In reply please quote: APP144475 IRIS Document No: 71864 File No: 61 76 85A

15 June 2022

Waikato

Private Bag 3038 Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton 3240, NZ

waikatoregion.govt.nz 0800 800 401

Gleeson Managed Fill Limited C/- Kate Madsen kate@pauaplanning.co.nz

Dear Kate

Request for Further Information under Section 92(1) of the RMA

I refer to the application received on 14 April 2022 (Application No. APP144475) for the following:

Reference Id	Purpose
AUTH144475.01.01	Earthworks and vegetation clearance within high risk erosion areas associated with the overburden, cleanfill and managed fill disposal Areas 2, 3 and 4.
AUTH144475.02.01	To discharge overburden to land at Fill Areas 2, 3 and 4
AUTH144475.03.01	To discharge Cleanfill and Managed Fill to Land at Fill Areas 2, 3 and 4
AUTH144475.04.01	To discharge stormwater and treated water in association with Fill Areas 2, 3 and 4.
AUTH144475.05.01	To divert stormwater and groundwater in association with Fill Areas 2, 3 and 4.
AUTH144475.06.01	To undertake stream diversions, reclamation of streams and associated bed disturbance in association with filling Areas 2, 3 and 4.

I advise that, in accordance with s92(1) of the RMA, I request further information in relation to the application. The reason I request this information is that it is necessary to enable Waikato Regional Council to better understand:

- the nature of the activity, and/or
- the effect(s) it will have on the environment, and or
- the ways in which adverse effects may be mitigated.

The information I request is as follows:

Ecology

The ecological peer review is underway and it is anticipated that further information will be requested on several aspects of the effects assessment including:

1. An assessment of the wetlands downstream of proposed Fill Areas 2 and 4.



- 2. Confirmation of the area of wetland affected, the Stantec report says Wildlands calculated 1869 m², which is more than calculated by Boffa Miskell 1530 m².
- 3. Evidence that what the EMP refers to as Vegetation Type 10/ Management Unit 6/Planting Zone 9 did in fact comprise 70% exotic Mercer grass in 2020 and not grazed native swamp millet.

The above matters form part of the further information request. I will send through any further queries as soon as I receive them.

Managed Fill Discharges

Please provide response to the questions from Dr Jonathan Caldwell as set out under the following subheadings:

EHS's AEE and Waste Acceptance Criteria (page 864)

Please comment on how the results of fate and transport modelling based on an easterly groundwater flow towards Waikato river might be impacted if ponded water in Fill Area 2 is found to be recharged by an obscured spring as potentially indicated by GAIA's geotechnical engineering assessment (page 487). In summary, is there potential for a westerly transport closer to the surface in Fill Area 2 if a spring is found to be recharging this area?

Please address the following issues relating to the proposed waste acceptance criteria in Table 5 (also applies to Table 6 in the Fill Management Plan):

- It is unclear whether it is TCLP or SPLP analysis that applies to tributyltin. The MfE guidance refers to TCLP but the footnote 15 and the column header refers to SPLP? Also, the footnote number linked to the leachate limit for tributyltin should be 15, not 14.
- For fill to be deposited within the top 2 metres of the fill site, some of the waste acceptance criteria has been based on the Class 5-Cleanfill WasteMINZ (2018) Technical Guidelines for Disposal to Land but it isn't clear what the origin of some of the numbers is. Also BaP should be 2 mg/kg, not 0.0054 mg/kg. Toluene and ethylbenzene values are also the wrong way around.

EHS's Surface water Sampling and Analysis Plan (page 245)

Please confirm whether Fill Area 2 will have in addition to a discharge monitoring site located immediately downstream of the proposed wetland treatment system, a receiving environment monitoring site in the unnamed stream. The AEE and the SAP doesn't clearly discuss or justify this.

Please identify all monitoring locations on map, even if just tentative or approximate with specific numbers or letters etc to avoid confusion e.g. DS1 and DS2 which have already been identified for FA3&4 but also DS3(?) could be used for identifying the monitoring location down gradient of Fill Area 2?

Please clarify the proposed frequency of monitoring i.e. why is receiving environment sampling to be undertaken four times per year and surface water discharge monitoring to be undertaken five times per year? Wouldn't it be better to have the same frequency when the number of monitoring rounds are so similar?

Section 3.3.1.3 refers to the sampling and analysis of water from the storage tank. It says that samples will be analysed on-site using a HACH D 3900 spectrophotometer to determine total boron, copper, and zinc to confirm if they meet US EPA CMC criteria. If the results are lower than the US EPA CMC criteria and pH is between 6 to 9 pH units then the water can be

discharged to the stormwater treatment pond. Please confirm whether this analysis should also include lead?

Please clarify whether it is intended that WETT analysis will be used to derive a zinc limit for the discharge from Fill Area 2? If so where is it intended that the sample will be taken from for this analysis?

Please clarify why Table 4-2 does not include a trigger value for zinc, noting that Table 4-2 has been incorrectly labelled as 4-1. It is assumed that the WETT analysis derived value determined for DS1 would be applied at DS2? There also needs to be some further discussion on confirming the WETT analysis derived value after FA3 and FA4 have been in operation i.e. further confirmation of the original WETT analysis.

Please provide further explanation of how the hardness modification will be applied to aluminium and chromium trigger limits. The ANZ methodology identifies that hardness modification can be applied to chromium (III) but doesn't specify its use for chromium (VI) or aluminium?

Please provide an explanation of what value is to be set if background concentrations are found to exceed 80% of the ANZ 95% protection value after hardness correction for aluminium and chromium.

Please confirm how the Level 2 criteria for the underdrain storage tank water for Fill Area 3 is calculated. The SAP indicates that it is based upon an assumed removal efficiency of 50% and 15-fold dilution factor in the SRP. I note that this is on the assumption that the volume of water in the pond is a minimum of 750 m³. While I agree with the proposed Level 1 criteria, I do not agree with the Level 2 criteria for copper, lead and zinc as even assuming a 25-fold dilution (i.e. 750 m³/30 m³) and 50% removal due to alum dosing, the concentrations would still be above the DS1 discharge criteria. It would require a 30-fold dilution (900 m³) to achieve the correct discharge criteria.

Erosion and Sediment Control Plan FA2 and FA4 (Southern Skies Environmental Ltd, dated 7 March 2022) pg 217 & 836 and Phase 1 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan FA3 – Site Establishment and Initial Filling (Southern Skies Environmental Ltd, dated 7 April 2022) pg 851 The ESCP for Fill Area 3 refers to a 75 m³ tank which will be positioned at the discharge point of the wetland to collect discharged water until final discharge limits are established. Please confirm whether this is to allow for the proposed 20 rounds of baseline monitoring at DS2 in order to establish the aluminium and chromium trigger limits which are proposed to be interim to begin with? It is just not clear why this tank would be necessary.

The diagrams in the ESPC for Fill Area 3 are confusing and need more labelling and don't indicate where the treatment wetland will be placed and how it fits in with the SRP and 75 m³ tank and final discharge to ephemeral stream.

Both ESCPs for FA2&4 and FA3 refer to cleaning out of sediment when the SRPs are no more than 20% full. Please clarify whether this is referring to 20% of the pond volume based on sediment depth only i.e. when 20% of the pond volume is made up of sediment? If so it is assumed that there will be an easy way of measuring this?

Huntly Site and Fill Management Plan Rev 07, dated April 2022 pg 188

Footnote at bottom of each page still refers to a 06 Version and 2021 date.

The Waste Acceptance criteria Table 6 will need updating once EHS has amended some of the errors identified in Table 5 of EHS's AEE for the managed fill.

Section 12.3 of the Application (pg 46) refers to Pre-Testing and Pre-Approval of Fill Material and refers to secondary testing of loads upon arrival to site (every 500m³, plus random testing and an annual audit – by samples and by x-ray). However, the Fill Management Plan does not provide any detail on this. Please provide detailed procedures regarding how secondary testing of loads, random testing and annual audit by lab analysis and XRF will be undertaken.

Draft Acid Sulfate Soil Management Plan by EHS, dated June 2022

The plan identifies that runoff from the treatment pad will be piped to a holding pond sized for up to the 50 year storm event. The pond will be dewatered by pumping to the quarry pit when its pH is between 6 and 9. The pH will be monitored and buffered with caustic soda if required to ensure the pH range is achieved. Will there be any additional water quality analysis such as a metal and metalloid suite as additional confirmation?

Air Quality AEE and related management Plans

The Asbestos air monitoring programme, dated April 2020 on page 355 only contains the front page. The subsequent pages are all part of the Dust Management Plan dated February 2020 but with Asbestos air monitoring programme on the header of each page? Please clarify whether an Asbestos air monitoring plan is available and if so please provide a copy of it.

Erosion and Sediment Control

Please provide a response to question from Josh Evans who is undertaking the review of the ESCP.

Considering the catchment size of Fill Area 4 being 5.21 ha being larger than Fill Area 2 which includes further treatment devices such as the Wetland treatment device, why are these methods not being adopted for Fill Area 4?

Groundwater Effects

Please respond to the queries and information requests set out in the review titled '*Gleeson Managed Fill Consent Application Review of Groundwater Effects*', prepared by Tim Baker of SLR, dated 10 June 2022 (WRC doc # 24123816). A copy of the review is attached and the information requests are copied below.

I have the following questions/requests/queries, and recommend that they be put to the Applicant to assist the review of groundwater related effects:

Conceptualisation

• Please provide a validation of the hydraulic properties listed in Table 2 of Appendix 10.1 Waste Acceptance Criteria Report. These are referenced as being from an 'unpublished PDP report' and have no supporting information (as fields sheets, monitoring locations etc). An explanation of who collected the data, under what methodology, when and how they were collected is required. As the only data of this type presented, they are critical to the assessment.

• Please provide a conceptual cross section/s of the site that includes interpreted groundwater levels relative to the quarry, the fill areas, and receptors such as streams/wetlands/river.

• Quarry dewatering – is this permanent and what is the radius of influence. If quarrying stops, will groundwater levels increase and would this affect any of the Fill areas? A cross section may be useful in assessing this risk.

• There is no mention of groundwater strike on BH301 and BH302. Is this because no groundwater was encountered, or because it was not recorded?

