

Please attach additional sheets if there is not enough space for your submissions. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your submission.

2 This is a submission on an application from (name, address & activity) –

Application number: LU/0231/25
Applicant: ResourceCo Ltd
Address: 3831 Cambridge Road, RD 3, Cambridge
Proposed activity(s): Establish and operate a managed fill activity

3 Trade competition

Select one	☐ I am	a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991.
	☒ I am not	
Select one	☒ I am	directly affected by an effect of the subject matter that –
	☐ I am not	(a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

4 Attendance at Council hearing

Select one	☒ I do	wish to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission
	☐ I do not	

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

☒ Yes
☐ No

5 The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

See Attached detailed submission document

6 My submission is either in part or all: ☐ In support ☒ Opposed ☐ Neutral

The reasons for my submission are: See attached detailed submission

7 I seek the following decision from the consent authority:

(Give precise details, including the parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought)

Complete revocation of consent to operate managed land fill, see seperate detailed submission

8 Hearings Commissioners

Select one	☒	I request	that you delegate your functions, powers, and duties to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority.
	☐	I do not request	

9 Signature of submitter *(note: a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means, however please type your name below)*

Name and Signature of submitter:
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Blair Ballard

Dated 28 June 2026

Notes to submitter

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in Part 11A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the consent authority.

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners.

WDC LU/0231/25 - Limited Notification - 3831 Cambridge Road. Class 3 landfill proposed by ResourceCo Ltd, Rubbish Farming Ltd.

WRC: APP147661

IRIS Document No: 93344

File No: 61 88 38A

28 June 2026

Submission: Blair Ballard , [REDACTED] .

Acronyms:

WDC: Waipa District Council

WRC: Waikato Regional Council

1. Opposition:

This Submission is lodged in complete opposition to the resource consent application for Resource Co Ltd to establish a managed fill facility of demolition waste on the edge of the currently expanding Urban boundary limits and alongside the Waikato river for the next 20 years and beyond.

I request to be heard if there is a hearing for the consent application.

If the committee insists on granting consent for this operation there needs to be considerably higher levels of compliance and securities, as noted below, to ensure generational security of the site and an environment which supports the Cambridge community and protect the waterways of other communities downstream of the site.

2. Water

My principal concern is the introduction of a dump/fill site in such close proximity to the towns drinking water supply route and our waterways.

Given what we know about the state of our waterways and have never been more concerned about this and are introducing initiatives to secure and improve this we seem to be continually accepting unnecessary risk with our commercial activities when we are being mandated to reduce the risk on contaminants entering the Waikato river.

There appears to be no forecasted use or designation of what the recovered land can be use for afterwards.

Recent initiatives such as the 750M Waipa Biodiversity river and stream corridor and the recently approved Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 (PC1) with core objectives to restore and protect the health of the Waikato and Waipā River catchments for the next 80 years. These initiatives seem at odds both ethically and physically in establishing a Class 3 dump and fill facility on a site completely enveloped within a designated Biodiversity river and stream corridor.

For those reasons I oppose the application of consent to operate the class 3 fill site.

If the committee insists that this consent must be issued I submit that the site must be held to a higher degree of standard (Class 1)with non-permeable barriers in place to prevent leachate at

a higher level and a caveat that the site cannot be used to dump and store those higher class materials there, this is too safeguard the site intergenerationally as the new PC1 plan states.

By admission of General Manager Aaron Morgan there is very high volumes of water permeating at current surface level from the southern boundary wall of the property. This insinuates there is large groundwater flow through and under the site and pit as it is filled. This ground water will pass through the fill even with small amounts of contaminates it seems reasonable that we will have contaminates passing into the Waikato river.

The site groundwater has ready access to the Waikato river through the long drain situated on the Northern border and then down through the unnamed tributary in the main river.

Has this large water flow through the site been rigorously assessed that the site stability will not be compromised and also that this water path will be protected generationally so as not to have the possibility for leachates to be delivered to the waterways for the future?

This appears in direct contradiction to the PC1 ruling ethos and direction given we are mandated to reduce contamination and increase regeneration of the waterways condition.

