

BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

AND

IN THE MATTER of Proposed District Plan for Lower Hutt

& IN THE MATTER of Hearing Stream 4 (HS4)

SUBMITTER Winstone Aggregates

LEGAL SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF WINSTONE AGGREGATES

Hearing Stream 4 (Special Purpose Quarry Zone)

17 July 2026

**PHERNNE
TANCOCK**
Duncan Ballinger

Barrister, Harbour Chambers
phernne.tancock@legalchambers.co.nz
duncan.ballinger@stoutstreet.co.nz
+64 21 496 823

MAY IT PLEASE THE PANEL:

1. These submissions are filed on behalf of Winstone Aggregates. I appear on behalf of Winstone Aggregates, a Division of Fletcher Concrete (**Fletcher**) and Infrastructure Ltd (**Winstone**). Winstone has made a submission (Submitter No. 444, Further Submission No. F34) on the Proposed Hutt City District Plan.

Introduction

2. Winstone is the only quarry operator in the Hutt District. The land in the proposed Special Purpose Quarry Zone (**SPQZ**) (and currently in the operative plans Extraction Zone) contains two sites: the Belmont Quarry on Hebden Crescent and the Dry Creek Quarry on Liverton Road, both of which are owned by Winstone's parent company, Fletchers, and operated by Winstone.
3. The district plan review has provided a valuable opportunity for Winstone to assess its operations and ensure the plan better equips the quarry for the next 20 years. It has also provided an opportunity for Winstone to seek improvements to the two-decade-old provisions to better reflect modern quarrying practice, its future operations, and give effect to statutory direction and planning practice. The SPQZ sits on one of the last remaining significant mineral deposits near Wellington City.
4. Winstone has worked closely with Council staff since the draft plan stage to prepare for the new SPQZ.

Lack of aggregate resource in Hutt City – the last quarry

5. The relief sought by Winstone is essential to ensure a continued supply of aggregate to the region (particularly Wellington City where demand is highest). Quarries are the only source of aggregate. Aggregate is essential in the construction industry, used in road construction, building projects, and infrastructure development. It is also required to respond to natural disasters and to improve strategic resilience.

6. The Wellington region (including Lower Hutt District) is facing some hard choices as to where aggregate will be sourced (and the resulting increased cost of doing so):
 - a. Locally sourced quarries have been in rapid decline. Fifty years ago, there were 30 plus aggregate quarries across the Wellington regions including in the Haywards and Belmont Hills, and today only a handful remain.
 - b. There is no alternative to aggregate, it is a finite mineral which is consumed in huge quantities to build, maintain and support our communities.
 - c. It is a heavy, bulky product best utilised as close to where it is sourced as possible to reduce both emissions and transport costs.¹
 - d. Quarries can only be established where accessible and quality aggregate resource lies and where the resource is near the surface. The majority of land suitable for quarrying has been sterilised via development or incompatible land uses.
7. Winstone's relief seeks to maximise the life of Belmont Quarry and to protect and reinvest in its existing operations, rather than seek new quarries further afield. As outlined by Mr Heffernan, the SPQZ contains a sizeable aggregate resource of high-quality rock, capable of supporting quarrying activities for a further 40 years.²
8. Efficiently utilising the existing Belmont Quarry is a sustainable way to support access to secure aggregate and, in turn, to contain aggregate extraction within the SPQZ, an area of land associated with quarrying for more than a century.

National Direction

¹ On average the economic cost per tonne doubles every additional 30km it is transported.

² Evidence of Mr Heffernan para 4.1-4.3 and 5.4.

9. The benefits of quarrying are recognised at a national level in government direction. A reliable source of locally available aggregate is necessary to achieve:

- a. The development and infrastructure outcomes of the NPS-UD to provide for housing supply.
- b. Quarrying is recognised as an “infrastructure supporting activity” in the NPS-I.³ Policy 5 of the NPS-I is highly relevant:

Policy 5 Recognising and providing for infrastructure supporting activities:

(1) Decision makers must recognise and provide for the role of infrastructure supporting activities by:

- (a) Recognising the importance of infrastructure supporting activities to enable the benefits of infrastructure to be realised;
- (b) Recognising the operational and functional need of some infrastructure activities including supporting quarrying operations to operate in, be located in, or traverse particular environments and locations; and
- (c) Enabling the timely delivery of infrastructure supporting activities.

c. Other relevant Policies providing direction in the NPS-I

(2) New definitions of “buffer and “sensitive activities”; ”⁴

³ ‘**infrastructure supporting activities** means activities that are not ancillary infrastructure activities but that are needed to directly support infrastructure and may include quarrying activities.’

