



FTAA-2605-1228: Application received for referral of the project under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 – Stage 2 decisions

Project Name: Clevedon Quarry Expansion

Date submitted	9 July 2026	Tracking	26-BRF-01738
Security level	In-Confidence	Priority	Urgent

To	Action sought	Response by
Hon Chris Bishop Minister for Infrastructure	Decisions on recommendations	17 July 2026

Actions for Minister's Office staff	Return the signed briefing to: FTAreferals@mcert.govt.nz Send email to Ministers to invite written comments
Number of appendices: 6	Appendices: 1. Statutory framework for making decisions 2. Application documents for Clevedon Quarry Expansion project 3. Stage 1 Briefing Note and decisions 4. Section 18 Report on Treaty settlements and other obligations 5. Comments received from invited parties 6. Draft Notice of Decisions

Ministry contacts

Name	Position	Telephone	1 st contact
Max Gander-Cooper	Principal Author		
Stephanie Frame	Manager	s 9(2)(a)	✓
Ilana Miller	General Manager	s 9(2)(a)	



Project location



Image 1: General location of Clevedon Quarry Expansion project, in the Auckland region (red star).



Image 2: Clevedon Quarry Expansion project area (outlined in red).

Key messages

1. This briefing seeks your decisions under section 21 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (the Act) on the application from Stevenson Aggregates Limited (the applicant) to refer the Clevedon Quarry Expansion project (the project) to the fast-track approvals process.



2. A copy of the application is in Appendix 2. This is the second briefing on this application. The first (Stage 1) briefing (26-BRF-01330) with your initial decisions annotated is in Appendix 3.
3. The project is to, in stages, increase the aggregate resource at Clevedon Quarry from 60 million tonnes (MT) to approximately 150 MT, and provide for this resource to be extracted over a period of up to 50-years. The proposal involves expanding the quarry in five stages across an area of approximately 75 hectares. The quarry floor depth will remain unchanged from Reduced Level (RL) 20 metres for each stage. No changes are proposed to the current consented annual extraction limit of 3 MT per year.
4. The expansion would extend the current quarry at 546 McNicol Road south-eastward into 646 McNicol Road and 439 Otau Mountain Road.
5. The project will require the following proposed approvals:
 - a. resource consents under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)
 - b. variations to two existing land use resource consents held by the applicant
 - c. approvals under the Wildlife Act 1953.
6. We recommend you accept the referral application as the project meets the criteria set out in section 22 and does not appear to involve an ineligible activity.
7. We seek your decisions on this recommendation and notification of your decisions.

Assessment against statutory framework

8. The statutory framework for your decision-making is set out in Appendix 1. You must apply this framework when you are deciding whether to accept or decline the referral application and when deciding on any further requirements or directions associated with referral of the project.
9. Before accepting the project, you must consider the following:
 - a. the application (in Appendix 2)
 - b. the section 18 Treaty settlements report (in Appendix 4)
 - c. any comments from invited parties (in Appendix 5)
 - d. any document that requires your consideration under section 16 and comply with any procedural requirements under section 16.
10. Following that, you may accept the application if you are satisfied that it meets the criteria in section 22 of the Act and if there are no reasons meaning you must decline the application. We provide our advice on these matters below.

Section 18 Treaty settlements and other obligations report

11. A Treaty settlements and other obligations report (the report) prepared under section 18 of the Act is attached at Appendix 4.
12. The report notes that Auckland has a complex Treaty settlement landscape with many overlapping interests. Accordingly, there are a significant number of relevant Māori groups for the project area, which are included in Attachment 3 of the report.



13. The report identifies five relevant Treaty settlements and other arrangements relevant to the project area, being:
 - a. Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014
 - b. Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Claims Settlement Act 2018
 - c. Ngāti Tamaoho Claims Settlement Act 2018
 - d. Ngāti Pāoa Claims Settlement Act 2025, and
 - e. Te Ākitai Waiohua deed of settlement signed 12 November 2021.
14. The report identifies that the Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Claims Settlement Act 2018 provides for a statutory acknowledgement over the Wairoa River and its tributaries. The project area lies within this statutory area. In addition, the Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Claims Settlement Act 2018 and the Te Ākitai Waiohua deed of settlement each include a statutory acknowledgement over the Wairoa Gorge Scenic Reserve. The report considers your invitation (including providing information about the application) to Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Trust and Te Ākitai Waiohua to comment on the application under section 17(1)(d) of the Act is comparable to the requirements for statutory acknowledgements under the RMA and Treaty settlements.
15. The Tāmaki Collective redress deed, and the Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki, Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Pāoa, and Te Ākitai Waiohua settlements, provide for relationship agreements with the Department of Conservation (DoC) that set out procedures and principles to be followed by DoC when consulting on statutory authorisations.
16. In response to the invitation for Māori groups to comment under section 17(1)(d) of the Act, you received comments on the application from Ngāti Tamaoho Settlement Trust. Ngāti Tamaoho Settlement Trust voiced expectations in relation to management plans and methodologies for assessing and protecting ecosystems and species, baseflow monitoring and augmentation, tikanga-informed management approaches, cultural monitoring, ecological restoration, and Ngāti Tamaoho involvement in the project.
17. The report does not identify any matters which make it more appropriate for the proposed approvals to be authorised under another Act or Acts.

