



Boffa Miskell



Response to Comments Section 55 Report

FTAA-2603-1185 HUNUA QUARRT DEVELOPMENT -
RESPONSE TO S51 AND S53
COMMENTS 18 AUGUST 2026



Boffa Miskell is proudly a
Toitū net carbonzero certified consultancy

Document Quality Assurance

This document may be cited as: Boffa Miskell Ltd 2026. <i>Response to Comments Section 55 Report: 18 AUGUST 2026</i> . Report prepared by Boffa Miskell Ltd for [insert client name here].				
For any information regarding this report please contact: [Name] [Discipline] [Professional Level] info@boffamiskell.co.nz				
Revision /version:	Issue date:	Prepared by:	Description:	Reviewed by:
Final	18 August 2026	Claire Kelly Senior Principal Planner Lucy Deverall Associate Principal Planner Nick Pollard Partner Planner	Draft report issued to client	Ken Gimblett Partner Planner
Approved for issue: Nick Pollard Planning Partner 18 August 2026				
Release and Reliance This report has been prepared by Boffa Miskell Limited on the instructions of our Client, in accordance with the agreed scope of work. If it is intended to support an application under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, it may be relied upon by the Expert Panel and relevant administering agencies for the purposes of assessing the application. While Boffa Miskell Limited has exercised due care in preparing this report, it does not accept liability for any use of the report beyond its intended purpose. Where information has been supplied by the Client or obtained from external sources, it has been assumed to be accurate unless otherwise stated..				

File name & Project number: [Document1] BM250767

Template revision: 20120419 0000

Cover photograph: Hunua Quarry Development, 2026

Executive Summary

1. This report has been prepared on behalf of Winstone Aggregates (Winstone or Applicant) in accordance with section 55 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024. It responds to comments received on the substantive application for the Hunua Quarry Development, which seeks to develop the existing Symonds Hill Pit within Hunua Quarry to secure additional high-quality greywacke resource and enable the continued extraction of aggregate from the quarry for a further 80 years. The report summarises the matters raised through the section 51 and section 53 processes, identifies amendments made in response, and has been prepared to assist the Panel in its consideration of the application.
2. The Panel invited comments from 139 parties, including Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, Watercare, Healthy Waters, administering agencies, ministers, iwi authorities, requiring authorities, other statutory bodies, neighbouring residents and other landowners. Formal comments were received from 15 parties. These included residents from Ponga Road, Judge Richardson Drive and Kauri View Road, Auckland Council, the Department of Conservation, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, Te Ākitai Waiohū Settlement Trust, Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated, the Auckland Conservation Board and relevant ministers.
3. The comments identify a number of recurring themes. These include ecology, streams and biodiversity; cultural effects and mana whenua interests; traffic and road safety; visual amenity and landscape effects; noise, blasting and vibration; water quality, flooding and groundwater; dust and air quality; the adequacy of mitigation and consent conditions; and economics. Several comments also recognise the positive effects / impacts of the proposal and its regional significance with the Hunua Quarry, providing a significant role in supplying aggregate for Auckland, and the economic and infrastructure benefits associated with the proposal.
4. Ecology-related comments focused on the loss of indigenous vegetation, effects on Significant Ecological Areas, wetlands, stream habitat and threatened or at-risk species, and the adequacy of proposed offsetting and compensation. In response, the Applicant's ecology evidence provides further analysis of the offset and compensation package, including the Meremere offset site, the use of biodiversity offset accounting, stream realignment outcomes, ecological monitoring, augmentation and adaptive management. Amendments to conditions are proposed to

strengthen requirements for ecological outcomes, offsetting, compensation planting, stream design and monitoring.