Effects on shallow groundwater flow

• There is reference to the potential for springs and seeps at least two of the Fill Areas in the GAIA geotechnical report. Has any further information on the presence of springs been obtained?

• Will activities (such as underdrainage) at any of the Fill Areas result in the loss of stream flow downstream from the Fill Areas? Noting the potential for drainage water from FA3 is to be trucked offsite if quality is not suitable for discharge to the streams. If so, has this been quantified (such as via a simple water balance model)?

Modelling

• There is limited documentation on the conceptual setting (geology/hydrogeology) assumptions adopted for the RBCA modelling. The model requires inputs such as groundwater depth and hydraulic conductivity. Please provide further information on the assumptions made to populate the model inputs.

• Is the RBCA assessment representative of the fate and transport of contaminants from all three proposed Fill Areas?

• Does the RBCA model include the mine tailings contaminants present at FA3?

• Is the Waikato River is the most appropriate receptor given that the pathway to the river would be via the regional groundwater system. The general conceptualisation and geotechnical reporting indicates that the most likely pathway would be via shallow groundwater seepage to localised wetlands/streams/springs, then the Waikato River.

Monitoring

• What monitoring of groundwater is proposed?

Dewatering Fill Area 3

The application includes dewatering Fill Area 3 by pumping subsoil drainage water into a tank. Please advise what your activity status assessment is for this activity and whether another resource consent is needed.

The RMA requires that, within 15 working days of receiving this request, you must respond to the Waikato Regional Council in one of three ways, as follows:

- 1. Provide the information requested; or
- 2. Advise in writing that you agree to provide the information; or
- 3. Advise in writing that you refuse to provide the information.

Should you agree to provide the information, please confirm this in writing. The date for the supply of this information is on or before 15 July 2022. Please advise the Waikato Regional Council of any delay to the provision of this information prior to this date.

Should you refuse to provide the information or not provide it within the period specified, I advise that Waikato Regional Council may proceed with public notification.

I advise that processing of your application will be placed on hold from the date of this letter to the date of receipt of the information requested, or if you refuse to provide the information, the date of receipt of that advice.

Should you require any further information with regard to the above, please contact me on 07 858 6073 or email at emma.cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz. If responding in writing, please quote application number APP144475.

Yours sincerely

9. Un

Emma Cowan Resource Officer - Land Development

Attached: Groundwater Effects Review titled 'Gleeson Managed Fill Consent Application Review of Groundwater Effects', prepared by SLR, dated 10 June 2022 (WRC doc # 24123816).



10 June 2022 720.30022.00100-L01-v0.1-20220610.docx

Waikato Regional Council Private Bag 3038 Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton 3204

Attention: Joshua Evans

Dear Joshua

Gleeson Managed Fill Consent Application Review of Groundwater Effects

Thank you for the opportunity to complete this technical review of groundwater effects in relation to the Gleeson Managed Fill operation for Waikato Regional Council. The following pages contain my review and include some further questions/clarifications I recommend WRC submit to the applicant.

Should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

TIM BAKER Principal Consultant - Water Resources

Overview of Proposal and Activities

The Huntly Quarry (operated by Gleeson Quarries) is a long-established hard rock quarry located at 300 Riverview Road, Rotorawo. The quarry is immediately adjacent to the Waikato River, approximately 3 km south of Huntly town centre.

As the quarry expands, overburden must be removed to expose the hard rock. The existing overburden site has reached capacity and the Gleeson Group (comprising Gleeson & Cox Ltd, Gleeson Managed Fill Ltd and Gleeson Quarries Huntly Ltd) are seeking resource consents to establish new overburden and managed fill sites within three gullies (identified as fill areas (FA) 2, 3 and 4) on property legally described as Pt Lots 9 and 10 DP 1278 and Lot 1 DP 25272 comprised in Certificate of Title SA922/109 (noting that a fourth fill site, 5, has already been consented, WRC 141137).

The managed fill includes the importation and deposition of both clean fill (including overburden material from the adjacent Huntly Quarry) and managed fill. Refer to the appended site layout plan for reference). The total fill volume is estimated to be approximately 2,000,000 m³ comprising Fill Area 2 (717,000 m³), Fill Area 3 (478,500 m³), and Fill Area 4 (800,000 m3).

Managed fill acceptance criteria (Waste Acceptance Criteria, WAC) have been proposed by EHS Support (EHS, 2022). The managed fill may contain asbestos. WAC for managed fills are typically levels aimed at controlling adverse effects¹ acknowledging that concentrations of contaminants in the material be at above concentrations found in soil and groundwater in the environment around the site. This means that there is a potential for effects, and therefore requires assessment and monitoring.

This technical memo provides a review of the assessment of effects of the proposed activities in relation to groundwater and groundwater associated features. Please note that the suitability and derivation of WAC have not been reviewed as part of this assessment.

Key Documents Reviewed

The following documents were reviewed for the development of the technical memo:

- Assessment of Effects. Proposed Overburden & Managed Fill Activity. Riverview Road Huntly. Prepared by Paua Planning, April 2022.
- Assessment of Environmental Effects and Waste Acceptance Criteria. Prepared for Gleeson Managed Fill by EHS Support, April 2022.
- Soil Sampling Assessment Sub Soils Fill Area 3 (FA3). Letter prepared by EHS Support to Kate Marsden, 6 May 2021.
- Huntly Quarry Disposal Sites Geotechnical Assessment. Revision C. Report prepared by GAIA Engineers, 5 November 2019.

Geological Setting

The regional and site geology is described in the Assessment of Effects and Waste Acceptance Criteria Reports produced by EHS Support (EHS, 2022). The geology can be summarised as:

• The regional geology consists of Greywacke (Hakarimata Formation, Newcastle Group and Triassic aged)

¹ Technical Guidelines for Disposal to Land Waste Management Institute New Zealand (WasteMINZ) August 2018



- The quarry lies on the northwest limb of a northeast-trending synform (downward fold). This formation is an indurated siltstone, with fossiliferous sandstone higher up in the formation
- Unconformably overlying this unit are members of the Tertiary aged Te Kuiti Group (laminated medium-fine grained sandstones, siltstones and thin coal beds), including erosional remnants of the Waikato Coal measures
- Recent Taupo Pumice ash overlies some of the Waikato Coal measures, mostly on ridge tops. Much has been removed as part of quarry stripping investigations (i.e. overburden)
- The Newcastle Group Greywacke (i.e., the quarried material) is highly weathered at the surface and less weathered with increasing depth, particularly in stream banks and beds.

Hydrogeological Setting

Limited baseline hydrogeological data are presented by the Applicant, however the general conceptualisation presented by both EHS and GAIA is that there are two groundwater systems beneath the site:

- A deeper groundwater system within the greywacke. Flow direction in this system is regionally toward the Waikato River however it is influenced beneath the site by the dewatering of the quarry.
- Shallow perched groundwater associated with material of lower permeability near surface such as the weathered Waikato Coal Measures, recent colluvium and imported fill. GAIA report the potential for presence of groundwater seeps and springs associated with these perched systems.

EHS report that the deep groundwater levels within the main quarry pit are approximately 19 m RL and approximately 12 m RL adjacent to the Waikato River. Groundwater seepage at the base of the main quarry is pumped into and flows eastward along an unnamed stream and stormwater pond before entering the Waikato River. This pumping has the effect of dewatering the area surrounding the quarry, so it is assumed by SLR that the 19 m RL measurement is of a lowered groundwater table. The source of these groundwater level measurements is listed as being from PDP Consultants and is unpublished data. I recommend this is verified.

For the shallow/perched system, the gullies in which FA2, FA3 and FA4 are proposed have ground surface elevations ranging from 47 to 66 m RL, indicating a separation of the deeper system from the shallow and/or perched system. Two boreholes (BH301, BH302) were drilled at location FA3 for geotechnical purposes to depths of 24 and 25 m respectively, however no piezometers were installed, and water levels were not recorded.

The GAIA geotechnical report provides site some specific information on the shallow systems:

• FA2 is located at the end of a gully that is in the form of a natural amphitheatre. Several small gullies converge at the base of the amphitheatre resulting in an area of ponded water. Just downstream of this pond, a dam has been created. GAIA note that the site was visited during a dry period yet there was a 'moderate' amount of water flowing over the dam, indicating the potential for the ponds to be spring fed.



- FA3 is a gully that was reportedly similar in nature for FA2 (GAIA, 2019) but has been partially filled with mine overburden from nearby historic mining activities. Overburden placed as fill within the gully has created a large flat area that is present within the fill area and extends into the neighbouring property to the north. The 2019 AEE² notes that '*Fill Area 3 was observed to be to be hydraulically conductive with numerous fast seepages observed in the sidewalls of the opened pits. High groundwater levels in the near surface could negatively impact the stability of new material placed above it'. Deep sub-soil drainage is proposed at this site to allow for the reduction of pore pressure and dissipation of perched groundwater from the mining fill when under load (of the managed fill).*
- FA4 is very similar in nature to FA2 with an amphitheatre shaped basin with surface ponding and a farm dam. It is unclear whether the dam is filled from surface run-off or spring fed.

Groundwater quality at the site (including the quarry and proposed fill areas) has not been assessed. This is because apart from seeps from faces within the quarry, groundwater has not been reported in any boreholes (EHS, 2022). It does not appear that any samples from the seeps/springs identified by GAIA have been sampled. Sampling from these seeps/springs would provide a useful baseline.

A summary of groundwater quality from bores surrounding the site is presented in the AEE. While these data are not representative of the site, they assist with providing an indication of localised groundwater quality.

Groundwater Receptors

The Applicant has carried out a bore search of the WRC borehole database and reports that there are no bores within the site or between the managed fill and the Waikato River. This is assumed to be the Applicant's area of focus due to the conclusion that groundwater flow was east toward the Waikato River.

However, I have checked the WRC online GIS³ and found 2 bores in proximate distance to the site:

- Bore 72_10634 is located within the quarry (so just south of the proposed Fill areas) and was drilled in 2019. It is 71.5 m deep. No water level was reported on the database.
- Bore 69_1443 is approximately 650 m north of the property boundary. It is 21 m deep with no other details recorded.

A search of the Waikato Maps Resource Consents maps for water permits indicates that the only consented water takes within 1 km of the site are those associated with the quarry.