Section 16 Effects of Treaty settlements and other obligations on decision-making

18. Should you decide to accept this referral application, under section 16(2)(c) of the Act we propose you direct any panel considering a substantive application for the project to:
 - a. comply with the consultation process set out in the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau conservation relationship agreement when engaging with Tūpuna Taonga o Tāmaki Makaurau Trust on the Wildlife Act 1953 approvals being sought (unless a modified arrangement can be agreed);
 - b. consider whether, and how, to apply the consultation process set out in the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau conservation relationship agreement when engaging with the relevant iwi members of the Tāmaki Collective.

Written comments received

19. Comments were received from Auckland Council (AC), the Minister for Resources, the Minister for Economic Growth, Ngāti Tamaoho Settlement Trust and the Department of Conservation (DOC).
20. Comments from Ngāti Tamaoho Settlement Trust are summarised in paragraph 16 above.
21. The key points of relevance to your decision-making are outlined in Table A, with a summary provided below:
 - a. AC do not have any significant concerns with the project and have not identified any reasons why the referral application should be declined
 - b. the Minister for Resources considers that access to long-term sources of aggregate may provide certainty to infrastructure planners, and support New Zealand's significant infrastructure pipeline, especially in the Auckland Region, as well as the Government's Going for Growth and Going for Housing Growth strategies
 - c. the Minister for Economic Growth considers that the proposal may be assessed as having the potential to deliver significant regional economic benefits
 - d. DOC considers that, due to the scale, nature and location of the proposed project site, the project is likely to have significant adverse effects on ecological values. DOC notes that it may be most appropriate for any wildlife effects that are expected to occur more than 10 years in the future (considering the project has a 50-year term), for the applicant to seek Wildlife Act approvals outside of the Fast-track Approvals process closer to the time when the impacts are anticipated in order to better assess the likely effects. DOC considers the fish transfer required for the project to meet the threshold for a Complex Freshwater Fisheries Approval under relevant legislation and notes that without this approval, it will be difficult to fully assess the impacts on freshwater fisheries.

Further information provided by applicant, relevant local authorities, relevant administering agencies

22. You did not request any further information from the applicant, relevant local authorities or relevant administering agencies under section 20 of the Act.

Reasons to decline

23. The statutory framework in Appendix 1 sets out the situations where you must decline the application for referral under section 21(3).
24. We consider that you have sufficient information to make an informed decision. We consider you can be satisfied that the project does not involve any ineligible activities and that it meets the referral criteria set out in section 22. As such, we have not identified any reasons under section 21(3) that you must decline this application.
25. You may also decline the application for any other reason under section 21(4). The Act gives some guidance on matters you could consider when deciding whether to decline an application and these are set out in Appendix 1.
26. As outlined in Table A below, we have considered the relevant matters and have not identified any grounds that would require you to decline the application.



Reasons to accept

27. The statutory framework in Appendix 1 sets out the reasons you can accept a project for referral.
28. Our assessment of these matters is summarised in Table A. We consider the project meets the requirements of section 22, as:
- a. the project is a development project that would have significant regional benefits because it:
 - i. will increase the supply of housing, address housing needs, or contribute to a well-functioning urban environment [s22(2)(a)(iii)] – as the project will provide long-term supply of aggregate supporting construction in the Auckland Region
 - ii. will support the development of natural resources, including minerals and petroleum [s22(2)(a)(vi)] – as the project will provide for the on-going supply of aggregate to the Auckland market for up to 50-years
 - b. referring the project to the fast-track approvals process would facilitate the project, including by enabling it to be processed in a more timely and cost-effective way than under normal processes as such projects often require a suite of regional and district consents and generally involve more complex environmental matters, resulting in typically lengthy and costly approval processes
 - c. is unlikely to materially affect the efficient operation of the fast-track approvals process because the project is neither novel in the New Zealand context nor beyond the scope of what a panel would typically assess under the RMA.

Conclusions

29. We consider the project meets the section 22 criteria and you could accept the referral application under section 21 of the Act and refer the project to the fast-track approvals process with the specifications outlined below.
- a. two years from the date of your notice of decisions as the deadline for lodging the substantive application.

Next steps

30. The Secretary for the Environment (the Secretary) must give notice of your decisions on the referral application, and the reasons for them, to the applicant(s) and anyone invited to comment under section 17 and publish the notice on the Fast-track website.
31. In your notice of decisions you must direct a panel to comply with any requirements identified in section 16. The following directions are required:
- a. you direct any panel considering a substantive application for the project to:
 - i. comply with the consultation process set out in the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau conservation relationship agreement when engaging with Tūpuna Taonga o Tāmaki Makaurau Trust on the Wildlife Act 1953 approvals being sought (unless a modified arrangement can be agreed);



- ii. consider whether, and how, to apply the consultation process set out in the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau conservation relationship agreement when engaging with the relevant iwi members of the Tāmaki Collective.

32. If you decide to refer the project, the Secretary must also give notice of your decision to:

- a. the panel convener
- b. any additional iwi authorities or Treaty settlement entities that you consider have an interest in the matter other than those invited to comment under section 17
- c. the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA)
- d. the relevant administering agencies

33. You must also provide all of the information you received that relates to this application to the EPA and the panel convener, including:

- a. the referral application
- b. any comments received under section 17
- c. the report obtained under section 18
- d. if a report was obtained under section 19, that report.

