



FTAA-2603-1185 – Winstone Aggregates Company Response to Section 53 Comments and Selected Section 51 Reports

17 August 2026

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	3
SECTION 53 COMMENTS – WINSTONE RESPONSE	4
COMMENT 1: JOE SHANNON AND JAN DUPKER [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	4
COMMENT 3: TE ĀKITAI WAIOHUA SETTLEMENT TRUST	4
COMMENT 6: PAUL AYLETT [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	9
COMMENT 7: GAVIN AND REBECCA GILES [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	10
COMMENT 8: AUCKLAND COUNCIL.....	11
COMMENT 10: GERALD AND ANITA MASTERS [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	19
COMMENT 12: BRIAN AND KATE PARK [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	21
SECTION 51 REPORTS AND ADVICE – WINSTONE RESPONSE	21

Document Information

Document name	FTAA-2603-1185 – Response to Comments
Version	A
Author	Phil Heffernan – Project Manager
Reviewed by	Cam Russell - Senior Projects and Environmental Advisor
Approved by	Ian Wallace – Environment and Planning Manager

Introduction

This document provides Winstone Aggregates' company response to selected matters raised in reports and advice provided under section 51 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, and comments provided on the Hunua Quarry Development substantive application under section 53 of the Act.

The responses in this document address matters where Winstone considers a direct company response is appropriate, including operational matters, ongoing engagement, property and commercial matters, and Winstone's position on particular requests.

These responses are intended to be read alongside the separate responses prepared by the Applicant's technical specialists. The technical responses address the detailed technical matters raised in both the section 51 reports and section 53 comments and provide the supporting assessment for the Applicant's position.

This document does not seek to reproduce a response to every matter raised. Where no separate Winstone response is provided, the matter is addressed in the relevant specialist, planning or legal response.

Winstone has sought to respond constructively to the matters raised and, where appropriate, has identified opportunities to clarify or refine the proposed consent conditions and management framework. Where Winstone does not support a requested change, the reasons for that position are set out in the relevant response.

Winstone appreciates the time taken by commenters and administering agencies to review the application and provide feedback, and remains committed to ongoing engagement with mana whenua, neighbouring landowners, regulatory agencies and other stakeholders as the Project progresses.

Section 53 Comments – Winstone Response

Comment 1: Joe Shannon and Jan Dupker [REDACTED]

Comment 1.001 - *Commenter is concerned that extending Saturday operating hours will reduce the rural amenity currently experienced at their property.*

Comment 1.002 - *Request to retain existing Saturday cut-off time of 1.00pm rather than allowing longer Saturday construction/quarry-related hours.*

Response

Winstone acknowledges the importance the commenter places on Saturday afternoon rural amenity.

The application seeks flexibility to undertake construction and quarry-related activities within the hours proposed in the consent conditions. This flexibility is important to the staged development of the Symonds Hill Pit and enables Winstone to respond appropriately to operational requirements, maintenance, weather conditions and customer demand.

Winstone therefore does not support a fixed 1.00pm Saturday cut-off. Activities will remain subject to the applicable consent conditions and noise limits. The Applicant's specialist noise response addresses the effects associated with the proposed hours.

Comment 1.003 - *If conditions managing Saturday hours are amended, this commenter expects all related consent conditions to be updated consistently.*

Response:

Winstone agrees that the consent conditions should be internally consistent and supports any consequential drafting amendments required to achieve that.

Comment 3: Te Ākitai Waiohū Settlement Trust

Comment 3.001 - *Consultation started initially as a resource consent application but engagement at a governance level on this Project has yet to occur.*

Response:

Winstone acknowledges Te Ākitai Waiohūa's distinction between engagement with its kaitiaki representatives and engagement at governance level.

Winstone values its longstanding relationship with Te Ākitai Waiohūa and acknowledges that project-specific engagement to date has primarily occurred through the Kaitiaki Forum and kaitiaki and technical channels. Winstone is committed to continuing that engagement and is willing to engage directly with the Settlement Trust at governance level as the Project progresses.

