

TAMAHERE COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

TITOKI SANDS LTD SUBMISSION

The Tamahere Community is a group set up by the Waikato District Council to work alongside Councillor Wally Hayes. The Committee's aim is to act as a portal for Community views on Council planning and issues that impact on the Tamahere community.

In particular the Committee's focus is on the ongoing development, review and implementation of the revised Tamahere Community Plan, "The Lifestyle Community", 2004-2013, and to ensure development that takes place within our region also fits within the WDC LTCCP and Future Proof. The Committee submitted its strong support of Future Proof during the consultation phase.

The current WDC LTCCP includes a review of planning in the Tamahere District. This will commence later this year. This is an important review that will pull together in a master planning exercise all aspects of growth, roading, land use, transport and development for the District. Whilst the world cannot stop, major planning milestones must be taken into account when considering developments such as Titoki Sands.

SUBMISSION

We submit that the Tamahere Community Committee oppose the Titoki Sands Quarry application for the following reasons:

1. Environmental Impact:

- a) After destroying the soil structure, the ability to adequately rehabilitate elite soils is questionable.
- b) With the washing of sand, even if the water goes into settling ponds, the ordinary rain that will be collected on the site will go straight into our local streams with no purifying layers of silt for it to feed through.
- c) It is unclear how and where the 730,000m³ of silt will be stockpiled and how fine silt will be stopped from flying in the wind. We also cannot understand the silt management strategy whereby the final sand product would have 24% silt content.

2. Future Proof:

The essence of the Tamahere Community Committee's submission to Future Proof was to stop this kind of adhoc development happening. Does a sand quarry with all its implications fit within the Future Proof strategy documentation and more especially fit within Tamahere being a gateway to Hamilton? Any development taking place MUST comply with Future Proof even though the documentation is still to be enacted. Other points within Future Proof worth noting:

- a) 3.3 Recognition of the need to protect land resources for production, including reverse sensitivity effects of rural living.
- b) 3.9 Natural Environments
 - Suggestions of Priority Issues: Protection of green areas, gully areas, river edges and peat lakes.
 - Protection of key ecological sites where appropriate.
- c) 3.10 Industrial Development

- Need for greater emphasis on industrial land provision to address land supply shortages.
 - Specific comments about strategic sites for rezoning: Horotiu, Te Rapa, Hautapu and Airport/Tamahere.
 - Site selection and development controls to avoid land use conflicts between industry and residential/rural residential land uses.
- d) 8.31:4 Sustainable Resources/Mineral Resources/Point 2
- Ensure that rural residential and urban development avoids mineral resource areas and that conflict between extraction of mineral resources and associated activity has been reduced by ensuring that any sensitive activities are not located adjacent to where mineral resources are being extracted. (Note: The timeframe for this is ongoing.)

3. Traffic:

One of the key objectives of the Tamahere Community Committees input into the WDC Parks & Reserves Strategy was to get locals out of cars and onto bikes and footpaths, most especially children going to and from Tamahere School. The impact of the increased traffic flow from this development would not only reduce the safety of carrying out this activity but also make it incredibly dangerous. It would also have the following other potential impacts on our community:

- a) It would further increase the traffic access issues from side roads such as Cherry Lane, Bollard Road, etc, while putting increased pressure on one of Hamilton's main gateways into Hillcrest, the traffic tail of which stretches as far back as the Tamahere interchange at some peak traffic times.
- b) Exec summary, page iii, 1 & 4.2.2, p.23 & 6.5.3, p.32 all comment on the use of the existing access for all vehicle movements in stage 1. Who will monitor left turn only, road surface contamination, black ice and visibility issues such as fog? Is the access to the Pa site always to be via this entrance, and what are the traffic flows and crash impacts of this?
- c) WDC are aware of the local demand for a footpath on Tauwhare Road between Woodcock Road and the school, yet they recently allowed TNZA to install a retaining wall that compromised this footpath. If this application is approved, then footpath design and construction must be considered by WDC and Titoki.
- d) Exec Summary, page iii, para 4, identifies dust as a nuisance but this is minimised by the "wet process" yet there is no mention of debris tracking and truck spillage onto local roads, and during stage 1 this will be a major issue. How will product, water and other contaminants be prevented from spilling on the road and creating hazards which could well result in accidents?
- e) Resulting from the increased traffic flow, Transit may enact their proposal to cut the access from Devine Road onto the slip lane leading to SH1. This would have disastrous consequences on the traffic flows within our community, not to mention the inconvenience it would cause for locals.
- f) App 8, 19.1, p22, states traffic flows as 327vpd or 39vph in peak hours, yet App 3, Further Info, Table 1 discusses 500 max vpd which leads us to ask what the real traffic are and the subsequent safety issues?
- g) The Tamahere Markets are recognised as one of the leading markets of their kind in New Zealand and enhance the country living lifestyle we as a

community identified as being our vision in the Tamahere Community Plan (2004-2013). Safe access is essential for the both the community and those agencies who give consent for the markets to run, and adding as many truck movements as this proposal does, puts the future of these markets at risk.

4. Monitoring and Controls:

We have major concerns at the Councils ability to monitor and control the Resource Consent conditions, with IcePak and the Hooker Road Sand Quarry being perfect examples of WDC's inability to date of doing this.

5. Noise:

In the Exec Summary, page iii, para 3, says the noise nuisance will be managed to meet WDC rules. 6.2.11, p29, sensitivity analysis allowed for an increase in traffic by 30; taking figures to 300 vpd and this resulted in only a 1.6dBA change to noise levels.

- a) Traffic figures are already given as 328 norm and a max of 500 has been referred to. Both these figures put the application outside that of a permitted activity into the Discretionary category. THEREFORE more weight should be given to the impact of noise on local residents.
- b) Many residents will be affected by the constant noise of machinery working on the proposed site, not to mention trucks breaking and accelerating through the three roundabouts they would need to go through before entering northbound onto SH1. The local school would also be adversely affected, being situated right next to the on ramp these trucks would be accelerating up countless times every day.
- c) Future proof policies and philosophy's regarding buffer zones and zone types should be used in reviewing this application.