## 1 Invited parties: Land owners

**Table 1.1: Land owners comment summary and applicant response**

Response prepared by the Applicant and Planners.

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 28/08/25 | Bobbie Win | [redacted] | Support is expressed for proceeding with the proposal as quickly as possible. | 1a | Thank you for your time and support. |
| 2 | 3/09/25 | Rob McGehan | [redacted] | Not in opposition, but suggestions proposed.<br>The applicant provides comments and insights from living near the quarry, summarised below. | 2a | Thank you for your time and suggestions. |
| | | | | **Public amenities**<br>No walking tracks/parks or playgrounds have been built in the area since developments have occurred. In the master plan, the council should have created spaces for the neighbourhood families to ride bikes and walk as it's becoming too dangerous with more trucks and high-density industrial land. A short loop track exists around a manmade lake but no real public spaces. The new Hunua Views subdivision does not have a kids playground, there is nothing in the area and it is linked to the quarry subdivision originally. Would like to see pressure applied by council to create facilities for locals. | 2b | This is a matter for Auckland Council. |
| | | | | **Suggestions for public spaces**<br>• Develop the Macwhinney reserve for walking tracks, and a loop up around the Waihoihoi Stream bordering the quarry; or<br>• Some sort of facility (park/playground or a walking/bike track) around the corner Fitzgerald/Drury Hills Road area where there's planting. | 2c | Rurunui/Macwhinney Reserve is owned by Auckland Council. The corner where Fitzgerald Road meets Drury Hills Road is also outside of the Applicant's Landholdings and primarily owned by Drury South Limited. While the extent of the Waihoihoi Stream referred to by the commenter is unclear, we note that the provision of public amenity outside the Applicant's Landholdings is a matter for Auckland Council.<br>If the commenter is referring to developing public spaces within Applicant Landholdings, we note that would be a health and safety risk due to quarrying activities. |
| | | | | **Blasting**<br>On 16 occasions, direct contact was made with the quarry after earthquake-like shaking in the house. This has only been in the last 5 or so years since the expansion has been in planning, and explorative blasting commenced in that area. Ground movement tests are below RC guidelines, but concerns remain. Feel the new block is getting too close to the existing houses. Not against the expansion, but they may need to adjust the blasting parameters to suit. | 2d | Blasting has always complied and will continue to comply with H28.6.2.2. Vibration and blasting of Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part when measured at or within the notional boundary of any dwelling, or on the dwelling itself (not including the source site).<br>Refer to Blast Vibration and Noise Level Conditions 91 to 93 and Blast Vibration Management Conditions 94 to 96.<br>In each instance, Mr McGehan has contacted the quarry through the Engagement Manager. The Engagement Manager's contact details are available on the Applicant's webpage, and information on how to make contact is also provided to the community through various letter drops and other forms of advertising. Their role is to be a conduit between the quarry and the community, with responsibility for responding to and resolving complaints and queries. |
| | | | | **Existing vegetation**<br>Along the quarry boundary is a large plantation of invasive privet. It self-seeds the area and causes health issues. It should be eradicated in the site extent. | 2e | A Net Gain Delivery Plan: Pest and Weed Control (NGDP:PWC) is provided for in Conditions 50 and 51. The NGDP:PWC will include a plant pest management programme that describes the ongoing maintenance and management of pest plant species, including control methods and ongoing monitoring. This programme is part of the 108 ha of forest enhancement actions proposed across wider Applicant landholdings. The Applicant considers the large area of pest plant that Mr McGehan is |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | referring to is located on the western boundary of the Applicant's wider landholdings and is covered within the mitigation plans. |
| | | | | **Truck traffic**<br>No problem with increased truck traffic if roads are kept clean. Historically, roads have been filthy with dust and aggregate spillages. | 2f | In order to manage dust and movement of aggregate, all practicable measures will be undertaken, as detailed in a new Dust Management Plan (DMP). This DMP draws on the existing knowledge and operational measures in the Drury Quarry DMP and includes a range of measures, such as:<br>• The maintenance of wheel washing facilities at the site exit, utilised by vehicles as required to minimise the tracking of dust-generating material on paved surfaces and public road.<br>• Frequent watering of unsealed surfaces where discharges of dust are likely to arise.<br>• Restricting vehicle speeds around the site.<br>• Maintaining unsealed surfaces of vehicle routes where discharges of dust are likely to arise through grading and rolling to minimise dust, and stabilisation of exits from unsealed surfaces onto sealed roads. |
| **3** | 15/09/25 | Jenny Yu | [redacted] | Jenny Yu raises concerns regarding the proposal, as outlined below. | 3a | Thank you for your time, we have provided responses below. |
| | | | | **Air quality**<br><br>While current regional monitoring suggests that air quality in Drury is generally good, these readings are most unlikely to reflect real conditions immediately next to the quarry.<br>Residents living nearby are chronically exposed to the pollution and small dust particulate matter, which raises concerns about long-term health and wellbeing. It is known that the land is gradually lowering over time. This can increase dust suspension, affect drainage, increase dust and particulate emissions from extraction and transport. This further affects the health and amenity of nearby residents. | 3b | It is noted that the Drury South area, which is closer to [redacted] is undergoing significant change with multiple large-scale developments occurring. Much of this development also results in dust discharge.<br><br>In order to manage dust and movement of aggregate from within the quarry, all practicable measures will continue to be undertaken, as detailed in a new Dust Management Plan (DMP). This DMP draws on the existing knowledge and operational measures in the Drury Quarry DMP and includes a range of measures, such as:<br>• Daily monitoring of weather forecast, and plan work scheduled and dust management responses accordingly.<br>• Continuous dust monitoring with telemetry at a number of locations around the Sutton Block and Drury pits.<br>• The maintenance of wheel washing facilities at the site exit, utilised by vehicles as required to minimise the tracking of dust-generating material on paved surfaces and public road.<br>• Frequent watering of unsealed surfaces where discharges of dust are likely to arise.<br>• Restricting vehicle speeds around the site.<br>• Maintaining unsealed surfaces of vehicle routes where discharges of dust are likely to arise through grading and rolling to minimise dust, and stabilisation of exits from unsealed surfaces onto sealed roads.<br>With dust mitigation measures put in place (refer to Section 6.2.1 and DMP), dust emissions will be minimised to within 50 to 100 m of the source, and therefore there is a low likelihood of effects on any nearby sensitive receptors.<br>Multiple dust monitor locations are proposed to cover both the existing Drury Quarry pit and the proposed Sutton Block (refer to Figure 10 of the Air Quality Assessment (Technical Report K, of the AEE) which shows the location of proposed dust monitors). Condition 27 requires the locations of the dust and Met monitoring stations to be included in the DMP.<br>Regarding potential health effects, section 6.4.2 of the Air Report concludes that the potential for off-site respirable crystalline silica (RCS) effects will be very low. The current consent conditions, which require continuous instrumental dust monitoring, are considered sufficient to manage dust levels overall, including RCS. |
| | | | | **Noise** | 3c | Predicted noise levels will continue to comply with the relevant AUP limits (for all daytime and nighttime works). |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Some residents in the Macwhinney Drive area are currently negatively affected by noise pollution from the quarry. The proposed expansion would exacerbate these issues. | | A range of mitigation measures are proposed to manage and mitigate noise on sensitive receivers, including:<br>• Natural screening (terrain) from the north-western pit edge.<br>• The pit bench design will be designed to ensure natural screening (terrain in form of quarry benches or bund) in the north-western corner. The purpose of this is to block line-of-sight from dwellings in upper Macwhinney Drive from mobile plant on high benches of the pit and act as an active noise barrier.<br>• Restrictions on night-time activities are to be limited to the base of the pit.<br>• Permanent monitoring sites.<br>• Communications Plan.<br>A Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) forms part of the conditions of consent. |
| | | | | **Indigenous vegetation**<br>The removal of indigenous vegetation within the ecological area which could impact native flora and fauna. | 3d | Due to the nature and scale of the Project, and that aggregate extraction can only take place where aggregate is found naturally in situ, some adverse ecological effects are unable to be avoided, remedied or mitigated due to the functional need of aggregate extraction. Therefore, a key component of the project is the extensive ecological off-set package. This package will provide ecological benefits over time through creation of new habitat and enhancement of existing habitat through buffer planting and pest control. The proposed revegetation planting will provide a contiguous tract of forest between Kaarearea Paa SEA_T_5349 and wider SEA_T_5323, significantly improving the extent, quality and connectivity of local indigenous biodiversity and habitats. |