5. Comments from mana whenua and others raised concerns about cultural landscapes, Mangapū Stream, Pukekōiwhiri Pā, indigenous vegetation, waterways, ridgelines, archaeological matters and the ability for mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga. In response, the Applicant proposes additional and amended conditions, including a Cultural Management Plan and refinements to the Kaitiaki Forum provisions, to support ongoing mana whenua involvement in the preparation of management plans, including aspects of rehabilitation, monitoring, cultural protocols and the management of cultural values.
6. Traffic and road safety comments focused primarily on an existing safety issue on Hunua Road. The transport response provides further analysis of the relevant crash history and visibility matters and supports the ongoing offer to implement audio tactile centreline markings to discourage drivers from crossing the centreline.
7. Landscape and visual comments focused on effects on nearby properties, overburden areas, ridgelines, culturally important locations, the time required for planting to become effective, and the need for long-term rehabilitation and maintenance. The landscape response explains how visual effects have been assessed, identifies further property-specific site visits (for 736 Ponga Road and 68 Judge Richardson Drive), and recommends amendments to conditions for off-site visual mitigation planting, indigenous plant sourcing, involvement of Te Ākitai Waiohū in rehabilitation outcomes for areas visible from Pukekōiwhiri Pā, and the timing, maintenance and design of planting.
8. To assist the Panel the Applicant has provided an amended version of the draft conditions and prepared a tabular assessment showing how the conditions and management plans implement the expert recommendations across the relevant topics. The amendments are intended to provide a clearer and more integrated framework for monitoring, reporting, adaptive management, mana whenua and resident engagement where required.
9. Overall, the authors consider that the matters raised through the section 51 and section 53 processes have been appropriately addressed through this report, the technical responses and the amended draft conditions. Subject to those amended conditions, we consider that the actual and potential effects of the Hunua Quarry Development can be appropriately managed, while enabling the continued supply of a regionally significant aggregate resource for Auckland's growth, infrastructure and construction needs.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Scope of this Report	1
3.0 Structure of Response	1
4.0 Statement of Qualifications and Relevant Experience	2
5.0 Context	3
5.1 Overview of Comments Received	3
6.0 Comment Themes	4
6.1 Ecology, Streams and Biodiversity	4
6.2 Cultural Effects and Mana Whenua Interests	6
6.3 Traffic and Road Safety	7
6.4 Visual Amenity and Landscape Effects	8
6.5 Noise, Blasting and Vibration	9
6.6 Water Quality, Flooding and Groundwater	10
6.7 Dust and Air Quality	11
6.8 Adequacy of Mitigation and Consent Conditions	11
6.9 Economics	12
7.0 Conclusion	12

Appendices

Appendix 1: Comment Analysis

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Appendix 3: Response to Comments Relating to Ecology Matters

Appendix 4: Response to Comments Relating to Groundwater Matters

Appendix 5: Response to Comments Relating to Landscape and Visual Matters

Appendix 6: Response to Comments Relating to Noise and Vibration Matters

Appendix 7: Response to Comments Relating to Stream Diversion Design Matters

Appendix 8: Response to Comments Relating to Transport Matters

Appendix 9: Response to Comments Relating to Iwi Engagement,
Cultural Values and Matters

Appendix 10: Response to Comments Relating to Winstone
Operational / Corporate Matters

Appendix 11: Amended Draft Conditions in Response to Comments

Appendix 12: Tabular Assessment of the Amended Draft Conditions

Appendix 13: Updated Lizard Management Plan

Appendix 14: Annotated Comments

Appendix 15: Response to Comments Relating to Fish Passage

Appendix 16: Updated Boundary Adjustment Subdivision Plan

Appendix 17: Cultural Impact Assessment from Ngaati Whanaunga

1.0 Introduction

10. This report supports the substantive application for the Hunua Quarry Development, which seeks to develop the existing Symonds Hill Pit within the Hunua Quarry to secure additional high-quality greywacke resource and enable the continued extraction of aggregate from the quarry for a further 80 years. The purpose of this report is to summarise the matters raised through the section 53 comments process, identify any amendments and assist the Panel in its consideration of the application.
11. The applicant undertook engagement and consultation on the proposal between November 2025 and March 2026, with further engagement ongoing following the lodgement of the substantive application on 30 March 2026. An update on engagement was provided to the Panel on 22 June and 8 July 2026.
12. Engagement is ongoing and following the issue of this response the applicant intends to engage with Auckland Council, the Department of Conservation and iwi.
13. The Panel invited comments on the application under section 53 of the FTAA between 14 July and 11 August 2026.