Whilst there appears to be little to no use of the groundwater close to the site, the presence of seeps and springs indicates the potential for groundwater dependent ecosystems to be present withing the proposed Fill areas. I have not assessed the ecological value of these systems, or whether there are downgradient features such as wetlands that are dependent on flow from the seeps and springs. This needs to be covered by the ecological review.

Review of Assessment of Effects

I consider that there are two main aspects of this consent application that have the potential to affect groundwater beneath the site. These are:

³ <u>Groundwater (waikatoregion.govt.nz)</u>



² GLEESON QUARRIES HUNTLY LTD. PROPOSED OVERBURDEN & MANAGED FILL DISPOSAL AREAS. Bundled application to Waikato Regional Council for regional Resource Consents associated with undertaking the deposition of overburden and managed fill within identified gullies adjacent to the Gleeson Huntly Quarry, Riverview Road Huntly. Report date: 15 November 2019. Report Version: Rev01

- The creation of subsoil drainage in the ground beneath each of the proposed fill area to ensure a stable platform for the managed fill material. This drainage may lead to the diversion of shallow perched groundwater and/or loss of natural spring flows.
- Seepage of contaminants from the managed fills and mine waste into groundwater (nothing the FAs are not lined) at concentrations that may affect surface water receptors.

With regards to the subsoil drainage, the Application does not appear to assess what, if any, the effect that the placement of fill in the headwaters of each valley will have on stream flows and/or the overall water balance of each catchment (noting the observations of perennial flow into the dams at FA2 and FA4). I recommend that further information is provided on this aspect. Additionally, the presence of springs appears to be uncertain and should be further assessed.

Additionally, if there are perennial spring flows, there is a potential that the springs/dams are providing habitat for freshwater species. I recommend the Council ecologist address this issue if it has not already been addressed.

The potential effects of seepage from the base of the fill area on groundwater and ultimately the Waikato River has been assessed by EHS (2022) using the Risk Based Corrective Action (RBCA) model. This is a fate and transport model that predicts the concentration of a contaminant of concern on an identified receptor. I have some questions largely focused about the general conceptualisation adopted for the modelling. The questions are listed below.

Conclusion / Recommendations

I have the following questions/requests/queries, and recommend that they be put to the Applicant to assist the review of groundwater related effects:

Conceptualisation

- Please provide a validation of the hydraulic properties listed in Table 2 of Appendix 10.1 Waste Acceptance Criteria Report. These are referenced as being from an 'unpublished PDP report' and have no supporting information (as fields sheets, monitoring locations etc). An explanation of who collected the data, under what methodology, when and how they were collected is required. As the only data of this type presented, they are critical to the assessment.
- Please provide a conceptual cross section/s of the site that includes interpreted groundwater levels relative to the quarry, the fill areas, and receptors such as streams/wetlands/river.
- Quarry dewatering is this permanent and what is the radius of influence. If quarrying stops, will groundwater levels increase and would this affect any of the Fill areas? A cross section may be useful in assessing this risk.
- There is no mention of groundwater strike on BH301 and BH302. Is this because no groundwater was encountered, or because it was not recorded?

Effects on shallow groundwater flow

- There is reference to the potential for springs and seeps at least two of the Fill Areas in the GAIA geotechnical report. Has any further information on the presence of springs been obtained?
- Will activities (such as underdrainage) at any of the Fill Areas result in the loss of stream flow downstream from the Fill Areas? Noting the potential for drainage water from FA3 is to be trucked off-site if quality is not suitable for discharge to the streams. If so, has this been quantified (such as via a simple water balance model)?



Modelling

- There is limited documentation on the conceptual setting (geology/hydrogeology) assumptions adopted for the RBCA modelling. The model requires inputs such as groundwater depth and hydraulic conductivity. Please provide further information on the assumptions made to populate the model inputs.
- Is the RBCA assessment representative of the fate and transport of contaminants from all three proposed Fill Areas?
- Does the RBCA model include the mine tailings contaminants present at FA3?
- Is the Waikato River is the most appropriate receptor given that the pathway to the river would be via the regional groundwater system. The general conceptualisation and geotechnical reporting indicates that the most likely pathway would be via shallow groundwater seepage to localised wetlands/streams/springs, then the Waikato River.

Monitoring

• What monitoring of groundwater is proposed?

Checked/ Authorised by: KT





Figure 1: Oblique Image looking North-East at Fill Site 2 Showing Topographic Features



Figure 2: Oblique Image looking South at Fill Site 3 Showing Topographic Features



Figure 3: Oblique Image Looking South at Fill Site 4 Showing Topographic Features



From:	Emma Cowan
То:	"Kate Madsen"
Cc:	Sheryl Roa; Joshua Evans
Subject:	APP144475-Further Information Request s92(1)
Date:	Wednesday, 15 June 2022 1:49:55 PM
Attachments:	720.30022.00100-L01-v0.1-20220610 Final.pdf
	APP144475-Further Info Ltr s92(1)-71864.pdf

Hi Kate

Please find attached the s92(1) further information request and the accompanying groundwater effects peer review.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any queries or would like to discuss.

Kind regards

Emma Cowan | RESOURCE OFFICER - LAND DEVELOPMENT | Land Development, Resource Use WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato P: +6478586073 M: +6421798277 F: facebook.com/waikatoregion Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

This email message and any attached files may contain confidential information, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately and destroy the original message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Waikato Regional Council. Waikato Regional Council makes reasonable efforts to ensure that its email has been scanned and is free of viruses, however can make no warranty that this email or any attachments to it are free from viruses.

Hi Kate

Thank you for this information which has been shared with the relevant technical experts. As indicated in the s92 letter there are additional ecology information requests. Ecologist Karen Denyer has the following questions and requests.

- 1. Could you please provide the photos supplied by Wildlands in the share file, the resolution is poor in the pdf.
- 2. Confirm the location of sediment ponds and whether their construction and operation will affect any wetlands that meet either the definition of natural wetland in the NES or the definition of significant wetland in the WRPS.
- 3. Confirm the extent of wetland that may trigger WRPS significant wetland criterion.
- 4. Provide clear evidence that areas subject to compensation works will be legally protected in perpetuity via a covenant or similar tool.
- 5. Provide more detail on proposed monitoring in the Compensation area for residual pest animals and biodiversity outcomes (including lizards, birds, and the extent and quality of habitat created) to ascertain whether the restoration activities have achieved the stated objectives.

Kind regards

Emma Cowan | RESOURCE OFFICER - LAND DEVELOPMENT | Land Development, Resource Use WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato P: +6478586073 M: +6421798277 F: facebook.com/waikatoregion Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

From: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>

Sent: Monday, 20 June 2022 8:21 am

To: Emma Cowan < Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz>

Cc: Sheryl Roa <Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; Joshua Evans

<Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; 'Julia Masters' <julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz>

Subject: RE: APP144475-Further Information Request s92(1)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Waikato Regional Council. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

HI Emma et al,

Please find attached ecology response and ESC response.

Responses to groundwater, acid soils, WAC/managed fill discharges, SAP, SFMP & planning

matters coming in next few days.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:**

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Sent: Wednesday, 15 June 2022 4:51 PM
To: 'Emma Cowan' <<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>
Cc: 'Sheryl Roa' <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; 'Joshua Evans'
<<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>
Subject: RE: APP144475-Further Information Request s92(1)

Thanks Emma,

Will consult with experts and get back to you asap.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:**

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Emma Cowan < Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz>

Sent: Wednesday, 15 June 2022 1:50 PM
To: 'Kate Madsen' <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Cc: Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Joshua Evans
<<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>
Subject: APP144475-Further Information Request s92(1)

Hi Kate

Please find attached the s92(1) further information request and the accompanying groundwater effects peer review.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any queries or would like to discuss.

Kind regards

Emma Cowan | RESOURCE OFFICER - LAND DEVELOPMENT | Land Development, Resource Use WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato P: <u>+6478586073</u> M: <u>+6421798277</u> F: <u>facebook.com/waikatoregion</u> Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

This email message and any attached files may contain confidential information, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately and destroy the original message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Waikato Regional Council. Waikato Regional Council makes reasonable efforts to ensure that its email has been scanned and is free of viruses, however can make no warranty that this email or any attachments to it are free from viruses.

This email message and any attached files may contain confidential information, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately and destroy the original message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Waikato Regional Council. Waikato Regional Council makes reasonable efforts to ensure that its email has been scanned and is free of viruses, however can make no warranty that this email or any attachments to it are free from viruses.

From:	Jonathan Caldwell
To:	Andrew Rumsby; Kate Madsen
Subject:	RE: APP144475-Further Information Request s92(1) - Managed Fill Discharges
Date:	Tuesday, 28 June 2022 5:09:55 PM

Thanks Andrew

Regards

Jonathan

Jonathan Caldwell | SENIOR SCIENTIST - ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTRY | Geothermal & Air, Land Ecology & Contamination, Science, Policy WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato P: +6478590502 M: +64210332802 F: facebook.com/waikatoregion

Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

From: Andrew Rumsby <andrew.rumsby@ehs-support.com>

Sent: Tuesday, 28 June 2022 4:35 pm

To: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>; Jonathan Caldwell <Jonathan.Caldwell@waikatoregion.govt.nz> **Subject:** RE: APP144475-Further Information Request s92(1) - Managed Fill Discharges

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Waikato Regional Council. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Jonathan (and Kate),

I have provided a my comments in red below.

Feel free to call me if you have any further questions.

Regards

Andrew

From: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 28 June 2022 10:46 AM
To: Andrew Rumsby <andrew.rumsby@ehs-support.com>
Subject: Fwd: APP144475-Further Information Request s92(1) - Managed Fill Discharges

Back at office in 30 mins - will call then. See below

Kate Madsen

Begin forwarded message:

From: Emma Cowan <<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>
Date: 28 June 2022 at 10:23:59 AM NZST
To: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Cc: Joshua Evans <<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>, Sheryl Roa
<<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>
Subject: FW: APP144475-Further Information Request s92(1) - Managed Fill Discharges

Hi Kate

Dr Caldwell has reviewed the managed fill discharges s92 response. Review comments and the updated s92 request is as follows.

Here is my revised s92 requests based on the further updated supporting information that has

been provided in the interim and also in response to Tim Baker's query around the derivation and suitability of some of the Waste acceptance criteria. Changes or additions to my original section 92 requests are identified in my original email to you further below in yellow highlight, relevant responses by the applicant's consultants to some of my requests are identified in red text with my response to their response in blue text.