| | | | | **Water**<br>Changes to surface water flows and groundwater levels potentially affecting nearby streams and wetlands. | 3f | Refer to Groundwater and Surface Water assessment (Volume 2, Technical Report L). Drawdowns on surface water are proposed to be mitigated via stream augmentation to maintain existing low-flow conditions, ensuring no change to baseflow or soil moisture south of the stream (see consent conditions 143-167).<br>The proposed dewatering is not expected to cause adverse effects on the hydrology of wetlands (refer to Section 3.3 and 4.7 and Figures 6 and 7 of Groundwater and Surface Water Report (Technical Report L). This is because the wetlands are sustained by shallow and perched groundwater systems that are hydrogeologically separate from the deep, regional greywacke aquifer proposed to be dewatered. The zone of influence relates only to the regional groundwater table in the greywacke. |
| | | | | **Traffic**<br>The increased truck movements, dust, and noise would disrupt daily life and safety. | 3g | The Sutton Block application does not seek any additional truck volumes / or increases in intensity of traffic but instead will extend the duration of quarry-related traffic over a longer period. The application changes the active quarrying area of land, not the intensity of the quarrying activity. The quarried aggregate from the Sutton Block will be processed through the existing Front of House facilities, meaning production remains constrained by current capacity afforded through these facilities.<br><br>All quarry traffic will continue to use Bill Stevenson Drive, which was designed and constructed to serve the full extent, scale and intensity of traffic movements associated with quarrying and ancillary activities at the Drury Quarry site. |
| | | | | **Visual amenity**<br>the scale of the development would also significantly alter the landscape and visual character of the area which negatively affect the market value of nearby properties. | 3h | To understand the effects on visual amenity, a number of representative viewpoints were selected, and the potential visual effects have been assessed (including through the use of Visual Simulations) at different stages of operation as part of the Landscape and Visual Amenity Effects Assessment prepared by Boffa Miskell (Technical Report J, Volume 2) (LVA).<br>A package of planting is proposed to minimise visual effects at strategic locations. This package is provided for in the Landscape and Visual Mitigation and Management Plan (LVMMP) (refer to Condition 34 and 35).<br>Based on the location of [redacted] (between Viewpoint Group 1 and 2 in the LVA), it is expected that they will experience very low or low adverse effects during early stages due to distant pine removal and initial works, then very low effects in later stages as the 15 m wide planting buffer to the west of the proposed Sutton Block pit extent matures and screens views. |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Landscape character**<br>Drury has a unique community character and rural identity, which contributes to local wellbeing. The proposed expansion would adversely affect the sense of community and overall quality of life for residents. | 3i | The existing Drury Quarry has been operating for over 80 years and therefore forms part of the existing community.<br>The majority of the Sutton Block (approximately 78 ha) is located within the SPQZ, which anticipates this activity. Although approximately 30 ha of the proposed quarry falls outside of the SPQZ, and within Rural Zoning (Rural – Mixed Rural Zone and Rural – Rural Production Zone), these zones are influenced by the quarry activities to the south.<br>Accordingly, the proposed activities are consistent with the existing broader landscape. |
| **4** | 18/09/25 | Jones Family Trust (Graeme & Vicki Jones) | [redacted] | We are concerned at the proposed extension coming so close to our property.<br>We are currently experiencing quarry blasts, dust, noise from multiple sources of quarry activity i.e., beeping buzzers throughout the night (which appears to have increased recently). | 4a | Please refer to the following responses above: 2d (Blasting), 3b (Air quality/ dust) and 3c (Noise). |
| | | | | With the extension, what further disruptions to our household should we expect to encounter.<br>Is there any mitigation plans for the current residential property which is on the immediate boundary. | 4b | A suite of management plans is proposed to mitigate any actual or potential effects, including a Blast Management Plan (BlaMP), DMP, CNVMP and LVMMP. |
| **5** | 21/09/25 | Daniela and Elsbeth Huber | [redacted] | Submission as per: Appendix 3 List of land parcels whose owners and occupiers are invited to comment under section 53(2)(h) and (i): [redacted]<br>OPPOSE expansion due to proximity of our property – [redacted] Drury, Auckland. | 5a | Thank you for your time, we have provided responses below. |
| | | | | We currently already have excessive Noise, Dust and Vibration due to the works from the Quarry – this is currently starting very early in the morning and very late in the evening – close to midnight. When they do explosive works we can hear the very loud explosions - our House and Windows shake and vibrate – one such recent occasion was on Thursday 4th September 2025 at approximately 11.15 am.<br>Currently we have great concerns for increased and continuous NOISE, DUST AND VIBRATION<br>Rural/Lifestyle setting ongoing Noise, Dust, Vibration etc so close to the property and currently the Quarry should not operate between 5pm - 6am or in the weekend.<br>Limit operational daily hours and no weekend work in this area to allow for enjoyment of the quiet Rural/Lifestyle zone we live in. | 5b | Please refer to the following responses above: 2d (Blasting), 3b (Air quality/ dust) and 3c (Noise).<br>Specifically, the Applicant notes:<br>• Blasting will continue to comply with H28.6.2.2. Vibration and blasting of Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part when measured at or within the notional boundary of any dwelling, or on the dwelling itself (not including the source site).<br>• Predicted noise levels will continue to comply with the relevant AUP limits (for all daytime and nighttime works). |
| | | | | The Quarry should already be doing the following for the work which is already impacting our quality of life with the ongoing Noise, Dust and Vibration:<br>• Increase density of planting between properties to help with noise and visual appearance.<br>• Twice yearly clean roof / gutters to remove contaminants due to quarry operations, as house is on water tanks.<br>• Upgrade all windows / doors to double glazing to minimise constant noise inside residence due to the close proximity of work being carried out.<br>• Annual check for vibration damage. | 5c | • A package of planting is proposed to minimise visual effects at strategic locations. This package is provided for in LVMMP and includes a 15 m wide planting buffer to the west of the proposed Sutton Block pit (refer to Condition 34 and 35). We also note that the proposal does not encroach into the area of bush on Lot 1 DP 126627, which is adjacent to [redacted] to the southeast. This area is subject to a covenant.<br>• We note that this property is located within the AUP Quarry Buffer Area Overlay, which recognises the influence of quarries beyond the zoning.<br>• As noted in response 5b above, the predicted noise levels for all stages will comply with the permitted AUP standards.<br>• As requested by Auckland Council, all vibration and noise to comply with German Standard DIN 4150-3 1999: referred to in the AUP (refer to Condition 92). Proposed Condition 93 also requires blast vibration and noise levels to be measured according to AS2187.2:2006 (or any amendment |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | thereto). This standard includes limits for ground vibration and air overpressure for maintaining human comfort, along with limits for preventing cosmetic damage to structures. |
| | | | | We completely OPPOSE for the Quarry to come closer to our property by expanding as proposed on the plan.<br>We OPPOSE the Quarry to extend so close to our property due to our rural/lifestyle zoning being compromised.<br>As mentioned above the current tree line has grown tall but foliage is sparse and it will be another 20 years before new trees planted now wound help reduce noise.<br>The Noise, Dust and Vibration will cause both physical and mental harm – Dust in Water Tanks and Lungs and the constant Noise will not allow for quality rest time and the vibrations will cause damage to the property.<br>We have been here for over 25 years; we have a stunning views but already we are not enjoying sitting outside - especially in the Summer due to the constant current noise and dust from the Quarry.<br>There is noise/ vibration measuring equipment that is further down the road but is conveniently placed – low lying and surrounded by dense bush so as to minimize the extent of the actual noise/vibration reading. | 5d | Please refer to the following responses above: 3i (Landscape Character) and 3h/5c (Visual Amenity).<br>Regarding noise monitoring sites, the Applicant notes the following:<br>• Multiple noise monitoring locations are proposed to cover both the existing Drury Quarry pit and the proposed Sutton Block. New noise monitoring locations will be established for Sutton Block (refer to Condition 87).<br>• A map of the location of these monitors will also be provided under section 4.4.1 'Long-term Noise Monitoring' of the draft Quarry Management Plan (QMP).<br>Regarding blast/vibration monitoring sites, we note the following:<br>• Multiple blasting/vibration monitoring locations are proposed to cover both the existing Drury Quarry pit and the proposed Sutton Block. New blast monitoring station(s) locations will be established for Sutton Block (refer to Condition 98). The vibration monitoring equipment located further down the road is put in place prior to a blast, and this was requested by the landowner. |
| | | | | If the Quarry does expand, we will lose the value in our home and future subdivision opportunity. If the Quarry does go ahead with the expansion so close to our property – we expect the Quarry to pay: FULL MARKET VALUE FOR OUR HOME INCLUDING FUTURE SUBDIVISION POTENTIAL. | 5e | The Applicant notes this is a private property matter.<br>The Sutton Block has been earmarked for development for some time as confirmed through the SPQZ zoning under the AUP. As stated in response 5c above, this property is located within the AUP Quarry Buffer Area Overlay, which recognises the influence of quarries beyond the zoning. |
