

## SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE – Matthew Curran

1. I am the planner who drafted the Assessment of Environmental Effects for the proposal. I was involved in the initial conversations with a number of the submitters. I was involved in responding to each council's request for further information and I collated the applicant's package of additional information submitted in relation to the application for resource consents.
2. I have three corrections to my evidence.
3. In paragraph 3.2(a) I note a predicted 3dB infringement of the Central Otago District Plan. As I understand it, with the mitigation now proposed which control operations before 7 am , this infringement is now no longer predicted.
4. In paragraph 3.12 I state that an additional 22 l/s is sought to be abstracted by the applicant, that figure should be 24 l/s.
5. In paragraph 7.23 in quoting from Plan Change 7 I have incorrectly struck out freshwater in clause 10A.1.(a)
6. Mr Whyte and I have conferenced informally leading up to the hearing and yesterday during proceedings, I can confirm we agree on the following key planning matters:
  - a) Policies 5.3.4 and 5.4.8 (in relation to recognising the appropriate location and benefits of mineral extraction) in the Partially Operative RPS should have been considered in the Section 42A reports.
  - b) If resource consents are required to remove material on Lot 2 DP 508108, they can be applied for separately from this process.
  - c) The applicant's proposed approach to groundwater abstraction in light of Plan Change 7, being to retain the existing water permit and seek consent only for the additional water sought in the AEE, is acceptable providing the new water permit is subject to a six year consent term.
  - d) Schedule 5B in the Otago Regional Water Plan contains the method for identifying groundwater takes potentially affected by bore interference. It uses the trigger value of 0.2m for unconfined aquifers. Additional assessment is required to determine whether those effects are acceptable.
7. Regarding the duration of the Discharge to Land Permit, the draft consent refers to a 16 year consent term, I based this on the term of the existing water permit, however I have reflected on this and suggest that the duration of the consent is 20 years as sought in the AEE. This approach recognises that the applicant will likely replace the new water permit when the new Land and Water Plan for Otago is proposed. The durations of all other consents are as proposed in my evidence.
8. The commission had some questions around cleanfill yesterday, I note that placing cleanfill is permitted by Rule 7.6.3 in the Regional Plan: Waste for Otago (the Waste Plan).

*7.6.3 Cleanfill landfills (permitted activity)*  
*The discharge of any contaminants into or onto land when occurring as the result of cleanfill landfills is a permitted activity, provided that no sediments enter into any water body.*
9. The Central Otago District Plan (CODP) does not include a specific a rule for cleanfill placement but permits activities providing they comply with the relevant standards. No

standards apply directly to the placement of cleanfill, apart from to exclude it from consideration. Standard 4.7.6I allows cleanfill to be placed within 10 m of a waterbody and restrictions on extraction and displacement activities under Standard 4.7.6 J(b) do not apply to cleanfill. Non-complying activity Rule 4.7.5(ii) that relates to 'Waste Disposal to Land' specifically excludes cleanfill.

10. I note that the commissioner has asked for examples of quarries that are located close to sensitive receptors. As per paragraph 4.12 of my evidence the edge of the Fulton Hogan Parkburn Quarry is located within approximately 50 m of at least 20 dwellings and a cherry packhouse. I also note that located within the Parkburn Quarry are settling ponds that are elevated above and located close to the lake which do not appear to be having a visual effect on water quality in Lake Dunstan. I accept that the applicant cannot rely on the extent to which effects are authorised at the Fulton Hogan Parkburn Quarry to suggest the effects of proposal are acceptable, however I maintain that this comparison is useful to draw some comparisons for context.
11. There has been some discussion in relation alternatives. Mr Sutton's evidence addresses the matters which are relevant to considering quarry locations. These include the location of a suitable mineral resource. The Central Otago rural environment is varied in terms of the land uses it supports; horticulture, viticulture, rural lifestyle living and quarrying are all prevalent along the western shoreline of Lake Dunstan. Although I was not involved in the consideration of alternative sites by the applicant, it would appear to me that it would be difficult to consent a quarry which requires access of State Highway 6 and would have no effects on residential, horticultural or viticulture activities.
12. I note that in considering sites that are suitable for mineral extraction and processing the Partially Operative RPS (PO-RPS) recognises the functional needs of mineral extraction and processing activities to locate where the resource exists (Policy 5.3.4) and giving preference to avoiding mineral extraction and processing in a number areas, including but not limited to, outstanding natural landscapes, areas of outstanding natural character and areas of subject to significant natural hazards. The existing quarry and expansion land are not located in any of the areas that the PO-RPS gives preference to avoiding (Policy 5.4.8).
13. Based on the Section 42A reports I understand that Mr Whyte and I are in agreement that the effects on the following values will be minor or less than minor; noise, transport, lighting, public safety, ecological, cultural, heritage, archaeological, natural hazards, hazardous substances, construction effects and cumulative effects. I also note that Mr Whyte and myself are both in agreement that the proposal will have positive economic effects if granted.
14. Based on the Section 42A reports Mr Whyte and I disagree on the level of effect with respect to landscape character and visual amenity, air quality and groundwater quality. In assessing these affects I have relied on the evidence of Mr Cudmore, Dr Freeman and Mr Compton-Moen and have come to the conclusion that effects will be acceptable.
15. Following a review of the Joint Witness Statements, I remain of the view that effects can be mitigated to an acceptable level. It appears to me that the noise and groundwater experts largely agree that the proposal will have an acceptable level of environmental effect, noting that the groundwater experts have been tasked with drafting a condition to address potential groundwater quality effects upstream of the applicant's settlement pond. While there remains some disagreement about air quality effects, the experts appear to agree that if the proposed conditions are implemented effectively, effects will be acceptable. It is my opinion that you can rely on conditions as proposed by the applicant to be implemented.

16. In terms of my statutory and planning assessment, I reiterate that I consider the proposal to be consistent with most, and not contrary to the balance, of the relevant objectives and policies, noting that there will be some loss of land associated with the creation of ponds following cessation of quarrying. I also consider that the proposal is consistent with the purpose and principles set out in Part 2 of the Resource Management Act.
17. Draft resource consent conditions were circulated yesterday, these remain a work in progress. I would be happy to briefly run through the conditions as proposed. A final version will be provided with the applicant's closing submissions.

**Matt Curran**