⁴ **Buffer** means an overlay, a specific control layer **or rules** in a district plan to manage the effects of activities that may be sensitive or incompatible with, or adverse effect infrastructure activities, and may include restrictions on those activities or measures to manage effects of infrastructure on those activities.’

(3) Policy 10 *Planning for and managing the interface between existing and planned infrastructure and other activities;*

(4) Policy 11 *Assessing the interface between infrastructure and other activities.*

- d. Quarrying is also recognised as being locationally constrained – only being sourced where it is located and accessible, and has established consent pathways via the effects management hierarchy in the NPS- IB⁵ and FM⁶, which recognise that the nature of quarrying often brings it into conflict with protection of natural inland wetlands and significant indigenous vegetation and rivers and streams and NES-F.⁷ Winstone accepts that often those competing values of needing to locate where the aggregate is found, can give rise to tension between protection and beneficial use.

Regional Policy Statement

10. The Regional Policy Statement (**RPS**) for the Greater Wellington Region is also a relevant consideration. Notably:

- a. **Objective 31** – that the demand for mineral resources is met from resources located in close proximity to the areas of demand;
- b. **Policy 60** – Utilising the region’s mineral resources directs decision makers on plan changes to consider:

‘particular regard shall be given to-

- (a) The social, economic and environmental benefits from utilising mineral resources within the region; and

⁵ NPS-IB (Clause 3.11)

⁶ NPS-FM (Clause 3.22) and

⁷ NES-F (Section 45A and 45D)

- (b) Protecting significant mineral resources from incompatible or inappropriate land uses.

- 11. While Greater Wellington has not mapped the region's aggregate resources, Belmont, as a supplier of 40% of the aggregate market, is clearly a regionally significant mineral resource.⁸
- 12. The explanation to Policy 60 emphasises to decision-makers the need to protect significant mineral resources from incompatible and inappropriate land uses. Notes that:

“this protection extends to both the land required for the working site and associated access routes. Examples of methods to protect significant mineral deposits include buffer areas in which sensitive activities may be restricted, and the use of noise reduction measures and visual screening”.

Support for changes in Officers' response

- 13. There is a high degree of alignment between Winstone and the Officers on most matters. Mr Hopkins' evidence lists the areas of agreement from the Officers' s42A report.⁹ The Officers' response also makes a number of recommendations that Winstone supports:
 - a. QUARZ- R4 recommendation to remove the reference to conservation activities;
 - b. QUARZ-R4 recommendation: QUARZ-R4 be deleted (albeit for different reasons than Winstone); and
 - c. Vibration provisions. (QUARZ-P6, QUARZ-S3.2b (Blast Noise) deletion of QUARZ-S7, QUARZ-SZ-S3.12) There is total agreement between Winstone and HCC on these provisions.

Remaining areas of disagreement

⁸ Evidence of Mr Heffernan para 4.2

⁹ Evidence of Mr Hopkins para 9.1-9.2

14. There is remaining disagreement on the following matters:
 - a. QUARZ – S5 Quarry Amenity Protection Overlay – Removal of Area 3;
 - b. Exclusion to (QUARZ-S1- Height of radio towers, cell towers, support structures and cement silos from QUARZ-S1);
 - c. The need for notification of the Quarry Owner/Operator and non-complying activity status for resource consents within the Quarry Zone Protection Overlay (Officer Response para 4.5 -4.10, 4.11 - 4.12);
 - d. Retaining indigenous vegetation provision in the Quarry Zone (QUARZ-P7); and
15. These reasons for disagreement are explained by Winstone's experts in their written evidence. Winstone's experts have also provided rebuttal comments on the Officers' response, proposing solutions to address concerns where they can.