| **6** | 22/09/25 | Dan & Shanthe Gawn | [redacted] | **Position in Summary**<br>We do not support the expansion in principle; however, we acknowledge Auckland's demand for aggregate and accept that an approval may be granted. Our submission therefore focuses on ensuring that any approval is subject to strict, enforceable conditions that avoid, remedy, or mitigate the adverse effects on our property, community, and environment. | 6a | Thank you for your time and suggestions. We have provided responses below. |
| | | | | At the Drury Quarry Neighbours' meeting convened on Wednesday, 16 July 2025, Mr. Kurt Hine, General Manager Aggregates for Stevenson Aggregates Limited ("SAL"), advised that SAL wished to be regarded as "a good neighbour." When questioned regarding the anticipated return on investment ("ROI") of the proposed expansion, Mr. Hine responded that, even if he were aware of such information, he would not disclose it. This exchange is not recorded in the official minutes of that meeting.<br>It is submitted that SAL stands to obtain substantial financial benefit from the proposed expansion. While it is not objectionable for a commercial entity to pursue legitimate profit, the use of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2020 ("FTAA") in lieu of a standard Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA") process heightens the obligation upon applicants to demonstrate good faith engagement with affected parties and to ensure that | 6b | The Applicant notes that this comment is referring to the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020, but we are seeking consent under Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA). The purpose under section 3 of the FTAA is "to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure and development projects with significant regional or national benefits".<br>Although the purpose of the FTAA 2024 is different to that of the Fast-track Consenting Act 2020, the applicant has proposed a suite of environmental management plans to avoid, mitigate, remedy and offset adverse effects on the environment. These environmental management plans, along with relevant monitoring and reporting form part of the proposed consent conditions.<br>In order to satisfy the requirements of section 29(1)(a) of the FTAA, the Applicant has undertaken consultation with the following parties as listed in section 11 of the FTAA:<br>• Relevant local authorities;<br>• Any relevant iwi authorities, hapū, and Treaty settlement entities, including—iwi authorities and groups that represent hapū that are parties to relevant Mana Whakahono ā Rohe or joint management agreements.<br>• The relevant administering agencies. |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | adverse effects are properly identified, avoided, remedied, or mitigated.<br>Section 3 of the FTAA makes clear that the purpose of the legislation is to "urgently promote employment growth and support the recovery of New Zealand's economy from the impacts of COVID-19 while continuing to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources." Furthermore, under sections 16 and 17, expert consenting panels must have regard to "any actual and potential effects on the environment" and "measures to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects." Section 24 further empowers panels to impose conditions to ensure that adverse effects are appropriately managed.<br>In this context, SAL's statements that it seeks to be "a good neighbour" must be measured against these statutory requirements. To advance a project that delivers significant shareholder returns while permitting adverse effects on neighbouring landowners would be inconsistent with the purpose of the FTAA and contrary to the principles of sustainable management embedded in the statute.<br>Accordingly, it is submitted that the decision-making panel should scrutinise SAL's claims and require enforceable conditions, pursuant to s24 FTAA, to ensure that adverse effects on neighbouring landowners are avoided, remedied, or mitigated. Without such conditions, SAL cannot reasonably be regarded as conducting itself in a manner consistent with its stated position of being "a good neighbour." Refer<br>Our following comments therefore focus on avoiding, mitigating, and monitoring effects on our property at [redacted] and the surrounding environment, and on ensuring conditions are specific, measurable, and enforceable. | | The Applicant has also undertaken consultation and engagement with the local community and neighbouring properties regarding the Sutton Block Project.<br>Consultation began in 2021 with a community open day in early 2022. A webpage was set up for the project with information and a number of frequently asked questions (FAQs). Mail drops inviting the community to discuss the project with the Stevenson have been ongoing. As set out in section 5 of the QMP, engagement with stakeholders will continue throughout the consenting, construction, and operation phases.<br>Section 6 of the QMP also outlines the complaints procedure, including measures taken to respond to the complaint (including a record of the response provided to the complainant) or confirmation of no action if deemed appropriate. A dedicated Engagement Manager is employed to manage community queries, feedback, complaints and comments. |
| | | | | **Legal / Process Bases**<br>• [redacted] is located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA). We are obligated and compelled to maintain the bush block in a pristine condition, underscoring the importance of avoiding, mitigating, and monitoring quarry effects on this sensitive environment.<br>• We also acknowledge Te Tiriti o Waitangi and our obligations and privilege to work with tangata whenua and for us personally to act as kaitiaki of this significant area.<br>• Minute 2 sets the Section 53 invitation, recipients, and lodgement details, with comments due on 24 September 2025 to the EPA.<br>• Section 53 comments are not RMA submissions; emphasis is on effects and enforceable mitigations. Only commenters receive draft conditions (s70), potential hearing invites (s56), and retain limited rights of appeal on a question of law (s99). | 6c | A key component of the project is the extensive ecological package. This package will provide ecological benefits over time through creation of new habitat and enhancement of existing habitat through buffer planting and pest control. This relates specifically to the bush adjacent to the [redacted] boundary.<br>Specifically, the proposed revegetation planting and forest enhancement actions have been designed to connect isolated patches of remanent rock forest, restore degraded habitats and provide a contiguous tract of forest between Kaarearea paa SEA_T_5349 and SEA_T_5323 located to the east and north of the Sutton Block, resulting in a significant improvement in the extent, quality and connectivity of local indigenous biodiversity and habitats. |
| | | | | **Requested Conditions (Specific, Measurable, Enforceable)**<br>**1) Visual effects (amenity & outlook)**<br>**1.1** Construct an earth bund and/or engineered acoustic/visual barrier along the nearest quarry boundary prior to any new | 6d | As stated in response 3h above, a package of planting is proposed to minimise visual effects at strategic locations. This package is provided for in the LVMMP. Notably, the LVMMP must include: |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | extraction in Sutton Block stages visible from Sonja/Macwhinney/Peach Hill.<br>**1.2** Set minimum heights and continuity to achieve full ground-level screening of plant/haul roads from our dwelling; include an evergreen native planting plan with survival/replacement obligations and a 12-month establishment window.<br>**1.3** Require pre-stage visual compliance assessments with fixed-point photosimulations (including a viewpoint from [redacted].<br>**1.4** Lighting controls: full cut-off luminaires, no upward light spill, curfews aligned to operating hours, and no high-mast floodlighting oriented toward dwellings. | | • Buffer planting of approximately 15 m wide will be established along the western extent of the Project design following the removal of pine trees (Condition 35c). To achieve prompt visual screening, exotic species are proposed with native species.<br>• To reduce visibility of the quarry from locations along Sonja Drive and to assist with overburden disposal, a bund is proposed in the northern portion of the Site (Condition 35d).<br>• Buffer planting between the northern toe of the bund and the neighbouring Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) must be established following the completion of the bund (Condition 35e).<br>• Buffer planting of indigenous trees must be interplanted near the crest of the newly formed eastern ridge (proximate to the pit edge) (Condition 35f).<br>• Indigenous ecological mitigation planting to the south of the quarry pit east of Kaarearea Paa should incorporate some quick growing indigenous species to provide screening to views from the south and south west (Condition 35g).<br>• The implemented planting shall be monitored and maintained for the duration of the Project (Condition 35h).<br>• It was offered by the Applicant at the 16 July 2025 meeting, that visual simulations of the proposed quarry pit and bund viewed from [redacted] would be provided to Dan and Shanthe Gawn. The Project Landscape Planner visited the site to take photographs and the visual simulations were provided to the Gawns on 21 August 2025.<br>• Lighting will also be minimised as far as practicable to meet the permitted standards of the zone(s) under the AUP (Condition 90). Condition 91c also requires that all permanent exterior lighting must be downward facing, with zero upward tilt, emits zero direct upward light and is not located on the ridgelines (unless there is no practicable alternative, or it is required for safety reasons). This is also provided for in the QMP (Conditions 65-66). |
| | | | | **2) Ecology & native bush (including kiwi)**<br>**2.0** Recognise that the bush block contained within [redacted] lies within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), requiring preservation of its ecological integrity in alignment with Te Tiriti o Waitangi principles of protection and partnership.<br>**2.1** Prepare an Ecological Management Plan (EMP) prior to commencement by a suitably qualified ecologist, in consultation with DOC and relevant iwi. Include baseline surveys, habitat protection and enhancement for indigenous fauna (including but not limited to Kiwi, Kererū, and Moko-pāpā).<br>**2.2** Protect fauna: stage works to avoid key breeding seasons; undertake pre-work surveys and relocate fauna if required; implement predator control within adjacent bush; limit night-time activity near bush edges.<br>**2.3** Maintain mapped vegetated buffers between extraction/haul routes and native bush remnants; any encroachment triggers a panel-approved EMP update. | 6e | Refer to response 6c above.<br>Proposed condition 38 requires that the Ecological Management Plan (EMP), must include a number of sub-plans (Conditions 40 to 52) below:<br>• Lizard Management Plan<br>• Native Avifauna Management Plan<br>• Bat Management Plan<br>• Native Freshwater Fauna Management Plan<br>• Edge Effects Management Plan<br>• Sutton Block Riparian Planting Plan |