2.0 Scope of this Report

14. This report summarises the matters raised by invited parties under Section 51 and Section 53 of the FTAA. It outlines the matters that have been raised by invited parties that have commented, any updates made to the project in response to the comments including conditions and summarises those changes. This report has been prepared to address the requirements of Section 55 of the FTAA.
15. The Department of Conservation (DOC), and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT), provided Section 51 Reports on the substantive application. These were received on 27 and 28 July 2026 respectively.
16. The Applicant and their experts have carefully considered the comments received and, where appropriate, has refined aspects of the Proposal and proposed conditions in response to matters raised.
17. This report should be read in conjunction with the substantive application documents and the additional documents provided as updates in response to ongoing consultation and exchanges with the Panel.

3.0 Structure of Response

18. To assist the Panel this report is comprised as follows:
 - a. This **Summary report** provides an outline of the process undertaken, a summary of the matters raised by invited parties and the high level responses made to those comments. Detailed responses to individual comments can be found in the technical appendices to this report.

- b. **Appendix 1** contains an analysis of the comments, applying a unique code to each comment. This unique code can be used to track through how and where each comment has been responded to and linking this with an expert assessment of the matter raised.
- c. **Appendices 2 – 10** include individual responses from the experts to each of the comments that have been identified through the analysis.
- d. **Appendix 11** contains an amended set of draft conditions. The amendments have been made to the version issued to the Panel on 14 July 2026 and that included changes and amendments identified by the Panel through their SMART review. The mark-up provided with the amended draft conditions has included a comment bubble where a change has been made in response to a comment, with the inclusion of the unique code identified in Appendix 1.
- e. **Appendix 12** contains a tabular assessment of the conditions that tracks the working across the topics and how the conditions and management plans implement these requirements.
- f. **Appendix 13** contains an updated Lizard Management Plan following comments from DOC.
- g. **Appendix 14** contains annotated comments from the invited parties, for reference and identify where the individual comment has generally been raised.
- h. **Appendix 15** contains additional comments relating to fish passage.
- i. **Appendix 16** contains an updated boundary adjustment subdivision plan.
- j. **Appendix 17** contains a cultural impact assessment Ngaati Whanaunga Incorporated Society dated 8 April 2026. This is provided to assist the Panel and is not referred to elsewhere in this report.

4.0 Statement of Qualifications and Relevant Experience

- 19. This report has been coauthored by Claire Kelly, Lucy Deverall and Nick Pollard (Planners, Boffa Miskell). It has been reviewed by Ken Gimblett (Partner | Planner, Boffa Miskell). These authors and reviewer contributed to the preparation of the Hunua Quarry Development: Substantive Application – Part B – Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) dated 30 March 2026 and revision 1.0 of this document dated 22 June 2026.
- 20. Their qualifications and experience is as described in section B1.8 of the AEE and Appendix B12.1 of the substantive application.
- 21. This report has been prepared and reviewed in accordance with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses, contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023. Other than where it is stated that reliance is placed on the advice of another person, the authors confirm that the issues addressed in this report are

within their area of expertise. The authors have not omitted consideration of any material facts known to them that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

22. We have reviewed and provided input into the applicant's response to comments table in relation to comment codes in Appendix 1.

5.0 Context

5.1 Overview of Comments Received

23. The Panel invited comments¹ from 139 parties in total. Those invited to comment included:
 - a. One local authority (Auckland Council, including Auckland Transport, Watercare and Healthy Waters)
 - b. Two administering agencies (DOC, HNZPT)
 - c. 13 iwi authorities
 - d. Eight government ministers
 - e. Three administering agencies
 - f. Three requiring authorities
 - g. Five other parties (Director-General of Conservation, New Zealand Conservation Authority, Auckland Conservation Board New Zealand Fish and Game Council and Game Animal Council)
 - h. Neighbouring residents (on adjacent land, consent holders of bores in the zone of influence and landowners where it was assessed that they would be subject to moderate – high landscape visual effects).
24. Of those who were invited to comment under section 53 of the FTAA, formal comments were received from the 15 parties, identified in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Comments received from the invited parties

EPA Comment No.	Commenter	Address, if resident
1.	Joe Shannon and Jan Dupker	
2.	Minister for Resources	
3.	Te Ākitai Waiohū Settlement Trust	