34. We will undertake this action on your behalf.

35. We have attached a draft notice of decisions letter to the applicant(s) based on our recommendations (refer Appendix 6) and we will provide it to all relevant parties. We will provide you with an amended letter if required.

36. Our recommendations for your decisions follow.



Recommendations

37. We recommend that you:

- a. **Note** section 21(3) of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (the Act) requires you to decline the referral application from Stevenson Aggregates Limited (the applicant) if you are satisfied that the project involves an ineligible activity, or you consider that you do not have adequate information to inform the decision under this section or if you are not satisfied that the Clevedon Quarry Expansion project (the project) meets the referral criteria in section 22 of the Act.

Noted

- b. **Agree** that before deciding on the application for project referral under section 21(1) of the Act you have considered:

- i. the application in Appendix 2
- ii. the report obtained under section 18 in Appendix 4
- iii. any comments and further information sought under sections 17 and 20 and provided within the required timeframe (if you have received any comments or further information after the required timeframe you are not required to consider them but may do so at your discretion) in Appendix 5.

Yes / No

- c. **Note** the application under section 16 of:

- i. Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014
- ii. Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Claims Settlement Act 2018
- iii. Ngāti Tamaoho Claims Settlement Act 2018, Ngāti Pāoa Claims Settlement Act 2025
- iv. Te Ākitai Waiohū deed of settlement signed 12 November 2021

Noted

- d. **Note** that this provides for the consideration of:

- i. relationship agreements with the Department of Conservation (DoC) that set out procedures and principles to be followed by DoC when consulting on statutory authorisations

Noted

- e. **Agree** you are satisfied the project will meet the referral criteria in section 22 of the Act as:

- i. the project is a development project that would have significant regional benefits because it:
- ii. will increase the supply of housing, address housing needs, or contribute to a well-functioning urban environment [s22(2)(a)(iii)] – as the project will provide long-term supply of aggregate supporting construction in the Auckland Region
- iii. will support the development of natural resources, including minerals and petroleum [s22(2)(a)(vi)] – as the project will provide for the on-going supply of aggregate to the Auckland market for up to 50-years



- iv. referring the project to the fast-track approvals process would facilitate the project, including by enabling it to be processed in a more timely and cost-effective way than under normal processes as such projects often require a suite of regional and district consents and generally involve more complex environmental matters, resulting in typically lengthy and costly approval processes
- v. is unlikely to materially affect the efficient operation of the fast-track approvals process because the project is neither novel in the New Zealand context nor beyond the scope of what a panel would typically assess under the RMA.

Yes / No

- f. **Agree** there is no reason the project must be declined under section 21(3)

Yes / No

- g. **Agree** to accept the referral application under section 21(1) and refer the whole project to the fast-track approvals process under section 26(2).

Yes / No

- h. **Agree** to specify Stevenson Aggregates Limited as the person who is authorised to lodge a substantive application for the project

Yes / No

- i. **Agree** to direct a panel to comply with the following matters under section 16:

- i. comply with the consultation process set out in the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau conservation relationship agreement when engaging with Tūpuna Taonga o Tāmaki Makaurau Trust on the Wildlife Act 1953 approvals being sought (unless a modified arrangement can be agreed);
- ii. consider whether, and how, to apply the consultation process set out in the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau conservation relationship agreement when engaging with the relevant iwi members of the Tāmaki Collective

Yes / No

- j. **Agree** to specify under section 27(3)(b) of the Act:

- i. The deadline for lodging the application is two years from the date of your notice of decisions

Yes / No

- k. **Agree** that the Secretary for the Environment will provide your notice of decisions to:

- i. Anyone invited to comment on the application including local authorities and relevant Māori groups
- ii. the panel convener
- iii. the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA)
- iv. the following relevant administering agencies:
 - 1. Department of Conservation

Yes / No



Signatures

Stephanie Frame
Manager – Fast-track Operations

Hon Chris Bishop
Minister for Infrastructure

Date:

Table A: Stage 2 analysis

Recommendation	<u>Accept</u> the referral application and refer the project to the fast-track approvals process		
Project details	Project Name	Applicant	Project Location
	Clevedon Quarry Expansion	Stevenson Aggregates Limited	The existing Clevedon Quarry is located entirely within 546 McNicol Road, Clevedon. The expansion would extend the current quarry south-eastward into 646 McNicol Road and 439 Otau Mountain Road.
Project description	The project is to, in stages, increase the aggregate resource at Clevedon Quarry from 60 million tonnes (MT) to approximately 150 MT, and provide for this resource to be extracted over a period of up to 50-years. The proposal involves expanding the quarry in five stages across an area of approximately 75 ha. The quarry floor will remain unchanged from Reduced Level (RL) 20 m for each stage. No changes are proposed to the current consented annual extraction limit of 3 MT per year. The project will require the proposed approvals: - resource consents under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) - variations to two existing land use resource consents held by the applicant - approvals under the Wildlife Act 1953. No other approvals under specified Acts are sought as part of the application.		
Minister invites comments / requests information	Comments from invited parties		
	Local Authorities <i>Auckland Council (AC)</i> Overall, AC does not have any significant concerns with the project and has not identified any reasons why the referral application should be declined. <u>Franklin Local Board</u> The Franklin Local Board states it would like to see more mitigation to manage potential effects on local roads. The Board considers that there are safety issues, in particular with the following: - the one lane bridge on Tourist Road with limited space for pedestrians and cyclists - the intersection of Tourist Road with Monument Road - the intersection of Tourist Road with Creighton's Road and Papakura-Clevedon Road - Ardmore Primary School, which has a limited drop-off / pick up space on the main Papakura-Clevedon Road when most children arrive at and leave school by car. <u>Auckland Transport</u> Auckland Transport considers that the proposal appears to offer limited regional transport benefits. Auckland Transport considers that the increased heavy vehicle loading due to extending quarry operations from 20 years (as currently consented) to 50 years, will accelerate pavement deterioration leading to higher maintenance costs, reduced pavement life, and potential safety risks. Concerns are also raised about required intersection and pavement upgrades (including at 530 McNicol Road), uncertainty over whether previously conditioned road works have been completed, and the need for further information (e.g. a pavement impact analysis) to assess effects on road performance and design life. <u>Parks and Community Facilities</u> AC notes that, while there are currently no plans to expand the Hunua Ranges Regional Park adjacent to the site, AC's proposed introduction of a recreation plan in the near future may increase the number of visitors to the western side of the reserve significantly and this should be considered when assessing effects on the reserve and its users. AC recommends that the applicant: - address reverse sensitivity effects on users of open space and conservation values through appropriate design responses and ongoing work management - provide construction and environmental management plans including specific mitigation for impacts on adjacent open spaces and the conservation work occurring - address mitigation of any dust effects on the use of the ranges during construction of each stage of expansion - provide conformation and management plans for impacts from any increase in movement along Orum Road adjacent to the open space. <u>Watercare Services Limited</u> Watercare has no concerns with the referral application. Watercare and Healthy Waters hold a neutral position to whether this application is referred to the fast-track approvals process. <u>Comments on applicant's economic assessment</u> AC considers there to be missing elements from the applicant's economic analysis and that greater transparency in the calculations provided is needed to improve confidence in the results.		

	Ministers <i>Minister for Resources</i> The Minister notes that the Government’s Minerals Strategy (January 2025) emphasises the production of aggregate, including greywacke, such as that from the Clevedon Quarry, as strategically important and the building block for our infrastructure and housing needs. The Minister considers that access to long-term sources of aggregate may provide certainty to infrastructure planners, and support New Zealand’s significant infrastructure pipeline, especially in the Auckland Region, as well as the Government’s Going for Growth and Going for Housing Growth strategies. The Minister notes that aggregate is listed as one of New Zealand’s critical minerals due to the high level of economic importance of aggregate to New Zealand, and the regulatory constraints limiting new supply opportunities. The Minister notes that it is important that quarries be located near demand centres, such as Auckland (being our largest demand centre), considering the cost of aggregate doubles after the first 30 kilometres of transport. <i>Minister for Māori Crown Relations: Te Arawhiti and Minister for Māori Development</i> The Ministers support the application progressing and encourage the applicant and the panel to have due regard to relevant Treaty settlement legislation and instruments and any feedback received from relevant Māori groups, as set out in the Treaty settlements and other obligations (Section 18) report prepared by the Ministry for the Environment. <i>Minister for Economic Growth</i> The Minister considers that, having regard to the information provided by the applicant, the proposal may be assessed as having the potential to deliver significant regional economic benefits under section 22(2)(a)(iv) of the Fast-track Approvals Act. Māori Groups <i>Ngāti Tamaoho Settlement Trust</i> Ngāti Tamaoho raised expectations in relation to management plans and methodologies for assessing and protecting ecosystems and species, baseflow monitoring and augmentation, tikanga-informed management approaches, cultural monitoring, ecological restoration, and Ngāti Tamaoho involvement in the project. Administering agencies <i>Department of Conservation (DOC)</i> <u>Wildlife Act Approval</u> DOC states that during pre-lodgement consultation with the applicant they discussed that Wildlife Act Approvals (WAA) typically are not issued for more than 10 years at a time. Considering the long timeframe of the project, DOC noted that it may be most appropriate for any wildlife effects that are expected to occur more than 10 years in the future, for the applicant to seek WAA through the business-as-usual process closer to the time when the impacts are anticipated in order to better assess the likely effects. <u>Complex Freshwater Fisheries Activity Approval</u> DOC states that during pre-lodgment consultation they advised the applicant that the proposal may require Complex Freshwater Fisheries Activity Approval (CFFA), particularly for in-stream works or fish transfers, but it appears the lodged application has not sought any such approvals. DOC considers the fish transfer required for the project to meet the threshold for a CFFA under relevant legislation and notes that without this approval, it will be difficult to fully assess the impacts on freshwater fisheries. We note the applicant has not sought this approval through the fast-track process, and it can be resolved outside this process if required. <u>Significant adverse ecological effects</u> DOC considers that, due to the scale, nature and location of the proposed project site, the project is likely to have significant adverse effects on ecological values. This includes impacts on local freshwater ecosystems from surface water diversions and groundwater drawdown. The applicant identifies that the project will result in the permanent and irreversible loss of approximately 2.3 km of stream habitat, including disturbance of freshwater fauna and potential direct mortality during works. The project will result in the loss of vegetation and terrestrial habitat, including approximately 6.7 ha of high-value regenerating tree-fern broadleaf forest. Long-tailed bats are known to forage at the site and eDNA has identified the presence of Hochstetter’s frogs. Further, native birds and lizards may use the site. DOC recommends that, should the project be referred, the following information be provided with the substantive application: • a comprehensive ecological assessment, including assessments of expected effects across the different stages of the project (in 10-year increments), to assist in decision making around how best to approach WAA and CFFA • comprehensive wildlife surveys to confirm the presence (or absence) of wildlife • complete details of proposed offsetting and compensation measures.
The Minister must decline an application if the Minister is satisfied that the project involves an ineligible activity [section 21(3)(b)]	We consider you can be satisfied that the project does not involve an ineligible activity because it: • would not occur on identified Māori land, Māori customary land or a Māori reservation as confirmed by the relevant records of title • would not occur in a customary marine title area or protected customary rights area as it is not in the coastal marine area • is not an aquaculture activity or activity that is incompatible with aquaculture activities that would occur in an aquaculture settlement area and for which the applicant is not authorised to apply for a coastal permit because it will not occur in the CMA and will not involve an aquaculture activity • would not require an access arrangement which cannot be granted under the Crown Minerals Act (including s61(1A)) because it does not include an access arrangement and would not occur on Schedule 4 land • would not be prevented by section 165J, M, Q, ZC or ZDB of the RMA because it will not occur in the CMA