| | | | | **3) Noise & vibration (incl. blasting)**<br>**3.1** Require compliance with the more stringent of applicable Auckland Unitary Plan provisions and relevant NZ Standards/Guidelines for environmental noise and quarry blasting/vibration.<br>**3.2** Install independent, permanent noise and vibration monitors at representative locations (including near [redacted]) with continuous logging during operations and blasts.<br>**3.3** Public reporting: monthly dashboard online and quarterly summaries to adjacent owners. | 6f | Noise and Blasting monitoring have been designed and monitored by independent experts.<br>Refer to response 5d (noise and blast/vibration monitoring).<br>The 'trigger level' is the AUP standards for both blasting and noise levels:<br>• Blasting will comply with H28.6.2.2. Vibration and blasting of Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part when measured at or within the notional boundary of any dwelling, or on the dwelling itself (not including the source site).<br>• Predicted noise levels will comply with the relevant AUP limits (for all daytime and nighttime works<br>As requested by Auckland Council, all vibration and noise to comply with German Standard DIN 4150-3 1999: referred to in the AUP (refer to Condition 92). Proposed Condition 93 also requires blast vibration |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **3.4** Define trigger levels and corrective actions (e.g., modify blast charge/sequence, acoustic treatment of plant, haul-route/speed changes).<br>**3.5** Offer independent pre-condition building surveys (photos/video & structural notes) for dwellings within an agreed radius (including ours) prior to blasting; repeat on request after significant blast events. | | and noise levels to be measured according to AS2187.2:2006 (or any amendment thereto). This standard includes limits for ground vibration and air overpressure for maintaining human comfort, along with limits for preventing cosmetic damage to structures, and monitoring results are required to demonstrate compliance.<br>As mentioned above, the consent conditions require independent monitoring against international standards to protect buildings and people. |
| | | | | **4) Air quality (dust/PM)**<br>**4.1** Adopt a Dust Management Plan: water carts/misting; wheel-wash; sealing of internal haul roads near boundaries; stockpile management; wind-triggered shut-down or relocation of dust-generating activities.<br>**4.2** Install PM monitors at sensitive receptors/boundaries most exposed to prevailing winds; publish data and monthly summaries; define exceedance protocols and complaint response timelines. | 6g | Refer to the Applicant's response 3b (Air Quality) above.<br>Regarding wind/met monitoring sites, we note the following:<br>• A Dust Management Plan will be adopted.<br>• Multiple dust monitor locations are proposed to cover both the existing Drury Quarry pit and the proposed Sutton Block (refer to Figure 10 of the Air Quality Assessment Technical Report K which shows the location of proposed dust monitors).<br>• One meteorological (Met) monitoring station is proposed for both sites (refer to Section 2.2 and 5.5.3 of the Air Quality report). This one station is considered sufficient to provide meteorological data for both pits.<br>• Condition 27 has been amended to require the locations of the dust and Met monitoring stations to be include in the DMP. This is also referred to in Conditions 128 and 129, which set out the 'Monitoring and Reporting Conditions' for the dust and Met stations. |
| | | | | **5) Traffic, safety & access**<br>**5.1** Specify approved haul routes that avoid residential streets (especially Sonja Drive) and set heavy-vehicle curfews outside core daytime hours.<br>**5.2** On-site measures: mandatory wheel-wash, load tarping, and sealed exits to prevent track-out; require clean-up within 2 hours of any material deposition on public roads attributable to quarry traffic. | 6h | Refer to the Applicant's response 2f and 3g above. |
| | | | | **6) Hours of operation**<br>**6.1** Limit extraction, processing, and heavy-vehicle movements to daytime weekday hours only; no Saturday, Sunday or public holiday operations; no night-time blasting.<br>**6.2** Any exception requires advance notice to adjacent owners and an updated acoustic/lighting plan. | 6i | • No blasting will occur during night-time hours.<br>• Blasting is expected to take place 2–3 times per week on average.<br>• While the quarry will operate 24/7, all activities will be managed to ensure compliance with AUP noise and lighting standards. |
| | | | | **7) Surface water, stormwater & sediment**<br>**7.1** Implement an Erosion & Sediment Control Plan sized for design storms, designed/signed off by a suitably qualified professional. Use flocculation where needed; no untreated discharge to receiving environments.<br>**7.2** Set turbidity triggers and shut-down protocols during high-risk weather. | 6j | Condition 22 – 23 provides for Specific Erosion and Sediment Control Plans (SESCPs) to set out the measures to be implemented to minimise erosion and sediment discharges beyond the site for the Project.<br>There are also specific conditions set out in Part C of the proposed conditions for the diversion and discharge of stormwater. Refer to Erosion and Sediment Control and Monitoring conditions, which also include provisions for rainfall events (Conditions 77 to 84).<br>Condition 24 and 25 set out requirements for water quality monitoring of the NT-1 stream. This includes reference to monitoring parameters including turbidity and responses in the event of elevated results. |
| | | | | **8) Community liaison, complaints & transparency**<br>**8.1** Establish an Adjacent Landowners Liaison Group meeting quarterly with published minutes.<br>**8.2** Complaints protocol: 24/7 duty phone; acknowledge within 24 hours; investigate within 3 working days; share findings/remedies in writing. | 6k | In response to community feedback received, the Applicant is willing to establish a Community Liaison Group (CLG) made up of representatives of nearby residents to discuss quarry-related matters. A draft condition requiring the establishment of a CLG will be included in the next revised condition set which will be issued on 10 October (subject to any further direction from the Panel).<br>Otherwise, currently, Section 6 of the QMP also outlines the complaints procedure, including measures taken to respond to the complaint (including a record of the response provided to the complainant) or confirmation of no action if deemed appropriate. |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **8.3** Publish quarterly summaries of noise, vibration, dust, traffic counts, and water quality; provide raw data to adjacent owners on request. | | A dedicated Engagement Manager is employed to manage community queries, feedback, complaints and comments.<br>Also refer to Condition 8 'Complains Register'. Notably, a copy of the Complaints Register must be kept up to date and made available to the Council upon request as soon as practicable after the request has been made.<br>A suite of monitoring data requirements is included in the proposed conditions. |
| | | | | **9) Property value protection**<br>**9.1** Undertake independent baseline valuations for dwellings within an agreed radius (including [redacted] prior to expansion works.<br>**9.2** Adopt a Property Value Protection Plan (PVPP): if a sale within a defined window demonstrates a loss attributable to quarry effects (independently assessed), compensate the differential plus reasonable marketing costs.<br>**9.3** Alternative remedy: a good-faith purchase offer at pre-works market value (independently assessed) if ongoing effects are unreasonable despite compliance. | 6l | These are private property matters. Not relevant to this application. |
| | | | | **10) Staging, certification & enforcement**<br>**10.1** Require pre-start certifications (visual bunds/planting established; monitors installed/calibrated; baseline surveys complete) as conditions precedent to each extraction stage.<br>**10.2** Commission independent annual compliance audits reported to the EPA and circulated to adjacent owners.<br>**10.3** Include a periodic review clause (e.g., every 2 years) to tighten controls if monitoring shows unanticipated effects. | 6m | Where relevant, the management plans provide for pre-start provisions. For example, Condition 27(e) – (f) require the DMP to include Procedures for the operation, maintenance, and calibration of the meteorological monitor and ambient dust monitors as required by Condition 128 and 129 respectively.<br>Similarly, under Condition 27(g)(iv), the DMP must include contingency measures to investigate the causes of any exceedances of the dust alert levels and to minimise dust discharges in the event that the investigation identifies on-site dust cause as the cause of an exceedance.<br>Condition 71 requires the Consent Holder to submit an Annual Monitoring Report. This report as detailed in conditions 72-73 must set out and demonstrate how the site has remained compliant with its consents. |