¹ Refer [Minute 2 of the expert panel](#) for the Hunua Quarry Development

EPA Comment No.	Commenter	Address, if resident
4.	Minister of Climate Change	
5.	Minister for Infrastructure	
6.	Paul Aylett	
7.	Gavin and Rebecca Giles	
8.	Auckland Council	
9.	Department of Conservation	
10.	Gerald Masters and Anita Masters	
11.	Paul and Vivienne Manak	
12.	Brian and Kate Park	
13.	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	
14.	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated	
15.	Auckland Conservation Board	

6.0 Comment Themes

25. After reviewing the comments, there were a number of comments in support of the project notably aspects of: Quarry is regionally significant; Important source of aggregate for Auckland; Strong economic and infrastructure benefits; with Ministers and some technical specialists commenting in support of the project and its benefits.
26. The key issues raised in the comments fall into nine main themes.

6.1 Ecology, Streams and Biodiversity

27. Key concerns
 - a. Loss of approximately 44 ha of indigenous forest and impacts on Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs).
 - b. Loss of wetlands and permanent modification of the Mangapū Stream tributary.

- c. Permanent loss or reclamation of over 1 km of stream habitat.
 - d. Effects on threatened and at-risk species including native fish, bats, lizards and indigenous vegetation.
 - e. Questions about whether the proposed stream realignment can ever achieve the same ecological and natural character values as the existing stream.
 - f. Concerns that proposed biodiversity offsetting and compensation packages are insufficient or inadequately demonstrated.
28. Commenters that raised it
- a. Te Ākitai Waiohū
 - b. Auckland Council ecology specialist
 - c. DOC.
29. Key concern
- a. The comments concluded that the application does not currently demonstrate no net loss of biodiversity and that additional information, revised offsets and stronger conditions are needed.
30. The concerns have been addressed as follows:
- a. Appendix 3 (ecology) includes further analysis on the offset and compensation packages and provides:
 - i. An assessment of the Meremere offset site sufficiently meets the offsetting principles.
 - ii. A rationale for early successional species selected for focus areas 1 and 2.
 - iii. A rationale for values ecologically functional channel aspects of the stream realignment proposal and outcomes to be achieved in conditions and specified in the Stream Realignment Management Plan and the Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan.
 - iv. Acknowledges the need to update the Ecological Management Plan for Focus Areas 1 and 2 to include recovery and propagation of regionally at-risk and threatened flora.
 - v. Clarifies that effects management has been applied to all identified effects of the Hunua Quarry expansion project.
 - vi. Revised the extent of intermittent and permanent classifications as they apply to Tributaries 3 and 4 of the Managapū Stream.
 - b. Appendix 3 contains commentary on the BOAM model attributes including:
 - i. Justification for how the structural attributes have been used as surrogates for biodiversity attributes.
 - ii. Confirmation that multipliers for lag time and uncertainty in the calculation of net present biodiversity value have been included.

- iii. Inclusion of hydrological functions and ecological connectivity provided by forest seepage wetlands into the BOAM model attributes.
- c. Appendix 3 contains commentary on the MALF and outlines conditions including the proposed monitoring, augmentation and adaptive management framework, to ensure ecological effects that may arise from artificially low flows caused by quarry dewatering are appropriately managed.
- d. Appendix 3 recommends that:
 - i. Conditions require the SEV metric to be applied during the design phase of the channel.
 - ii. Conditions require offsetting and compensation planting to occur before vegetation is cleared.
 - iii. Conditions provide for the cumulative impact of the losses of stream length.
 - iv. Conditions are amended to ensure the activities are meeting the no net loss objective.

6.2 Cultural Effects and Mana Whenua Interests

- 31. Key concerns
 - a. Significant adverse effects on cultural landscapes associated with Te Hunua, Mangapū Stream and Pukekōiwiriki Pā.
 - b. Removal of indigenous vegetation and alteration of waterways with cultural significance.
 - c. Loss of ridgelines visible from culturally important sites.
 - d. Concerns about archaeological remains and accidental discovery protocols.
 - e. Ensuring kaitiaki involvement in the project and support the conditions requiring a Kaitiaki Forum with ongoing involvement in the preparation of management plans management plans, rehabilitation and monitoring.
 - f. Concerns about fast-track consultation timeframes and iwi capacity to engage.
- 32. Commenters that raised it?
 - a. Te Ākitai Waiohū Settlement Trust
 - b. Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated
 - c. DOC and Heritage New Zealand commentary
- 33. Auckland Council have also raised the lack of information about cultural effects as a concern.
- 34. Te Ākitai Waiohū sets out that they oppose the quarry expansion in principle, noting areas of concern and seeking an ongoing commitment that respects and reflects the cultural values and aspirations of mana whenua. Te Ākitai Waiohū notably support

the conditions that seek to recognise and protect cultural values, noting the Kaitiaki Forum and input into the preparation of management plans.