3. Transparency, Trust, Bond

As Neighbours we were never consulted in the original consent to establish a recycling facility at 3831 Cambridge road. WDC deemed effects to be less than minor, however within days of the site being compacted and prepared, complaints of dust noise and extreme vibration were experienced by the residents and complaints lodged with WDC and a meeting arrange by WDC with residents WDC and Director Henry Fullerton-Smith at WDC offices 5th May 2025. HFS expressly said ,when directly asked if plan was to expand site, that there was no intention to expand site when in fact applications had already been made to increase capacity and fill the site, we were intentionally misled. On 23 September 2025 Peter Fullerton-Smith arrived at my door step in the evening and expressed that he was HFS father and was there to smooth relations with Neighbours. He did not express at that time he was Director and shareholder of Resource Co.

I expressed my concerns regarding site and transparency to which he stated that he had wished the council had publicly notified the consent and wished that all the consents were publicly notified. To improve trust and transparency. My comments to him were that I sincerely hope that no one ever does this to him in his own back yard in his town of Pio Pio.

I note now that Resource Co sought non notified public notification of this consent.

In the WDC Notification report land use consent date 27/05/2026

"It is acknowledged that there is a high level of interest in this site and application from neighbours

and the community, as well as the complaints received about the existing consented waste recycling

facility onsite. However, this is not considered to constitute a special circumstance to require public notification.

In this instance, the proposal is not considered to have unusual or exceptional circumstances

warranting public notification”

My comment to this is the first class 3 managed land fill site in the Cambridge town urban area right next to the Waikato river. I believe this assessment is erroneous and this consent should be held and paused for full public consultation given this is the second non notified consent and the exceptional nature of the works and unusual site location so close to the wider public's water supply not only in Cambridge but wider Waikato area and Auckland region.

During the recent resident meeting arranged by Kelly Bouziad CEO, Cambridge chamber of commerce and Resource Co Ltd Directors and General Manager on 21 June 2026 when asked if the site has had asbestos on site we were told that the only Asbestos on site was small amounts of legacy material that had been uncovered, when it is known that in Aug 2025 consent was breached and Asbestos was dumped at site by one of their contractors. Despite all the relevant checks and processes that are proclaimed to be undertaken. We were told at this meeting it is not possible to dump contaminated material at the site due to the “Strict and Stringent” compliance required from contractors and site.

I do not genuinely believe material that will be dumped at site will be vigorously inspected and checked to not be contaminated with non consented materials for the next 20 years and therefore be completely sound environmentally generationally.

For those reasons I oppose the application of consent to operate the class 3 fill site.

If there is an insistence to issue Consent by the committee for the site there should be a significant Cash bond held by either WRC or WDC from Resource Co Ltd and Rubbish farming Ltd to facilitate the rectification and security of the site in event of liquidation or insolvency of either company or any other event which prevents the company from fulfilling its mandated and financial requirements to secure the site and make environmentally sound. This bond requirement should be held for some years after the site is recovered to ensure that local council and government do not foot the bill for any miscomings if they were to eventuate. Similar to the 2019 Tamarind Fiasco of the Taranaki offshore Tui Oil field where the NZ government was forced to foot the \$300 million cleanup bill due to the Liquidation of Tamarind Taranaki Ltd.

This bond should be reviewed annually, assessed for accuracy based on the state of the site and quantities of materials stored to ensure the values are inflation adjusted and sufficient to cover these costs, if there is a shortfall in the bond there should be a top up of the bond by the companies to ensure it remains relevant and resilient.

4. Noise

“The two key areas of noise assessed by Mr Jones are the truck noise and operation noise of the proposal. In summary, the applicant owned trucks operating onsite can be fitted with broadband reversing alarms to reduce noise, while the external contractor trucks that may be fitted with a tonal

alarm, in the event they need to reverse while unloading, this is for a brief period and is unlikely to be audible at existing dwellings”

Council reports that the noise levels will only just breach boundary constraints and can be mitigated and that other neighbors further away than I am will not suffer the annoyance of reversing beepers and extra added nuisance noise. I can say that we are subjected regularly to the private nuisance of reversing beepers and machinery operation particularly on weekends when we are home trying to enjoy our rural outlook and aspect.

I am concerned as the site rises we will be subject to higher ambient noise levels and more private nuisance noise from beepers tail gates slamming and loads dumping, rollers running. For those reasons I oppose the application of consent to operate the class 3 fill site and also I submit as below my concerns regarding hours of operation if the committee insists it must issue consent for this operation.

5. Dust

We have raised complaints about Dust from site as early as May 2025 under the new operators and have still suffered effects of dust in the area. Before the site is even fully operational.

I have now disconnected the rain water collection I had in place from 50% of my roofing to supplement the trickle feed Pukerimu water supply we receive.