| | | | | **Conclusion**<br>We reiterate our position that we do not support the proposed quarry expansion in principle. However, we acknowledge Auckland's demand for aggregate and accept that the Panel may determine that approval should be granted under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2020.<br>In that event, it is essential that approval be subject to strict, specific, measurable, and enforceable conditions. These conditions must ensure that adverse effects on neighbouring properties, ecological values (including the Significant Ecological Area on our property), and community amenity are avoided, remedied, or mitigated in accordance with sections 16, 17 and 24 of the FTAA.<br>As tangata whenua and kaitiaki of our land at [redacted], we emphasise that our obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi require us to protect and preserve the bush block within our SEA. The Panel must ensure that Stevenson Aggregates Limited's commercial interests do not come at the cost of devaluing neighbouring properties or degrading ecological and cultural values.<br>Accordingly, we request that the Panel incorporate the conditions set out in this submission into any approval, require ongoing monitoring and transparency, and provide us with draft | 6n | It is considered that the proposed suite of environmental management plans required as part of the proposed consent conditions appropriately avoid, mitigate, remedy and offset adverse effects on the environment.<br>The Applicant considers that many of the suggestions by the landowner are appropriately provided for as part of the current proposed conditions and additional conditions are proposed as a result of these suggestions. |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | conditions under section 70, along with an invitation to any hearing. | | |
| **7** | 23/09/25 | Upper Ponga Road residents: Ruth Edgar, Issac Pio, and Sean Stanning | [redacted] | **Introduction**<br>These comments are provided by neighbours of the proposed Drury Quarry Sutton Block expansion who live to the north of the site. We have been residents of the area for up to 25 years and value the character and amenity of our rural environment. We rely on rainwater as our primary drinking water source and there are unique ecological values which may be threatened or lost through the quarry expansion. We are making these comments because we value the ecological integrity of the existing environment and have significant concerns regarding the ecological effects, the potential drawdown of groundwater, and the impacts of noise, vibration and dust on health and water quality. We are concerned that these effects will lead to additional or increased requirements for property maintenance. | 7a | Thank you for your time and suggestions. The Applicant has provided responses below.<br><br>The Applicant notes that [redacted] is subject to a no-complaints covenant (instrument No. 9353472.1) which states the following:<br>• Shall not at any time directly or indirectly make, lodge, be a party to or otherwise support in any way any submission, objection, application, proceedings, or appeal (whether pursuant to the RMA or any other statute or to any statutory amendment or replacement thereof) which has the effect of objecting to, limiting, prohibiting or restricting:<br>o Any Activities or any other uses of the Applicant's land;<br>o Any district or regional planning provisions applying to the Applicant's land relating to the Activities on the Applicant's land or any other uses of the Applicant's land;<br>o Any application by the Applicant for any consent or approval to develop or operate Activities on the Applicant's land or any other uses of the Applicant's land.<br>• Includes an indemnity for any breaches of the no complaints covenant.<br><br>[redacted] was not invited to provide comment. |
| | | | | **Summary of Key Concerns**<br>• Loss of rare species and ecological habitats. (Native Geckos and long tail bats)<br>• Impacts on groundwater levels and hydrology, with possible consequences for wells, wetlands, and streams.<br>• Dust emissions and their effect on rainwater collection systems and water quality.<br>• Adverse effects of new or increased noise and vibration from quarry activities, as well as traffic movements.<br>• Visual change to the outlook and landscape from and around our properties.<br>• Long-term, possibly irreversible ecological degradation.<br>• Insufficient mitigation, monitoring, and enforceable guarantees. | 7b | • Refer to Applicant response to 3d (Indigenous vegetation) and 6e (EMP).<br>• Refer to Applicant response 3f (groundwater and hydrology).<br>• Refer to Applicant response 3b (Air Quality/ Dust).<br>• Refer to Applicant response 2d (Blasting) and 3c (Noise). Specifically,:<br>– Blasting will comply with H28.6.2.2. Vibration and blasting of Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part when measured at or within the notional boundary of any dwelling, or on the dwelling itself (not including the source site).<br>– Predicted noise levels will comply with the relevant AUP limits (for all daytime and nighttime works).<br>• Refer to Applicant response 3g (Traffic).<br>• Refer to Applicant response 3h (Visual amenity).<br>• Refer to Applicant response 6c (Ecological package)<br>• Refer to Applicant response 6k (Monitoring). |
| | | | | **Quarry Operations**<br>We need more information to understand more clearly the following aspects of the quarry expansion and the potential impacts on our properties:<br>• **Hours of operation** – will the quarry operate only during daytime hours, with no night time or early morning activities, especially on weekends, including traffic movements, blasting and processing activities.<br>• **Quarry staging** - What are the approximate dates/years for each quarry stage. What does stage 5 involve? | 7c | Refer to Applicant's response 6i (Hours of operation) above.<br>As with Stage 4, expansion of the pit will be incremental, deepening and widening as resource is extracted, with internal pit roads being constructed as expansion occurs. However, it is during this stage we will predominately see the progressive deepening of the pit to a maximum depth of -60 RL m. During this stage, the temporary Northern Bund will also be removed.<br>Within five years of confirmed closure, the Quarry Management Plan (QMP) will be updated to include closure and rehabilitation plans (refer to Condition 66(g)). |
| | | | | **Ground conditions**<br>We are concerned that expanding the quarry towards our properties may lead to adverse effects on ground stability. For example, properties around the Three Kings Auckland quarry experienced subsidence and cracked foundations due to groundwater drawdown which destabilised the area. What | 7d | Refer to Applicant response 3f (groundwater and hydrology). |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | investigations have been undertaken to ensure a clear understanding of ground conditions and the effects on stability of our properties? | | |
| | | | | **Quarry access**<br>We are concerned about the traffic effects on our properties in relation to heavy vehicle movements, greater traffic volumes and potential noise and safety effects. In particular we would like to understand:<br>• What are the current and future plans for accessing the quarry?<br>• What guarantees are provided that Ponga Road will be kept free of all quarry traffic?<br>• What are the expected vehicle movements over the various phases of the quarry project?<br>• On which roads are these expected to take place? | 7e | Refer to Applicant response 3g; the Sutton Block expansion is not predicted to change the overall scale and intensity of traffic movement by the existing Drury Quarry, given the production capacity is influenced and constrained by the processing equipment and facilities on-site.<br>The vast majority of heavy traffic generated by the Quarry under both the existing and Sutton Block pits would involve truck movement between the Ramarama Interchange roundabout, along Maketu Road and via Bill Stevenson Drive into the main gates of the Drury Quarry. This is a purpose-built quarry entrance, with all quarry front of house activities in this location. |
| | | | | **Ecological Effects**<br>The expansion will directly impact areas of native bush, wetland features, and streams. Independent ecological assessments acknowledge that the effects are rated as high to very high. Of particular concern are the adverse effects on nationally critical species such as long-tailed bats and New Zealand Tree Gecko, which have been identified in the vicinity. The proposal appears to underestimate the risks to rare and threatened species and further investigation is required.<br>The proposed mitigation—replanting small areas and pest control—is inadequate to compensate for the permanent loss of complex habitats. Full ecosystem functionality could take over 100 years to re- establish, which represents an unacceptable generational loss. | 7f | As detailed in the Assessment of Ecological Effects (Technical Report A, Volume 2), Copper skinks ('Regionally Declining') are the only native lizard species confirmed to be present within the site, of the six species originally identified as potentially present. It is possible for additional species to be present, but the poor habitat quality indicates limited capacity to support a diverse and representative assemblage of native lizards (geckos and skinks). As stated in applicant response 6c, a Lizard Management Plan forms part of the EMP and will set out measures to manage effects on any native lizard species that are found as part of the work. (Condition 38).<br>Four bat surveys were undertaken between 2020 and 2024. In 2020, one bat pass was recorded within the immediately surrounding environment on the Drury property but outside the proposed Sutton Block LOQ footprint. No other passes were detected within or adjacent to the Site over the other surveys. While no activity was recorded within the project footprint, long-tailed bats are a very high value species known to be highly mobile. Vegetation within the project area has the potential to support roost habitat. Accordingly, as stated in applicant response 6c, a Bat Management Plan forms part of the EMP (Condition 38).<br>The offset package consists of approximately 57 ha of revegetation and 108 ha of pest and weed control, enhancement of 3,341 m of stream and 4.04 ha of wetland restoration, including the creation of wetland habitat. The offset measures are primarily proposed within the wider SAL landholdings, in the immediate area surrounding the existing Drury pit and Sutton Block. The overall package also includes planting, stream and wetland offset works at an offset site. The proposed revegetation and forest enhancement works are designed to connect isolated remnants of rock forest, restore degraded habitats, and provide a continuous forest tract between Kaarearea Pā SEA_T_5349 and SEA_T_5323 located to the east and north of the Sutton Block. In total, this will create approximately 680 hectares of connected indigenous forest and habitat, significantly improving the extent, quality, and connectivity of local biodiversity.<br>Also refer to Applicant response to 3d (Indigenous vegetation) and the Net Gain Delivery Plans (Conditions 53-53, 55-58, 61-62, and 63-64), which are anticipated to result in an overall Net Gain in ecological values over a period of 30 years. |
