential zone boundary with existing dwellings'	Reject
			.09 Reject proposed changes to Rule A1.4.	Accept in part
			.10 Reject proposed changes to Rule A1.5(e).	Reject
			.11 Amend the definition of quarrying and mining so that it only refers to commercial activities.	Reject
N Henderson	27	Unclear	.01 I suggest a separation of 1km to be appropriate if this quarry must eventuate.	Reject
P R & M R Calvert	28	Support in part	.01 Adopt plan change in its entirety with a greater separation of 1km.	Accept in part
R B Thomson	29	Support in part	.01 Adopt plan change in its entirety or in its entirety but with a	Accept in part
J O Sonne	30	Support in part	.01 I support the Plan change no7 where a 1km separation could happen but as stated above I oppose the activity entirely.	Reject
B F Kirwan	31	Support	.01 Adopt plan change in its entirety.	Accept in part
R M Wharfe	32	Support in part	.01 Adopt plan change in its entirety.	Accept in part
			.02 That the Winstone Aggregates application to establish a sand quarry in Kings Road be rejected and that any further applications be opposed but should one be successful that the area between quarry and residents be increased to 1km.	Reject

Submitter	Sub #	Type		Decision requested	Decision
J Holbrough	33	Support in part	.01	To make the application a non-complying activity.	Reject
F Sonne	34	Unclear	.01	If the Council respects the wishes of the community they would not allow quarrying and mining anywhere near Leithfield beach	Reject
R G Holbrough	35	Unclear	.01	I think there should not be a quarry any where near house with in 2km.	Reject
M N Beswick	36	Unclear	.01	We definitely do not want a quarry or mining of any type at any distance.	Reject
WITHDRAWN	37				
J Anthony	38	Unclear	.01	That the quarry work will be declined.	Reject
L Cooper	39	Unclear	.01	To create a minimum separation gap of 1km, but preferably to reject the plan change and ensure that the quarrying activity does not proceed.	Reject
K D Brown	40	Unclear	.01	No quarry close to holiday area.	Reject
I Blacklock	41	Unclear	.01	As I go here on holiday I certainly do not want it. No quarry.	Reject
E T & J A Archer	42	Support in part	.01	Adopt the plan change but with a greater separation distance, preferably 1km.	Accept in part
Y Baker	43	Unclear	.01	None stated.	
J E Walker	44	Unclear	.01	Please change No.7. But I still don't want this thing on my doorstep.	Reject
R D Walker	45	Unclear	.01	Change No 7. but we still don't want it on our doorstep.	Reject
D F Walker	46	Unclear	.01	Please change No 7 100mtrs. But we don't want this thing on our doorstep.	Reject
G M Jesson, C R Webb, and A Larsen	47, 48, and 49	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change but with a separation distance of 1km from any residential areas.	Accept in part
J E & J A Meek	50	Support in part	.01	To adopt the change but with a non-complying area of 1km.	Accept in part
J E Hibbard	51	Support in part	.01	Adopt the changes to the objectives, policies and explanations	Accept in part
			.02	River flood protection shingle extraction should remain	Reject
W D Hall	52	Support in part	.01	No entrance to any quarry or mine off Kings Rd because of the	Reject
			.02	Plus the change of 500m to 1km from a residential area.	Reject
S J Spencer	53	Support in part	.01	I feel that a buffer zone of 500m is better than none at all, but strongly advocate for a buffer zone of 1km.	Accept in part
E M Buchanan	54	Support in part	.01	Separation distance of 1km excluding flood protection work in the (Kowai) riverbed.	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub #	Type		Decision requested	Decision
I Fawcett	55	Support in part	.01	Commercial quarrying and mining only to be permitted beyond 1km of any existing residential area excluding flood protection activity.	Accept in part
WITHDRAWN	56				
H Fitzmaurice	57	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change with a 2km buffer.	Accept in part
			.02	That there be no quarry in Leithfield Beach.	Reject
D J Fitzmaurice	58	Support in part	.01	"Work together for a better Community"	
			.02	Adopt plan change with a buffer zone of 1.5km near established communities.	Accept in part
			.03	No quarry in/off Kings Rd Leithfield Beach.	Reject
			.04	Ensure District Plan and Community Plan recognise the special characteristics of towns in Hurunui.	
