

Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA)

MINUTE 7 OF THE EXPERT PANEL

Resumption of processing
Expert conferencing – ecology and groundwater
Request for information (applicant and Auckland Council)

Drury Quarry Expansion - Sutton Block [FTAA-2503-1037]

21 October 2025

Resumption of processing

[1] The applicant has requested that processing of the application be resumed, following ten working days of suspension. The applicant's request can be viewed on the fast-track website, here: <https://www.fasttrack.govt.nz/projects/drury-quarry-expansion-sutton-block/correspondence>

[2] The Panel confirms that processing will re-commence from (and including) today, Tuesday 21 October 2025.

[3] The Panel's final decision is now due to be provided on **11 December 2025**.

[4] The Panel notes that the applicant has provided an updated set of proposed resource consent conditions, dated 10 October 2025. These are available on the fast-track website, linked here: <https://www.fasttrack.govt.nz/projects/drury-quarry-expansion-sutton-block/substantive-application>

Expert conferencing – ecology and related groundwater experts, 31 October 2025, in person and via Teams

[5] The Panel (Somerville-Frost and Kensington) attended a brief teleconference with the applicant held at short notice on Monday, 20 October 2025. General availability for conferencing on ecology and related groundwater matters, on 31 October 2025, was confirmed for the applicant's experts, and tentatively confirmed for the Auckland Council ecology expert (as Auckland Council was not in attendance).

[6] Given the very tight timeframes the Panel requires expert conferencing to be undertaken as soon as possible, and accordingly provides notice as follows:

- a. Expert conferencing will be held on **Friday 31 October 2025**, in person at the Buddle Findlay offices in central Auckland (HSBC Tower, 188 Quay Street), from 9am to 5pm. Remote attendance will also be available via Microsoft Teams.
- b. A formal notice will issue shortly, once location and timing details are confirmed.
- c. Any party that was invited to comment on the application may have an expert (in ecology or groundwater matters) attend conferencing. Please advise the EPA of proposed attendee's details, along with their qualifications and experience, by 5pm **Friday 24 October** via email at info@fasttrack.govt.nz.
- d. The Panel will attend expert conferencing, so that we may ask questions for clarification directly. The Panel's appointed hydrology expert, Jon Williamson of Williamson Water and Land Advisory, will also attend.
- e. The applicant's legal and / or planning advisers may also attend, in an observer role. Auckland Council may similarly wish to have their legal and / or planning advisers present, but are not required to.
- f. An agenda will be created as the first item of business on the day. The

Panel's core agenda items are set out in Appendix One to this Minute.

- g. The Panel has asked for a lawyer or planner to be made available, from the applicant's team, to record notes of the expert conferencing. This is intended to be a contemporaneous document created on a shared screen as conferencing progresses, and will be based on the agenda.

Request for information #3

[7] The Panel requests from the applicant, under section 67(1)(a)(i) of the FTAA, the information set out in Appendix Two to this minute (items [1] to [9]).

[8] The Panel requests from Auckland Council, under section 67(1)(a)(ii) of the FTAA, the information set out in Appendix Two to this minute (item [1] only).

[9] Ten working days is provided in terms of section 67(3), with the response(s) therefore due by **Wednesday 5 November 2025**.



Catherine Somerville-Frost

Drury Quarry Expansion - Sutton Block Expert Panel Chair

Appendix One
Panel's core agenda items for ecology and
related groundwater expert conferencing

- [1] What is the nature and scope of potential (indirect) ecological effects from de-watering at the Sutton Block?
- [2] In particular, what is the likely extent of drawdown impacts, and what effects might that have on surface water such as wetlands and streams?
- [3] How would these effects be monitored for? In particular:
- a. Which streams might need to be monitored, and which wetlands?
 - b. Is sufficient baseline data available for those resources?
 - c. How often and over what time period would monitoring, and related reporting, be required?
- [4] If there are impacts on surface water features, how would these be addressed?
- [5] If required, how would augmentation be achieved, and what steps would be necessary to make sure augmentation appropriately addressed any adverse effects and did not create further adverse effects?
- [6] What monitoring is required to ensure the SEV enhancement values are achieved?
- [7] How has the potential loss of aquatic extent and loss of aquatic values of ecological features of streams and wetlands been addressed through the effects management package?
- [8] How do the various parts of the effects management package detailed in the application relate to:

