

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of a Board of Inquiry appointed under s149J of the Resource Management Act 1991 to consider Notice of Requirements and applications for Resource Consent made by the New Zealand Transport Agency in relation to the East West Link roading proposal in Auckland.

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF PAUL CRIMMINS ON BEHALF OF AUCKLAND
COUNCIL
AIR QUALITY**

1. Corrections to Evidence

- (a) I confirm that the conclusions as set out in my statement of evidence (dated 4 May 2017) remain true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
- (b) However, as set out below, since the preparation of my evidence, I have had further discussions regarding the conditions of consent with Ms Needham, the air quality expert engaged by the applicant. These discussions have resulted in an update to my recommendations regarding appropriate conditions of consent for air discharges.

2. Overview of Key Conclusions of Evidence

- (a) I consider that the construction of the Proposal, including the operation of the proposed concrete manufacturing facility, shall cause discharges of contaminants into air, primarily dust. However, I consider that these discharges can be adequately avoided, remedied and mitigated by conditions of consent.
- (b) I consider that the assessment undertaken by Ms Needham (as detailed in Technical Report 9 of the application bundle) adequately demonstrates that the operational air discharges (from vehicles using the future route and surrounding network) are not likely to cause significantly increased adverse air quality effects when compared to a scenario without the Proposal.

3. Summary of Issues Resolved and Unresolved

- (a) Following the submission of my evidence and the expert caucusing for air quality, which was held on 26 May 2017, I have had further discussions with Ms Needham regarding the wording of the proposed air quality conditions.
- (b) I now consider that conditions AQ.1 to AQ.4 and CB.1 to CB.7 proposed by Ms Hopkins in her rebuttal evidence (dated 20 June

2017) are adequate for avoiding, remedying and mitigating the air quality effects of the Project.

- (c) I consider that, if the consents are granted according to these proposed conditions, significant air quality effects are not likely to occur at any location.
- (d) Further to my evidence, I can confirm that I cycled the route of the East West Link on 17 July 2017 (deviating around the Mercury Energy site via Church St and Great South Road). In particular, I was interested in investigating the likelihood of the air quality reverse sensitivity effects raised by the evidence of Dr Brady (for Stratex). I did detect odours from industries along the route from near the SH20 bridge to Alfred St, but did not consider that they constituted an offensive or objectionable effect at that time given the limited duration of my exposure while commuting along the existing foreshore cycleway. At the time of my inspection, I did not detect any odours or visible emissions from Stratex, near the busy intersection of Sylvia Park Road and Great South Road.