S Fitzmaurice	59	Support in part	.01	To ban Q&M in the Leithfield Beach area; or failing that, to have a separation gap of at least 2000 metres from any residential housing.	Reject
G J Hamilton	60	Support in part	.01	To have the Leithfield Beach community exempted totally from Q&M. Failing that to have a greater buffer separation of 2km from commercial enterprise.	Reject
M J Jamieson	61	Support in part	.01	To have the Leithfield Beach/Pukeko Junction and Leithfield area exempted totally from Q&M, and that any of these activities be 2km from this environment.	Reject
			.02	Adopt plan change in its entirety but with the above exclusion.	Accept in part
R U Teika	62	Unclear	.01	No quarry. Don't destroy natural beauty. Leave for future generations to enjoy as do locals and visitors.	Reject
J Cooper	63	Unclear	.01	There should be no quarry. It will not bring any benefit to the area and would de-value the area due to pollution, noise and visually.	Reject
P S Anthony	64	Oppose in part	.01	No quarry at Leithfield Beach.	Reject
A McKenzie	65	Unclear	.01	None stated.	
J T Field	66	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change 7 with a 1km buffer zone.	Accept in part
D R Buchanan	67	Support in part	.01	I think there should be at least 2km between the houses and the quarry.	Reject
L A Ellis, and J & V McGeoch	68, 69	Support in part	.01	Adopt Plan Change in its entirety preferably with a 1kmm separation distance.	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub #	Type		Decision requested	Decision
R A Riley, and D L Honey	70, 71	Support in part	.01	The only acceptable outcome as an alternative to plan change No7 is to increase the separation distance to 1km.	Reject
E Hiddleston	72	Unclear	.01	Do not see why any mining or quarrying should be done so close to a residential area. Majority of houses in Leithfield Beach are	Reject
K Hiddleston	73	Unclear	.01	None stated.	
B J Smith, J D Smith, D Smith, and M P Smith	74, 75, 76, 77	Support in part	.01	Adopt the plan change with a greater separation distance of 1km between Q&M and residential areas.	Accept in part
K Felgate	78	Support in part	.01	Increase the separation distance for quarrying or mining to 2.5km at least.	Reject
V Dwyer	79	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change in its entirety but with a greater separation distance of 1km, with bunds, and beautification, and sound proofing barriers.	Accept in part
C F Mills	80	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change in its entirety but with a greater separation distance of 1km with bunds.	Accept in part
M-J E Smith	81	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in its entirety.	Accept in part
WITHDRAWN	82				
D Redshaw	83	Unclear	.01	No mining and quarrying at Leithfield Beach.	Reject
S Butler, J Hodgkinson, J Painter, A L Thomas-Rose, J E James, D Rasbatch, Karchbold, H O Isherwood, V Redshaw, L J Cooper, D W Giddens, (Illegible), Luff, N C Shepherd, and J E & D J Summers, A Davies, F N Hamilton,	84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 104, 113, 115, 116, 117	Unclear	.01	None stated.	Reject
B C Painter	98	Unclear	.01	Firstly that the council does not let the quarry here at all, that if it has to be here then no closer than 1km to the closest house, and a paper road through the paddock to give independent access to the quarry other than the intersection at SH1.	Reject
T Harrison, and N Campbell	100, 101	Unclear	.01	Stop quarrying and mining at Leithfield Beach.	Reject
J R Black, and J Thorne	102, 103	Support in part	.01	Adopt the plan change in its entirety, but with a greater separation distance between quarrying and mining activity and residential areas of 1km.	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub #	Type	Decision requested	Decision
R F O'Halloran	105	Support in part	.01 That Q&M be non-complying if within 1km of any residence, and non-complying if within 2kms of a residential area.	Reject
K McAnally, L Conrad, C Bailey, and C MacKenzie	106, 127, 131, 133	Support in part	.01 Adopt the plan change but with a greater separation distance of 1km.	Accept in part
A Anthony	107	Support in part	.01 That the change be adopted but with a separation distance for Q&M of 1km from the nearest residence, and 2km from the nearest "residential grouping".	Accept in part
WITHDRAWN	108			
L Davidson	109	Unclear	.01 Get a plan minimum distance of 2km.	Reject
			.02 At the least limit truck movements around residential areas.	Accept in part
J Ross, and P H Joli	110, 114	Support in part	.01 Adopt a plan change with a minimum separation distance of 2km.	Reject
			.02 Limit truck movements through residential areas.	Accept in part
L Smart	111 and 119	Support in part	.01 Adopt plan changes but tighten up policies.	Accept in part
			.02 Adopt permitted riverbed gravel extraction.	Accept in part