| | | | | **Environmental degradation**<br>• Have the surrounding flora, fauna, and water features been accurately quantified?<br>• What monitoring is in place to quantify the effects of the quarry?<br>• What effect is the quarry expected to have on streams and ground water in and around nearby QE2 covenanted areas and other ecological areas? | 7g | The proposal includes a number of ecological reports which not only document existing flora, fauna and water features but also propose methods and work to manage effects on these features and offset where required. Refer to conditions 53, 55-58, 61-62 and 63-64.<br>Monitoring is proposed as part of the consent conditions to cover a number of aspects of the quarry operation. This includes monitoring of noise, dust, blasting, sediment control, ecology offset and planting etc. Refer to conditions 86-87, 91-92, 102, 105-106, 109-112, 118-121. |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Groundwater and Hydrology**<br>The quarry application briefly mentions adverse but unquantified effects on streams and groundwater near the quarry. There is no mention of adverse effects on water (ground, surface, and rainwater) in the wider quarry neighbourhood.<br>The Ponga Rd properties are uphill and downwind from the quarry and are bound to experience the immediate adverse effects of changes to groundwater levels arising from work within the quarry.<br>In addition, as we depend on rainwater collection for drinking water and will be directly downwind, we are deeply concerned about the effect of dust emissions on drinking water, as discussed below.<br>The proposal also lacks sufficient detail on the drawdown of groundwater. Key questions remain unanswered:<br>• What changes in water quality are expected?<br>• How will this be monitored and what are the remedies when problems occur?<br>• How safe will bore and rainwater be (e.g. contaminated bore water or polluted rainwater because of increased silicate particles, fumes, dust, etc).<br>• How deep and extensive will drawdown effects be?<br>• What impacts will this have on neighbouring wells and household water supplies?<br>• How will wetlands, streams, and riparian ecosystems be affected by changes in hydrology?<br>Without robust hydrological modelling and baseline data, the risk to local water systems remains high. | 7h | A comprehensive assessment of the potential effects of the proposed groundwater take and diversion may have on groundwater quality, stream depletion effects, and drawdowns on local bores is included in the Groundwater and Surface Water assessment (Volume 2, Technical Report L). The proposed groundwater take is not expected to result in any changes in water quality. Freshwater monitoring (both quality and quantity) is proposed under consent conditions 143 –167).<br><br>There are 22 farm wells identified in the Greywacke within the maximum zone of influence for the worst-case scenario Stage 4 dewatering stage (refer to Figure 15 attached to Technical Report L, Volume 2). Based on the Auckland Council groundwater database, all bores within the maximum zone of influence (across all dewatering stages, including worse-case scenario dewatering Stage 4) are deeper than the predicted drawdowns and are likely to accommodate the drawdowns without any reduction in yield. However, if nearby farm wells do experience drawdowns as a result of the proposed Sutton Block development, this will be managed through the Groundwater Monitoring Plan required under proposed Consent Condition 29, which requires monitoring of boreholes to the proposed trigger level set out in Schedule A and will specify actions to be implemented to mitigate these effects.<br><br>Refer to the Applicant's response to 3b regarding the potential effects of dust emissions on drinking water and the Applicant's response at 3f regarding effects on streams and wetlands. |
| | | | | **Dust Effects on Drinking water**<br>As stated above, we are neighbours who depend on rainwater collection for drinking water. As we will be directly downwind, we are deeply concerned about dust emissions on our rainwater collection for drinking water. Quarry dust can deposit on roofs, gutters, and storage tanks, contaminating drinking water and increasing the need for costly maintenance and filtration.<br>The current dust monitoring regime (sampling every six days) is inadequate to capture peak events during dry, windy conditions. More frequent, independent monitoring and public reporting are needed. The applicant has not provided clear commitments to compensate or mitigate impacts on private rainwater supplies. | 7i | Refer to Applicant response 3b. |
| | | | | **Health effects**<br>Clearer information is required to understand the short-term and long-term health effects that could arise from the quarry activities e.g. silicosis, respiratory issues from dust. It is essential to understand how such effects will be monitored and mitigated and whether the applicant proposes to pay for regular health monitoring checks for people in the neighbourhood to ensure that there are no developing negative health conditions. | 7j | Refer to Applicant response 3b. |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Visual and light pollution**<br>Additional information is required to understand the visual effects, including landscape changes and lighting at night. It appears that much of the assessment and proposed mitigation is taken from the end of Sonja Road. In particular:<br>• What are the sightlines to the new quarry area from different points along Ponga Road?<br>• Does the hill behind #1598, 1604, 1616, 1679 remain as it is?<br>• How will the lighting be contained exclusively within the quarry site?<br>• What effects will lights have on the night sky or views towards horizon (e.g. the sky towards the horizon above the Glenbrook area and towards the Clevedon area often has an artificial orange- red glow at night). | 7k | Lighting will also be minimised as far as practicable to meet the permitted standards of the zone(s) under the AUP (Condition 90). Condition 91c also requires that all permanent exterior lighting must be downward facing, with zero upward tilt, emits zero direct upward light and is not located on the ridgelines (unless there is no practicable alternative, or it is required for safety reasons). This is also provided for in the QMP (Conditions 65-66). |
| | | | | **Noise pollution**<br>We are very concerned about potential increases to noise levels affecting the enjoyment of our rural properties. Greater explanation is required in relation to:<br>• Have current noise levels been quantified at sites along Ponga Road and around the new quarry area?<br>• Exactly what are the noise levels expected at different times of the day, the week, and the year (i.e. busy seasons/low seasons, etc).<br>• What is the expected change in noise levels, especially downwind, compared to current levels?<br>• Will there be blasting or sudden loud noises?<br>• What is the noise management, notification, and monitoring plan?<br>• What are the remedies when noise levels increase above agreed levels (financial penalties, site shut down, etc). | 7l | Refer to Applicant response 3c (Noise). Refer to 5d for associated monitoring. |
| | | | | **Vibration**<br>We are concerned about the effect of vibration on our properties from quarry activities, including excavation, blasting and processing. The potential effects may adversely affect ground stability, as well as amenity effects. | 7m | Refer to Applicant response 2d (Blasting/ vibration). Refer to 5d for associated monitoring. |
| | | | | **Air pollution**<br>We need to understand the potential changes and effects on air quality at our properties:<br>• Has current air quality been quantified at sites along Ponga Road and around the new quarry area?<br>• What are the types of particulate matter/dust that will be released into the atmosphere?<br>• What is the expected change in air quality at downwind sites compared to current quality?<br>• What are the remedies when air pollution levels increase above agreed levels (financial penalties, site shut down, etc). | 7n | Refer to Applicant response 3b (Air Quality/ Dust). |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Inadequacy of Mitigation and Offsetting**<br>Proposed offsets (e.g. planting 3 hectares of bush, pest control on 28 hectares) do not match the scale or quality of what will be lost. Offsetting in distant areas does little to preserve local biodiversity and ecological connectivity. Rehabilitation will take decades, if not centuries, to restore functional ecosystems. Expansion of the quarry should not be allowed if adverse effects do not adequately address loss of ecological values. | 7o | Refer to Applicant response at 7f. The offset and compensation plantings are required by the consent conditions to be maintained and monitored and suitably protected so as to ensure they achieve an overall net gain (Condition 55(c)). |
| | | | | **Conditions Requested**<br>We request that if consent is granted then appropriate, robust and enforceable conditions must be imposed. We consider that such conditions should include:<br>• Independent, seasonal ecological surveys for rare and threatened species before works commence.<br>• Exclusion of existing high value ecological areas from the quarry working areas, as an outcome of the pre-commencement surveys and restoration and offset targets, with financial bonds to ensure compliance.<br>• Revegetation and environmental enhancement strategy to be certified and the first stages given effect to before works can proceed for the expansion of the quarry, with effective and enforceable maintenance, replacement and monitoring of such requirements.<br>• Explicit conditions setting limits on hours of operation, noise levels, vibration and light pollution from the quarry.<br>• Exclude Ponga Rd from being used for quarry access and activities other than environmental monitoring.<br>• Quantifiable and independent water system survey (ground, surface, rain) across several wet and dry seasons before any changes in water usage are allowed.<br>• Comprehensive groundwater monitoring throughout the consent period, with safeguards for neighbouring bores and ecosystems.<br>• Frequent, independent dust monitoring, including peak event measurement, with results publicly available.<br>• Compensation to be payable to surrounding properties if dust monitoring identifies dust effects on adjacent sites, including the additional cost of maintenance due to quarry activities (house washing, tank cleaning, water testing, water filtration).