Comment 3.011 - *Commenter supports conditions that seek to recognise and protect cultural values.*

Response:

Winstone welcomes Te Ākitai Waiohūa's support for conditions that recognise and protect cultural values and supports the continuation of appropriate mechanisms for ongoing mana whenua engagement.

Comment 3.012 - *Commenter expects that the Kaitiaki Forum will meet with greater frequency than existing arrangements, particularly during the review of management plans.*

Response:

Winstone agrees that there may be periods during the Project where additional engagement is appropriate, particularly during the review of key management plans and ahead of significant stages of works.

Winstone does not consider it necessary to prescribe a permanently increased meeting frequency of the Kaitiaki Forum. The existing Kaitiaki Forum arrangements provide for regular meetings together with additional meetings, site visits and focused engagement where required, and Winstone considers this provides an appropriate and flexible mechanism.

Comment 3.013 - *Commenter does not support reliance on the NZHPT authority process. Recording information on archaeological discoveries does not mitigate the adverse effects on cultural values*

Comment 3.014 - *Commenter does not support reliance on the accidental discovery provisions in Auckland Unitary Plan Rule E12.6.1 (currently reflected in Condition 96).*

Comment 3.015 - *Commenter seeks Specific Accidental Discovery Protocols be developed in consultation with Mana Whenua and incorporated into the consent conditions.*

Comment 3.016 - *Commenter seeks an agreed protocol to address tikanga Māori specific to the site.*

Comment 3.020 - *Discovery protocols be developed in consultation with Te Ākitai Waiohūa to ensure that tikanga Māori processes are followed, assessments undertaken prior to decisions made regarding the destruction of a discovered site.*

Response

Winstone acknowledges Te Ākitai Waiohūa's concern that the statutory archaeological process does not, by itself, address all effects on cultural values.

Winstone considers that the archaeological authority and applicable statutory archaeological requirements remain necessary and appropriate and should not be displaced. However, Winstone is supportive of those statutory processes operating alongside appropriate site-specific tikanga and discovery protocols developed through engagement with mana whenua, provided that the resulting requirements are integrated with the Archaeological Management Plan and do not create conflicting statutory or operational processes.

Winstone also notes that, since lodgement of the application, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga has reviewed and commented on the proposed archaeological conditions, which have subsequently been updated.

Comment 3.018 - *Commenter is concerned that a 12 months' timeframe for filing of archaeological records is excessively long (condition 13) and should be reduced to no more than 6 months.*

Response:

Winstone does not support reducing the 12-month timeframe for completion of the final archaeological report to six months.

The 12-month period relates to preparation of the final archaeological report and allows sufficient time for the archaeological investigation, analysis of findings, specialist input and preparation of a complete and robust record. Reducing that period to six months would impose an unnecessarily onerous timeframe, particularly given the scale and duration of the Project.

Winstone also notes that the archaeological conditions already provide for information to be made available considerably earlier. They require annual reporting while archaeological works are underway, notification of the completion of archaeological works within five working days, and an interim report and updated archaeological site records within 20 working days of completion of on-site archaeological work.

In that context, Winstone considers the existing 12-month timeframe for the final report to be appropriate and does not consider a shorter timeframe is necessary.

Comment 3.019 - *Commenter seeks that the Archaeological Management Plans are prepared in stages and provided to Te Ākitai Waiohūa for review and feedback prior to approval.*

Response:

Winstone supports providing Te Ākitai Waiohūa with a reasonable opportunity to review and comment on relevant staged archaeological management documentation before it is finalised or submitted for statutory approval or certification.

Winstone does not consider that the conditions should confer a separate approval or veto function on any individual party where statutory approval or certification rests with another authority.

Comment 3.021 - *The commenter is provided with opportunities to deliver cultural inductions prior to the commencement of earthworks and to undertake iwi monitoring during earthworks.*

Response:

Winstone supports providing appropriate opportunities for Te Ākitai Waiohūa to deliver cultural inductions and to participate in iwi monitoring..