			.03 Adopt non-complying 500m separation provision. Residential areas can't grow with commercial quarrying in their close location.	Reject
			.04 Review assessment criteria.	Reject
WITHDRAWN	112			
T Atkins	116	Support in part	.01 I am happy with where they are, but any closer would result in too much noise. No closer please.	Accept in part
T H van der Stap	117	Support in part	.02 The shingle plant should not be any closer than 500m to where people live so noise level stays at a minimum as well as dust.	Accept in part
S Salmon	118	Unclear	.01 I oppose quarrying closer to the beach.	Reject
F Smart	120	Support in part	.01 To adopt the plan change but with a greater separation distance	Accept in part
S Smart	121	Support in part	.01 To adopt the change but with a separation distance of 1.5km from a residential area.	Accept in part
S E M Smart	122	Support in part	.01 Adopt new plan provisions relating to issues, policies and explanations.	Accept in part
			.02 Adopt change allowing farmers access to gravel for farm tracks and householders getting sand and gravel for own use.	Accept in part
			.03 Increase separation distance to 2km.	Reject

Submitter	Sub #	Type		Decision requested	Decision
J McLellan	123	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change, but with a 2km separation distance between Q&M and residential areas.	Accept in part
G A Smith	124	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change but with a 1km separation distance between Q&M and residential areas; and that quarrying companies meet the cost of roading upgrades to support new activity.	Accept in part
D H Smith	125	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change with a minimum separation distance of 1km.	Accept in part
K Clarke	126	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change with a minimum separation distance of 1km.	Accept in part
S Hill	128	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change but with a separation distance of 1.5km.	Accept in part
A Smith	129	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change with a minimum separation distance of 1km.	Accept in part
D Thomson	130	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change but with a separation distance of 2km from a residential area.	Accept in part
A Chan	132	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change and have a separation gap of 1000m+.	Accept in part
WITHDRAWN	134				
B Watts	135	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change in its entirety with a separation gap of at least 1km.	Accept in part
J Gin	136	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change and have at least 1km distance apart.	Accept in part
C A Sealey	137	Support in part	.01	All the changes in No.7 but with a greater distance, like 1km.	Accept in part
M J Smart	138	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change with a larger separation area.	Accept in part
L A Smart	139	Support in part	.01	Implement policy change. Hard rock quarrying 2k from residential areas. Limit hours of work and duration.	Accept in part
			.02	Adopt changes for riverbed extraction as only short time activity i.e. for own use, driveways, farms tracks, and non commercial.	Accept in part
			.03	Implement non-complying change. Would prefer 1km separation.	Reject
P B Nixon	140	Support in part	.01	Adopt with 1km separation.	Reject
			.02	Adopt with sound/dust barriers.	Reject
			.03	Adopt with provisions for the disposal of flood water.	Reject
			.04	Adopt with resolution of heavy vehicle problems.	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub #	Type		Decision requested	Decision
V McLean	141	Oppose in part	.01	Reject the 500m buffer zone as it would prevent river protection work in Liethfield Village.	Accept
T Hofmann, E F Hofmann, R C J Croucher, J E J Croucher, H J Croucher, and S Hofmann	142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change in its entirety but with a non-complying zone of 1km between Q&M and residential areas.	Accept in part
S J Field	148	Support in part	.01	To introduce prohibited activity status for Q&M if within 2km of a residential area.	Reject
L Field	149	Support in part	.01	Halt the mining full stop or at the very least 1000m from housing-residential area.	Reject
G C Dunlop	150	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change but with the amended distance of 1km.	Accept in part
C Dunlop	151	Unclear	.01	That the proposed Q&M in the Leithfield area does not proceed.	Reject
R Wilsea-Smith	152	Support in part	.01	Adopt the plan change but would like the distance to be increased to 1km.	Accept in part
D & M Patton	153	Support in part	.01	Change the distance to 1.5km and include restrictions not to interfere with access to residential areas.	Reject