Deletion of Area 3 from the Quarry Amenity Protection Overlay

16. Winstone's planning and landscape evidence has addressed the merits of its request to remove Area 3 from the Quarry Amenity Protection Overlay/Special Amenity Area Overlay. While Winstone's submission sought deletion of the overlay, only Area 3 is of practical significance to quarrying operations and contains a large amount of usable quarriable rock (estimated at 3.3 million tonnes), which is important to the economic functioning of the City and region.
17. Mr Compton-Moens' initial assessment has focused primarily on visual amenity (as that is what the overlay and associated provisions purport to protect), finding that effects would be minor (low) at most and did not

warrant the protection afforded to it by the Officer.¹⁰ Mr Compton-Moen has responded to the matters raised by Ms Armstrong and has confirmed that they do not alter his view that Area 3 should be removed. Winstone's position is that:

- a. Area 3 does not have amenity, landscape or natural character values that warrant special protection.
- b. The Area 3 Overlay is redundant from an effects perspective; it does not address or manage the effects it purports to;
- c. Just because Area 3 was historically afforded protection in the operative plan does not mean it is automatically appropriate to continue that protection. The Panel must be satisfied that good reasons exist for the extent of the Area 3 Overlay.
- d. Removal of Area 3 provides access to a high-quality rock deposit on land that has long been set aside for quarrying, within the SPQZ.
- e. Wellington is now in an aggregate deficit, in that it consumes more aggregate than it can supply. Belmont is the last quarry in the district and one of four remaining quarries in this part of the region – the more constrained the aggregate supply becomes, the greater the need for the Panel to carefully consider the appropriateness of including the Area 3 overlay in the plan.
- f. The overlay sits over the top of a significant aggregate resource (of regional benefit) - retaining the overlay fails to strike the right balance in terms of costs and benefits.
- g. The costs to Winstone of retaining Area 3 are not insignificant and should not be overlooked. While there is a consent pathway, there are costs, risks, and uncertainties inherent in that process that are exacerbated by inclusion on an overlay without sound evidential foundation.

¹⁰ Evidence of Mr Compton-Moen para 4.4

- h. The Panel will need to determine (on the evidence before it) the extent to which the Area 3 overlay is needed to control and effect, including whether the protection afforded is justified.
18. As explained by Mr Compton-Moen, Ms Armstrong's preliminary assessment of section 6 matters (natural character, outstanding natural landscape values she says are associated with Area 3) is not supported by close examination of the existing surrounding environment, or planning documents.
19. The Officer (in reliance on Ms Armstrong's evidence) has erred by placing too much weight on protecting these values, which provide very little localised amenity protection, without properly balancing them against the benefits of deletion and the costs of maintaining the status quo.
20. Winstone is concerned that these minor localised effects have been given greater weight than the clear guidance in the National Direction and the Regional Policy Statement, which recognise both the challenges faced by quarrying activities and the need for aggregate, as well as the benefits in terms of growth, housing and infrastructure that require a secure and efficient supply of aggregate. As explained by Mr Hopkins, the National Direction and RPS (outlined earlier in these submissions) provide guidance to decision-makers; when properly applied, these directions support the deletion of Area 3.

Reduced overlay/ 10m retained Buffer Strip

21. In Winstone's initial submission, it sought full deletion of Area 3; however, it did offer an alternative: a reduced overlay consisting of a 10m retained land strip (if the Panel considered it necessary).¹¹ Both the Officer and Ms Armstrong sought further information about this alternative.
22. Having considered Ms Armstrong's evidence, Mr Compton-Moen agrees that a 10m retained land strip (a 10m frontage of Area 3) along the quarry

¹¹ Evidence of Mr Compton-Moen at 5 (referred to in that evidence as potential reduced overlay or edge treatment).

frontage should be retained (if Area 3 is deleted) and has provided more details on how that could be incorporated into the SPQZ.

QUARZ-S1 (Height)

23. Winstone seeks an amendment to QUARZ-S1 to provide an exclusion for radio towers, cell towers, support structures, and cement silos from the maximum height limit for buildings in the Quarry Zone. These structures all have a functional and operational need to be located at the Quarry – they are a vital component of aggregate production. The activities (storage, processing, washing, production of aggregate) are included in the wider definition of “quarrying activities”, but the current height limit proposed in S1, would trigger consent.
24. The Officers, based on evidence from Ms Armstrong, rejected Winstone’s relief on this point primarily due to concern about the impact of prominent skyline breaches.
25. The fact that no upper height limit was defined as part of the exception sought may have led to this concern; Further amendments are proposed to address this.