Comment 3.022 - *Commenter seeks that off-set mitigation for residual adverse effects occurs on the site or within the immediate environs of the area of impact.*

Response:

Winstone understands Te Ākitai Waiohūa's preference for ecological mitigation and restoration to occur on the Project site or as close as practicable to the affected environment, and Winstone has sought to maximise suitable opportunities within and around Hunua.

Winstone does not, however, support a requirement that all offset or compensation measures must occur on the site or within its immediate environs. The location of those measures also needs to take account of ecological suitability, land availability and security, practicability and the ability to deliver enduring environmental outcomes. The Applicant's ecology response addresses the technical basis for the proposed package

Comment 3.024 - *Commenter is not opposed to the indigenous forest revegetation at Meremere Quarry, however not more than 10% of the required off-set mitigation should be at Meremere Quarry.*

Response:

Winstone does not support a fixed 10% cap on ecological measures at Meremere Quarry.

Winstone remains willing to consider opportunities to increase ecological restoration within Te Ākitai Waiohū's area of interest where those opportunities are technically suitable and practically deliverable. However, the final distribution of offset and compensation measures should be driven by the ability to achieve the required ecological outcomes rather than by an arbitrary percentage allocation.

Comment 3.029 - *Commenter expects to be involved in all stages of the stream alignment and restoration.*

Winstone supports meaningful Te Ākitai Waiohū involvement at key stages of the stream realignment and restoration process through the Kaitiaki Forum and targeted project engagement.

Final technical design, certification and statutory decision-making will remain the responsibility of the relevant technical experts and approval authorities.

Comment 3.031 - *Commenter expects to participate in the development of the Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan.*

Winstone supports providing Te Ākitai Waiohū with opportunities to participate in the development and review of the Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan, particularly in relation to cultural outcomes and rehabilitation priorities.

Comment 3.034 - *Commenter seeks conditions incorporate opportunities for Te Ākitai Waiohūa to exercise kaitiakitanga and mana motuhake within this significant area of its rohe.*

Winstone supports practical opportunities for Te Ākitai Waiohūa to exercise kaitiakitanga through the Project, including through ongoing engagement, review of relevant management plans, cultural monitoring, planting and appropriate salvage or relocation activities.

The consent conditions provide clear opportunities for participation while retaining the appropriate statutory and operational responsibilities of the Consent Holder and relevant approval authorities.

Comment 3.035 - *Commenter supports the conditions requiring a Kaitiaki Forum, and records that Te Ākitai Waiohūa will continue to assert its own position on matters.*

Noted. Winstone recognises that participation in the Kaitiaki Forum does not require Te Ākitai Waiohūa, or any other mana whenua participant, to relinquish or modify its own position on Project matters.

Comment 3.040 - *Commenter seeks ongoing commitment from Winstone Aggregates to engage with Te Ākitai Waiohūa to ensure that the Hunua Quarry Expansion respects and reflects the cultural values and aspirations*

Response

Winstone confirms its ongoing commitment to engage with Te Ākitai Waiohūa throughout the development and implementation of the Project.

This will include engagement through the Kaitiaki Forum and direct project-specific engagement where appropriate. While Winstone and Te Ākitai Waiohūa may not agree on every matter, Winstone is committed to maintaining a constructive relationship and to continuing to understand and consider Te Ākitai Waiohūa's cultural values and aspirations as the Project progresses.

Comment 6: Paul Aylett

Comment 6.002 - *Commenter requests that that the hours worked and the decibel level in the pit and haul road are not extended beyond the current hours worked.*

Response:

Winstone acknowledges the commenter's concern regarding operating hours and noise as the Symonds Hill Pit is developed.

The application proposes to substantially continue the existing consent controls relevant to activities in this area, including the controls applying to noise and operations associated with the pit and haul road. Winstone considers that continuation of these controls provides an appropriate level of protection for neighbouring properties as the quarry develops.

The Applicant's specialist noise response provides further detail on the applicable noise standards and the assessment of effects associated with the Symonds Hill Pit and haul road.