I do not have the confidence that the site will manage dust appropriately before I can ascertain that my water supply has been contaminated if sourced from the roof if it becomes fully operational.

I have concerns as the level of the site increases that it projects into a higher areas more subjected to the prevailing winds that now swirl around in the pit. That we would see an increase in dust annoyance.

For those reasons I oppose the application of consent to operate the class 3 fill site.

6. Competence

I note in the consent notification there is no section laying out the qualifications and experience of the operators to undertake such a large, lengthy, complex and detailed operation and any risk assessment of this competence capability.

By way of admission by Peter Fullerton-Smith at the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce arranged meeting 21 June 2026 The senior management have no experience in managing this type of site and have “perhaps blindly” followed and relied solely on contractors advice and as such errors are already been made.

Given the size, scale, and longevity of the operation and the potential negative generational outcomes the consent should be denied on this basis so that the Cambridge community is not used as a Guinea pigs as to whether or not this trial will be successful.

7. Hours of operation

I oppose the hours of operation to include Saturday and any future desire for Sunday operations. Monday to Friday operations should be limited to 7am-5pm if the committee is insistent the operation must be granted consent.

I have already received private nuisance, because of the operations, to the Rural outlook we have had, sought and seek to maintain at our rural property.

For those reasons I oppose the application of consent to operate the class 3 fill site.

8. Traffic

Truck movements to the right assessments, when exiting the facility, doesn't appear to have factored the incline and time to accelerate across the road and up the hill of , especially, large truck and trailer units out of the front entrance onto Cambridge road heading south towards Te Awamutu. Only distance has been considered and number of vehicle movements. There is already regular significant risky gap taking witnessed at this intersection when truck and trailer units especially need to accelerate turning right out of the entrance to head south. Northbound Vehicles coming down the Cambridge road hill towards the entrance regularly need to reduce and check speed well below speed limit to prevent impacts with impatient or poorly timed drivers wanting to exit the facility.

Vibration ,noise and road damage along Pope street area has also been heavily noted and a petition presented to council from residents about extra Truck movements already causing private nuisance and road damage. In response to this the council noted.

"The Council is considering longer-term transport and freight route options for Cambridge as part of Cambridge Connections."

My comment to this how do you divert the current forecasted extra 64 truck movements per day away from this arterial area to the site if they come online?

WDC Notification report land use consent date 27/05/2026 notes that Development Engineer, Brendan Koevoet, and Councils Transportation Manager, Bryan Hudson are satisfied

"Therefore, the effects relating to traffic generation and safety are considered to be less than minor."

Yet the existing truck and traffic movements before this site is fully operational has engaged 111 residents of the Pope street area in April 2026 to submit a petition to council that they clearly consider the current truck and traffic movements effects to be more than minor. Has this petition been considered in this assessment?

I submit this Consent notification be paused and expanded to include full public notification and reassessment.

9. **NZ Native critically endangered long tailed Bats, (Pekapeka).**

Cambridge Urban areas are a known location for these nationally critical Bats. These Bats are known to *“use ‘highways’ such as rivers to travel out into rural areas to feed”*. (Ref: WDC Bat surveys Apr 2022).

The Resource Co site is directly adjacent the Cambridge urban areas and in the adjoining river corridor paths out to Rural areas.

There is no mention in the WDC Notification report land use consent, 10 April 2026, or the WRC No notification decision, Doc #33699307, 13 May 2026 of any Bat specific effects or conditions that have been factored or considered. This critically endangered species is of National significant importance to the Public and Tangata Whenua.

This should have been considered and applied for full public consent notification to enable full transparency, available resources and opportunity to be applied to assess and consider the implications for the forecasted 20 year operations will have on these Bats, their habitat, current migratory paths, roosting and feeding areas to ensure their best survival outcomes. It would be negligent of the WDC and WRC to not have publicly notified this consent based on this and also to approve consent of this facility at such a large scale and long time frame without careful and thorough assessment of this and its effects.

Has there been full review of any effects of the, Dust, Noise, Vibration, Lighting, operations and the nature of the materials being dumped and stored for eternity on the site and their potential to contaminate and interfere with the recuperation, over the next 20+ years, of this critically endangered species and its existing habitat before any other further action is taken on the consent application?

If there has not, then I submit the consent application must be paused and re-submitted for public and Department of Conservation notification based on this.

Blair Ballard