Provisions requested to protect against reverse sensitivity

26. There is a high level of agreement between Winstone and the Officers regarding the Quarry Protection Area and relevant provisions. There is no dispute that provisions in the plan are required to manage reverse sensitivity effects:¹²
 - a. The Quarry was lawfully established many years ago; quarry operations have occurred on the site for over 100 years;

¹² Evidence Mr Heffernan at 3.1 -4.5.

- b. The Quarry was originally established in a rural or industrial quarrying area well away from residential or other sensitive activities.
 - c. Over the years, the Quarry has faced various forms and degrees of residential encroachment resulting in the Quarry Protection Overlay.
 - d. Belmont Quarry is a regionally significant mineral deposit, one of the four operative quarries remaining in this part of the Wellington Region. The importance of the Quarry is also recognised in the operative and proposed district plans.
 - e. It makes a considerable contribution to the Wellington Regional economy, in both direct and indirect benefits.
27. The extent of the Quarry Protection Overlay mapped by Council is also not disputed; it has been a feature of the operative plan for a long time. The remaining dispute concerns the status of noise-sensitive activities in the buffer area and whether notification should be provided to the quarry owner or operator.

Notification to Quarry operator/owner

28. Winstone's submission points 444.88 and 444.59 sought that consent applications for noise-sensitive activities within the Quarry Protection Overlay be limited to, or notified to, the quarry operator and owner. The reason for this was that the Quarry Operator wanted to be alerted and have the opportunity to submit on resource consent applications that may give rise to reverse sensitivity issues. Public notification is currently precluded in these rules.
29. Much of the SPQZ contains land that will eventually be quarried. Without a mechanism in the plan requiring consultation with the quarry operator, it is unclear whether the impact on Belmont Quarry and the ability to sterilise land long set aside for quarrying would be considered.

30. The Officer's Section 42A report (in paragraph 102) states that there is no provision in the RMA requiring limited notification to certain parties.
31. Counsel agrees with the Officer's report on this. The RMA does not appear to allow for a rule that requires limited notification of certain parties. Rather, Section 77D(a) allows rules in plans that require public notification or preclude public or limited notification (section 77D(b) and (c)).
32. As a result, Mr Hopkins¹³ has provided two alternative options to strengthen the notification framework for sensitive activities (both aligned with section 77D(a) RMA:
- a. A public notification rule for sensitive activities (i.e. constructing new dwellings in the QZPO (RLZ-QZPO-R1), residential activities (RLZ-QZPO-R2) or visitor accommodation (RLZ-QZPO-R2 seeking to establish in the QZPO where the approval of the Quarry Operator is not provided (*however, on reflection it is recognised that this is out of scope*¹⁴); or
 - b. A rule requiring the Council to give explicit consideration to the quarry operator as an affected person when making an assessment under section 95E. (working with the existing section 77D(b) Rule) which limits public notification.
33. As explained by Mr Heffernan, it is difficult to see how reverse sensitivity effects could be properly understood or considered by Council without input from the quarry operator.¹⁵

Non-complying activity status

34. Winstone also sought that noise-sensitive activities in the QZPO (visitor accommodation and residential activities) be afforded non-complying activity status. This is appropriate given the inherently incompatible nature of noise-sensitive activities seeking to be established within the Quarry

¹³ Evidence of Mr Hopkins at 10.16.

¹⁴ Winstone's initial submission supported the existing reference to limited notification in the plan.

¹⁵ Evidence of Mr Heffernan at 7.1-7.8

Protection Overlay, which recognises the inability to internalise effects at the zone boundary. Non-complying activity status provides a very strong signal to plan users that these activities are inherently incompatible with the Quarry Protection Overlay and should be established in this area only under exceptional circumstances. Winstone considers it is appropriate for the plan to actively discourage noise-sensitive activities in the Quarry Protection Overlay, as this is a location where the plan accepts that not all (for example acoustic and vibration, dust and visual effects) can be internalised; it is not uncommon to employ non-complying activity status in these instances.

35. It is submitted that this is an appropriate use of a rule or control, in combination with the Quarry Protection Overlay, and is consistent with both the NPS-I and RPS Policy 60 direction “to protect” (i.e. protect from material harm) regionally significant mineral deposits (or infrastructure supporting activities such as quarrying) from reverse sensitivity effects that would constrain its development.