	- would not occur on Schedule 4 land as confirmed by the relevant records of title - would not occur on a national reserve as confirmed by the relevant records of title - would not occur on a reserve held under the Reserves Act 1977 that is managed by or vested in someone other than the Crown or a local authority and that person has not consented in writing as confirmed by the relevant records of title - is not a prohibited activity or decommissioning activity under the EEZA, 15B or 15C of the RMA as it does not involve activities relevant to the EEZA, 15B or 15 C of the RMA - is not for the purpose of an offshore renewable energy project because it will not occur offshore or involve renewable energy production No comments raised by parties invited to comment have indicated that the project would be ineligible for referral.
The Minister must decline an application if the Minister considers they do not have adequate information to inform the decision [section 21(3)(c)]	We consider you have adequate information to inform the referral decision.
Relevant considerations and procedural requirements in Treaty settlement, Mana Whakahono ā Rohe, joint management agreement, or the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 or the Ngā Rohe Moana o Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou Act 2019 [section 16]	Should you decide to accept this referral application, under section 16(2)(c) of the Act we propose you direct any panel considering a substantive application for the project to: - comply with the consultation process set out in the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau conservation relationship agreement when engaging with Tūpuna Taonga o Tāmaki Makaurau Trust on the Wildlife Act 1953 approvals being sought (unless a modified arrangement can be agreed); - consider whether, and how, to apply the consultation process set out in the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau conservation relationship agreement when engaging with the relevant iwi members of the Tāmaki Collective.
Section 22 assessment criteria	
The project is an infrastructure or development project that would have significant regional or national benefits [section 22(1)(a)]	<i>The Minister <u>must</u> consider a relevant Government policy statement (GPS) [s22(1A)]</i> The only current GPS is the Government Policy Statement on Grocery Competition. As this project does not involve a supermarket development or grocery-related activities, there is no GPS relevant to your decision. The Minister <u>may</u> consider any of the following matters, or any other matters the Minister considers relevant: <i>Will deliver new regionally or nationally significant infrastructure or enable the continued functioning of existing regionally or nationally significant infrastructure [s22(2)(a)(ii)]</i> The applicant considers that quarries play a vital role in supporting infrastructure throughout New Zealand by providing a steady and essential supply of raw materials for construction. The applicant states that, according to the Infrastructure Commission’s Infrastructure Pipeline¹, there are several large projects planned across Auckland. The applicant considers the Clevedon Quarry Expansion would provide consistent, readily available local aggregate supply to support these projects and to meeting Auckland’s infrastructure needs. While we acknowledge that the project will contribute to providing local aggregate supply to meet Auckland’s infrastructure needs, we do not consider that the project will directly deliver new regionally or nationally significant infrastructure or enable the continued functioning of existing regionally or nationally significant infrastructure. Therefore, we do not recommend you refer the project under this criterion. <i>Will increase the supply of housing, address housing needs, or contribute to a well-functioning urban environment [s22(2)(a)(iii)]</i> The applicant considers that ensuring the seamless provision of aggregate is vital for a resilient and well-functioning city and society. The applicant states that Auckland’s growth depends on reliable, affordable access to aggregate, being essential for housing, commercial development, transport infrastructure and ongoing renewals. Demand for aggregate is projected to rise steadily, and, according to the applicant’s market economics report (Appendix D of the application), under almost all scenarios Auckland’s local supply will fall short, creating a widening gap that will increasingly rely on aggregate imported from other regions. The applicant notes the Government named eight quarry projects on its Fast-track Approvals Act (FTAA) list, including in the Auckland Region. In the scenario where these projects are consented, the applicant still considers that these listed quarry expansion projects are not expected to address Auckland’s current deficit. The applicant considers the approval of the Clevedon Quarry Expansion project would secure access to approximately 150 MT of aggregate in the Auckland market, ensuring supply for up to 50 years, and provide certainty to the infrastructure and development sectors to support Auckland’s long-term growth. The Minister for Resources notes the importance of aggregate production as the building block for our infrastructure and housing needs. The Minister states it is important that quarries be located near demand centres, such as Auckland (our largest demand centre) considering the cost of aggregate doubles after the first 30 kilometres it is transported. The Minister considers that access to long-term sources of aggregate may provide certainty to infrastructure planners, and support New Zealand’s significant infrastructure pipeline, especially in the Auckland Region, as well as the Government’s Going for Growth and Going for Housing Growth strategies. We consider the project will provide long-term supply of aggregate – an essential raw material for construction - which will support construction in the Auckland Region. Therefore, we consider the project will contribute to increasing the supply of housing, addressing housing needs, and contribute to a well-functioning urban environment and we recommend that the project <u>meets the criterion under section 22(2)(a)(iii).</u>

