

Opening Statement – Cambridge Chamber of Commerce

Thank you for the opportunity to be heard today.

It is no coincidence that three key Cambridge organisations—the Cambridge Town Hall Trust, the Cambridge Community Board, and the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce—are speaking in succession today.

Collectively, we represent the voice of our town—both its residents and its business community.

The Cambridge Chamber of Commerce represents over 400 businesses, and we are in daily dialogue with a diverse cross-section of industry leaders across a wide range of sectors.

These conversations provide us with valuable insight into the priorities, concerns, and expectations of local business.

I have been struck by the level of engagement we've seen from the business community regarding this hearing—many have followed up to check on the hearing date and the status of proceedings.

It's a level of interest we rarely see. That in itself speaks volumes, you heard this from the Community Board. This proposal matters.

The consequence on our town are significant.

The Chamber's core mandate is business wellbeing, but that comes with a wider duty of care to the town in which our businesses operate.

Our role requires us to be fair, principled, and balanced in our advocacy.

We met with representatives of Shaw's to better understand their position on the revised conditions.

You will recall that Mark Chrisp spoke previously on behalf of Shaw's Quarries Limited, a Schick family entity, which has been exploring a resource consent for a sand quarry on land owned by Windsor Park Leasing Limited—just across SH1 from the site under discussion today.

The Chamber has been aware of Shaw's interest in this area from the outset. Regardless of our position, we believe strongly that all proposals must be subject to the same level of scrutiny and integrity. Our advocacy must be consistent, no matter the applicant.

The Schick family, known to many in this room, are long-standing contributors to our community. As Jonny Schick personally told me, “I want to be able to walk down the street and hold my head high.”

That comment reflects a genuine commitment to community standards and responsibility—something that must be matched by process and outcomes.

This statement speaks volumes in that they have abandoned their sand quarry proposal after significant spend - upwards of \$50,000 because of the unmitigated and irreversible effect of traffic on our town.

Please take a moment to consider that!

If this action doesn’t convince you of the impact that this quarry will have on Cambridge – then I don’t think anything will.

Moving on to our next items.

We see the conditions to encourage Northbound traffic to journey south as delusional.

We find the reliance on measures to *encourage* northbound travel—such as informational flyers—to be unrealistic and economically unsound.

In practice, transport operators will make routing decisions based on efficiency, fuel costs, and delivery timeframes.

It is highly unlikely that voluntary guidance will override the commercial imperative to take the shortest, fastest route—which, in many cases, will lead vehicles through Cambridge.

Without enforceable route conditions or meaningful deterrents, these measures are unlikely to achieve the intended traffic mitigation outcomes.

Relying on goodwill in the face of clear economic drivers is not a credible traffic management strategy for an operation of this scale.

All of the above links back to the conditions relating to the Travel Management Plans required under the consent, which in turn help inform the per-tonne financial contribution. This mechanism is intended to align the impact of heavy vehicle traffic with the extent to which local council roads are affected by the activity.

This raises important questions regarding the proposed contribution of \$0.043 per tonne for this particular applicant.

As we understand it, these financial contributions are typically assessed on a case-by-case basis, considering factors such as proximity to the state highway network, the safety and suitability of that access, and the volume of traffic movements permitted.

While this site is geographically close to SH1, the issue lies in the lack of direct northbound access. As a result, a significant proportion of heavy vehicles will be funnelled onto local roads—exacerbating wear and creating safety concerns. In this context, the proposed contribution appears insufficient and does not fairly reflect the burden placed on local infrastructure.

At this time, we would also like to endorse Ray Talbot's submission, specifically referring to page 13 of the WDC Consent Conditions and advises that Condition 35 should be revised to include that "Independent Road Safety Audit (RSA)" must be carried out in accordance with the NZ Transport Agency Safe System audit guidelines.

This condition would then provide a measurable Consent Requirement. The mitigation of road user hazards are paramount for Newcombe/Tirau intersection, the focus on just sight lines is inadequate and a competent assessment of the hazards and mitigation is required before approving a design.

Subcontractor Engagement

The Cambridge Chamber of Commerce shares the concerns regarding the current wording of Condition 28(a) and (b), and considers the proposed measures to be insufficient and lacking enforceability.

While initiatives such as subcontractor evenings and distribution of driver information are well-intentioned, they rely too heavily on voluntary compliance. The language used—phrases like “encourage respect” and “promote courteous driving”—is aspirational rather than directive, and does not provide the community with the assurance of consistent or measurable behaviour change.

Given the scale and frequency of heavy vehicle movements associated with this proposal, the community requires firm and enforceable conditions to mitigate the impacts on safety, wellbeing, and quality of life.

As such, we recommend that subcontractor engagement measures—particularly attendance at subcontractor information evenings—be made mandatory, and that stronger mechanisms be implemented to support compliance and accountability.

In our previous submission, we noted the BBO peer review in which Cameron Inder stated he was unable to confirm with confidence that the transport effects of the proposed sand quarry—located within the urban environment of Cambridge—would be *minor or less*, as suggested by the applicant's traffic engineer.

Having reviewed the revised conditions, we remain unconvinced that they sufficiently mitigate the scale and impact of traffic associated with this application. The volume and nature of heavy vehicle movements proposed will have a significant and ongoing effect on Cambridge, and the current amendments do not adequately address or reduce that burden.

As such, I would like to introduce my colleague Tobie Ueckermann - a Director and Principal Traffic/Transportation Engineer with Transplan Limited based in Cambridge who has over twenty-eight years' experience working as a civil and traffic/transportation engineer.