C A Ross	154	Support in part	.01	We would like the activity to be more than 500m from the residential area.	Reject
C Benton	155	Support in part	.01	That the activity be more than 500m from residential area to comply.	Reject
I Logan	156	Unclear	.01	That the separation distance for Q&M be at least 1km from any residential area.	Reject
S & B Walker	157	Unclear	.01	Forbid Q&M at leithfield Beach or charge 60% fee per quantity taken.	Reject
M Schist	158	Unclear	.01	That HDC not consider "a gap" at Leithfield Beach of anything less than 5km.	Reject
K Nelson, and G Spragg	159, 160	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change in its entirety but with a separation distance of at least 1000m.	Accept in part
D P Olds, G L Williams	161, 174	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change in its entirety but with a 1km non-complying zone between Q&M and residential areas.	Accept in part
P Bovey, and M Cracroft-Wilson	162, 171	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in its entirety.	Accept in part
S Schist	163	Unclear	.01	If we have to have Q&M let it be with a decent buffer of between 1 5kms.	Reject

Submitter	Sub #	Type		Decision requested	Decision
M Roche, and S Roche	164, 165	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change in its entirety but with a 1km non-complying zone.	Accept in part
F R Roche, and K F Roche	166, 167	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change but with a 1km non-complying area. and leaving gravel extraction from riverbe	Accept in part
			.02	Discretionary activity status for gravel extraction from riverbeds for flood protection.	Reject
A Smith, and N Smith	168, 169	Support in part	.01	Adopt the plan change but with a 1km zone.	Accept in part
C E Mulligan	170	Support in part	.01	Adopt the plan change in its entirety and even consider a larger separation area.	Accept in part
H Williams	172	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change in its entirety but with a 2km non-complying zone between Q&M and residential areas.	Reject
S Skjoldebrand	173	Unclear	.01	I suggest that sand be mined from the Ashworths Beach area - which is far enough away.	Reject
G R Hullah	175	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change with a 500m buffer zone.	Accept in part
P Hullah	176	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change with a 1km buffer zone.	Accept in part
B & J Bown	177	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change but increase the separation distance to 1km for sand mining and 2km for hard rock quarrying.	Accept in part
M A Watt	178	Support in part	.01	Adopt plan change but with a separation distance of at least 1km.	Accept in part
B Stenberg	179	Support in part	.01	A separation distance of 2.5km from residential dwellings whereby commercial Q&M would be a non-complying activity.	Reject
			.02	That quarrying and sand/gravel extraction be a non-complying activity 4km in a NW to W direction of established communities.	Reject
			.03	Special attention and protection to be given to any area within 3km of the coast with regard to safeguarding ground water from salt contamination caused by Q&M.	Reject
			.04	Do not exempt transport of extracted resource.	Accept
WITHDRAWN	180				
M Whitby	181	Unclear	.01	Not to consent to any quarrying.	Reject
J C Joslen	182	Support in part	.01	Amend plan change to provide an enlarged separation of 2km.	Reject

Submitter	Sub #	Type	Decision requested	Decision
Leithfield Beach Residents Association Inc	183	Support in part	.01 Adopt plan change but with a 1km non-complying zone between Q&M and residential areas.	Accept in part
			.02 That gravel extraction from riverbeds for flood protection remain a discretionary activity.	Reject
			.03 That the permitted volumes/times for gravel extraction be increased.	Accept in part
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc	184	Oppose in part	.01 Delete proposed Rule A1.1.21 or provide a s32 assessment of natural character, landscape, amenity, ecological and other values of each of the reaches of river listed in the rule.	Accept in part
			.02 Introduce new rule for <150m <sup>3</sup> per annum gravel extraction at named and restricted sites as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity with performance standards similar to NRRP Rule BLR 3.	Reject
Winstone Aggregates	185	Oppose	.01 Delete the proposed changes to rules A1.4(a) and A1.5.	Accept in part
			.02 Amend 2nd sentence of bullet for buffer zone assessment criteria C1.2.4(x) to read ...As a guide, and depending on mitigation proposals, a minimum buffer zone of 500 metres for hard rock quarrying and 200 metres for sand and gravel extraction may be required between such activity and any residential zone.	Reject
