

Objection to CJ Industries revised proposal to extract gravel from Peach Island

Lodged 4.4.23



To whom it may concern,

This is an objection to the latest proposal from the applicant in 3 key areas:

1. Increased risk of environmental damage in a flood event
2. Visual amenity
3. Resource consent

1. Increased risk

From the latest amendments to the proposals around quarrying at Peach Island, it appears that the applicant now wants to achieve the 25,000m² stage 1 area in 3 'tranches'. This means instead of a 1,600m² pit, the applicant now wants to have a 8,300m² worked excavation in the stage 1 area.

While limiting the time of operations to October-March (which is when the groundwater level is supposed to be lowest) allows the applicant to dig deeper for gravel, it also sharply increases the risk of erosion and environmental damage if a flood occurs.

In my opinion the proposed limitation of October-March doesn't actually reduce the risk of a flood occurring in the first instance - flooding can happen at any time of the year and the largest floods historically occur (most often with cyclonic activity, which are becoming more frequent due to climate change) in the summer.

In the event of a major flood, this would therefore mean a multiple of the amount of sediment being carried down river and out into the ocean, further compromising the environment, which is already fragile at best. This is a huge gamble in my opinion, with no apparent expert evidence to back up any of it.

I can't see Planscapes involvement in any of this material? I've looked extensively at the soil management plan (07B-X) but there's nothing in there about these proposed changes?

2. Visual amenity

No amount of planting trees or remedial work the applicant is proposing will shield us (and all other elevated properties around the valley) from the even bigger (8,300m²) scar on the landscape (roughly five times the size of the original application) that will be front and centre for us. Further, this makes any landscape mitigation plans that the applicant is proposing completely obsolete.

2. Resource consent

We feel it is appropriate to remind all parties that here at 520 Motueka River West Bank Rd, just 1km from the proposed site, we have a Resource Consent for a Yoga and Meditation

Centre already granted. By definition these are activities that take place in quiet and tranquil environments, in order to benefit the clientele who are looking for exactly these qualities in a venue.

The applicant's proposal to extract gravel in an industrial site immediately in front of this property would be catastrophic to this venture, both in ongoing unacceptable noise levels and visual amenity.

To this end we may then explore Court or compensatory options for losses attributed to us for the proposed activity, either from the Council, the applicant or both, if the applicant's proposal is granted. We would be looking at both past and future losses, as well as general devaluation of this property due to the proposed activity. As demonstrated via video in the initial hearing, we have invested a large sum of money already in development of this facility.

Thank you

We live in this river valley for the peace and tranquility it offers. For the beauty of the natural landscape, for the escape from noise-pollution. It is an amazing environment.

We are not against gravel extraction in general terms, obviously it is a commodity, but in this instance the proposal appears completely out of kilter with the local community and outstanding natural beauty of the area.

Thank you for reading and acknowledging this objection,

Ollie and Nataliya Langridge,
520 Motueka River West Bank Rd.