Comment 7: Gavin and Rebecca Giles [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Comment 7.001 - *Commenter notes: quarry operations progressively move closer to our property boundary, our property may become increasingly isolated and exposed to direct quarry effects without the buffering previously provided by neighbouring residential occupation...does not clearly explain how the environmental and amenity effects on [REDACTED] will be managed as quarry operations advance towards our boundary.*

Response:

Winstone acknowledges the concern that [REDACTED] may feel increasingly isolated as quarry development progresses and as the ownership or occupation of surrounding properties changes.

The management of effects at [REDACTED] does not depend on neighbouring properties remaining independently owned or occupied. The property will continue to be subject to the relevant environmental protections and consent conditions applicable to the Project, and the Applicant's specialist responses address the specific matters of noise, dust, blasting, air quality, landscape and other environmental effects.

Winstone remains willing to engage directly with the owners of [REDACTED] regarding specific concerns as the Project progresses.

Comment 7.007 - *Commenter notes: A key unanswered question is what protections will remain for us as the occupants of [REDACTED] as the quarry progressively advances toward our property and surrounding*

properties cease to operate as occupied residences; and, request that Winstone clearly explain:

- *how [REDACTED] will remain protected if quarry operations ultimately approach our boundary;*
- *what criteria are being used to determine whether neighbouring properties remain suitable for residential occupation;*
- *whether equivalent assessments have been or will be undertaken for our property;*
- *what mitigation, compensation, or protective measures are proposed for directly affected neighbouring landowners.*

Response:

Winstone understands why the acquisition of surrounding properties has led the commenter to seek greater certainty about the future of [REDACTED].

Decisions by Winstone or Fletcher interests to acquire neighbouring properties are commercial decisions and should not be interpreted as a determination that those properties, or [REDACTED], are unsuitable for residential occupation. Winstone does not apply a separate “residential suitability” threshold through its property acquisition programme.

The Applicant’s technical experts will address how [REDACTED] has been assessed and the environmental controls and mitigation applicable to that property. Where additional mitigation is justified by the technical evidence, it should be addressed through the Project design or consent conditions.

Winstone does not support establishing a general property acquisition or compensation entitlement simply because quarry operations move closer to a neighbouring property.

Comment 8: Auckland Council

Comment 8.023 - *Commenter notes the Flood Risk Assessment updated 18 June 2026, requires detailed flood modelling to be undertaken during the detailed design phase to confirm that the proposal will not result in adverse flooding effects and offers a condition of consent requiring this.*

Response:

Winstone notes Auckland Council’s comment.

Comment 8.031 - *Commentor notes the application does not identify whether any industrial or trade activities (ITA) are proposed within the expansion area, or confirm whether the proposed expansion includes any ancillary existing or future ITA. Confirmation of the nature and extent of any ancillary activities proposed within the expansion area would assist in confirming whether any additional consents are needed.*

Comment 8.038 - *Commenter requests confirmation of whether the application includes ancillary activities that would require consent under Chapter E33 (Industrial and Trade Activities) of the AUP.*

Response:

Winstone confirms that the Project does not propose to establish any new ancillary industrial or trade activities within the Symonds Hill expansion area that require a separate consent under Chapter E33.

The Project provides for quarry extraction, associated in-pit processing and supporting quarry infrastructure as described in the application, with the existing processing, stockpiling and dispatch facilities continuing to be used. Existing ancillary activities elsewhere within the wider Hunua Quarry site will continue to operate under their existing approvals.

Comment 8.032 - *Commentor notes the management of stormwater effects associated with the proposed quarry expansion cannot be considered in isolation from the wider quarry water and environmental management frameworks.*

Response:

Winstone agrees with Auckland Council that stormwater and water management associated with the Project should operate as part of the wider Hunua Quarry water and environmental management framework.

That reflects the manner in which the existing quarry is managed and the intended approach for the Symonds Hill Pit. The Project's stormwater, quarry water, erosion and sediment control and environmental management measures are intended to operate as an integrated system.

Winstone does not consider that a separate additional stormwater management framework is required. The Applicant's specialist response addresses the technical integration of these systems.