EHS's AEE and Waste Acceptance Criteria (page 864)

Please comment on how the results of fate and transport modelling based on an easterly groundwater flow towards Waikato river might be impacted if ponded water in Fill Area 2 is found to be recharged by an obscured spring as potentially indicated by GAIA's geotechnical engineering assessment (page 487). In summary, is there potential for a westerly transport closer to the surface in Fill Area 2 if a spring is found to be recharging this area?

With regards to the organic contaminants, modelling of fate and transport has not been undertaken but waste acceptance criteria have been justified by aligning with a number of MfE guidelines and Auckland Unitary Plan acceptance criteria. While I am confident that those guidelines have been based on a formerly robust process at the time, please provide some further discussion of the relevance of those guidelines to setting waste acceptance criteria for organic contaminants at the Gleeson's site with regards to protection of groundwater and surface water, particularly with regards to the PAHs and organochlorine WAC.

PAHs and organochlorine compounds have high log KoC and very low water solubility (to the point of being insoluble in water for DDT and high molecular weight PAHs). Due to these factors EHS Support believe that the waste acceptance criteria will be protective of environmental health.

Please address the following issues relating to the proposed waste acceptance criteria in Table 5 (also applies to Table 6 in the Fill Management Plan):

- It is unclear whether it is TCLP or SPLP analysis that applies to tributyltin. The MfE guidance refers to TCLP but the footnote 15 and the column header refers to SPLP? Also, the footnote number linked to the leachate limit for tributyltin should be 15, not 14.
- For fill to be deposited within the top 2 metres of the fill site, some of the waste acceptance criteria has been based on the Class 5-Cleanfill WasteMINZ (2018) Technical Guidelines for Disposal to Land but it isn't clear what the origin of some of the numbers is. Also BaP should be 2 mg/kg, not 0.0054 mg/kg. Toluene and ethylbenzene values are also the wrong way around.

EHS's Surface water Sampling and Analysis Plan (page 245 of application and also updated SAP dated 14 June 2022) – I have made some minor changes to my requests below in yellow highlight based on that updated SAP

The discussion of the sampling locations for Fill area 2 on Pages 11 to 12 of the updated SAP (June 2022) is somewhat confusing. Figure 2-1 refers to a discharge monitoring point to be downstream of the SRP and Section 2.1 refers to a single downstream receiving surface water sample location for Fill area 2. Please confirm whether Fill Area 2 will have a discharge monitoring as well as a receiving environment monitoring location? The AEE and the SAP doesn't clearly discuss or justify this. Section 2.1 also incorrectly refers to collection of a water sample upstream of Fill Area 3.

Water samples will be collected from the discharge point from Fill area 2 and Fill area 3 /4 as well as environmental sampling points DS3 and DS5 which are located downstream of FA2 and Fill area 3 / 4. The exact location will be determined once the SRP has been built.

Please identify all monitoring locations on map, even if just tentative or approximate with specific numbers or letters etc to avoid confusion e.g. DS1 and DS2 which have already been identified for FA3&4 but also DS3(?) could be used for identifying the monitoring location down gradient of Fill Area 2 for example?

Please clarify the proposed frequency of monitoring i.e. why is receiving environment sampling to be undertaken four times per year and surface water discharge monitoring to be undertaken five

times per year? Wouldn't it be better to have the same frequency when the number of monitoring rounds are so similar?

Section 3.3.1.3 refers to the sampling and analysis of water from the storage tank. It says that samples will be analysed on-site using a HACH D 3900 spectrophotometer to determine total boron, copper, and zinc to confirm if they meet US EPA CMC criteria. If the results are lower than the US EPA CMC criteria and pH is between 6 to 9 pH units then the water can be discharged to the stormwater treatment pond. Please confirm whether this analysis should also include lead?

Please clarify whether it is intended that WETT analysis will be used to derive a zinc limit for the discharge from Fill Area 2? If so where is it intended that the sample will be taken from for this analysis?

Please clarify why Table 4-2 does not include a trigger value for zinc, noting that Table 4-2 has been incorrectly labelled as 4-1? It is assumed that the WETT analysis derived value determined for DS1 would be applied at DS2? There also needs to be some further discussion on confirming the WETT analysis derived value after FA3 and FA4 have been in operation i.e. further confirmation of the original WETT analysis.

Please provide further explanation of how the hardness modification will be applied to aluminium and chromium trigger limits. The ANZ methodology identifies that hardness modification can be applied to chromium (III) but doesn't specify its use for chromium (VI) or aluminium?

Please provide an explanation of what value is to be set if background concentrations are found to exceed 80% of the ANZ 95% protection value after hardness correction for aluminium and chromium.

Please confirm how the Level 2 criteria for the underdrain storage tank water for Fill Area 3 is calculated. The SAP indicates that it is based upon an assumed removal efficiency of 50% and 15-fold dilution factor in the SRP. I note that this is on the assumption that the volume of water in the pond is a minimum of 750 m³. While I agree with the proposed Level 1 criteria, I do not agree with the Level 2 criteria for copper, lead and zinc as even assuming a 25-fold dilution (i.e. 750 m³/30 m³) and 50% removal due to alum dosing, the concentrations would still be above the DS1 discharge criteria. It would require a 30-fold dilution (900 m³) to achieve the correct discharge criteria.

Erosion and Sediment Control Plan FA2 and FA4 (Southern Skies Environmental Ltd, dated 7 March 2022) pg 217 & 836 and Phase 1 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan FA3 – Site Establishment and Initial Filling (Southern Skies Environmental Ltd, dated 7 April 2022) pg 851

- (1) The ESCP for Fill Area 3 refers to a 75 m³ tank which will be positioned at the discharge point of the wetland to collect discharged water until final discharge limits are established. Please confirm whether this is to allow for the proposed 20 rounds of baseline monitoring at DS2 in order to establish the aluminium and chromium trigger limits which are proposed to be interim to begin with? It is just not clear why this tank would be necessary.
- (2) The diagrams in the ESPC for Fill Area 3 are confusing and need more labelling and don't indicate where the treatment wetland will be placed and how it fits in with the SRP and 75 m³ tank and final discharge to ephemeral stream.
- (3) Both ESCPs for FA2&4 and FA3 refer to cleaning out of sediment when the SRPs are no more than 20% full. Please clarify whether this is referring to 20% of the pond volume based on sediment depth only i.e. when 20% of the pond volume is made up of sediment? If so it is assumed that there will be an easy way of measuring this?

Southern Skies has responded:

 The discharge point will be at the outlet of the sediment retention pond. The additional treatment wetland is not required to achieve the anticipated and necessary sediment retention and water quality outcomes and is not proposed. An updated ESCP report and drawings is attached that removes any reference to wetlands. The tank provides additional storage and control for the collection and off-site disposal of water during the baseline monitoring and also in the event that water the sediment retention pond discharge did not meet discharge criteria. However, it is likely that the baseline monitoring will be completed before the site is established.

- 2. An updated ESCP report is attached that removes any reference to wetlands. They are not required to achieve the necessary sediment retention performance. The drawings have been reviewed and labelled as necessary.
- 3. It is in accordance with the WRC guideline page 68 i.e. the latter and measured on the manhole riser.

My response:

OK, this is something that hadn't been well communicated. The SAP provided by EHS still refers to a wetland. The main thing for me is that the discharge criteria at DS1 and the receiving environment criteria at DS2 are complied with. So if the applicant's consultants think that the SRP will be able to achieve this then I'm OK with that but it needs to be clear what is proposed and all of the documentation needs to be aligned to remove reference to a treatment wetland if there isn't going to be one.

And fine with the response regarding sediment removal from pond.

Huntly Site and Fill Management Plan Rev 07, dated April 2022 pg 188

Footnote at bottom of each page still refers to a 06 Version and 2021 date.

(Has been addressed)

The Waste Acceptance criteria Table 6 will need updating once EHS has amended some of the errors identified in Table 5 of EHS's AEE for the managed fill.

(EHS is addressing)

Section 12.3 of the Application (pg 46) refers to Pre-Testing and Pre-Approval of Fill Material and refers to secondary testing of loads upon arrival to site (every 500m³, plus random testing and an annual audit – by samples and by x-ray). However, the Fill Management Plan does not provide any detail on this. Please provide detailed procedures regarding how secondary testing of loads, random testing and annual audit by lab analysis and XRF will be undertaken.

EHS respond:

This request is asking for more detail that is required for a hazardous waste landfill, therefore it is proposed that the exact methodology will be determined later. However, a Certified Environmental Practitioner will undertake the work in accordance with MFE

Contaminated Land Management Guideline No. 5.

My response:

This is the sort of detail we have had in management plans for other managed fill sites. But I agree that it will provide confidence that it will be properly addressed if certified environmental practitioner undertakes work and in accordance with MfE CMLG No. 5.

Draft Acid Sulfate Soil Management Plan by EHS, dated June 2022

The plan identifies that runoff from the treatment pad will be piped to a holding pond sized for up to the 50 year storm event. The pond will be dewatered by pumping to the quarry pit when its pH is between 6 and 9. The pH will be monitored and buffered with caustic soda if required to ensure the pH range is achieved. Will there be any additional water quality analysis such as a metal and metalloid suite as additional confirmation?

EHS Response:

Significant dilution within quarry prior to any discharge from the quarry as well as reduced risk of soil contamination, given that the site will be cleared of soil before significant rainfall events. EHS

has indicated that for additional certainty, on-site testing of the discharge from the pond can be undertaken using a HACH D 3900 spectrophotometer.

My Response:

I agree this should be sufficient and we can consider this as part of the monitoring, especially for metals like zinc that are particularly mobilised by acid sulfate soil environments. **So consider this s92 request addressed.**

Air Quality AEE and related management Plans

The Asbestos air monitoring programme, dated April 2020 on page 355 only contains the front page. The subsequent pages are all part of the Dust Management Plan dated February 2020 but with Asbestos air monitoring programme on the header of each page? Please clarify whether an Asbestos air monitoring plan is available and if so please provide a copy of it.

Paua Planning responded:

The monitoring programme was included in the Asbestos management plan but had originally intended it to be in a separated document. They propose that the monitoring information is extracted into a separate AAMP as a condition of consent.