- a. Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated acknowledges the applicant's assessment of cultural values and the various measures proposed to respond to matters raised by mana whenua. Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated anticipate that the effects of the quarry expansion and extraction activities can be appropriately addressed through the consent conditions

35. The concerns have been addressed as follows:

- a. Conditions – including a new cultural management plan condition and changes to the Kaitiaki Forum condition (refer to the amended condition in Appendix 11). These changes have been considered in Appendix 2 (planning) and Appendix 9 (iwi engagement, cultural values and matters).
- b. The response to landscape comments in Appendix 5 acknowledges that the project will result in effects that can not necessarily be addressed through planting alone and notes the potential for mitigation measures to be developed through the Kaitiaki Forum and the cultural management plan.

6.3 Traffic and Road Safety

36. Key concerns

- a. Heavy truck movements expected to increase significantly.
- b. Existing safety issues on Hunua Road.
- c. Two serious crashes recorded at the bend near the quarry entrance.
- d. Concern that proposed rumble strips alone are insufficient.
- e. Need for sightline improvements, shoulder widening and road safety audits.

37. Commenters that raised it?

- a. Auckland Transport
- b. Auckland Council traffic engineers
- c. Franklin Local Board

38. Position

- a. AT considered there is potential for significant adverse road safety impacts unless additional mitigation is implemented.

39. The concerns have been addressed as follows:

- a. Appendix 3 (transport) includes further analysis on the road safety at the location identified by Auckland Transport where collisions have occurred at a curve on Hunua Road some 1km west of the site entrance, provides commentary and assessment, including:
 - i. The crashes were not caused by truck but rather the passenger vehicle approaching the corner and crossing the centre line.

- ii. Proposed rumble strip markings are appropriate mitigation in that they specially address the cause of the crashes being a car crossing the centreline on a corner.
 - iii. The intervisibility assessment request by Auckland Transport and detailed in Appendix 3 demonstrates and acceptable Approach Sight Distance is achieved.
 - iv. Benching will not address vehicles crossing the centre and will require extensive works on private property, that is not in the control of the applicant.
- b. Appendix 8 (transport) recommends that:
- i. Conditions are amended to include a requirement that road widening works should include minimum 1m road shoulder.
 - ii. Conditions requiring a Safe System Audit Report at the future Engineering Approval stage and audio tactile profiled centreline markings 'rumble strips' (should be included).

6.4 Visual Amenity and Landscape Effects

40. Key concerns:
- a. Moderate-high visual effects for some neighbouring properties.
 - b. Large overburden areas visible from surrounding residences and culturally significant locations.
 - c. Loss of ridgelines and natural landforms.
 - d. Long delay before mitigation planting becomes effective.
41. Auckland Council's landscape specialist generally accepted the assessment but noted:
- a. Significant adverse effects would persist for decades.
 - b. Success depends heavily on long-term rehabilitation and maintenance.
 - c. Five years of planting maintenance may be inadequate.
42. Other commenters that raised it?
- a. Te Ākitai Waiohū Settlement Trust
 - b. Ponga Road residents.
 - c. Judge Richardson Drive residents.
43. The concerns have been addressed in Appendix 5 (landscape) as follows:
- a. includes a rationale as to how the visual effects on properties has been determined and an explanation for planned site visits (through August – September 2026) [REDACTED] Ponga Road and [REDACTED] Judge Richardson Drive. The purpose of these site visits is to confirm the visibility of the consented and the

visual effects proposed quarry development, and identify what property-specific mitigation planting could practicably achieve for residents of [REDACTED] Ponga Road and [REDACTED] Judge Richardson Drive.