Officer’s suggested wording

36. The Officer has recommended that the relief sought by Winstone be rejected on both points. Winstone disagrees with the Officer’s reasons for this.
37. In terms of the seriousness of the issue, while complaints at Belmont Quarry are low,¹⁶ the current number of complaints is not determinative of whether reverse sensitivity effects may arise over the life of the plan; a greater level of rural residential development has occurred in the area in recent years.
38. Winstone is concerned that any newly consented sensitive activities may result in restrictions on its existing operations and constrain the quarry’s future development within the SPQZ. Establishing dwellings within the quarry protection overlay would create incompatible activities that place

¹⁶ Evidence of Mr Heffernan at 3.2

significant constraints on existing activities and may result in limits or closure.¹⁷

39. The Officer has (at 4.11) recommended amending the Restricted Discretionary Activity, matters of discretion to provide further direction as to the type of effects to consider:

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1. Reverse sensitivity effects on quarrying activities in the Quarry Zone, including but not limited to, the impact of the:
 - a. Visibility of the quarry from the sensitive activity
 - b. Noise and vibration from quarrying activities at the site, and
 - c. Dust generated by quarrying activities.

40. However, this is flawed; it encourages a Council Officer to focus on the effects experienced at a particular location at the time of consent, rather than considering how a new dwelling in the QPO may restrict future quarry operations; it also does not capture the essence of reverse sensitivity effects, additional compliance costs or risk of sterilising resource. The Environment Court in *Ngatarawa Development Trust Limited v The Hastings District Council* W017/2008 [2008] NZEnvC 100 (14 April 2008) has provided the following interpretation of reverse sensitivity:

“Some lawfully existing activities may produce adverse effects on their surrounding environments, or at least they are perceived to do so. Reactions to those effects, or perceived effects, by way of complaints or actions in nuisance can stifle their growth or, in extreme cases, drive them elsewhere. That stifling, or that loss, may be locally, regionally or even nationally significant. If an activity likely to emit adverse effects seeks to come into a sensitive environment, the problem should be manageable by designing appropriate standards and conditions, or by refusing consent altogether. It is when sensitive activities (usually, but not always, residential activities) seek to establish within range of a lawfully established but effect-emitting activity that management may become difficult. This is the concept of reverse sensitivity...

Reverse sensitivity is the legal vulnerability of an established activity to complaint from a new land use. It arises when an established use is causing adverse environmental impact to nearby land, and a new, benign activity is proposed for the land.

¹⁷ Evidence of Mr Heffernan at 4.5.

41. The Officers' recommended wording is static; defining aspects of those effects does not help to address the susceptibility of established effects-generating activities or protect the quarry's right to continuance of those effects into the future. Both the quarry and SPQZ acknowledge that it will not be able to internalise its effects. The proposed wording does not provide any additional means to protect the SPQZ from incompatible activities; rather, it gives examples of some, but not all effects.
42. The RPS contains strongly worded policy directives as to the importance of quarrying and the need to protect regionally significant mineral deposits by avoiding or minimising reverse sensitivity effects. This is not acknowledged by the Officer at all. The wording proposed by Mr Hopkins¹⁸ better addresses this issue.

Should the Panel give effect to changes to an NPS since the plan was notified?

43. In earlier hearing chapters it was suggested by the Officers that there was no obligation for the Panel to give effect to new or updated NPS and NES, as part of the district plan review, where the direction had been updated since the district plan review was notified. Winstone disagrees with this proposition.
44. Plan changes to district plans under the RMA must consider the matters in s 74, which include NPS's, the NZCPS, and national planning standards. The district plan must give effect to NPSs, the NZCPS, national planning standards and regional policy statements (s 75(3)(a)). In principle, a new NPS (or an amendment to an NPS, such as the December 2025 quarrying Amendments across the suite of National Directions) may need to be given effect to where it is made or amended after the Council has notified its plan but before a decision has been made. This is not always the case, as it depends on the NPS's transitional provisions. To illustrate:
- In *Horticulture NZ v Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council* [2013] NZHC 2492, the High Court held that a new NPS for freshwater that

¹⁸ Evidence of Mr Hopkins at 10.16.

was gazetted after Environment Court appeals had been filed was *not* to be considered in resolving the appeals, because the new NPS had its own specific implementation timetable and process.