			.03 Amend proposed Rule A1.4(b) to read Residential activity or visitor accommodation located less than 500m from the resource consent area for a commercial quarry or mine involving hard rock quarrying, or less than 200m from the resource consent area for a commercial quarry or mine involving sand or gravel extraction and processing, except for: (i) Existing residential activity within the property on which the quarry or mine is located; and (ii) residential activity within residential zones.	Accept in part
			.04 Amend Explanation to Policies 1.7 and 1.8, 3rd sentence to read ... The cause of this is that in some instances, not all of their adverse effects can be internalized: that is, they cannot always be internalised on the site. Amend Issue 10, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence to read ... Some intensive land uses have effects that can not always be wholly internalised on the site.	Reject

Submitter	Sub #	Type	Decision requested	Decision
Winstone Aggregates (continued)	185	Oppose	.04 Amend Explanation to Policies 10.6 and 10.6(a) to read: 2nd paragraph, 4th sentence ... But due to the special nature of those activities, those reasonable efforts may not always be able to internalise all the effects; 3rd paragraph, 1st and 2nd sentences ... Commercial quarrying and mining, for example, can create adverse traffic, dust, noise, vibration and visual effects that are more than minor. All reasonably practical mitigation measures intended to internalise the effects may in some circumstances still fail to stop those effects from being experienced outside the boundary of the property.	Reject
			Amend Explanation to Policy 10.9, paragraph 6, 1st sentence to read ... The noise (including vibration) emitted by quarries and mines and some other activities can at times exceed levels	
Canterbury Regional Council	186	Support in part	.01 That in the explanation for the new provisions the respective functions and roles of HDC and Environment Canterbury are clarified with respect to gravel extraction in the beds of rivers.	Reject
			.02 That Rule A1.2.21 be amended to (a) reduce extraction volumes to 10m <sup>3</sup> per week and 50m <sup>3</sup> per year in unspecified rivers; (b) reduce extraction volumes to 50m <sup>3</sup> per month and 150m <sup>3</sup> per year in specified rivers; (c) add schedule for Conway, Waiau, Leader, Hurunui, Waitohi and waipara rivers with volumes of 100m <sup>3</sup> per month and 300m <sup>3</sup> per year; and cross-reference to the PNRRP.	Reject
			.03 That any other consequential amendments to the Plan required to give effect to these changes be made.	Reject

Submitter	Sub #	Type	Decision requested	Decision
Fulton Hogan	187	Oppose in part	.01 Amend Policy 10.6 by adding the words "the effects of" before the words "quarrying and mining".	Reject
			.02 Amend Policy 10.6(a) to read: 2nd paragraph, 3rd and 4th sentences ... What is reasonable depends on careful consideration of the practicality, effectiveness and economics of the mitigation measures available. But due to the special nature of those activities, those reasonable efforts may not result in the internalisation of all effects; 3rd paragraph, 1st and last sentences ... Commercial quarrying and mining, for example has the potential to create ... The separation distance from residential areas for hard rock quarrying should generally be	Reject
			.03 Delete Explanation to Policy 10.9, paragraph 6, 1st sentence.	Reject
			.04 Amend Rule A1.2.21 to permit 5000m3 in any 12 year subject to stated standards.	Accept in part
			.05 Amend Rule A1.4(b) to recognise that the separation distance applies to historical quarrying and mining operations.	Accept in part
Crown Minerals	188	Oppose in part	.01 Amend the definition of "mining" to exclude "prospecting and exploration".	Accept
Hanmer River Holiday Park	189	Support in part	.01 A minimum 500m separation between residential boundaries and rock blasting or crushing activities.	Accept
			.02 Limit rock crushing hours of operation to 0900-1600 Monday to Friday.	Reject
			.03 Limit the duration of consents (i.e. 5-10years)	Reject
			.04 Require bunds or shields to mitigate noise levels.	Reject
Hurunui District Council	190	Support in part	.01 Amend gravel extraction volumes in Rule A1.2.21(a) 400m3 per month and 1000m3 per year.	Reject
			.02 Amend Rule A1.4(b) to recognise the extraction area of non-consented quarries having existing use rights.	Accept in part
Canterbury Regional Council	196F	Oppose in part	.01 Reject in part submission 187	Accept
	196F	Support in part	.02 Accept in part submissions 51, 183	Reject
	196F	Oppose	.03 Reject Submissions 9, 184, 190	Reject

Submitter	Sub #	Type		Decision requested	Decision
Fulton Hogan	197F	Support	.01	Accept submission 188	Accept
	197F	Support	.02	Accept submission 185	Accept in part
	197F	Support in part	.03	Accept in part submissions 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 167, 184, 190	Accept