<br>• Provision for how compensation will be addressed and funded throughout life of the quarry for remediation of issues caused by the quarry e.g. ground subsidence, degradation of local flora and fauna.<br>• Live environmental effects monitoring along Ponga Rd as below subject to legally and financially enforceable penalties.<br>In addition, conditions should be imposed on the eventual rehabilitation and reinstatement of the quarry working areas progressively as working areas are completed. | 7p | • Independent ecological surveys were undertaken by Bioresearches as part of the Assessment of Ecological Effects (Technical Report A, Volume 2).<br>It is considered that the proposed suite of environmental management plans required as part of the proposed consent conditions appropriately avoid, mitigate, remedy and offset adverse effects on the environment.<br>The suite of consent conditions proposed are robust and address issues raised where appropriate. |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Ongoing Environmental Monitoring**<br>Through conditions, if consent is granted, ongoing live monitoring should be required for:<br>• The quarry application mentions that some live monitoring for dust takes place in the quarry and its immediate vicinity.<br>• 1598, 1604, 1616, 1679 are all directly downwind from the quarry but no monitoring has been done at these properties.<br>• Monitoring stations with enforceable thresholds should be installed for these properties so that the quarry's effects on its neighbours can be genuinely measured and acted upon when thresholds are breached. | 7q | Refer to Applicant response 3b (Air Quality/ Dust). While these properties are downwind of the quarry site, they are outside the identified area where there is a higher risk of dust effects if no mitigation was in place (refer to Figure 9.1 of the AEE). It is also notex that they are all located beyond 600 m, which reduces the risk of potential dust effects greatly according to PDP Air Quality report. |
| | | | | **Conclusions**<br>Given the scale of ecological loss, risks to rare species, uncertainty around environmental (noise, lighting, visual, vibration and traffic effects) and groundwater impacts, and significant potential harm to our drinking water supplies, we oppose the proposal in its current form.<br>As a minimum, far more robust conditions, monitoring, and protections are required before any expansion should be considered.<br>We request that panel applies the precautionary principle: where there is risk of serious or irreversible harm, the project should not proceed without robust, independently verified evidence that effects can be safely avoided or fully mitigated. | 7r | The technical information used to inform this application is undertaken by independent specialists. |
| **8** | 24/09/25 | Steve Kelly | [redacted] | **Introduction**<br>My submission outlines my significant concerns regarding the effects on property value, roof-collected drinking water, dust, and noise, and requests conditions are imposed to address these issues. | 8a | Thank you for your time and suggestions. Responses are provided below. |
| | | | | **Effects on Property Value**<br>The proposed quarry operations are expected to operate for 50 years; this includes deep excavation works and round-the-clock activity. These changes will further increase the perception of ongoing industrial disturbance in what is otherwise a rural-residential setting. This will result in a potential loss of amenity through noise, dust, and visual impacts, and lead to market stigma, which depresses the resale value of our property even with mitigation.<br>**Relief conditions sought:** An amenity package for adjoining properties (further screening planting, maintenance of existing and future screening planting, annual exterior cleaning allowance, acoustic mitigation options, and financial support for property improvements to offset negative market effects). | 8b | Refer to Applicant response 5e (Property value) and 3h/5c (Visual Amenity). |
| | | | | **Roof Water Collection (Drinking Supply)**<br>At [redacted] all our household water comes from rainwater tanks. Dust deposition from pit development and quarrying creates a direct risk to safe drinking water through increased sediment, and contaminants entering the tanks, | 8c | Refer to Applicant response 3b. |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | requiring greater reliance on maintenance, which is an ongoing cost to me.<br>**Relief conditions sought:** Supply and ongoing maintenance of first-flush diverters, water filters, and sediment cartridges; annual tank inspection, cleaning, and water quality testing; an incident response process. For example, if dust fallout coincides with rainfall, the quarry operator funds tank dumps and refills as well as roof and tank clean. | | |
| | | | | **Dust Effects**<br>My property lies well within 1 km of the proposed quarry edge, meaning it is vulnerable to the effects of dust carried by prevailing winds. The Applicants material suggests that dust is "internalised within 50–100 m," but based on our current experience living near the existing quarry and Drury South development I find this to be unrealistic for fine particulates and not supported by actual events.<br>My concern is that dust will accumulate on roofs, vehicles, windows, and outdoor spaces, diminishing amenity and requiring more frequent cleaning. Dust may degrade our indoor and outdoor air quality and may create health effects for myself and my family.<br>**Relief conditions sought:** Quarry boundary dust monitoring (TMP, $PM_{10}$ and deposited dust) with data made publicly available. Dust trigger levels aligned with the Ministry for the Environment's Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing Dust with any exceedance triggering provision of cleaning support (roof, tank, and exterior surfaces) from the quarry operator. Imposition of strict operational controls in high winds, including cessation of dust- generating activities when defined thresholds are exceeded. | 8d | Refer to Applicant response 3b. |
| | | | | **Noise Effects**<br>Noise from blasting, quarrying, and vehicle movement will be clearly audible at [redacted] especially at night. The Applicant's modelling acknowledges increases of up to +7 dB at neighbouring dwellings which will be noticeable in a quiet rural setting.<br>I have concerns regarding sleep disturbance from night-time quarry activity, including truck movements, plant operations, and reversing alarms. The ongoing background noise will permanently alter the character of the area.<br>**Relief condition sought:** A night-time limit of 45 dB LAeq (15 min) at all neighbouring dwellings, verified by independent monitoring and available to the public. Enforceable restrictions imposed on mobile plant, tipping, and impact noise at night. Ongoing maintenance of the existing screening planting and further progressive planting of screening vegetation. A regime must exist such that when monitoring shows repeated exceedance, there is implementation of additional controls (e.g., acoustic fencing, relocation of plant etc.). | 8e | Refer to Applicant response 2d (Blasting) and 3c (Noise). Specifically:<br>• Blasting will comply with H28.6.2.2. Vibration and blasting of Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part when measured at or within the notional boundary of any dwelling, or on the dwelling itself (not including the source site).<br>• Predicted noise levels will comply with the relevant AUP limits (for all daytime and nighttime works).<br><br>Also refer to Applicant response 2f (Truck traffic). |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Requested Decision**<br>I request that the Panel:<br>1. Decline this consent unless the described effects are avoided, remedied, or mitigated by enforceable conditions.<br>2. Require the applicant to provide specific, monitorable protections for the health, amenity, and water supply of [redacted]<br>3. Require the applicant to establish ongoing liaison with the community to enable transparent monitoring and a direct complaints process. | 8f | It is considered that the proposed suite of environmental management plans required as part of the proposed consent conditions appropriately avoid, mitigate, remedy and offset adverse effects on the environment.<br>A suite of monitoring data requirements is included in the proposed conditions.<br>Refer to Applicant's response 6k (Complaints). |
| | | | | **Personal statement**<br>As the owner of [redacted], I am directly affected by this project. Without the imposition of robust enforceable conditions addressing water quality, dust, and noise, my family's health, property value, and quality of life will be unacceptably compromised for decades. | 8g | Refer to responses above. |
| **9** | 25/09/25 | André Hodgskin | [redacted] | **Introduction**<br>Thank you for the invitation to comment on this Fast-track application under which the quarry will operate 24/7. If approved as currently outlined, the impact on my property as an immediate neighbour with a common boundary will be substantial — and I request specific and detailed interaction between me and the applicant, with appropriate and due consideration by the expert panel.<br>I would like to comment that the process — and tight timeframe — for response is not easy or simple for some of my elderly affected neighbours. To access, read, consider, and respond to the reports prepared by specialist consultants over the years has been challenging to say the least — and I am aware that many have not responded as a result.<br>I've lived on the property for almost 25 years — and negotiated a costly settlement with Stevensons regarding the impact on and future development of my property — which is currently at stake. The adjacent paddock was planted in natives — and recently a new boundary fence fixed along the boundary — however the resident deer and goats still encroach regularly.<br>I will outline some aspects below that in my view have not been sufficiently addressed and require further investigation. Please note that these are examples only and may not cover every document in the application. | 9a | Thank you for your time and comments. We have provided responses below.<br><br>The Applicant has contacted Mr Hodgskin regarding the potential future development of his land and is awaiting a response. The Applicant remains willing to discuss this matter further with the Mr Hodgskin. |
