File No: WP/03/06/06 Consent file: WAR080518 [27010][27378][27491] 22 June 2009

Gen Hewit/Sylvia Allen MWH P O Box 9624 Te Aro Wellington PO Box 41 34 Chapel Street Masterton New Zealand T 06 378 2484 F 06 378 2146 W www.gw.govt.nz

Dear Gen/Sylvia,

Further information request under section 92(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991

Applicant:	Wairarapa Aggregates Ltd
Proposal:	<i>To operate a gravel extraction and cleanfill operation which will include crushing and washing of aggregate on site</i>
Location:	Kiwi Lumber land at Waingawa adjacent to Waingawa Swamp
Resource consents required:	Discharge permit: to discharge sediment laden washwater and stormwater to land(or to a wetland via land) Water permit to take water from the Taratahi water race Land use consent: to construct a settlement pond that may intercept groundwater

Further to receiving submissions and a meeting of the applicant and representatives with consent authorities, this letter seeks more information in support of the applications in order that we can better understand the effects of the proposal on the environment and whether the mitigation and management measures proposed will be sufficient to manage any potential adverse effects.

Information requested by Greater Wellington¹

1. **Water levels**: The proposal is to operate the quarry so that ground water is not intercepted other than for the construction of a stormwater settlement pond. More specifically the proposal is that the quarry operation will maintain a distance of at least 0.5m above groundwater. As Greater Wellington does not have site specific data on water levels at this site, monitoring will be required to determine the appropriate level of the quarry floor. To enable some assessment of appropriate finished quarry level, could you please provide all groundwater level monitoring data collected on the three monitoring bores constructed in 2008. It would also be helpful if expert opinion from an appropriately qualified person could be provided on the appropriate finished quarry level based on any monitoring data collected.

¹ Any person who has been asked to provide further information under section 92(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act), has the right to object to the consent authority in respect of that request for information under section 357A(1)(b) of the Act.

This information is required so that the most recent and available groundwater level information can be incorporated into the assessment of the application.

2. **Contaminated site issues**: High CFC readings have been made of the groundwater emerging from the old fill along side the site. The site was formerly the Waingawa Freezing works and it is possible that old refrigeration equipment has been buried causing this contamination. Can you confirm that location of the old Freezing Works site in relation to the proposed quarry area (closest distance). Can you also detail how the area now containing disposed sawdust immediately adjacent and east of the site will be separated from the quarry working site to ensure any run-off does not enter the quarry area.

This information is required so that a more complete assessment of the potential effects from the contaminated site can be made.

- 3. Erosion and Sediment Control Measures: Further information is required on erosion and sediment control measures to assess against the Greater Wellington's Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines (ESCG). The ESCG provides a minimum set of criteria for sediment control, and I refer to them below to provide assistance. We have reviewed the information provided against the ESCG and believe the following areas require further assessment.
 - The ESCG requires a separate settlement pond for every 3 hectare catchment of exposed site (see page 51). The quarry proposal is for an area of nearly 12 hectares, suggesting a possible need for 4 ponds rather than 1. Following discussions with Al Cross at your meeting on 10 June, we determined that the separate (second-tier) ponds would be in addition to the single large pond at the downstream (north eastern) end of the site.
 - The ESCG (page 51) advises sediment retention pond life should be restricted to less than 2 years and where they are required for a longer term then extra measures are required to ensure stability and effectiveness. Please provide detailed plans for such measures in relation to the second-tier ponds and details of how all ponds would be maintained through the life of the activity (pages 52-60) and how design and maintenance elements can be checked against those listed in the ESCG. If you believe that a particular element is not required or uses a different specification, please provide justification for so doing. We will also need to understand how water will flow (direction) between the sumps, settlement ponds and eventual discharge points.
 - Although there is an element of staging, the plans indicate that Stage 2 will be underway before covering stage 1 which alone is just over 3 hectares in area. Please provide more detail on staging and how sediment pond requirements will be met.
 - In the Quarry Management Plan reference is made to sump/sediment pits for washing aggregate. The ESCG (pages 84-86) provides a design guide for these type structures. Please provide further sufficient design information for your proposed structures to be checked against these guidelines.
 - The ESCG (pages 13-15) provide for stormwater diversion bunds to be designed to a 5% AEP not a 5 year ARI (which is only 0.18% AEP) as stated in your ESCP. It is not

clear whether diverted clean stormwater can drain into the water race via overland flow. There needs to be greater clarity about direction of discharge flow and management of clean stormwater discharge points.

• The information provided in relation to site maintenance and rehabilitation so far does not provide a complete schedule as suggested by section 7.7 in the ESCG. Please provide details for at least for the first stage of the operation as relevant.

This information is required in order to appropriately assess the discharge permit application against the ESCG for the Wellington Region.

4. Quarry Maintenance and Rehabilitation Plans

- No application has been made for a discharge to air permit so we assume that the intention is to manage dust to such a standard that no dust will migrate over the property boundary or over the wetland as would be required under the permitted activity rule in our Regional Air Quality Management Plan (Rule 10). The QMP suggests the main mechanism for dust control will be provided by spraying with water. As a large proportion of the site is to be open and not constantly working, a basic outline of how dust management is to be conducted in these non-operational periods should be provided.
- The site rehabilitation plan outlined in 2.2.8 and 3.5 of the QMP suggests that the site is to be rehabilitated to a standard suitable for rural residential subdivision. Please note that it is unlikely that a site filled with cleanfill will provide a suitable base for on-site waste water disposal or for healthy pasture. Does the applicant have any other suggestions for standard of site rehabilitation?

5. **Discharge locations** ?

• Please confirm the location of discharges from the site downstream of the main sediment retention pond, and identify whether discharges will be directly to the water race, to land or to the wetland.

Information requested by Carterton District Council

It is noted that Carterton District Council have requested an assessment by an expert hydro-geologist on the potential impact on the adjacent protected swamp area. This information will be helpful for the processing of the Greater Wellington application, particularly the discharge permit application which proposed to intercept groundwater adjacent to the protected swamp area. Accordingly this assessment should include information on the potential effects of the sediment retention ponds on the protected swamp area.

Date information required

Please provide the above information to me by 13 July 2009. If you are not able to supply the information requested² by this date, you must let us know in writing within this timeframe, either that you require additional time (at which time we will set a reasonable timeframe for you to provide the information) or that you refuse to provide the requested information.

We may decline your application if we consider we have insufficient information to enable us to determine your application, or if you do not respond to our request by 13 July 2009 or if you refuse to supply the information. If you consider you have a valid reason for refusing to provide the requested information, please contact me on the number below to discuss this further.

Processing of your application

Your application has been placed on hold, and the statutory 'clock' stopped³, until such a time that either I receive the above information, receive written notice that you refuse to provide it, or the time period for providing the requested information has expired. As soon as one of these occurs, the statutory 'clock' will restart and I can continue processing your application.

Please contact either myself (06 370-5684) or Al Cross (04 802-0309) in the first instance to discuss the requested information, and Deirdre Ross from Monday 29 June.

Hearing schedule

If the information requested is provided by Friday 3 July we may be able to schedule a hearing prior to the end of July, however it is probably more likely that a hearing will be scheduled for early September given the unavailability of you client in August.

Charging policy review

The Resource Management Charging Policy is reviewed on an annual basis. As a result of this process the charges associated with processing your consent may alter - you will be informed if this is the case.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Thawley Team Leader Consents and Compliance, Environmental Regulation

 $^{^{\}rm 2}$ Under section 92A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

³ Under section 88C of the Resource Management Act 1991