- b. There is an acknowledgement that that whilst the Hunua Pit Overburden Disposal Area sizeable and perceptible component as viewed from Pukekōiwiriki pā that this will be progressively softened as planting establishes a cohesive vegetated foreground.
- c. Rehabilitation planting will re-establish vegetative cover in areas of the modified ridges and reduce the contrast of exposed quarry surfaces, and confirms it will not reinstate the original elevation or physical profile of the ridgeline. Appendix 5 is clear to note that visual rating assessment ratings – low-moderate reducing to low following rehabilitation – does not diminish or override Te Ākitai Waiohūa's assessment of the cultural importance of the affected ridgelines.
- d. An acknowledgement that the progressive rehabilitation seeks to ensure that planting is undertaken as soon as areas become available, rather than being deferred until the end of quarrying.

44. Appendix 8 (landscape) recommends:

- a. Off-Site Visual Mitigation Planting Condition is amended to require planting to be implemented in advance (a minimum of 5 years) of the quarry stages expected to create the most noticeable change for each dwelling that accepts the offer.
- b. A requirement for Winstone to provide an opportunity to involve Te Ākitai Waiohūa in developing the rehabilitation outcomes for areas visible from Pukekōiwiriki pā.
- c. A requirement for all indigenous plants included in visual mitigation planting are sourced from the Hunua Ecological District.
- d. A requirement for off-site visual mitigation planting to provide for a 12-month establishment and maintenance period following planting, and that conditions allow for wider or denser planting than the 5m width, and be designed to respond to the property-specific basis.

6.5 Noise, Blasting and Vibration

45. Resident concerns

- a. Existing blasting already noticeable in nearby homes.
- b. Fear of structural damage from blasting vibrations.
- c. Loss of rural amenity.
- d. Concerns about possible extension of operating hours.
- e. Requests to maintain current Saturday restrictions.

46. Commenters who raised it?

- a. Ponga Road residents.
 - b. Judge Richardson Drive residents.
47. The concerns have been addressed as follows:
- a. Appendix 6 (noise and vibration) provides:
 - i. An explanation regarding the proposed blasting vibration limits in the draft conditions providing better protection for residents than the existing Auckland Unitary Plan standards, and that the proposed blasting conditions include overpressure and vibration limits that must be complied with regardless of the location.
 - ii. An acknowledgement that as the progressive reduction in the overpressure and vibration pit depth increases.
 - b. Appendix 2 (planning) details that that mineral extraction activities are a typical feature of the identified rural zones including the Mixed Rural zone.
 - c. Appendix 10 (Winstone) confirms that for operational reasons it is important to undertake construction and quarry-related activities within the hours proposed, but notes the need to comply with the conditions and noise limits.

6.6 Water Quality, Flooding and Groundwater

48. Key concerns
- a. Potential flooding risks associated with stream diversion.
 - b. Sedimentation effects during construction.
 - c. Groundwater drawdown affecting private bores and stream flows.
 - d. Need for more robust flood hydraulic modelling.
 - e. Concerns about water quality from quarry dewatering and augmentation flows.
49. Technical findings
- a. Most specialists considered these issues manageable if stronger monitoring and trigger-based conditions are imposed, but ongoing uncertainty remains.
50. The concerns have been addressed as follows:
- a. Appendix 7 (stream diversion design) recommends that conditions are amended requiring an assessment of the upstream risks associated with stream diversion and hydraulic modelling to demonstrate the design will not overtop the gully or haul road.
 - b. Appendix 4 (groundwater) recommends that various conditions are amended to include the appropriate trigger levels and monitoring framework including Stream flow monitoring of Taitaia Stream. Appendix 4 also includes analysis in response to resident's and their comments on the management of water take, high and low flow conditions, and augmentation methods.

- c. Appendix 2 (planning) provides an explanation of the proposed erosion and sediment control measures that will manage potential sedimentation effects.

6.7 Dust and Air Quality

- 51. Resident concerns
 - a. Dust effects on homes, gardens, water tanks and outdoor living areas.
 - b. Need for property-specific monitoring.
- 52. No further assessment is considered necessary given:
 - a. Air quality specialists were generally supportive:
 - b. Existing monitoring shows good compliance.
 - c. Dust is considered manageable through existing suppression systems and monitoring.
 - d. Effects predicted to be minor with conditions in place.