My Response:

I'm happy with either arrangement. Can stay in the Asbestos management plan if its easier. And happy with detail included on monitoring. **Consider this s92 request addressed.**

Kind regards

Emma Cowan | RESOURCE OFFICER - LAND DEVELOPMENT | Land Development, Resource Use WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera â Rohe o Waikato P: ±6478586073 M: ±6421798277 F: facebook.com/waikatoregion Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

From: Emma Cowan <<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>
Sent: Wednesday, 15 June 2022 1:50 pm
To: 'Kate Madsen' <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Cc: Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Joshua Evans
<<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>
Subject: APP144475-Further Information Request s92(1)

Hi Kate

Please find attached the s92(1) further information request and the accompanying groundwater effects peer review.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any queries or would like to discuss.

Kind regards

Emma Cowan | RESOURCE OFFICER - LAND DEVELOPMENT | Land Development, Resource Use WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato P: ±6478586073 M: ±6421798277 F: facebook.com/waikatoregion Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

 Thanks

Sheryl Roa | PRINCIPAL ADVISOR - CONSENTS | Regional Consents, Resource Use
WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato
P: +6478590731
M: +6421356854
F: facebook.com/waikatoregion
Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

From: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 15 June 2022 4:24 PM
To: Sheryl Roa <Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; Emma Cowan
<Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; Joshua Evans <Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz>
Cc: 'Shawn McLean' <shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz>; 'Mark Pelan'
<mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz>; 'Julia Masters' <julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz>
Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Consultation & WDC s92

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Waikato Regional Council. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

HI Sheryl,

We have provided WDC with a response to all s92(1) matters raised in their correspondence. This includes:

- Updated Traffic Impact Assessment
- Updated Visual Landscape Memo
- Updated Acoustic Assessment (sending today)
- Assessment Table (Rules and Obs/Pols) Decisions Version PWDP
- Copy of draft conditions as proffered to WRC

In terms of parties/persons we have consulted with since 2019, please see attached list.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand

DISCLAIMER:

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>
Sent: Tuesday, 14 June 2022 4:34 PM
To: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>; Emma Cowan
<<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Joshua Evans <<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>
Cc: 'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan'
<<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Julia Masters' <<u>julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz</u>>
Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Acid Sulphate Soils Draft Management Plan

Thanks Kate,

Thanks for the updated documents.

FYI - I understand that WRC has received comments from all of its technical advisors and Emma is currently drafting up a s92(1) request to be sent out tomorrow.

In terms of the notification Josh has drafted up the notification recommendation for WRC and WRC and WDC have communicated on the hearing process. WRC and WDC have agreed that WDC will be the lead agency on this process. It would be useful if you could provide a list (and their contact details) of any parties that the Company has communicated with regarding this application so that the Councils can send notice direct to them. WRC has drafted a list and it would be good to get this finalised.

Once the s92(1) request has been responded to WRC can make the notification decision. Has the Company provided WDC with the information as detailed in their s92(1) request?

Sheryl

Sheryl Roa | PRINCIPAL ADVISOR - CONSENTS | Regional Consents, Resource Use
WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato
P: +6478590731
M: +6421356854
F: facebook.com/waikatoregion
Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

From: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>

Sent: Tuesday, 14 June 2022 4:10 PM

To: Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Emma Cowan

<<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Joshua Evans <<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Cc: 'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan' <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Julia Masters' <<u>julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz</u>>

Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Acid Sulphate Soils Draft Management Plan **Importance:** High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Waikato Regional Council. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

HI Sheryl/Emma/Joshua,

Please find attached draft SAP (with updated figures). In addition the ESCP plans in Appendix 6.2 were the incorrect versions, so updated these to match the ESCP plans in Appendix 9.

Are we getting closer to notifying this application? Please advise.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:**

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>

Sent: Wednesday, 8 June 2022 9:34 AM

To: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>; Emma Cowan
 <<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Joshua Evans <<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>;
 Cc: 'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan'
 <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Julia Masters' <<u>julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz</u>>;
 Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Acid Sulphate Soils Draft Management Plan

Thanks Kate – both have been received by WRC.

Regards Sheryl

Sheryl Roa | PRINCIPAL ADVISOR - CONSENTS | Regional Consents, Resource UseWAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o WaikatoP: +6478590731M: +6421356854F: facebook.com/waikatoregionPrivate Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

From: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>

Sent: Tuesday, 7 June 2022 7:46 AM

To: Emma Cowan <<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Joshua Evans
 <<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>
 Cc: 'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan'
 <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Julia Masters' <<u>julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz</u>>
 Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Acid Sulphate Soils Draft Management Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Waikato Regional Council. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning,

Please find attached draft Acid Sulphate Soils Management Plan as discussed. Conditions to follow later today.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand DISCLAIMER:

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Sent: Friday, 3 June 2022 3:08 PM
To: 'Emma Cowan' <<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; 'Joshua Evans'
<<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; 'Karen Denyer Contact'
<<u>karen.denyer@papawerageological.co.nz</u>>
Cc: 'Sheryl Roa' <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; 'Kaitlin Morrison'
<<u>Kaitlin.Morrison@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; 'Shawn McLean'
<shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz>; 'Mark Pelan' <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>
Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Ecological Review (Site Walkover)

HI Emma and Karen,

Just to advise that the Acid Sulphate Soils Management Plan is currently being reviewed and I have been advised I will have it immediately after the long weekend, so will send it through on Tuesday, along with draft conditions to be proffered.

I note the following in regard to ecological assessments undertaken by Aecom for the original

FA2-4 application:

- 1. It was agreed that ecological matters would be assessed by WRC (to avoid double up with WDC)
- 2. S92 was received 18 December 2019 A Bat Management Plan & Ecological Management Plan (for compensation area) were provided on 6 March 2020
- 3. BMP was accepted as being ok by Fiona Davies (Aecom) on 19th March 2020– see attached letter:

I have reviewed the BMP and am comfortable that adequate measures have been put in place to manage risks to bats and their roosts and to compensate for the loss of potential roost trees. This will be achieved through the implementation of measures within the BMP including a tree removal protocol, replacement of potential roosts through artificial bat roosts and chainsaw hollows, along with the provision of a protected (in perpetuity) bat reserve. It is recommended that conditions of consent include a report to confirm the number of potential roost trees removed and how many artificial roosts and chainsaw hollows were installed along with the protection in perpetuity of the bat reserve (minimum area of 1.5 ha).

- 4. Note this Bat Reserve was accepted as mitigation for habitat loss for all fill areas
- 5. Further information was requested in regard to the EMP, which Jamie MacKay from Wildlands responded to on 2 April 2020
- 6. On 28 April Emma Cowan requested (email attached) the EMP be further updated following the agreement between Jamie and Fiona: Compensation accounting has <u>not</u> been provided by the applicants ecologists which details the ecological values of wetlands lost (this is additional to % indigenous vegetation and should include hydrological, physico-chemical etc functions of the wetland) and the corresponding ecological values/functions at wetland restoration sites (actual and potential) to demonstrate an appropriate compensation package. This is a preferred method to demonstrate no net loss of wetland value has been achieved. Nonetheless, on balance, from information provided by the applicants ecologist I would consider the compensation package of wetland, stream and terrestrial restoration to provide adequate mitigation for the wetland reclamation resulting from the site development. Given the addition of further restoration of areas to the original Ecological Management Plan provided, I would recommend that the Plan is updated to include the full and final restoration package.
- 7. ON 29 April 2020 I sent though an addendum to AEE in regard to betterment under Vison and Strategy doc, as Emma had requested on 28 April. (attached) The EMP was updated and sent through with full and final restoration package.
- 8. No further requests from an ecologist were received, either for the original application for FA's 2-4, nor for the following application for FA3 only.
- 9. Please note the compensation area was accepted as providing both mitigation for potential ecological effects from the managed fill operation, and betterment back to the catchment.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:** This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege.

If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Emma Cowan <<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>
Sent: Monday, 30 May 2022 10:41 AM
To: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>; Joshua Evans
<<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Karen Denyer Contact
<<u>karen.denyer@papawerageological.co.nz</u>>
Cc: Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Kaitlin Morrison
<<u>Kaitlin.Morrison@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; 'Shawn McLean'
<<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan' <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>
Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Ecological Review (Site Walkover)

Hi Kate

Lyndsey resigned from AECOM quite some time ago (early 2020 from memory) and is no longer available to assist with this project.

I have emailed the AECOM ecology peer reviews to Karen. The ecology reviews for Fill Area 2 and 4 were not completed because the activities were withdrawn from the application. The ecology review relating to the wetland in FA3 was somewhat discontinued following the unlawful drainage of that wetland. The new application will require an updated ecology review, no doubt the past work undertaken by AECOM will be taken into account.

Thanks for assisting with the site visit arrangements.

Kind regards

Emma Cowan | RESOURCE OFFICER - LAND DEVELOPMENT | Land Development, Resource Use WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato P: <u>+6478586073</u> M: <u>+6421798277</u> F: <u>facebook.com/waikatoregion</u> Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

From: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Sent: Friday, 27 May 2022 1:36 pm
To: Joshua Evans <<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Karen Denyer Contact
<<u>karen.denyer@papawerageological.co.nz</u>>
Cc: Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Emma Cowan

<<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Kaitlin Morrison <<u>Kaitlin.Morrison@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; 'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan' <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>> **Subject:** RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Ecological Review (Site Walkover)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Waikato Regional Council. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

HI Joshua,

As mentioned to Sheryl, In terms of the ecological assessment, it would be good if Karen Denyer could communicate with Lyndsey Smith of Aecom, who undertook the original ecological assessment on behalf of council – particularly given that nothing has changed in regard to ecological matters – and all queries had been closed out.

Shawn McLean, the quarry manager is on leave currently, I will check with Gleeson to see if Wednesday/Thursday suit for a site visit. Karen – please confirm if you require an ecologist to attend, or if it would be fine to meet with just myself. Thanks.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:**

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Joshua Evans <<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>

Sent: Thursday, 26 May 2022 11:10 AM

To: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>

Cc: Karen Denyer Contact <<u>karen.denyer@papawerageological.co.nz</u>>; Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Emma Cowan <<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Kaitlin Morrison <<u>Kaitlin.Morrison@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>

Subject: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Ecological Review (Site Walkover)

Morning Kate,

WRC have engaged Karen Denyer (cc'd) to undertake the review of the ecological aspects for the Gleeson's Managed Fill application.