	<i>Will deliver significant economic benefits [s22(2)(a)(iv)]</i> The applicant’s Economic Assessment (Appendix 2) compares the costs of supplying aggregate locally from Clevedon Quarry with sourcing it from the nearest out-of-region alternatives, being Smythes Quarry in Waikato and Maungaturoto Quarry in Northland. These alternatives are used as conservative benchmarks, reflecting the minimum likely cost impacts if local supply cannot meet demand. The analysis in the applicant’s economic assessment indicates that transporting aggregate from more distant sources would substantially increase overall costs, primarily due to greater travel distances. For example, delivering 300,000 tonnes annually from Clevedon costs approximately \$7.6 million per year. In contrast, sourcing the same volume from Smythes Quarry would add \$4.2 million annually, while Maungaturoto Quarry would add \$13.2 million. At the maximum consented production level of 3 MT per year, the estimated cost savings from using Clevedon rather than external sources range from \$38.6 million to \$119.8 million annually. Since transport costs make up the largest portion of total aggregate costs, these increases are likely to be passed on to end users such as councils, developers, businesses, and households, creating broader economic inefficiencies. Emissions costs from transport are estimated at \$1.6 million annually for Clevedon-sourced aggregate, compared with \$3 million from Waikato and \$4.7 million from Northland. This suggests potential annual emissions cost savings of \$1.4 million to \$3.1 million if local supply is maintained. Social costs, particularly those associated with road safety, are significantly lower for Clevedon, estimated at \$365,000 annually versus \$915,000 and \$2.3 million for the Waikato and Northland options, respectively. This translates to avoided social costs of between \$550,000 and \$1.9 million per year. The Minister for Economic Growth considers that the proposal may be assessed as having the potential to deliver significant regional economic benefits. AC considers there to be missing elements from the applicant’s economic analysis and that greater transparency in the calculations provided is needed to improve confidence in the results. We acknowledge the applicant’s assessment that the project may produce cost-savings in the long term for the Auckland region when aggregate from the project site is used rather than out of region sources. However, we note that there are other in-region quarries, including Kings Quarry (Wainui, North Auckland) and Drury Quarry (South Auckland), which also produce greywacke aggregate and would have reduced transport costs compared to the out of region quarries selected in the applicant’s economic assessment. The applicant has not detailed the cost-savings of sourcing aggregate from the project site compared to sourcing from in-region quarries. We note that King’s Quarry Expansion and Drury Quarry Expansion projects were both approved by panels in December 2025. We consider that these and other such in-region quarries may also contribute to Auckland Region’s aggregate supply needs in the long-term and therefore the cost savings from the project become unclear without an assessment that includes in-region quarries. In the absence of an economic assessment that considers cost savings that take into account other relevant in-region quarries, we cannot be confident that the project will deliver significant economic benefits. Therefore, we do not recommend you refer the project under this criterion. <i>Will support development of natural resources, including minerals and petroleum [s22(2)(a)(vi)]</i> The applicant considers that aggregate is an essential resource for development across New Zealand and that the construction of infrastructure relies on the ability to access, extract, process and transport this material efficiently. The applicant considers that, if the project is granted consent, it will secure additional mineral resources to provide for the on-going supply of aggregate to the Auckland market for an estimated 50 years. The applicant considers that the Clevedon Quarry Expansion (the project) represents a strategically important resource for both Auckland and the wider region, particularly given its proximity to future development projects and its significant aggregate reserves. The Minister for Resources states that aggregate is listed as one of New Zealand’s critical minerals due to the high level of economic importance of aggregate to New Zealand, and the regulatory constraints limiting new supply opportunities. We consider that the project will support the development of natural resources – aggregate, and therefore we recommend the project <u>meets the criterion under section 22(2)(a)(vi).</u> <i>Will support climate change mitigation, including the reduction or removal of greenhouse gas emissions [s22(2)(a)(vii)]</i> The applicant states that aggregate is a high-volume, low value product which is expensive to transport. This means that for aggregate extraction to be more sustainable (reducing other indirect effects like emissions and social costs), it should be located proximate to the areas it is required, and closest to the areas with predicted highest demand. The Clevedon Quarry is located in close proximity to areas of projected future growth in South Auckland and through to the Waikato (i.e., Papakura down to Mercer) and East Auckland. The applicant has estimated potential annual emissions cost savings of \$1.4 million to \$3.1 million if local supply is maintained. Whilst a reduction in travel distances would assist with a reduction in emissions, we do not consider that scale of potential reduction achieved by this project will result in a reduction of regional significance. Therefore, we do not recommend you refer the project under this criterion. <i>Is consistent with local or regional planning documents, including spatial strategies [s22(2)(a)(x)]</i> The applicant considers the project is consistent with the Auckland Unitary Plan. We have not received any comments from Auckland Council regarding the consistency of the project with relevant planning documents. Without comments from the Auckland Council, we are unable to confirm if the applicant is consistent with local or regional planning documents. Therefore, we do not recommend you refer the project under this criterion.
Referring the project to the fast-track approvals process [section 22(1)(b)]	<i>Would facilitate the project, including by enabling it to be processed in a more timely and cost-effective way than under normal processes [s22(1)(b)(i)]</i> The applicant considers that the fast-track approvals process would facilitate the project by enabling it to be processed in a more timely and cost-effective way than under normal processes. The applicant notes that infrastructure projects often require a suite of regional and district consents and generally involve more complex environmental matters. As a result, they typically face lengthy and costly approval processes for both applicants and councils. Under a standard consenting pathway, applicants may need to participate in council hearings and then respond to subsequent appeals in the Environment Court. The applicant considers that the fast-track process avoids these inefficiencies by consolidating decision making into a single pathway with strict statutory timeframes.

