

SOL Quarries Ltd
joint hearing
8 Dec 2020

Before Independent Hearing Commissioners
at Christchurch

CRC1193773, CRC193564, CRC193563, and RMA/2019/373

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: Application by SOL Quarries Limited to extend a quarry

by: **Christchurch International Airport Limited**
Submitter

Summary of Felicity Blackmore on behalf of Christchurch
International Airport Limited

Dated: 8 December 2020

REFERENCE: J M Appleyard (jo.appleyard@chapmantripp.com)
A Hill (amy.hill@chapmantripp.com)

Chapman Tripp
T. +64 3 353 4130
F. +64 3 365 4587

60 Cashel Street
PO Box 2510, Christchurch 8140
New Zealand

www.chapmantripp.com
Auckland, Wellington,
Christchurch

**CHAPMAN
TRIPP** 

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF FELICITY BLACKMORE

- 1 My name is Felicity Blackmore.
- 2 I am the Environment and Planning Manager in the Strategy and Sustainability team at Christchurch International Airport Limited. I am authorised to give evidence on CIAL's behalf.
- 3 CIAL works hard to protect the Airport against hazards which affect safe and efficient operations. We do our own work on-airport but the risk profile is also affected by activities that happen off-airport, like this Application.
- 4 I have explained CIAL's core concerns related to quarrying activities that happen close to the Airport in my evidence. Quarrying can create effects that impact on the safe and efficient operation and functioning of the Airport. The SOL quarry is particularly close to the Airport and so it has clear potential to create increased risk to Airport operations. But those risks can be managed through appropriate conditions.
- 5 In summary, the key issues for CIAL are:
 - 5.1 Bird strike risk management – it is critical to ensure that the quarrying activities do not create permanent waterbodies, ponding, vegetation planting, or other land uses that increase the risk of bird strike. The SOL quarry is very close to the Airport. If it creates features that attract birds, they will be gathering and flying very close to the runway and potentially across flight paths;
 - 5.2 Groundwater protection - CIAL has several bores which provide potable water and it would like to ensure that cleanfilling, depth of excavation, and hazardous substance storage and handling, is managed appropriately to avoid any groundwater effects. CIAL supports the ECan s42A officer's comments relating to cleanfill management for these reasons;
 - 5.3 Lighting and glare - the quarry is very close to aircraft flight paths. I understand that the proposal does not currently include any lighting. If there is lighting at any point in the future, it would need to be designed and operated to make sure that there is no glare or other impact on aviation safety for aircraft taking off and arriving;
 - 5.4 Dust management – without proper mitigation, dust can cause real problems for pilot visibility around the Airport. CIAL is happy with the dust mitigation conditions that have been offered, as long as there is enough water available to SOL for it to execute the dust mitigation proposed.

Proposed conditions

- 6 I have read the conditions that were circulated by SOL on 1 December 2020 and the addendum to Mr Hedley's evidence dated 2 December 2020. I have a few comments in addition to those made by Ms Hill.
- 7 I am happy with the additional condition which Mr Hedley has confirmed SOL seeks to reinstate in his 2 December addendum. This will resolve my concerns about CIAL's ability to monitor bird strike risk from the quarry on an ongoing basis.
- 8 At paragraph [47] of my evidence I suggested some changes to CCC consent condition 42 and Regional land use consent condition 53 (referring to the numbering in the 1 December 2020 version). I would still prefer that the changes I suggested are made. A 48-hour drainage time for any ponding is consistent with activity specific standard (b)(i) and (ii) of Permitted Activity P3 6.7.4.3.1 in the CDP.
- 9 Limiting the amount of time water ponds reduces the bird strike risk as it removes the potential attractant. Ponding water over the permitted activity standards requires a specific birdstrike risk assessment to understand how the change in environment may impact bird behaviour and how this may impact the likelihood of birdstrike.
- 10 Phil Shaw, an expert on wildlife hazard management from Avisure, presented as part of the CDP IHP process in 2016 and his evidence was that ponding water, even of a fairly small size, should be mitigated within 3km of the Airport. I have put a quote from that evidence below:¹

Where an area >100m² is excavated and results in water being present for more than 48 hours, this should be mitigated up to 3km from the airport. Even relatively small ponds developed during construction or other forms of excavation can attract birds sporadically. If these are close to the airport they may elevate the risk. I understand the concerns around enforcement, but at least if a condition of consent is included and CIAL observe birds attracted to a particular excavation, they can require remedial action. Without such a condition in place, CIAL will have no course of action to mitigate the risk other than liaising with the proponent who will be under no obligation to act on the risk.

- 11 I am happy to answer any questions from the Panel.

¹ Evidence in Chief of Philip Shaw on behalf of Christchurch International Airport Limited, Chapter 6 – General Rules and Procedures (Stage 2&3), 17 February 2016, at page 17 and Table 1. Available online at <http://chchplan.ihp.govt.nz/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/2348-CIAL-Evidence-of-Phil-Shaw-17-2-2016.pdf>.