Comment 8.036 - *Commenter notes the Mangapū Tributary Realignment – Preliminary Design and Effects Technical Assessment concludes that the*

proposed stream realignment will result in increases in flood levels of up to 50 mm within land owned by the Applicant and up to 15 mm within rural residential areas, with no effects on existing buildings. Proposed conditions of consent (no. 65) (version dated 22/06) requires a further hydrological assessment and provides an opportunity to confirm the hydraulic performance of the final design (prior to construction). A further condition requiring verification of flood effects based on as-built information following completion of the stream realignment is considered appropriate.

Response:

Winstone notes Auckland Council's request for post-construction verification of flood effects following completion of the Mangapū Tributary realignment.

The proposed conditions already require hydrological assessment and modelling of the final design prior to construction. Winstone considers that whether a further post-construction verification requirement is necessary, and what form that verification should take, is appropriately addressed through the Applicant's specialist response.

Winstone does not consider it appropriate to introduce an additional condition unless it provides a clear environmental-management benefit beyond the existing design, certification and monitoring requirements.

Comment 8.041 - *Commentor notes that cross reference in Condition 115 (22 June 2026 version) should be amended as follows: "(c) Manual inlet and outlet sampling from SRPs as detailed in Condition ~~106(c)~~ 116(c).*

Response:

Agreed. The cross-reference should be corrected in the next version of the conditions.

Comment 8.042 - *Commenter notes that cross reference in Condition 199 - 205 need to be updated*

Response:

Agreed. The cross-reference should be corrected in the next version of the conditions.

Comment 8.043 - *Commenter seeks an amendment to Condition 65 to verify the outcomes of the detailed design of the channel prior to construction.*

Response:

Winstone does not consider that Condition 65 requires a further substantive amendment beyond the existing detailed-design verification framework. The proposed conditions already require further hydrological assessment and hydrodynamic modelling before the final channel design is implemented. The Applicant's specialist response addresses whether any drafting refinement is required to make that existing obligation clearer.

Comment 8.044 - *Commenter seeks in the alternative to an amendment to Condition 65 to verify the outcomes of the detailed design of the channel prior to construction, a new condition as follows: "65A. Within 12 months of completion of the diversion channel, the Consent Holder must undertake hydrodynamic modelling based on the as-built survey of the completed channel and provide a verification report to Auckland Council. The purpose of the report shall be to confirm that the completed channel performs generally in accordance with the flood modelling undertaken under Condition 65 and that no material increase in downstream flooding effects has occurred as a result of the final constructed channel."*

Response:

Winstone considers the proposed additional Condition 65A to be onerous.

The proposed condition framework already requires the Mangapū Tributary realignment to be subject to further hydrological assessment and hydrodynamic modelling using the detailed design before that design is finalised and construction occurs. This provides the appropriate opportunity to confirm that the final channel design achieves the required downstream flood outcomes.

Winstone considers that requiring the hydrodynamic model to then be rerun following construction would substantially duplicate the detailed-design assessment and impose an additional modelling requirement without a demonstrated need.

Winstone supports appropriate as-built verification that the diversion channel has been constructed in accordance with the approved detailed design. However, it does not consider that this needs to extend to a further full hydrodynamic modelling exercise unless the as-built survey identifies a material departure from the approved design or another matter that warrants further assessment.

Comment 8.046 - *Commenter notes the applicant's proposal to undertake earthworks of approximately 23.398 million m³ over an area of 108ha.*

Response:

Noted.

Comment 8.047 - *Commenter notes that the applicant's assessments conclude that provided the earthworks are undertaken in accordance with the application documents, including a final Infrastructure Report and ESCP, and earthworks related conditions of consent, that the potential effects associated with all land disturbance will be appropriately managed.*

Response:

Noted. Winstone welcomes Auckland Council's conclusion that the potential effects of land disturbance can be appropriately managed through the proposed management and condition framework.

