
MINUTE 8 OF THE EXPERT PANEL

Requests for information from Applicant – Various Technical Disciplines
Kings Quarry Expansion – Stage 2 [FTAA-2502-1018]

(15 October 2025)

[1] The purpose of this Minute is to request further information from the applicant as provided for under section 67 of the Fast Track Approvals Act 2024. The Expert Panel requests that the following information be provided to the EPA by 30 October, except where otherwise stated.

Landscape and visual

[2] The landscape and visual assessment (Helen Mellsop, March 2025) identifies a moderate level of effect from around RVP-3. It is requested that the applicant provide visual simulations from this viewing position. This should include a simulation(s) for a period after the first 15 years. As the Panel recognises preparation of visual simulations can be time-consuming, it requests that any further or updated simulations be provided to the EPA by 6 November.

Groundwater and water management

[3] The information provided on behalf of the Applicant states that the site currently has 13 streams draining from it, and during the operational phases of the quarry multiple water management steps are proposed (e.g. sediment and stormwater ponds). The application documents include proposals to re-vegetate the site post-quarrying, but the Panel has seen no information about proposed water management after the quarrying phase. Given there are several streams draining the site now, and run-off that will require treatment during quarrying, there appears to be a risk of relatively large volumes of uncontrolled water moving through and leaving the site after the quarrying has ceased. The Applicant is

requested to provide information on how this water will be managed after the active quarrying of this area is complete.

Air quality and dust management

[4] The Applicant is requested to provide any information that assists in explaining the spatial extent and shape of the ‘Quarry Buffer Area Overlay’ adjacent to parts of the Site. This Overlay is reproduced in Figure 5-3 of the Air Quality Assessment (Air Matters, 3 March 2025).

[5] The applicant is requested to provide an updated Dust Management Plan providing further detail of the mitigation measures, including the proposed active (real time) monitoring of dust and responses. Please include details of the matters identified in section 6.1.7 of the Air Quality Assessment (‘Dust monitoring’), such as locations for dust monitors, detail of how and when dust monitoring will be undertaken, trigger levels, consideration of wind speed/direction, and responses. Please also clarify whether any baseline monitoring is proposed.

Economic effects

[6] The Assessment of Economic Effects (m.e. Consulting, 27 March 2025) has some missing references – refer Contents page, and pages 15, 16, & 17. We invite the Applicant to update that information.

[7] At section 3.3.1 of the Assessment of Economic Effects, there are various estimates of future aggregate demand. In that respect:

- (a) There is a “medium” and “high” growth estimate. Please explain how these have been selected, what factors have been considered, and why there is not a “low” growth estimate?
- (b) What level of confidence does the author have in those projections respectively?
- (c) What data have been considered in reaching these estimates?

[8] At page 21 of the Assessment of Economic Effects, it concludes that the aggregate quarries at Coatesville and Helensville present “no suitable alternative to Kings Quarry in any practical sense”. Please provide further explanation of the reasons for this conclusion.

[9] The Assessment of Economic Effects references the Winstones Flat Top Quarry at 560 Haruru Road (refer Appendix). Please provide a summary of operations at that quarry, and confirm whether and how those operations (and any resulting/associated effects) have been considered in the Assessment of Economic Effects, and in all other relevant assessments prepared on behalf of the Applicant?

Greenhouse Gas emissions

[10] Do assumptions around emissions in the Greenhouse Gas Emission Assessment (Air Matters, 26 March 2025) need to be updated following the change to the offset/compensation sites? If so, please provide an updated assessment.