6.8 Adequacy of Mitigation and Consent Conditions

- 53. A recurring theme across almost all submissions and expert reviews was:
- 54. Concern that:
 - a. Proposed offsets and compensation are not fully proven.
 - b. Long-term maintenance requirements are too weak.
 - c. Monitoring needs to be more rigorous.
 - d. Adaptive management triggers should be strengthened.
 - e. Some information gaps remain.
- 55. Suggested improvements
 - a. Stronger ecological performance targets.
 - b. Longer maintenance periods.
 - c. Continuous environmental monitoring.
 - d. Greater mana whenua involvement.
 - e. Clearer enforcement and review mechanisms
- 56. Various amendments and analysis is included in Appendix 2 regarding conditions and Appendix 11 includes an updated set of draft conditions that have been amended in response to the comments. In addition, Appendix 12 includes a tabular assessment of the various topic groupings of conditions and management plans to ensure that the expert recommendations have been correctly implemented to ensure the potential impacts and effects are appropriately managed.

6.9 Economics

57. Auckland Council's specialist reviewer for economics raised some technical aspects associated with the Applicants assessment. The areas of concern related to the applicant's economic assessment which relied on a per capita demand basis which in the reviewer's opinion risked overstating demand associated with the existing population and understating demand arising from growth (e.g. aggregate demand arising from to growth-related activity and growth-related data). The reviewer also identified that economic assessment did not quantify the potential costs arising from environmental impacts and other externalities, suggesting that the application would be more complete if it included a cost-benefit analysis.
58. Regardless of the areas of concern expressed the reviewer noted general agreement overall concluding that the project will result in significant regional and national benefits and no further response is required.

7.0 Conclusion

59. The comments received through the section 51 and section 53 processes have been carefully reviewed by the Applicant and its technical experts. The comments identify a range of matters requiring a response. While a number of submitters raised concerns or sought further information, the comments also acknowledge the regional significance of Hunua Quarry, the importance of the aggregate resource to Auckland's infrastructure supply, and the economic and infrastructure benefits associated with the proposal.
60. In response to the matters raised, the Applicant has provided further expert assessment and has refined the proposed consent conditions and supporting management plan framework. Key amendments include strengthened requirements for ecological offsetting, compensation, monitoring and adaptive management; additional provisions to recognise mana whenua values and enable ongoing involvement through the Kaitiaki Forum and a Cultural Management Plan; refinements to transport, road safety and stream diversion conditions; and further clarification of how landscape, noise, vibration, groundwater, water quality, dust and air quality effects will be managed over the life of the project. These amendments are intended to provide a clear, enforceable and integrated framework for managing the actual and potential effects of the proposal.
61. Overall, we consider that the matters raised in comments have been appropriately addressed through the responses contained in this report, the appended technical responses, and the amended draft conditions. The proposed conditions provide for ongoing monitoring, reporting, adaptive management, engagement with affected parties and mana whenua, and review mechanisms where required. On that basis and having regard to the project's acknowledged regional and infrastructure benefits, we consider that the Panel can be satisfied that the effects of the Hunua Quarry

Development can be appropriately managed and that the approvals sought may be granted subject to the amended conditions.

Appendix 1: Comment Analysis

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Appendix 3: Response to Comments Relating to Ecology Matters

Appendix 4: Response to Comments Relating to Groundwater Matters

Appendix 5: Response to Comments Relating to Landscape and Visual Matters

Appendix 6: Response to Comments Relating to Noise and Vibration Matters

Appendix 7: Response to Comments Relating to Stream Diversion Design Matters

Appendix 8: Response to Comments Relating to Transport Matters

Appendix 9: Response to Comments Relating to Iwi Engagement, Cultural Values and Matters

Appendix 10: Response to Comments Relating to Winstone Operational / Corporate Matters

Appendix 11: Amended Draft Conditions in Response to Comments

Appendix 12: Tabular Assessment of the Amended Draft Conditions

Appendix 13: Updated Lizard Management Plan

Appendix 14: Annotated Comments

Appendix 15: Response to Comments Relating to Fish Passage

Appendix 16: Updated Boundary Adjustment Subdivision Plan

Appendix 17: Cultural Impact Assessment from Ngaati Whanaunga