	We consider referring the project to the fast-track approvals process would facilitate the project, including by enabling it to be processed in a more timely and cost-effective way than under normal processes under section 22(1)(b)(i). <i>Is unlikely to materially affect the efficient operation of the fast-track approvals process [s22(1)(b)(ii)]</i> The applicant considers that referring the project is unlikely to materially affect the efficient operation of the Fast-track approvals process for the following reasons: • relevant experts have been engaged to provide preliminary advice and assess potential adverse effects on the environment, with no specific concerns on the proposal raised • consultation has been undertaken to date and will be ongoing, and feedback from this process will be used to inform and refine mitigation measures proposed as part of the project • Steveson Aggregates Limited has engaged a project team comprising of planners and technical specialists, with appropriate legal support, to progress the substantive application so it can be lodged promptly if the referral application is accepted to ensure the efficient operation of the Fast-track process • the project does not affect any of the Māori related considerations which are required to be considered and addressed. We consider referring the project is unlikely to materially affect the efficient operation of the fast-track approvals process, in line with the criteria for accepting a referral application under section 22(1)(b)(ii), as we consider the project is neither novel in the New Zealand context nor beyond the scope of what a panel would typically assess under the RMA.
Reasons to decline	
Minister <u>must</u> decline [section 21(3)]	<i>The Minister <u>must</u> decline a referral application if:</i> <i>The application may not be accepted under subsection 1 (meets referral criteria)</i> The analysis above concludes that the project meets the section 22 referral criteria, and as such, we do not consider this applies. If you agree, there is no reason to decline the application under this section. <i>The Minister is satisfied the project involves an ineligible activity</i> As detailed above, we do not consider that the project involves an ineligible activity. If you agree, there is no reason to decline the application under this section. <i>The Minister considers that they do not have adequate information to inform the decision under this section</i> We consider you have adequate information to inform your referral decision. If you agree, there is no reason to decline the application under this section. To conclude, we have not identified any reason that you must decline the application under section 21(3).
Minister may decline [section 21(4) and 21(5)(a-h)]	<i>The Minister <u>may</u> decline a referral application for any other reason, whether or not it meets the criteria in section 22.</i> <i>Reasons to decline a referral application under subsection 4 include, without limitation:</i> <i>The project would be inconsistent with a Treaty settlement, Ngā Rohe Moana o Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou Act 2019, Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011, a Mana Whakahono ā Rohe, or a joint management agreement</i> Nothing in the application, the comments received from invited parties, or the section 18 Treaty settlements report indicates the project would be inconsistent with these documents. <i>It would be more appropriate to deal with the matters that would be authorised by the proposed approvals under another Act or Acts</i> We have not identified any matters that would make it more appropriate to deal with the matters that would be authorised by the proposed approvals under another Act or Acts. <i>The project may have significant adverse effects on the environment</i> DOC considers that, due to the scale, nature and location of the proposed project site, the project is likely to have significant adverse effects on ecological values. This includes impacts on local freshwater ecosystems from surface water diversions and groundwater drawdown. The applicant identifies that the project will result in the permanent and irreversible loss of approximately 2.3 km of stream habitat, including disturbance of freshwater fauna and potential direct mortality during works. The project will result in the loss of vegetation and terrestrial habitat, including approximately 6.7 ha of high-value regenerating tree-fern broadleaf forest. Long-tailed bats are known to forage at the site and eDNA has identified the presence of Hochstetter's frogs. Further, native birds and lizards may use the site. DOC states that in pre-lodgment consultation they advised the applicant that the proposal may require Complex Freshwater Fisheries Activity Approval (CFFA), particularly for in-stream works or fish transfers, but it appears the lodged application has not sought any such approvals. DOC considers the fish transfer required for the project to meet the threshold for a CFFA under relevant legislation and notes that without this approval, it will be difficult to fully assess the impacts on freshwater fisheries. DOC also noted that it may be most appropriate for any wildlife effects that are expected to occur more than 10 years in the future, for the applicant to seek WAA outside of the Fast-track Approvals process closer to the time when the impacts are anticipated in order to better assess the likely effects. We consider that the applicant has provided sufficient information with the referral application to indicate that any significant effects on the environment can be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated through design refinement, management plans, offset/mitigation measures, and consent conditions. At the substantive stage, an expert panel would also have the ability to seek further technical advice and impose conditions on any approvals granted to ensure the effective management of potential adverse effects. <i>The applicant(s) has a poor compliance history under a specified Act that relates to any of the proposed approvals</i>