- By contrast, in *Hawke's Bay Eastern Fish and Game Councils v HBRC* [2014] NZHC 3191, the High Court reached a different conclusion. A Board of Inquiry had assessed a plan change against the NPS-FM 2011, but the High Court said there were errors of law in its approach. In the meantime, the NPS-FM 2014 had been gazetted. The High Court directed the Board of Inquiry to reconsider its decision in light of the NPS-FM 2014. This was because the NPS-FM 2014 had a requirement for it to be implemented as promptly as possible.
- In *Southern Cross Healthcare* [2023] NZHC 948 at [86] the High Court held the Environment Court on a plan change appeal was obliged to give effect to the NPSUD 2020, even though the NPSUD had only become operative after the plan change had been notified. At [83] the Court says it was practicable to give effect to the NPSUD when the Environment Court was making its decision on the plan change appeal.
- In *Balmoral Developments (Outram) Ltd v Dunedin City Council* [2023] NZEnvC 59 at [103] the Court found that the NPSHPL would apply to a plan change appeal in circumstances where the NPSHPL was gazetted while the Court was hearing the appeal. The Court noted that whether a new NPS would be applicable to an appeal would depend on the implementation and transitional arrangements in the NPS, and that reference to other instruments would be of little assistance to the Court (at [90]).

45. Winstone's original submission sought wide and general relief that any updates to NPS and NES be implemented via the plan (where there was opportunity to do so).

46. The Ministry of Environment Guidance¹⁹ on updating the National Direction: changes to multiple instruments for Quarrying and Mining Provisions confirms that implementing this suite of changes requires immediate action.²⁰

NPS- Infrastructure

47. The National Policy Statement for Infrastructure 2025 (NPS-I) is directive and specific about the timing for its implementation. Clause 3.1 of that NPS says that decision makers must give effect to this NPS on and from the commencement date (which was 15 January 2026). Furthermore, the explanatory note offers additional guidance:

This National Policy Statement is to be applied by all persons exercising powers and functions under the Act. The objective and policies are intended to guide decision-makers in making decisions on the determination of resource consent applications [.....] **The objective and policies will also provide guidance for local authorities on plan-making.**

(emphasis added)

48. The explanatory note also addresses the requirement for the Panel to give effect to the NPS-I where Ministerial exemptions have been granted to proceed with Planning processes.

“In August 2025, the Government passed an amendment to the Act that introduced a requirement to stop most plan-making under the Act, unless it was an exemption. This “plan stop” amendment suspends the requirement to review plans and policy statements and prevents notification of new plan or policy statement changes or variations until the end of 2027, when the new resource management system will be in effect.

Due to the plan stop amendment, plans and policy statements will not be updated to give effect to this National Policy Statement (**unless a relevant exemption applies**).”

49. This is therefore most similar to the *Hawke's Bay Eastern Fish and Game Council* decision, where the relevant National Policy Statement directed decision makers to implement it as promptly as possible.

¹⁹ <https://environment.govt.nz/assets/publications/RM-reform/Updating-National-Direction-Changes-to-Multiple-Instruments-for-Quarrying-and-Mining-Provisions.pdf?v=456ed8bc40ac42774d4a0b947c47c248f8ad7435>

²⁰ Amendments were made to NPS-I Clause 3.11, NPS-FM (clause 3.22), NES-F section 45A, 45D and NPS-HPL (clause 3.9)

50. As Hutt City Council has received a Ministerial exemption to continue its district plan review, the Panel will need to ensure that it gives effect to the NPS-I in its decision.

Witnesses

51. Winstone Aggregates will be calling four witnesses for this hearing stream:
- a. Mr Phillip Heffernan & Mr Paul Herbert (corporate evidence Winstone Aggregates);
 - b. Mr Jamie Exeter (Styles Group) acoustic and vibration.
 - c. Mr David Compton- Moen (DCM Ltd.) (landscape and visual effects); and
 - d. Mr Colin Hopkins (Planning consultant, DCS Planning).

Conclusion

52. Winstone respectfully requests the amendments to the Special Purpose Quarry Zone which reflect:
- a. the agreements with the Officer (where there is no dispute);
 - b. the changes sought in the planning evidence of Mr Hopkins;
 - c. the matters where there is agreement between Winstone and Council arising from the Officer's response.
53. All of the wording changes sought by Winstone (including updated relief taking into account the Officer's response to Winstone's evidence) will be collated by Mr Hopkins and provided to the Panel on Tuesday.



Phernne Tancock
Counsel for Winstone Aggregates

Dated the 17th day of July 2026