

Before Independent Commissioners Appointed by the Canterbury Regional Council and Selwyn District Council

In the matter of The Resource Management Act 1991

And

In the matter of Applications by **Fulton Hogan Limited** for all resource consents necessary to establish, operate, maintain and close an aggregate quarry (**Roydon Quarry**) between Curraghs, Dawsons, Maddisons and Jones Roads, Templeton

**SUPPLEMENTARY REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF DONALD GORDON
CHITTOCK ON BEHALF OF FULTON HOGAN LIMITED**

DAVINA PENNY EVIDENCE

DATED: 30 OCTOBER 2019

Counsel Acting: David Caldwell

Email: david.caldwell@bridgesidechambers.co.nz

Telephone: 64 21 221 4113

P O Box 3180

Christchurch 8013

Introduction

1. My name is Donald Gordon Chittock. I am the National Environment and Sustainability Manager at Fulton Hogan Limited (**Fulton Hogan**).
2. I have previously provided a written brief of evidence in relation to the Roydon Quarry Proposal. That evidence is dated 23 September 2019. I confirm my qualifications and experience as set out in paragraphs 1 to 8 of that evidence, except that I would like to amend paragraph 3 to say the following:

"I hold a Masters of Professional Studies in Environmental Management from Lincoln University. In 2016 I also attended the Kellogg Rural Leadership Programme where my research topic was about keeping communities engaged in collaborative processes using the Canterbury Water Management Strategy as an example."

Scope

3. In my rebuttal evidence I address the evidence of Ms Davina Penny.

Setbacks

4. In paragraphs 2 and 60 Ms Penny states a lack of clarity on where a mobile crushing plant will operate and closeness to quarry boundaries. I confirm the information in the application and further information provided, that mobile processing equipment will not be located closer than 250m to Fulton Hogan site boundaries.
5. As an example, to open the site up and create the central processing area we will require the use of mobile plant. In that situation mobile plant will be temporarily located adjacent to the edge of the central processing area.

Site selection

6. Paragraphs 11- 16 raise several points.
7. The Templeton Golf course land swap project that Ms Penny refers to is on hold at the present time. There are several regulatory hurdles to surmount in respect of that particular proposal. Not all of the same hurdles apply to Roydon.
8. In paragraph 15 Ms Penny is correct that Fulton Hogan did surrender the New Zealand Petroleum and Mineral exploration permits it had secured over

five land areas. We did not own the land areas nor have any council resource consents or landowner agreements in place with the landowners. To remove any exploration permit work programme compliance issues, they were surrendered.

9. Lastly on this section Ms Penny mentions the planning constraints that apply to McLeans Island land not being made clear. In the CCC district plan review, large parts of McLeans Island land were classified as significant ecological areas or outstanding natural landscape areas, simply meaning no significant change in characteristics of the land can occur.
10. In summary, Fulton Hogan is satisfied as to the appropriateness of the site being pursued and the ever-decreasing pool of available sites close to demand.

Concerns regarding site rehabilitation

11. Ms Penny questions whether it is adequate to have a finished ground level comprising one meter of unexcavated material and 300 millimetres of topsoil. Other experts have addressed this including Mr Mthamo, Mr Eldred and Mr Van Nieuwkerk. Mr Bligh has also advised this proposed finished level complies with a permitted activity rule in the Land and Water Regional Plan.
12. Bird-strike risk is raised in paragraph 26. Fulton Hogan has confirmed in previous responses that the site does not require ponds. This is addressed in rebuttal evidence in response to the evidence for Christchurch International Airport Ltd.

Inadequacies of proposed mitigation

13. Robust mitigation is called for by Ms Penny in paragraph 57. Fulton Hogan has been concerned to ensure this from the outset. The evidence of various witnesses address the various mitigation measures proposed. Predominantly, these relate to air quality, traffic, noise, landscaping/visual effects and water quality.

Monitoring and Enforcement concerns

14. In paragraphs 88-95 Ms Penny states her concern at the monitoring of resource consents by the Regional Council. Mr Bligh addresses this topic in his primary evidence.

15. Fulton Hogan is agreeable to the suggestion made by Ms Penny in her requested consent conditions to have a representative of the Templeton Community on the proposed quarry Community Liaison Group. Fulton Hogan has previously extended an invitation for a representative to attend the Community Advisory Group meetings through consent application drafting in 2018. The invitation was declined.

Donald Chittock
30 October 2019