Comment 8.056 - *Commenter provides a summary of the areas of potential contamination, intrusive investigation findings, soil management requirements; and makes a recommendation regarding works completion reporting.*

Response:

Noted. Winstone accepts that the identified areas will be subject to the further investigation and, where required, remediation and validation processes provided for in the proposed conditions.

Comment 8.060 - *Commenter notes the proposed conditions in Section 16 of the PSI & DSI to be relevant. They require further investigation in the areas of Stages 7 and 8 prior to works starting in these areas, to determine the need for a Remediation Action Plan (RAP). If remediation is required, a Site Validation Report (SVR) is to be submitted to council after remediation works.*

Response:

Noted. Winstone accepts that the identified areas will be subject to the further investigation and, where required, remediation and validation processes provided for in the proposed conditions.

Comment 8.072 - *Commenter notes interest in the boundary adjustment which potentially triggers the esplanade reserve provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA').*

Response:

Winstone does not agree that the proposed boundary adjustment triggers a requirement for an esplanade reserve.

Auckland Council's comment appears to arise from the earlier scheme plan, which has subsequently been updated. The proposal is a boundary adjustment between existing landholdings and is not intended to create an additional developable allotment.

The updated scheme plan and the statutory position are addressed further in the Applicant's planning and survey responses.

Comment 8.074 - *Commenter notes the in-principle written approval does not authorise works in the park and notes should the Panel be minded to grant consent, formal third-party landowner agreements will need to be concluded with the Regional Parks team, addressing operational matters and advice note is recommended in this regard.*

Comment 8.075 - *Commenter notes the range of conditions that will require the review and approval of site-specific delivery plans for any works within the park, including pest plant and animal control, planting plans, and kauri dieback management.*

Comment 8.076 - *Commenter recommends an advice note that finalised management plans and any plans required by Parks in its capacity as landowner should be one and the same or, at a minimum, fully consistent to avoid conflicting requirements or expectations.*

Comment 8.079 - *Commenter seeks the inclusion of an advice note to Condition 24 as follows: "Any management plans prepared under these conditions that relate to works within the Hunua Ranges Regional Park should be one and the same as, or consistent with, the management plans required by Auckland Council (Parks and Community Facilities) in its capacity as landowner. Early and ongoing engagement with the Regional Parks team on the adequacy of those plans is recommended. Note that one set of management plans does not override the other, and the consent holder will be responsible for ensuring that they remain compliant with their conditions of the resource consent as well as any requirements of Parks and Community Facilities."*

Comment 8.080 - *Commenter seeks the inclusion of an advice note to Condition 140 as follows: "The written approval provided by Auckland Council (Parks and Community Facilities) is an in-principle landowner approval only and does not itself authorise offsetting or compensation works within the Hunua Ranges Regional Park. Prior to carrying out any such works within the park, the Consent Holder must conclude a separate landowner agreement with Auckland Council's Regional Parks team addressing operational matters, including (but not limited*

to) access arrangements, health and safety requirements, staging and methodology of works, maintenance and monitoring obligations, long-term management responsibilities, and any cost recovery or funding arrangements."

Response:

Winstone acknowledges that Auckland Council's in-principle landowner approval does not, by itself, authorise works within the Hunua Ranges Regional Park and that appropriate landowner arrangements will need to be concluded with the Regional Parks team before those works are undertaken.

Winstone intends to continue working with Regional Parks on the practical implementation of the proposed offset and compensation works, including access, health and safety, staging, maintenance and monitoring requirements.

Winstone also agrees with the objective of avoiding duplication or inconsistency between management plans required under the resource consent and those required by Auckland Council in its capacity as landowner. Wherever practicable, Winstone's preference is for a single set of management documentation to satisfy both processes.

Winstone is therefore supportive of appropriate advice notes recording these matters, subject to the final wording being agreed through the planning and legal review of the conditions.