- a. ecological mitigation;
- b. biodiversity offsetting; and
- c. ecological compensation

[9] Is a bond required in relation to delivery of ecological outcomes, or to ensure compliance with particular conditions (e.g. relating to remedial or restoration work, or ongoing monitoring of long-term effects).

Appendix Two

Further Information Request #3

Applicant and Auckland Council:

[1] The Panel requests that the applicant and Auckland Council prepare a table setting out any resource consent conditions that are not agreed between them. For each condition that is not agreed, the particular text that each party seeks is to be included, in tracked changes from the applicant's 10 October 2025 version, if possible. Brief reasons / explanations should also be provided.

Applicant:

[2] The response to Auckland Council's economist's comments referred to a model error that resulted in lower lifecycle benefits (\$2.5bn – 5.4bn becomes \$0.9bn – 2.0bn). It is not clear to the Panel which paragraph(s) and / or table(s) of the *Economic Impact Assessment* (authored by m.e consulting and dated 20 February 2025) are required to be amended. Please provide details, in tracked changes if possible (pages to be substituted would be acceptable).

[3] Please provide a copy of the groundwater consent that the Panel understands may have recently had a section 127 application approved (to increase per day and annual limits, and to change bore locations and triggers). This was referenced as WAT60277068-C in the application material.

[4] Would there be a need for a 'link' to that groundwater consent in the groundwater consent currently before the Panel? For example, the recently varied consent would appear to authorise up to 5,750m³ per day and 2.1m m³ per year. Is that *on top of*, or intended to be *part of*, the 19,500m³ per day and 7m m³ per year applied for under this application? The Panel assumes the latter, but seeks clarification.

[5] Please provide copies of R/LUC/2015/2419 and R/REG/2015/2420. The Panel understands that these are earthworks consents already in place for the majority of the

Sutton Block (at least to the previous pit boundary before the shift to provide a greater buffer to the Pa site), covering 315ha and expiring in 2045. Is there a need to address any double-ups or potential inconsistencies between those consents, and the consents that have been applied for? For example, in the event of grant the Panel would not wish to see compliance difficulties / uncertainties arise where different standards or requirements were imposed for the same activity type across the two sets of consents (i.e. those already held, and those that would result from a grant of approvals to this application).

[6] Do the draft archaeological authority conditions included with Heritage New Zealand's section 51 FTAA report match the Word version provided to the Panel and dated 01 October 2025? If there are differences, please provide tracked changes for these, with an explanation of any differences if needed.

[7] In a similar vein, do the conditions for the wildlife approval in the Word version provided to the Panel and dated 01 October 2025 adopt the changes requested in the Department of Conservation's section 51 FTAA report? If not, please provide a WriteCompare / tracked changes version, and an explanation of any differences. Alternatively, please confirm whether the 01 October 2025 conditions are agreed with DOC, by virtue of the 29 September 2025 email chain filed with the applicant's response to comments.

[8] Auckland Council has suggested (and we understand the applicant has agreed) that an additional consenting trigger under rule E11.4.1 (A8) – Earthworks greater than 2,500m² where the land has a slope equal to or greater than 10 degrees – is required for regional land disturbance under the application for land use consent referenced as LUC60449475. In order to assist with capturing this aspect of the proposal, please provide a description of the proposed works which relate to this consent trigger.

[9] The application for land use consent referenced as LUC60449475 includes mention of triggering district land disturbance rules under Chapter E12 of the AUP(OP); however, no specific rules have been highlighted as being relevant. Please confirm whether any rules

under Chapter E12 of the AUP(OP) are triggered and, if so, provide a description of the proposed works which relate to any relevant consent trigger(s).