[11] The Greenhouse Gas Emission Assessment records several assumptions made in forming that assessment. The Panel invites the Applicant to provide further detail as to the following:

- (a) The Greenhouse Gas Emission Assessment states (refer section 3 and Tables 3-1 and 3-2) that assumptions around displacement of other aggregate suppliers include reliance on information provided by Applicant representatives. Is the Applicant able to provide further objective basis for these assumptions?
- (b) The Greenhouse Gas Emission Assessment states (page 12) that “given the large range of assumptions, there is a moderate uncertainty with the derived GHG emissions” and (Section 4 – Conclusion) “A moderate level of uncertainty should be considered given the number of high-level assumptions that have been made”. Is the Applicant able to further quantify this uncertainty?
- (c) The Greenhouse Gas Emission Assessment states (Section 4 –

Conclusion) that “Most notably the impacts of establishing and operating the quarry itself have not been included in this assessment”. Please provide an explanation of why this approach has been taken, and any reasons why this is appropriate, including whether it accords with accepted practice?

Noise and vibration

[12] Please provide a response to the following factual questions arising from the Assessment of Noise Effects (Hegley Acoustic Consultants, February 2025):

- (a) The analysis “has assumed a top of the hole hammer drill will be used” (page 7). Please confirm whether this is the case, and if so, how this is to be secured via conditions? If not, what are the implications?
- (b) The number of truck movements are expected to be 94 trips (188 movements) per day, “an increase from the 50 daily trips (100 movements) of the current consent” (paragraph 7, page 7). Please confirm the timing of this increase; whether this is consistent with other information provided by the Applicant as to the number of truck movements?
- (c) The analysis states (paragraph 11, page 8) that “Throughout quarrying, a water truck will be used to manage the dust”. Please provide further detail of where and how a water truck will be used, particularly in quarrying operations.
- (d) The analysis makes statements around the operating hours for the quarry (refer pages 8-9), including that “Quarry operational hours will be from 5am – 7pm Monday to Saturday”, and that “While 1 – 3 above do not provide any detail on what could occur at the quarry between its opening at 5.00am and the commencement of quarrying at 7.00am, they make it clear that, whatever the activity, it is not to be intensive”. Please clarify more clearly the proposed restrictions on operations between 5am – 7am, and how the proposed draft conditions (including condition 67 of the Updated proposed draft

conditions provided on 15 September 2025) will manage this.

[13] At section 4.4 of the Assessment of Noise Effects the modelled scenario is described. Please confirm whether this assessment includes any noise and/or vibration generated in association with the adjacent 'Flat Top' quarry located at 560 Haruru Road; and if not, the Applicant's view as to whether those effects should be included?

[14] At section 4.5 of the Assessment of Noise Effects it states that averaging has been excluded from the analysis notwithstanding expressing the view that "averaging would therefore be appropriate". The Panel invites the Applicant to provide further comment as to average noise levels, consistent with the approach suggested in NZS 6802.

[15] Section 4.7 of the Assessment of Noise Effects proposes some mitigations to specifically manage noise and vibration effects at Site 16 (782 Haruru Road). Please confirm how these mitigations are proposed to be captured in conditions. Please also provide a draft copy or outline of the Quarry Noise and Vibration Management Plan (QNVMP) referenced in that section. [The Panel notes here that the proposed draft conditions propose the submission of a Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) to Council for certification. The Panel has some concern that this approach may not provide adequate detail/certainty as to the proposed management of noise and vibration effects.]

[16] Section 5 of the Assessment of Noise Effects states that "The assessment of quarry noise has been undertaken against the noise rules of the AUP (H28.6.2.1) on the basis that compliance confirms that the effects are reasonable. For this reason, an assessment against the current ambient sound level was not considered necessary.". Please provide further explanation for this statement, including whether it is considered relevant that AUP noise provision H28.6.2.1 is a controlled activity noise standard relating to the Special Purpose – Quarry Zone?

[17] Section 6 of the Assessment of Noise Effects briefly addresses effects

associated with blasting. The Panel acknowledges proposed draft conditions 74 and 75 (LUC) relating to noise and blasting; however, would appreciate further detailed information including the anticipated timing and frequency of blasting; and a linking explanation between the noise assessment and the limits in/requirements of the proposed draft conditions.



Chris Simmons
Expert Panel Chair