| | | | | **Quarry Management Plan**<br>It was agreed when I settled with Stevenson in 2010 that I be involved (or at least consulted) in QMP. To date I have not been included other than an initial consultation in July 2025 at my request. I would like clarification on how community will be included in management process — alongside monitoring of records — will these be published regularly to keep us informed? How will Auckland Council monitor/administer reporting from FH/Stevenson — or will this only take place if/when complaint is received? | 9b | Refer to Applicant response 6k. |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Blast Vibration Noise Levels**<br>While these are only 'predictions' at this stage — how is accuracy determined — with application likely to be approved based on predictions rather than actual measurements? | 9c | Refer to Applicant response 2d (Blasting/ vibration). Refer to 5d for associated monitoring. |
| | | | | **Air Discharge**<br>A 200m buffer zone has been documented. Please advise how this was determined at 200m — as topography influences determine measurement discharge. The bund planned for NW quarry is insufficient — view has NO effect on properties West. Should be extended towards West. Are there drawings/cross sections available to demonstrate how effective it will be? Has the size/height been determined? Will it be landscaped/planted? Has the effect of wind speed and direction been applied? | 9d | Under the AUP E14 Air quality rule E14.4.1 (A91), *"Mineral extraction activities at a rate exceeding 200 tonnes/hour from any one quarrying process"* is a controlled activity in the Special Purpose Quarry Zone (SPQZ) provided it meets the controlled activity standard E14.6.2.2. This standard requires a distance of at least 200 m between crushing activities and the nearest dwelling. The proposal can and will comply with this 200 m distance.<br>In addition, with dust mitigation measures in place (refer to Section 6.2.1 of the AEE), dust emissions will be minimised to within 50 to 100 m of the source, and therefore there is a low likelihood of effects on any nearby sensitive receptors. Wind direction and speed have been assessed as part of the Air Quality Assessment (Technical Report K, of the AEE). Please also refer to Applicant response 3b regarding Air Quality/ Dust.<br>The Northern Bund is primarily intended to reduce visibility of the quarry from locations along Sonja Drive and to assist with overburden disposal (Condition 35d). Once complete, the bund will be established in grass and exotic tree planting will commence near the boundary of the ONL (at the toe of the bund). In addition, buffer planting approximately 15 m wide will be established along the western extent of the Project design, following the removal of the existing pine trees. Refer to Applicant response 6d for further details on the package of planting proposed to manage visual effects.<br>The pit benches will also be designed to ensure natural screening (terrain in form of quarry benches or bund) in the north-western corner. The purpose of this is to block line-of-sight from dwellings in upper Macwhinney Drive from mobile plant on high benches of the pit and act as an active noise barrier.<br>Visual simulations are provided as part of the Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment (AEE Volume 2, Technical Report J). Based on the location of [redacted], it is expected to be best represented by Viewpoint Group 1 (Macwhinney Drive). It is noted that this group will experience **low** adverse effects during early stages due to pine removal and initial works, then **very low** effects in later stages as mature buffer vegetation screens views. With Drury Hills Road being further set back from the site then Macwhinney Drive, it is expected that any potential visual effects will be reduced in comparison and therefore Viewpoint Group 1 would be a conservative assessment of what may be experienced at Drury Hills Road. |
| | | | | **Haul Road**<br>The new 12m wide haul road to the NW is indicated to follow the ridgeline. Is there a section through this road to indicate the impact on the landscape? Are the bunds along it included in this dimension and will they be planted/landscaped? Will the trucks/machinery be visible from neighbouring properties? Has the impact of these haul vehicles 24 hours a day been included in the MD acoustic report? | 9e | Refer to Applicant response 3h and 6d (Visual Amenity). |
| | | | | **Acoustics**<br>The MD report appears to be inconsistent and incorrect. I questioned this at the panel hearing back in 2010 — and was advised that landscaping has no impact on acoustics. This is again challenged — and has been proven otherwise. I request a specific report on my property at [redacted] that takes into account all aspects mentioned above — noting again that my boundary is common with FH/Stevensons — and the proposed quarry edge is closest to my house than any other residential neighbour. | 9f | Refer to Applicant response 3c (Noise). |

| Response No. | Date | Name | Address | Comment summary | Applicant response reference | Applicant response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **10** | 29/09/25 | Tim Macwhinney | [redacted] | The footprint for quarrying, as shown on the Tonkin+Taylor aerial photograph, shows them as having the least distance of any other property adjoining the Sutton block quarrying footprint.<br>Our family has owned the land on [redacted] for farming for nearly 100 years. In 1989, the land was subdivided for rural residence lots. At this stage, the Sutton block was owned by the Suttons. Stevensons Ltd purchased it in the early 2000s.<br>When we had our subdivision approved by Franklin Council in 1988, we had to provide a 30ha area as a buffer zone between our property and Stevenson quarry properties, which — as shown on the aerial photograph — makes up most of the buffer on the western boundary of the proposed Sutton Block Quarry footprint.<br>At the time of obtaining our rural residential subdivision approval from Franklin Council, Stevensons Quarry Ltd was requesting a 500-meter buffer zone around their quarry. The gap showing between my two properties and the proposed quarry footprint is less than 50m. This is unacceptable, especially considering the setback we had to provide as a buffer zone in 1988.<br>We are aware that Fulton Hogan now owns the Sutton property, but this should not change precedent in terms of setting back quarrying from other rural residential/lifestyle zones.<br>We also note that there is more than enough land for the western boundary of the proposed quarry zone to be moved eastwards, away from the eastern boundaries of properties at [redacted] | 10a | As described in this AEE, the majority of the Sutton Block is zoned SPQZ under the AUP and was also zoned for Quarry use under the previous Papakura District Plan. From a policy perspective; the Sutton Block has been earmarked for quarry use for some time. It is noted that these properties are located within the AUP Quarry Buffer Area Overlay, which recognises the influence of quarries beyond the zoning.<br><br>In terms of required setbacks, we note that under the AUP E14 Air quality rule E14.4.1 (A91), *"Mineral extraction activities at a rate exceeding 200 tonnes/hour from any one quarrying process"* is a controlled activity in the Special Purpose Quarry Zone (SPQZ) provided it meets the controlled activity standard E14.6.2.2. This standard requires a distance of at least 200 m between crushing activities and the nearest dwelling. The proposal can and will comply with this standard, noting there is only one existing dwelling within 200 m ([redacted] and the Applicant is avoiding crushing within 200 m of that dwelling.<br><br>The Applicant will amend proposed Condition 124 to require no crushing activities to occur within 200 m of existing dwelling (i.e., within [redacted] being the nearest sensitive receiver) <u>or any future dwellings</u>.<br>In addition, activities will be managed to ensure compliance with AUP noise and lighting standards. Additionally, with dust mitigation measures in place (refer to Section 6.2.1 of the AEE), dust emissions will be minimised to within 50 to 100 m of the source, and therefore there is a low likelihood of effects on any nearby sensitive receptors.<br>With regard to the proposed location, it is noted that the east of the Sutton Block comprises of a Significant Ecological Area (SEA). In response to concerns raised during consultation with iwiin 2023, SAL has redesigned the Sutton Block extent to move further away from Kaarearea paa. The northern and north-eastern slopes of Kaarearea Paa form part of the proposed extensive native planting and ongoing pest control. This proposed planting connects up to the existing SEA to the east and north of the Sutton Block. |
| **11** | 29/09/25 | Natasha Bridgeman | [redacted] | I don't have an issue with expansion, however my concerns would be over the dust over summer. With regard to the monitoring are these completed whilst the quarry is not working, or when it is raining giving false/good results. Can water trucks be used on roadways over summer to reduce dust? | 11a | Please refer to the Applicant's response at 3b regarding dust management and monitoring. Water trucks are proposed to be used within the internal quarry boundary but not beyond the site. |
| | | | | I commend the quarry for the new native planting next to [redacted] boundary. It looks great and in years to come will act as a buffer. Will they continue with a weed and pest management program? Is there a plan to get rid of existing weeds (gorse and woolly nightshade) along peach hill road? | 11b | The planting referred to was undertaken in relation to consent LUC60425853. SAL will continue to undertake weed and pest control for a minimum of 5 years subject to canopy closure and survival density requirements being met.<br><br>In relation to pockets of gorse and woolly nightshade, please contact SAL's Engagement Manager with the exact location and the removal of this can be arranged. |
| | | | | With regards to the planned solar panel farm, will they also plant the roadside to reduce visual effects to keep in line with the rural area and be a stepping stone for wildlife. | 11c | The solar farm application is currently still being processed by Auckland Council. As part of the application, it is proposed to undertake planting alongside Peach Hill Road, although this cannot be confirmed until processing of the application is complete. If you would like to view those plans, please contact SAL's Engagement Manager.<br>Note, the solar farm does not form part of this application. |