Comment 8.077 - *Commenter notes the lodged scheme plan shows the boundary adjustment in an atypical way, by creating a new allotment (proposed Lot 2, 3.56ha) which is then to be amalgamated via a condition with Lot 2 DP 115598 (part of the existing quarry landholdings). The creation of an allotment of less than 4ha triggers s230 of the RMA*

Comment 8.078 - *Commenter notes an updated scheme plan (A25424 Drawing 1600, Revision) dated 24 July 2026 by CKL Consulting has been received but not formally provided to the Panel, confirmation should be obtained. Commenter notes that if the 24 July 2026 scheme plan was adopted it would mean both proposed lots would be greater than 4ha in size meaning that s230 of the RMA would not be triggered*

Response:

Winstone confirms that the purpose of the subdivision is to adjust the boundary between the existing landholdings. It is not intended to create an additional developable allotment.

The earlier scheme plan did not accurately reflect that intention and showed proposed Lot 2 as a separate 3.56 ha allotment before amalgamation. An updated scheme plan prepared by CKL dated 24 July 2026 has therefore been prepared, under which both resulting allotments are greater than 4 ha.

Accordingly, the issue identified by Auckland Council regarding the creation of an allotment of less than 4 ha does not arise under the updated scheme plan. Winstone will ensure that the updated scheme plan is formally provided to the Panel and relied on for the application.

The Applicant's planning and survey responses address the subdivision and esplanade reserve provisions in further detail.

Comment 8.081 - *Commenter seeks the inclusion of an advice note to Condition 141 as follows: "No ongoing legal protection is identified in Table 2 for the offset and compensation sites within the Hunua Ranges Regional Park, as the park is already legally protected in its status as a regional park. For clarity, Auckland Council will not accept covenants or other legal instruments being registered on the records of title for its regional park land."*

Response:

Winstone acknowledges Auckland Council's position that it will not accept covenants or other additional legal instruments over land within the Hunua Ranges Regional Park.

Winstone has no intention of imposing duplicative legal protection over Regional Park land where the existing status of that land already provides the required long-term protection. Winstone is comfortable with the conditions being clarified to recognise the existing legal protection of the Regional Park, subject to confirmation through the Applicant's planning and legal response that the wording appropriately secures the intended ecological outcomes.

Comment 8.294 - *Commenter requests: confirmation of whether the application includes ancillary activities that would require consent under Chapter E33 of the AUP (Industrial and Trade Activities). It would be beneficial to have this formally confirmed; and, they are overall satisfied that the proposed stormwater management approach is appropriate and are able to support the application.*

Response:

Winstone welcomes Auckland Council's conclusion that the proposed stormwater management approach is appropriate and its support for the application in this respect.

In relation to Chapter E33, Winstone confirms that the Project does not propose any new ancillary industrial or trade activities within the Symonds Hill expansion area requiring separate consent under Chapter E33. The Project includes the quarrying and associated activities described in the application, while existing ancillary activities within the wider Hunua Quarry will continue to operate under their existing approvals.

This confirmation should be read together with the Applicant's response to Comments 8.031 and 8.038.

Comment 10: Gerald and Anita Masters –

Comment 10.018 - *Commenter: acknowledge what the applicant already does well. It holds regular meetings with local residents, currently about every six months, and shares its dust and vibration monitoring openly, including the times when its limits have been exceeded; and, we ask that it be secured as a condition, so it continues for the life of the expanded quarry and through any change of owner or operator.*

Response:

Winstone appreciates the commenter's acknowledgement of the existing community engagement undertaken by Hunua Quarry, including the regular meetings with neighbouring residents and the sharing of environmental monitoring information.

Winstone values that relationship with the local community and intends to continue meaningful engagement as the Project progresses.

The appropriate frequency and format of engagement is likely to vary over time depending on the stage of quarry development and the matters of interest to neighbouring residents.

The proposed conditions already provide formal requirements for environmental monitoring, reporting and complaints management. Winstone considers those requirements, together with its ongoing commitment to community engagement, provide an appropriate and flexible framework.

Comment 10.027 - Commentor requests that conditions require: *"That if planting cannot provide effective mitigation without unacceptable effects on the property, an alternative mitigation process be available"*

Response:

Winstone does not support the inclusion of an additional or alternative mitigation process beyond the landscape mitigation measures proposed in the application and conditions.