The applicant states they have not been subject to any enforcement proceedings in relation to actions that were directly or indirectly within their control in the past 10 years (as at the date of this application). However, for completeness, the applicant details two abatement notices that were issued to Fulton Hogan in relation to quarries in New Zealand that are now owned and operated by the applicant (Stevenson Aggregates Limited), detailed below:

- On 19 September 2019, an abatement notice was received from Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC) at the Poplar Lane Quarry in Pāpāmoa, Bay of Plenty. This was in relation to exceeding the daily groundwater take. In consultation with BOPRC, it was determined that the only way to resolve this matter was for Stevenson Aggregates Limited to seek a new groundwater consent with an increased daily take allowance. Following consultation with iwi, this application was lodged and a hearing was held on 21 April 2026. No decision has been released yet.
- On 8 September 2017, an abatement notice was received from Auckland Council at Clevedon Quarry, 546 McNicol Road, Clevedon. This was following a slip that occurred on site. The abatement notice sought the stabilisation of the slip area, a revegetation plan, a remedial action plan and maintenance of all diversion bunds along haul roads internal to the site. Remedial works commenced in October 2017 and were mostly completed by May 2018, with the final stage of stabilisation completed in July 2019. Confirmation that these matters were resolved was provided to Auckland Council on 22 July 2019 and the abatement notice was formally cancelled by Auckland Council in October 2019.

We consider that nothing in the application or comments received from invited parties would indicate that the applicant has a poor compliance history under a specified Act.

The project area includes land that the Minister for Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations considers necessary for Treaty settlement purposes

The project area does not include land considered necessary for Treaty settlement purposes.

The project includes an activity that is a prohibited activity under the Resource Management Act 1991

The applicant has not identified any prohibited activities under the RMA.

A substantive application for the project would have one or more competing applications.

AC confirms that the project site is currently not subject to any existing RMA resource consent application that have been lodged with the Council that would be a competing application or applications if a substantive application for the project were lodged. AC also confirms there are not any existing resource consents issued where sections 124C(1)(c) or 165ZI of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) could apply, if the project were to be applied for as a resource consent under the RMA.

In relation to any proposed approval of the kind described in section 42(4)(a) (resource consents), there are one or more existing resource consents of the kind referred to in section 30(3)(a)

The comments received from AC confirm they have not identified any existing resource consents on or adjacent to the site of the kind referred to in section 30(3) of the Act.

Any other matter

We have not identified any other matters or reasons to consider declining the referral application.

We do not recommend you decline the application. We note you retain the discretion to decline a referral application under section 21(4) for any other reason, whether or not the project meets the criteria in section 22.

Appendix 1: Statutory framework summary

0. You are the sole decision maker for referral applications. If you accept a referral application, then the whole or part of the project will be referred to the fast-track approvals process.
1. If a Treaty settlement, the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011, the Ngā Rohe Moana o Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou Act 2019, a Mana Whakahono ā Rohe or a joint management agreement provides for consideration of any document or procedural requirements, you must, where relevant:
 - a. give the document the same or equivalent effect through this process as it would have under any specified Act; and
 - b. comply with any applicable procedural requirements.
2. You must decline a referral application if:
 - a. you are satisfied the project does not meet the referral criteria in section 22
 - b. you are satisfied the project involves an ineligible activity (section 5)
 - c. you consider you do not have adequate information to inform your decision.
3. You may decline an application for any other reason, including those set out in section 21(5) and even if the application meets the section 22 referral criteria.
4. You can decline an application before or after inviting comments under section 17(1). However, if comments have been sought and provided within the required time frame, you must consider them, along with the referral application, before deciding to decline the application.
5. If you do not decline a referral application at the initial stage you must copy the application to, and invite written comments from:
 - a. the relevant local authorities
 - b. the Minister for the Environment, the Minister for Māori Crown Relations: Te Arawhiti, and the Minister for Māori Development
 - c. any other relevant portfolio Ministers
 - d. the relevant administering agencies
 - e. the Māori groups identified by the responsible agency
 - f. the owners of Māori land in the project area (if applicable)
 - g. you may provide the application to and invite comments from any other person.
6. You can request further information from an applicant, any relevant local authority or any relevant administering agency at any time before you decide to decline or accept a referral application (see section 20 of the Act).
7. However, if further information has been sought and provided within the required time frame you must consider it, along with the referral application, before deciding to decline the application.