	197F	Oppose in part	.04	Reject in part submissions 54, 55, 108, 111, 122, 166, 167, 183	Accept in part
	197F	Oppose	.05	Reject submissions 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 83, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 113, 114, 118, 120, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 163, 164, 165, 168, 169, 172, 173, 174, 175, 177, 178, 179, 181, 182, 186	Accept in part
Winstone Aggregates	198F	Support	.01	Accept submissions 164, 188	Accept in part
	198F	Oppose	.02	Reject submission 183	Accept in part
B Stenberg	199F	Oppose	.01	Reject submissions 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 192), 185, 187	Reject
Leithfield Beach Residents Association	200F	Oppose in part	.01	Reject in part submission 185	Reject
S R Rayner	0801	Unclear	.01	I expect members of the Hurunui District Council to do everything in their power to support residents' opposition to this intrusive mining proposal.	Reject
Aggregate and Quarry Association of NZ Inc.	0802	Oppose in part	.01	Oppose the whole plan change.	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub #	Type		Decision requested	Decision
Aggregate and Quarry Association of NZ Inc. (continued)	0802	Oppose in part	.02	Or Amend Policy 1.8 to give greater weighting to the benefits of Q&M operations to properly balance positive and adverse effects. Provide recognition in the plan change that the extraction and processing of minerals and aggregates can only occur in fixed locations, the location of the resource cannot be changed and its supply is finite and add Policy 10.6(d) that recognises the benefits of Q&M.	Reject
			.03	Amend rules A1.4 and A1.5 to retain Q&M as a discretionary activity.	Accept in part
A W McKay	0803	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full.	Accept in part
P Scott	0804	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full if cannot be stopped altogether.	Accept in part
S Scott	0805	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full if it cannot be stopped.	Accept in part
D C Hilgendorf	0806	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full.	Accept in part
M Hilgendorf	0807	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full.	Accept in part
Pukeko Junction Café	0808	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full.	Accept in part
P H M Ellis	0809	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full.	Accept in part
E C Rowe	0810	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full.	Accept in part
L A Rowe	0811	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full.	Accept in part
Winstone Aggregates	0812	Oppose	.01	Redraft the plan change provisions to appropriately provide for aggregate extraction, processing and transportation and address the potential for reverse sensitivity effects to arise from sensitive development locating in close proximity to aggregate extraction and processing sites and transportation routes. This may include retaining those parts of the change which are appropriate in terms of Part 2 of the RMA, and making the suggested changes sought by Winstone in its primary submissions above, and the primary and further submissions submitted previously on the proposed plan change.	Accept in part
B P Price	0813	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full.	Accept in part
S L Charlesworth	0814	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full.	Accept in part
N Lees	0815	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full to have as minimal an impact on the	Accept in part
D W Allen	0816	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full.	Accept in part
B A Allen	0817	Support	.01	Adopt plan change in full.	Accept in part

Submitter	Sub #	Type	Decision requested	Decision
R and C Gardiner	0818	Support in part	.01 Amend to increase the non-complying zone distance from a residence to 1km.	Reject
			.02 If Q&M materials are transported on public roads provide conditions to maintain the safety of other road users that are monitored and upheld at all times.	Accept in part
Fulton Hogan Ltd	0819	Support in part	.01 Amend Rule A1.2.21(a) to increase permitted volume to 500m3 per year.	Reject
			.02 Amend Rule A1.2.21(b) to increase permitted volume to 2000m3 per year.	Reject
			.03 Amend Rule A1.4(a) to exclude river gravel extraction.	Accept
			.04 Amend Policy 10.6 and Explanation to Policy 10.6(a) as per 2005 submission 187.	Reject
Aggregate and Quarry Association of NZ Inc.	0802F	Support in part	.01 Accept in part submission 0812.	Accept in part
Winstone Aggregates	0812F	Oppose	.01 Reject submission 109, 110, 163, 179, 189.	Accept in part
		Support and oppose in part	.02 Accept and reject in part submission 184.	Accept in part
		Support	.03 Accept submission 0802.	Accept in part