As part of the review process, Karen has requested to undertake a walkover of the fill sites next Wednesday or Thursday.

Please let me know if either of the proposed days suit yourself and your experts.

Kind regards,

Joshua Evans | RESOURCE OFFICER - LAND DEVELOPMENT | Land Development, Resource Use WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato P: <u>+6478592860</u> M: <u>+64212208095</u> F: <u>facebook.com/waikatoregion</u> Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

This email message and any attached files may contain confidential information, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately and destroy the original message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Waikato Regional Council. Waikato Regional Council makes reasonable efforts to ensure that its email has been scanned and is free of viruses, however can make no warranty that this email or any attachments to it are free from viruses.

This email message and any attached files may contain confidential information, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately and destroy the original message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Waikato Regional Council. Waikato Regional Council makes reasonable efforts to ensure that its email has been scanned and is free of viruses, however can make no warranty that this email or any attachments to it are free from viruses.

This email message and any attached files may contain confidential information, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately and destroy the original message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Waikato Regional Council. Waikato Regional Council makes reasonable efforts to ensure that its email has been scanned and is free of viruses, however can make no warranty that this email or any attachments to it are free from viruses.

This email message and any attached files may contain confidential information, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If you have received this message in error, please

From:	Sheryl Roa
То:	Kate Madsen; Emma Cowan; Joshua Evans
Cc:	"Shawn McLean"; "Mark Pelan"; "Julia Masters"
Subject:	RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Acid Sulphate Soils Draft Management Plan
Date:	Tuesday, 14 June 2022 4:34:17 PM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thanks Kate,

Thanks for the updated documents.

FYI - I understand that WRC has received comments from all of its technical advisors and Emma is currently drafting up a s92(1) request to be sent out tomorrow.

In terms of the notification Josh has drafted up the notification recommendation for WRC and WRC and WDC have communicated on the hearing process. WRC and WDC have agreed that WDC will be the lead agency on this process. It would be useful if you could provide a list (and their contact details) of any parties that the Company has communicated with regarding this application so that the Councils can send notice direct to them. WRC has drafted a list and it would be good to get this finalised.

Once the s92(1) request has been responded to WRC can make the notification decision. Has the Company provided WDC with the information as detailed in their s92(1) request?

Sheryl

Sheryl Roa | PRINCIPAL ADVISOR - CONSENTS | Regional Consents, Resource Use
WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato
P: +6478590731
M: +6421356854
F: facebook.com/waikatoregion
Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

From: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 14 June 2022 4:10 PM

To: Sheryl Roa <Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; Emma Cowan
<Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; Joshua Evans <Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz>
Cc: 'Shawn McLean' <shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz>; 'Mark Pelan'
<mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz>; 'Julia Masters' <julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz>
Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Acid Sulphate Soils Draft Management Plan
Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Waikato Regional Council. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

HI Sheryl/Emma/Joshua,

Please find attached draft SAP (with updated figures). In addition the ESCP plans in Appendix 6.2 were the incorrect versions, so updated these to match the ESCP plans in Appendix 9.

Are we getting closer to notifying this application? Please advise.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:**

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>

Sent: Wednesday, 8 June 2022 9:34 AM

To: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>; Emma Cowan

<<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Joshua Evans <<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>

Cc: 'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan'

<<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Julia Masters' <<u>julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz</u>>

Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Acid Sulphate Soils Draft Management Plan

Thanks Kate – both have been received by WRC.

Regards Sheryl

Sheryl Roa | PRINCIPAL ADVISOR - CONSENTS | Regional Consents, Resource Use
WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato
P: <u>+6478590731</u>
M: <u>+6421356854</u>
F: <u>facebook.com/waikatoregion</u>
Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

From: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>

Sent: Tuesday, 7 June 2022 7:46 AM

To: Emma Cowan <<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Joshua Evans
 <<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>
 Cc: 'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan'
 <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Julia Masters' <<u>julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz</u>>
 Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Acid Sulphate Soils Draft Management Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Waikato Regional Council. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the

content is safe.

Good morning,

Please find attached draft Acid Sulphate Soils Management Plan as discussed. Conditions to follow later today.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:** This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege.

In se-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>> Sent: Friday, 3 June 2022 3:08 PM To: 'Emma Cowan' <<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; 'Joshua Evans' <<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; 'Karen Denyer Contact' <<u>karen.denyer@papawerageological.co.nz</u>> Cc: 'Sheryl Roa' <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; 'Kaitlin Morrison' <<u>Kaitlin.Morrison@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; 'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan' <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>> Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Ecological Review (Site Walkover)

HI Emma and Karen,

Just to advise that the Acid Sulphate Soils Management Plan is currently being reviewed and I have been advised I will have it immediately after the long weekend, so will send it through on Tuesday, along with draft conditions to be proffered.

I note the following in regard to ecological assessments undertaken by Aecom for the original FA2-4 application:

- 1. It was agreed that ecological matters would be assessed by WRC (to avoid double up with WDC)
- 2. S92 was received 18 December 2019 A Bat Management Plan & Ecological Management Plan (for compensation area) were provided on 6 March 2020
- 3. BMP was accepted as being ok by Fiona Davies (Aecom) on 19th March 2020– see attached letter:

I have reviewed the BMP and am comfortable that adequate measures have been put in place to manage risks to bats and their roosts and to compensate for the loss of potential roost trees. This will be achieved through the implementation of measures within the BMP including a tree removal protocol, replacement of potential roosts through artificial bat roosts and chainsaw hollows, along with the provision of a protected (in perpetuity) bat reserve. It is recommended that conditions of consent include a report to confirm the number of potential roost trees removed and how many artificial roosts and chainsaw hollows were installed along with the protection in perpetuity of the bat reserve (minimum area of 1.5 ha).

- 4. Note this Bat Reserve was accepted as mitigation for habitat loss for all fill areas
- 5. Further information was requested in regard to the EMP, which Jamie MacKay from Wildlands responded to on 2 April 2020
- 6. On 28 April Emma Cowan requested (email attached) the EMP be further updated following the agreement between Jamie and Fiona:

Compensation accounting has <u>not</u> been provided by the applicants ecologists which details the ecological values of wetlands lost (this is additional to % indigenous vegetation and should include hydrological, physico-chemical etc functions of the wetland) and the corresponding ecological values/functions at wetland restoration sites (actual and potential) to demonstrate an appropriate compensation package. This is a preferred method to demonstrate no net loss of wetland value has been achieved. Nonetheless, on balance, from information provided by the applicants ecologist I would consider the compensation package of wetland, stream and terrestrial restoration to provide adequate mitigation for the wetland reclamation resulting from the site development. Given the addition of further restoration of areas to the original Ecological Management Plan provided, I would recommend that the Plan is updated to include the full and final restoration package.

- 7. ON 29 April 2020 I sent though an addendum to AEE in regard to betterment under Vison and Strategy doc, as Emma had requested on 28 April. (attached) The EMP was updated and sent through with full and final restoration package.
- 8. No further requests from an ecologist were received, either for the original application for FA's 2-4, nor for the following application for FA3 only.
- 9. Please note the compensation area was accepted as providing both mitigation for potential ecological effects from the managed fill operation, and betterment back to the catchment.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:** This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege.

If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Emma Cowan <Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 30 May 2022 10:41 AM
To: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>; Joshua Evans
<Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; Karen Denyer Contact
<karen.denyer@papawerageological.co.nz>
Cc: Sheryl Roa <Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; Kaitlin Morrison
<Kaitlin.Morrison@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; 'Shawn McLean'
<shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz>; 'Mark Pelan' <mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz>
Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Ecological Review (Site Walkover)

Hi Kate

Lyndsey resigned from AECOM quite some time ago (early 2020 from memory) and is no longer available to assist with this project.

I have emailed the AECOM ecology peer reviews to Karen. The ecology reviews for Fill Area 2 and 4 were not completed because the activities were withdrawn from the application. The ecology review relating to the wetland in FA3 was somewhat discontinued following the unlawful drainage of that wetland. The new application will require an updated ecology review, no doubt the past work undertaken by AECOM will be taken into account.

Thanks for assisting with the site visit arrangements.

Kind regards

Emma Cowan | RESOURCE OFFICER - LAND DEVELOPMENT | Land Development, Resource Use WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato

P: <u>+6478586073</u>

M: <u>+6421798277</u>

F: facebook.com/waikatoregion

Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

From: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>

Sent: Friday, 27 May 2022 1:36 pm

To: Joshua Evans <<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Karen Denyer Contact

<<u>karen.denyer@papawerageological.co.nz</u>>

Cc: Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Emma Cowan

<<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Kaitlin Morrison

<Kaitlin.Morrison@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; 'Shawn McLean'

<<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan' <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>

Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Ecological Review (Site Walkover)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Waikato Regional Council. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

HI Joshua,

As mentioned to Sheryl, In terms of the ecological assessment, it would be good if Karen Denyer could communicate with Lyndsey Smith of Aecom, who undertook the original ecological assessment on behalf of council – particularly given that nothing has changed in regard to ecological matters – and all queries had been closed out.

Shawn McLean, the quarry manager is on leave currently, I will check with Gleeson to see if Wednesday/Thursday suit for a site visit. Karen – please confirm if you require an ecologist to attend, or if it would be fine to meet with just myself. Thanks.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:**

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Joshua Evans < Joshua. Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz>

Sent: Thursday, 26 May 2022 11:10 AM

To: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>

Cc: Karen Denyer Contact <<u>karen.denyer@papawerageological.co.nz</u>>; Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Emma Cowan <<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Kaitlin Morrison <<u>Kaitlin.Morrison@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>

Subject: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Ecological Review (Site Walkover)

Morning Kate,

WRC have engaged Karen Denyer (cc'd) to undertake the review of the ecological aspects for the Gleeson's Managed Fill application.

As part of the review process, Karen has requested to undertake a walkover of the fill sites next Wednesday or Thursday.

Please let me know if either of the proposed days suit yourself and your experts.

Kind regards,

From:	Sheryl Roa
То:	<u>Kate Madsen; Emma Cowan; Joshua Evans</u>
Cc:	"Shawn McLean"; "Mark Pelan"; "Julia Masters"
Subject:	RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Acid Sulphate Soils Draft Management Plan
Date:	Wednesday, 8 June 2022 9:34:31 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thanks Kate - both have been received by WRC.