The Applicant's landscape assessment has identified those properties where off-site planting is an appropriate mitigation response, and the proposed conditions provide a mechanism for that planting to be offered and implemented. The Applicant's landscape specialist has reviewed the matters raised in the comments and has confirmed that the mitigation proposed through the conditions remains appropriate.

Winstone considers that the proposed planting should be developed, where accepted by the landowner, in a manner that appropriately responds to the particular property and the relevant views while also taking account of the reasonable use and amenity of that property.

Winstone does not, however, consider it appropriate to create a further obligation to provide undefined alternative mitigation where a landowner considers the planting to be ineffective or otherwise unacceptable. Such a requirement would extend beyond the mitigation identified as necessary through the landscape assessment and would introduce uncertainty as to both the nature and extent of Winstone's obligations.

Winstone therefore considers that the mitigation measures already proposed in the conditions are appropriate and sufficient, and does not support the additional requirement sought by the commenter.

Comment 10.028 - Commenter requests that conditions require: *That acceptance of planting not constitute written approval of the application, settlement of effects, or waiver of any right, including the right to make complaints.*

Response:

Winstone considers that a neighbouring landowner's acceptance of planting or other property-specific mitigation does not, of itself, constitute written approval of the Project or prevent that landowner from raising future concerns or complaints.

Comment 12: Brian and Kate Park [REDACTED]

Comment 12.010 - Commenter notes: Our property at [REDACTED] has approximately 60% of 8ha fenced and protected from livestock and contains well established and recovering indigenous forest that presents an opportunity for further enhancement, as are other adjacent properties. We would be prepared to discuss this opportunity with Winstone or with Auckland Council. These properties could be integrated with the adjacent Kauri View Reserve.

Response:

Winstone appreciates the commenter identifying the potential ecological enhancement opportunities available at [REDACTED] and their willingness to discuss those opportunities.

The application includes a defined ecological offset and compensation package that has been developed by the Applicant's ecology specialists and is addressed in their response to comments.

Winstone would nevertheless be happy to discuss the opportunities identified by the commenter, including potential enhancement and connectivity with the adjoining Kauri View reserve. Any such discussions would be separate from, and would not alter, the ecological offset and compensation package proposed as part of the application unless subsequently agreed to be appropriate.

Section 51 Reports and Advice – Winstone Response

Comment 72: Department of Conservation – Wildlife Approval Report (s 51(2)(c))

Schedule reference 72.001 - Commenter notes that "DOC preference is that a project herpetologist and entomologist be named in conditions, which has not been provided within the LMP."

Schedule reference 72.006 - Commenter noted: "Although credentials have not been supplied with this application, contributing ecologists to the LMP, Katherine Muchna have previously been assessed by DOC as being suitably experienced to safely handle lizards and oversee their management" and "DOC requests the

opportunity to review and certify the credentials of any additional supervising project ecologists prior to approval."

Comment 72.007 - Commenter notes: "The LMP says lizard salvage will be implemented by or under the supervision of Matt Turner (Herpetologist, Boffa Miskell) or Katherine Muchna (Senior Herpetologist, Boffa Miskell) with support from Boffa Miskell staff." and "DOC's preference is that a project herpetologist and entomologist be named in conditions."

Response:

The Applicant agrees that lizard salvage and management must be undertaken or supervised by suitably qualified and experienced herpetologists. The LMP currently identifies Matt Turner and Katherine Muchna as the proposed supervising herpetologists.

The Applicant does not consider it appropriate to name individual practitioners in the conditions of a long-term approval, as personnel may reasonably change over the duration of the Project. The conditions should instead specify the required qualifications and experience and provide an appropriate process for confirming the suitability of any replacement supervising ecologist.

The Applicant is comfortable with DoC being provided with the credentials of any replacement supervising project herpetologist or other specialist required under the Wildlife Approval for confirmation that the person has the requisite qualifications, experience and competence, provided that the process does not unnecessarily constrain routine changes in personnel.