To the Commissioner,



370 Motueka River Westbank Road, Motueka.

Submitter 86. Land use consent application.

Submitter 56. Application to discharge contaminants.

In response to new information provided since Minute # 6.

Third Supplementary evidence of Timothy Corrie-Johnston

1.2 "I am site manager for CJ Industries base at Hau Road and for all of CJ Industries quarries."

Tasman District Council Management Staff and CJ Industries own staff (one of whom is a senior staff member and has extensive knowledge of the day to day workings of the Company) has confirmed to me that Mr Corrie-Johnston is not a paid employee of CJ Industries and is a self employed Consultant. Therefore, Mr Corrie-Johnston's assertion in his evidence that he is site manager at Hau Road and for all of the company's quarries and that he will be site manager at the Peach Island quarry may be incorrect and may be a point the Commissioner wishes to raise with Mr Corrie-Johnston. The reason this may be relevant is because it calls into question the assertions Mr Corrie-Johnston makes in his evidence about adhering to standard operating procedures to store, inspect, test and transport cleanfill including at Hau Road.

I have also been advised that there is currently no 'Site Manager' at Hau Road and the Company is trying to fill the currently vacant position of 'Primary Products Manager' or 'Aggregates Manager'.

This fact raises a number of red flags for me:

Is Tim Corrie-Johnston the right person now to be providing 'supplementary evidence' associated with this Application?

Who will be Managing Operations associated with CJ Industries at Hau Road and potentially 134 Peach Island Road?

What will their knowledge be of the current application for operations at 134 Peach Island Road including Management plans, potential conditions etc?

What other evidence provided by the Applicants needs more scrutiny?

Tim Corrie-Johnston, in his supplementary evidence also states a number of potential sources of clean fill that may be used to backfill at 134 Peach Island Road.

- 2.1 [a] to [c] Three other quarry sites with different rock content and different overburden make up and structure.
- [d] Civil construction sites: How many at any time? How many different sources of back fill? Soil types and structures?
- [e] Roading maintenance sites: How many at any one time? Different soil types and structures?Flood debris disposal: How many sites in an event? Soil types and structures?

There is also potential for up to 40 other different Contracting Companies providing back fill from multiple sites which in fact appears identical to how back fill was sourced for disposal at their other site at Douglas Road in the past with significant problems occurring. These sources may well provide the volumes required to back fill at Peach Island but again, how many other sites? Soil types and structures? Clean fill?

These multiple site sources for back fill cannot be monitored, tested, verified, or trusted.

That, with the potential of storing and processing at a number of different CJ Industries operated sites, does not provide any confidence that an appropriate SMP can be realistically managed or trusted particularly in regard to soil testing and monitoring programme. I do not believe that monitoring protocols can be implemented effectively for potentially 15 years of the consent duration. Sampling and testing by CJ Industries themselves simply will not be able to be trusted.

Supplementary Evidence- Gary Clark -Traffic Concepts.

Mr Clark puts emphasis on the point that truck movements will reduce at Hau Road even if back fill is stored and backfilled from that site due to 2 larger trucks being operated.

What a load of rubbish. There can only be a significant increase in truck movements to and from Hau Road on a daily basis. The potential use of these particular 2 trucks as part of the 30 truck movements a day to bring excavated gravel from Peach Island to Hau Road and back load with 'clean fill' will not reduce truck movements. It will simply mean heavier and bigger loads and add more risks to other road users from the quarries at Riwaka, whether via the Motueka Bridge and Motueka Valley highway or on the Westbank Road itself. The bigger trucks, if even used on this route, simply means higher production rates for CJ Industries.

If clean fill needs to be sourced and transported from the other quarries this will significantly increase truck movements on the main Riwaka to Motueka township route via Highway and bridge to the Pah Street intersection traffic lights, down Pah Street to Queen Victoria Street. This is the current continuous haul route the CJ industries trucks travel to and from the Riwaka and Marahau quarries.

I suspect that many more residents and potentially the TDC would have real issues and would have submitted on the original application if they had known about the intention to significantly increase truck movements through this area which is already busy with heavy traffic. Many of the current heavy vehicles are from CJ Industries. The other much shorter route that will ultimately be far too tempting not to take from Riwaka to the access at 493 MRWB Road directly up Westbank Road through Brooklyn township has been flagged at the Hearing. This will mean another significant increase in heavy truck movements through there as well which will pass a school and have to navigate a number of intersections and pass a large number of private homes.

This route has not been assessed and again if this had been proposed transparently it would have offered the public a chance to submit and I believe would have resulted in significantly more original submissions in opposition from locals from the beginning.

Stage 1 Pit size change.

Yet another change of plan at the last minute. Five times the pit size proposed now can only mean five times the risk. Five times the size of head cut and sediment loading created in the likely event of a flood event no matter what the time of year. Five times the amount of water excavated gravel, backfill and sediment deposited on the 4 main downstream properties, before that sediment returns to the Motueka River at the Blue Gums corner and ultimately ends up in Tasman Bay.

One thing that hasn't been said previously about the flood channel Stage 1 site is the likelihood that any gravel excavated from that site may well be totally unsuitable for use as aggregate for concrete as it may have high concentrations of soft granite that has been deposited on that site from the Chapman stream that floods straight onto Stage 1 and always has. Testing of other sites downstream of the Shaggery have been found to be useless because of the soft granite content. No apparent testing has been carried out on stage 1 so that will be interesting to watch going forward if consent is granted for this area.

<u>Summary</u>

I have run out of time to make any more comments about this application. I have submitted twice and spoken at the Hearing. I could go on and on but I've got better things to do. All the too and froing, constant changes to suit their narrative and the shear amount of time and effort required to try to keep some measure of understanding of the application has been frustrating. The changing and increasingly detailed information and very tight timelines for comment particularly of late has been challenging. As a lay submitter I struggle to see how this process is fit for purpose to the average person like me. Many folk in our community have given up on this as it is simply too hard.

This is the wrong thing in the wrong place.

If Consent is granted it will be a disaster for residents and will impact heavily on our community. This area should not be turned into a large-scale Industrial site purely for profit. Our water should be treasured, our land should be preserved for the future, our peace and wellbeing should be prioritised. The residents of the valley have been here a long time. We would like to be here well after CJ Industries have gone but what will we be left with?

Thank You for the opportunity to comment once more.

Pete Taia.