Regards Sheryl

Sheryl Roa | PRINCIPAL ADVISOR - CONSENTS | Regional Consents, Resource Use
WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato
P: +6478590731
M: +6421356854
F: facebook.com/waikatoregion
Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

From: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>

Sent: Tuesday, 7 June 2022 7:46 AM

To: Emma Cowan <Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; Joshua Evans
<Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; Sheryl Roa <Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz>
Cc: 'Shawn McLean' <shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz>; 'Mark Pelan'
<mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz>; 'Julia Masters' <julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz>
Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Acid Sulphate Soils Draft Management Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Waikato Regional Council. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning,

Please find attached draft Acid Sulphate Soils Management Plan as discussed. Conditions to follow later today.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:**

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz immediately and

delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 3 June 2022 3:08 PM
To: 'Emma Cowan' <Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; 'Joshua Evans'
<Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; 'Karen Denyer Contact'
<karen.denyer@papawerageological.co.nz>
Cc: 'Sheryl Roa' <Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; 'Kaitlin Morrison'
<Kaitlin.Morrison@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; 'Shawn McLean'
<shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz>; 'Mark Pelan' <mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz>
Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Ecological Review (Site Walkover)

HI Emma and Karen,

Just to advise that the Acid Sulphate Soils Management Plan is currently being reviewed and I have been advised I will have it immediately after the long weekend, so will send it through on Tuesday, along with draft conditions to be proffered.

I note the following in regard to ecological assessments undertaken by Aecom for the original FA2-4 application:

- 1. It was agreed that ecological matters would be assessed by WRC (to avoid double up with WDC)
- 2. S92 was received 18 December 2019 A Bat Management Plan & Ecological Management Plan (for compensation area) were provided on 6 March 2020
- 3. BMP was accepted as being ok by Fiona Davies (Aecom) on 19th March 2020– see attached letter:

I have reviewed the BMP and am comfortable that adequate measures have been put in place to manage risks to bats and their roosts and to compensate for the loss of potential roost trees. This will be achieved through the implementation of measures within the BMP including a tree removal protocol, replacement of potential roosts through artificial bat roosts and chainsaw hollows, along with the provision of a protected (in perpetuity) bat reserve. It is recommended that conditions of consent include a report to confirm the number of potential roost trees removed and how many artificial roosts and chainsaw hollows were installed along with the protection in perpetuity of the bat reserve (minimum area of 1.5 ha).

- 4. Note this Bat Reserve was accepted as mitigation for habitat loss for all fill areas
- 5. Further information was requested in regard to the EMP, which Jamie MacKay from Wildlands responded to on 2 April 2020
- 6. On 28 April Emma Cowan requested (email attached) the EMP be further updated following the agreement between Jamie and Fiona:

Compensation accounting has <u>not</u> been provided by the applicants ecologists which details the ecological values of wetlands lost (this is additional to % indigenous vegetation and should include hydrological, physico-chemical etc functions of the wetland) and the corresponding ecological values/functions at wetland restoration sites (actual and potential) to demonstrate an appropriate compensation package. This is a preferred method to demonstrate no net loss of wetland value has been achieved. Nonetheless, on balance, from information provided by the applicants ecologist I would consider the compensation package of wetland, stream and terrestrial restoration to provide adequate mitigation for the wetland reclamation resulting from the site development. Given the addition of further restoration of areas to the original Ecological Management Plan provided, I would recommend that the Plan is updated to include the full and final restoration package.

- 7. ON 29 April 2020 I sent though an addendum to AEE in regard to betterment under Vison and Strategy doc, as Emma had requested on 28 April. (attached) The EMP was updated and sent through with full and final restoration package.
- 8. No further requests from an ecologist were received, either for the original application for FA's 2-4, nor for the following application for FA3 only.
- 9. Please note the compensation area was accepted as providing both mitigation for potential ecological effects from the managed fill operation, and betterment back to the catchment.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:**

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Emma Cowan <Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 30 May 2022 10:41 AM
To: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>; Joshua Evans
<Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; Karen Denyer Contact
<karen.denyer@papawerageological.co.nz>
Cc: Sheryl Roa <Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; Kaitlin Morrison
<Kaitlin.Morrison@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; 'Shawn McLean'
<shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz>; 'Mark Pelan' <mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz>
Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Ecological Review (Site Walkover)

Hi Kate

Lyndsey resigned from AECOM quite some time ago (early 2020 from memory) and is no longer available to assist with this project.

I have emailed the AECOM ecology peer reviews to Karen. The ecology reviews for Fill Area 2 and 4 were not completed because the activities were withdrawn from the application. The ecology review relating to the wetland in FA3 was somewhat discontinued following the unlawful drainage of that wetland. The new application will require an updated ecology review, no doubt the past work undertaken by AECOM will be taken into account.

Thanks for assisting with the site visit arrangements.

Kind regards

Emma Cowan | RESOURCE OFFICER - LAND DEVELOPMENT | Land Development, Resource Use WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato

P: <u>+6478586073</u>

M: <u>+6421798277</u>

F: facebook.com/waikatoregion

Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

From: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Sent: Friday, 27 May 2022 1:36 pm
To: Joshua Evans <<u>Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Karen Denyer Contact
<<u>karen.denyer@papawerageological.co.nz</u>>
Cc: Sheryl Roa <<u>Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Emma Cowan
<<u>Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; Kaitlin Morrison
<<u>Kaitlin.Morrison@waikatoregion.govt.nz</u>>; 'Shawn McLean'
<<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan' <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>
Subject: RE: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Ecological Review (Site Walkover)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Waikato Regional Council. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

HI Joshua,

As mentioned to Sheryl, In terms of the ecological assessment, it would be good if Karen Denyer could communicate with Lyndsey Smith of Aecom, who undertook the original ecological assessment on behalf of council – particularly given that nothing has changed in regard to ecological matters – and all queries had been closed out.

Shawn McLean, the quarry manager is on leave currently, I will check with Gleeson to see if Wednesday/Thursday suit for a site visit. Karen – please confirm if you require an ecologist to attend, or if it would be fine to meet with just myself. Thanks.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:** This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Joshua Evans <Joshua.Evans@waikatoregion.govt.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 26 May 2022 11:10 AM
To: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>
Cc: Karen Denyer Contact <karen.denyer@papawerageological.co.nz>; Sheryl Roa
<Sheryl.Roa@waikatoregion.govt.nz>; Emma Cowan <Emma.Cowan@waikatoregion.govt.nz>;
Kaitlin Morrison <Kaitlin.Morrison@waikatoregion.govt.nz>
Subject: APP144475 - Gleeson managed Fill Ecological Review (Site Walkover)

Morning Kate,

WRC have engaged Karen Denyer (cc'd) to undertake the review of the ecological aspects for the Gleeson's Managed Fill application.

As part of the review process, Karen has requested to undertake a walkover of the fill sites next Wednesday or Thursday.

Please let me know if either of the proposed days suit yourself and your experts.

Kind regards,

Joshua Evans | RESOURCE OFFICER - LAND DEVELOPMENT | Land Development, Resource Use WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL | Te Kaunihera ā Rohe o Waikato P: <u>+6478592860</u> M: <u>+64212208095</u> F: <u>facebook.com/waikatoregion</u> Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3204

This email message and any attached files may contain confidential information, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately and destroy the original message. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Waikato Regional Council. Waikato Regional Council makes reasonable efforts to ensure that its email has been scanned and is free of viruses, however can make no warranty that this email or any attachments to it are free from viruses.

This email message and any attached files may contain confidential information, and may

From:	Kate Madsen
То:	"Julia Masters"
Cc:	"Jessica Thomas"; "Emma Cowan"; "Sheryl Roa"; Joshua Evans; "wade.hill@waidc.govt.nz"
Bcc:	<u>"Sue Simons"; "Chris Timbs"</u>
Subject:	RE: LUC0488/22 - Gleeson Managed Fill
Date:	Tuesday, 7 June 2022 7:30:16 AM
Attachments:	image001.png
	image002.png

HI Julia,

Just to confirm, Gleeson is requesting a hearing by Commissioner as per s100A of the RMA.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:** This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this ma

If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and

delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 3 June 2022 3:10 PM
To: 'Julia Masters' <julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz>
Subject: RE: LUC0488/22 - Gleeson Managed Fill

HI Julia,

I will confer with Gleeson and get back to you. Please find attached response to s92 query in regard to visual landscape effects.

Have a lovely long weekend :)

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u>

Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:**

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Julia Masters <julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 3 June 2022 11:37 AM
To: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>
Subject: RE: LUC0488/22 - Gleeson Managed Fill

Hi Kate

Council are thinking ahead in terms of notification and the hearing.

Had you given any thought to whether you will request a hearing by commissioner (as per section 100A)?

Thanks,

Julia Masters Senior Planner

027 4136 085 julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz



Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited Level 1, 71 London Street, Hamilton 3204 PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 kineticenvironmental.co.nz

From: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Sent: Tuesday, 31 May 2022 5:21 pm
To: Julia Masters <<u>julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz</u>>
Subject: RE: LUC0488/22 - Gleeson Managed Fill

Thanks for the update Julia – appreciated and understood :)

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: +64 9 4422959 Mobile: +64 21 944583 Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:** This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Julia Masters <julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 31 May 2022 11:33 AM
To: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>
Subject: RE: LUC0488/22 - Gleeson Managed Fill

Hi Kate

As you are likely aware, WRC have engaged Karen Denyer (Papawera Geological Consulting Ltd) to undertake the ecology review for this application. To avoid any duplication, Karen will also review the application in relation to any district council matters. The costs will be billed on via the WRC invoicing.

Please le me know if you have any concerns relating to this.

Kind regards,

Julia Masters Senior Planner

027 4136 085 julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz



Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited Level 1, 71 London Street, Hamilton 3204 PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 kineticenvironmental.co.nz

From: Julia Masters
Sent: Friday, 27 May 2022 3:16 pm
To: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Cc: 'James Gleeson' <<u>James@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan' <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Jessica Thomas'
<Jessica.Thomas@waidc.govt.nz>

Subject: RE: LUC0488/22 - Gleeson Managed Fill

Thanks for this. I will take a look next week as well as distribute as appropriate for review.

