

To: [Gen Seed](#)
Subject: OBJECTION TO QUARRY EXPANSION AT BRANDY HILL
Date: Sunday, 11 November 2018 6:37:35 PM

Dear Ms Seed,

I wish to strongly object to the Hanson quarry expansion proposal at Brandy Hill.

I read the Hanson reponse to submission and found their response, whilst comprehensive in the research, to show contempt for the residents that their proposed expansion will impact upon with deceitful use of data, blaming Council for social impacts and placing responsibility for transport noise reduction on their customers.

Their reponse to the submission is correct in implying that the quarry and the residents have lived in harmony for a number of years. We are not against the quarry operating and despite the myriad of trucks, many damaged windscreens (2 in the past year along due to a quarry truck) and low rumbles with each blast, we accept that the quarry has a right to operate. However operating 24 hours a day cannot be justified when surrounded by residential properties.

Hanson's submission indicates that we misunderstood the volume of trucks that would be rumbling along the road. If this be the case, why has the submission attempted to camouflage the real number of trucks by referring to "laden" loads (58 in total) when in actuality this means 116 truck movements that the residents will experience between 10pm and 6am. This is on top of the 600 during the day. Saying that the residents misunderstood is hypocritical when there is a clear intention to deceive by using smoke and mirrors.

The proposed driver code of conduct has been identified as the salve to soothe our concerns. I have concerns which are not addressed by this rather simple strategy. These are:

- a) How is the code of conduct to be monitored and therefore enforced?
- b) Who will be enforcing them - the Police for speed limits? The RMS for driver fatigue and log books? Hanson themselves for ensuring that their sales dispatches are within the maximum allowable laden loads per hour?
- c) Under what circumstances is use of compression braking for safety reasons valid? Who determines this and monitors it so it is enforceable?
- d) What does awareness of school buses....pedestrians and cyclists mean? How will drivers be trained in this awareness? Again, how will this be monitored and enforced? We have no footpaths, however Hanson blame this safety issue on Council for not putting these in.
- e) Imposing a speed limit of 60km/hr on trucks, whilst other vehicles can travel at 80km/hr on Brandy Hill Drive - how will this be feasible? There is 1 lane in each direction on this road, with double lines. When does having 2 different speed limits when there is only 1 lane for each direction of traffic become a logical and safe traffic management strategy?

Hanson also indicate that the driver code of conduct will place the onus on the drivers (their customers) to stick to "timing for departure and arrival to remain within approved limits and avoid convoying" (page 50). Hanson however state that "truck queueing, unnecessary idling of trucks and unnecessary trips would be reduced through logistical planning, where possible" (page 57). Hanson want to soothe us by making their customers responsible for transport timing, but will only take responsibility for this "where possible". What constitutes possible and not possible in regards to this?

Hanson have also stated that their current approved operating times already go into the late

evening, yet this is argued by residents. I have been monitoring truck movements in the evening and they do seem to be happening after approx 6pm. So if they have capacity to keep operating why are they not doing it now, but believe that 24 hours a day 7 days a week is so warranted?. Surely Monday - Friday 6am - 10pm and half day on Saturday will meet the increased demand they prophesise is required?

I do not believe that I am being unreasonable in requesting that 24 hour 7 days a week of trucks hurtling past my front door being denied. I am more than happy for the quarry to operate but in a manner that forsakes greed and a relentless drive to further erode safety, wellbeing and family unity by encouraging a non-essential service to operate 24 hours a day. The ill effects far out weigh the paltry benefits that are prophesised.

I seek your assistance in bringing this issue to a reasonable conclusion that provides a solution where all parties are able to benefit - the quarry that has some increase in operating hours and the residents who are allowed some quality of life when they are not hard at work.

Regards

Sent from Samsung tablet.