I have just finalised the s92 letter for you as per the attached. This includes a request for an updated TIA and assessment against the PWDP-DV which you have just provided. I've left those matters in the letter despite them being provided here simply as I won't have a chance to review them until next week.

Also I note that I have been liaising with Emma Cowan at WRC regarding the ecology peer review. The intention is that one review will be undertaken for WRC and WDC.

Kind regards,

Julia Masters Senior Planner

027 4136 085 julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz



Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited Level 1, 71 London Street, Hamilton 3204 PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 kineticenvironmental.co.nz

From: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Sent: Friday, 27 May 2022 2:48 pm
To: Julia Masters <<u>julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz</u>>
Cc: 'James Gleeson' <<u>James@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan' <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Jessica Thomas'
<Jessica.Thomas@waidc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: LUC0488/22 - Gleeson Managed Fill

HI Julia,

Please find attached TIA by TEAM traffic, as well as PWDP Table, and updated PWDP reasons for consent – draft set of conditions to come early next week, all going well.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:** This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Sent: Tuesday, 17 May 2022 11:28 AM
To: 'Julia Masters' <<u>julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz</u>>
Cc: 'James Gleeson' <<u>James@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan' <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>;
'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Jessica Thomas'
<<u>Jessica.Thomas@waidc.govt.nz</u>>
Subject: RE: LUC0488/22 - Gleeson Managed Fill

HI Julia,

Thanks for the update and clarifications below. I cannot say I am not disappointed for the request to update the TMP, given that the opening of the State Highway has reduced traffic flows considerably, and baseline assumptions have not changed. In addition, Gleeson pay Heavy Vehicle Impact Fees, and therefore the condition of the road is not their direct responsibility. All Gleeson Trucks comply with all legal requirements for heavy vehicles including Road User Charges (RUC). Gleeson therefore already contributes and invests in local road maintenance and improvements through HVIF as well as RUC charges which are allocated by the National Land Transport Fund.

However, we have engaged TEAM to update their assessment, and this should be available end of next week (at this stage).

The attached Macroinvertebrate Assessment has been sent to WRC that has been undertaken by Envoco on behalf of Gleeson. Two reference sites and two impact sites have been sampled to gauge the baseline water quality. It is intended to complete further sampling during winter, and again in spring, before works commence (if granted). I presume this will be reviewed by WRC ecologist, but you may wish to confirm with them.

The updated PWDP table should be with you next week, along with the conditions to be proffered.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:**

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege.

If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Julia Masters <julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 13 May 2022 2:13 PM
To: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Cc: 'James Gleeson' <<u>James@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan' <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Jessica Thomas'
<Jessica.Thomas@waidc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: LUC0488/22 - Gleeson Managed Fill - S88 and S37 letters

Hi Kate

Apologies I realised I didn't answer your question on notification from the email below.

At this stage the intention is that the WDC and WRC applications will be notified on the same date. This may require either WDC or WRC applying a s37 to ensure the dates match. I've already been in contact with the WRC team on this matter. I think it is only necessary for you to copy in the WRC planners when the matter is relevant to WDC also or is a general matter.

Also I asked Wade about the Huntly Quarry reference in the Decision version of the PDP and he agreed that it applies to the quarry on Tregoweth Lane.

Lastly, I note your comment below about getting an email from TEAM traffic to provide confirmation that nothing has changed. I received some comments from Naomi McMinn at Gray Matter on Monday. I then sent these on to the Development Engineer at Council as well as the Roading Development Manager. As a result of the review, we have the following further information request:

• On the basis that the Traffic Impact Assessment was prepared in September 2019, please provide an updated assessment that considers the current transport environment and the existing vehicle entranceway, including (but not limited to) the recent 5 year crash history, the condition of the road and identification of any other changes (such as new development).

In addition to this, I know you are preparing a detailed assessment against the rules of the Decisions version of the Proposed District Plan. Can you please ensure that this includes the relevant transport provisions, particularly for the interface with the road network.

These two points are essentially matters for a further information request. However, as I don't yet have comments from Dave Mansergh, I am sending this to you as an informal request to allow you to get underway – rather than holding this back until I hear if there is anything further to be added. I will formalise this request once I have all comments from the specialists.

Kind regards,

Julia Masters

Senior Planner

027 4136 085 julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz



Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited Level 1, 71 London Street, Hamilton 3204 PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240

kineticenvironmental.co.nz

From: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Sent: Monday, 9 May 2022 9:06 am
To: Julia Masters <<u>julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz</u>>
Cc: 'James Gleeson' <<u>James@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan' <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Jessica Thomas'
<Jessica.Thomas@waidc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: LUC0488/22 - Gleeson Managed Fill - S88 and S37 letters

Good morning Julia

Thanks for this. see my responses in red below. Would you also advise how the WDC/WRC notification processes align? Would it be useful for you to cc in WRC planners to these emails and visa-versa?

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u> Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:**

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Julia Masters <<u>julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz</u>>

Sent: Friday, 6 May 2022 2:28 PM

To: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>

Cc: 'James Gleeson' <<u>James@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>; 'Mark Pelan' <<u>mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz</u>>;

'Shawn McLean' <<u>shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz</u>>; 'Jessica Thomas'

<Jessica.Thomas@waidc.govt.nz>

Hi Kate

Thanks for your email.

I've been in contact with Shawn to organise a visit the site next Thursday morning.

Shawn – Did you receive my meeting request for that? I take it this is now sorted – thanks Shawn

On the points below, I can break the AEE down as and when required so no need for you to do that. A word version would be useful though so yes please send the through. See attached

Looking at the application, I see that you have provided in Appendix 7, a detailed assessment against the rules of the Operative and Proposed Waikato District Plans. This appears to be the one submitted with the original application (i.e. it is dated November 2019). Have you got an updated assessment for the Decisions version of the Proposed District Plan? While section 4.5.1 of the AEE identifies the rules that consent is required under, it doesn't assess the aspects of the proposal that are a permitted activity (as per clause 3(a) of the fourth schedule). Apologies, this was started but not completed. I will send updated Appendix 7 through this week.

I've had responses from all of the technical experts who peer reviewed aspects of the now withdrawn application to confirm their availability. Naomi McMinn at Gray Matter and Siiri Wilkening at Marshall Day are available. Dave Mansergh of Mansergh Graham is likely available, however he has a number of other commitments which need to be completed first. I have asked him (and the other experts) to firstly confirm that the assessments that they undertook for LUC0233/20 will continue to apply. Dave has outlined that he won't be able to come back to me on this until 20 May. He has said that if further assessment is required, including providing me with comments for the purposes of completing notification (noting that while you have requested public notification, we need to determine who will be directly notified), this won't be available until 10 June. He said that if there are substantial differences or additional information is required, he cannot guarantee these dates.

My preference is to proceed with Dave as the peer reviewer. On this basis, are you agreeable to providing your agreement to a s37 extension of time if additional time is needed to allow Dave to complete his review? I don't think we need to apply this extension right away, instead I propose that we wait to see what Dave's comments are on 20 May are, and then we have a discussion at that time? What are your thoughts? Yes, please continue with Dave – and if you would check in with him to see if he does get a quick window of time to look at it earlier that would be appreciated. Would it help to get an email from TEAM traffic confirming nothing has changed?

The alternative is that Council will have to find another expert who will have to undertake a full review. This will mean them starting from scratch which will likely take longer anyway and is likely to add to the cost.

Happy to discuss as required. I'm heading home now (I finish early on Friday to pick my kids up from school) but will be back on Monday.

Kind regards,

Julia Masters Senior Planner

027 4136 085 julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz KINETIC ENVIRONMENTAL

Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited Level 1, 71 London Street, Hamilton 3204 PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 kineticenvironmental.co.nz

From: Kate Madsen <kate@pauaplanning.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 6 May 2022 12:58 pm
To: Julia Masters <julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz>
Cc: 'James Gleeson' <James@gleesoncox.co.nz>; 'Mark Pelan' <mark.pelan@gleesoncox.co.nz>;
'Shawn McLean' <shawn.mclean@gleesonquarries.co.nz>; 'Jessica Thomas'
<Jessica.Thomas@waidc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: LUC0488/22 - Gleeson Managed Fill - S88 and S37 letters

HI Julia,

Thanks for your email and s88/s37 correspondence. A couple of things following up from our phone call:

- 1. I will cc in Jessica Thomas to any relevant emails (admin support), and Wade Hill when required.
- 2. I can easily break down my AEE into separate pdf's which can be sent to expert reviewers along with the technical report and previous s92 information if of assistance.
- I can provide a word version of my AEE if this is helpful an updated AEE is attached (updates in blue text) as a small ESC assessment was accidentally deleted from the version lodged
- 4. We should have an Acid Sulphate Soils Management Plan to you within the next week or so, and also water testing results in relation to getting baseline sampling for macro invertebrates within adjacent streams.
- 5. We are finalising the conditions we are proffering with the application as mitigation/remediation an updated draft version will be sent through in the next week.

Kind Regards, Kate Madsen Director – Paua Planning



Environmental & Social Impact Assessments - Resource Consents - Planning Advice and Action Phone: <u>+64 9 4422959</u>

Mobile: <u>+64 21 944583</u> Email: <u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> 178 Bawden Road R.D 2 Dairy Flat Albany Auckland 0792 New Zealand **DISCLAIMER:**

This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender at <u>pauaplanning@pauaplanning.co.nz</u> immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail.

From: Julia Masters <julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 3 May 2022 4:01 PM
To: Kate Madsen <<u>kate@pauaplanning.co.nz</u>>
Cc: Jessica Thomas <<u>Jessica.Thomas@waidc.govt.nz</u>>
Subject: LUC0488/22 - Gleeson Managed Fill - S88 and S37 letters

Hi Kate

As I understand you are aware, I am processing the consent application for the Gleeson Managed Fill Facility (LUC0488/22) on behalf of Waikato District Council.

Please see attached the acceptance letter and s37 letter regarding the extension of the notification period.

My contact details are below. I look forward to working with you.

Kind regards,

Julia Masters Senior Planner

027 4136 085 julia@kineticenvironmental.co.nz



Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited Level 1, 71 London Street, Hamilton 3204 PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240 kineticenvironmental.co.nz