

**APPENDIX J: SUMMARY OF s 53 COMMENTS RECEIVED**

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
<b>INVITED COMMENTS</b>			
1	Andrew and Rachel Wharry	<p>The Wharry's commented that OGNZL's proposed interconnecting tunnel corridor would traverse approximately 500 meters beneath their properties, affecting around 15 hectares of their land and five separate property titles, three of which contain residential dwellings.</p> <p>Their Wharry's farm has been in their family since 1972 and is now in the second generation of ownership. It holds significant personal and historical value to them and their children. The location of the proposed interconnecting tunnel raises serious concerns for the Wharry's, as it may limit their ability to subdivide and develop additional homelands for future generations. They are concerned about the potential and unknown impacts of an underground tunnel beneath their land, including dewatering, vibration, noise, reduced property value, insurance and liability implications, and the imposition of conditions on our certificates of title.</p> <p>The Wharry's also attached correspondence maintaining the mineral rights over their properties would prevent OGNZL from tunnelling beneath their property without their express consent.</p>	<p>The Wharry's consider the proposed interconnecting tunnel could feasibly be constructed beneath land already owned by OGNZL, specifically between Golden Valley Road and SH25.</p> <p>The Wharry's consider the tunnel could follow the existing public road corridor along State Highway 25 and Willows Road, continuing directly to OGNZL's Willows Road proposed mine site. The Wharry's consider this alternative route would avoid impacting any privately owned land.</p> <p>The Wharry's note that this suggested route aligns with the path OGNZL has already proposed for its upcoming service trench.</p>
2	Barry and Beverley Ross	<p>The Ross' have concern with the shallowness of the tunnel being 118-130 meters (variable) below ground level. The Ross' house is in very close proximity to the tunnel, and they are concerned about their underground services being damaged (in particular their septic tank and field tiles which are about 60 years old).</p> <p>The Ross's are also concerned with any discomfort to their tenant from the blasting, including damage to their home and their possessions. The Ross's do not wish to go through the process again (as they did with Newmont mining) trying to prove that the damage was caused by the mine blasting.</p>	<p>The Ross's request the installation of a new septic tank or connect the property to the sewage line prior to any damage occurs.</p> <p>The Ross's also request that a Branz report be undertaken.</p>
3	Bentham Farms Limited ( <b>BFL</b> )	<p>BFL share a boundary of the seaward side of the DOC land. The water for their farm comes from a fenced off spring near their back boundary with DOC. The spring has good flow and is 100% pure. It is BFL's understanding that some springs may be diverted as part of the WNP proposal. They have tried to discuss this with OceanaGold but have been unsuccessful.</p>	<p>BFL request that OGNZL provide the information they requested, and remedy any effects should their water quality and quantity become affected.</p> <p>BFL's also request OGNZL supply the name of a person to discuss this issue and process.</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
4	Steve and Bridget Cameron	<p>The Cameron's currently reside on property that has been in their family for 45 years. They have the following concerns with the application:</p> <p>(1) Health risk associated with increase in airborne dust, especially during windy or dusty summer months or during blasting.</p> <p>(2) Blasting, truck movement, and machinery operation resulting in excessive noise and frequent ground vibrations, which will be disruptive, especially given operations will be 24/7.</p> <p>(3) Due to the mine's proximity and the resulting disturbances, the effect on their property value.</p> <p>(4) Noise and safety effects from helicopter movements on their amenity, privacy, and enjoyment of outdoor spaces and gardens.</p> <p>(5) Traffic effects associated with the helicopter landing pad.</p> <p>(6) Potential for accidental explosions, which could cause serious injury or death, property damage, and environmental contamination.</p> <p>(7) The transportation of explosives to and from the magazine posing a risk, especially as this is in their direct line of sight and close to their home.</p> <p>(8) The explosive magazine is situated on a deserted part of the mine's farm and inadequate security measures could make the site vulnerable to theft (especially from Highland Rd).</p>	<p>The Cameron's request that in all aspects of the future and foreseeable mine operations, that the OGNZL consider their family and their future.</p> <p>The Cameron's also request proper storage and handling of explosives as being paramount, as mishandling can significantly increase the risk of accidents.</p>
5	Bruce Morrison	<p>Mr Morrison is the registered proprietor of land adjacent to the existing Tailings Surface Facility (TSF1A) and the proposed TSF3. The property is part of the 'milking platform' for the dairy farm east of Trig Road North with an underpass for efficient cattle and light vehicle access.</p> <p>Since 2011 the design crest height of TSF1A has increased from R.L. 177.25 to R.L. 182 and if approved, the construction of TSF3 may continue until the year 2040. The adjacent dairy farm to the north-east of his property is now owned by OGNZL. To facilitate the forecast construction of TSF3, Mr Morrison proposes some boundary adjustments.</p>	<p>Mr Morrison requests the easement agreement be scrapped in favour of a boundary adjustment - LOT 3 DPS77584 (3.6540 Ha) be amalgamated with the land used for construction of TSF3 and that 3.4650 Ha of Section 47 be amalgamated with Lot2 DPS77584.</p>
6	Bryce Ede Praedium Limited (BEPL)	<p>Three BEPL property has 5 natural springs, and if that water dries up, they will have an untenable unsalable property.</p>	<p>BEPL request OGNZL provide comfort around their security to groundwater.</p>
7	Chris and Anne Batten	<p>The Batten's are most concerned is with the Gladstone Open Pit. The Batten's home is about 400m from the edge of the pit and 700-900m from the Northern Rock Stack. While the Batten's are very concerned about dust, vibration, noise, and increased traffic, their greatest concern is the devaluation of their home. The application does not address these impacts. A loss in property value will greatly affect their choices and quality of life in the future.</p> <p>The Batten's consider the Fast Track process is very unfair. The timeframe to respond is very short for such a large and complex project, and the paperwork is difficult to follow for people like them who have no knowledge of these processes.</p>	<p>The Batten's request that future information for the public is written in plain language so that ordinary people can clearly understand what is being asked of them and how they can take part.</p> <p>The Batten's consider OGNZL should be offering top up</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
			<p>payments and property buy outs to those affected.</p> <p>The Batten's also consider OGNZL should be required to plant trees as a buffer to minimise as much noise and dust as possible.</p> <p>The Batten's request that before any final decision is made, OGNZL should appoint independent technical experts to assist locals like them to review and comment on the draft conditions when they are released, especially the conditions dealing with noise, vibration and blasting and dust.</p>
8	Coromandel Watchdog of Hauraki Linc (CWOHI)	<p><i>Significant Adverse Impacts on Receiving Environment</i> - CWOHI urge the Panel to give due weight to the expert evidence (Dr Emerman, Professor Leath, Dr Joy, Mr Kendal and Mr Tegg) attached to the comments, which identifies a range of actual and potential adverse impacts to the receiving environment. The CWOHI consider many of these impacts are irreversible.</p> <p><i>Significant Adverse Impacts on Highly Vulnerable and Nationally Significant Frog Species and Other Invertebrate Species</i> - CWOHI consider the modelling undertaken on behalf of OGNZL excludes the potentially most significant effect to frog populations, which is the dewatering of groundwater effects on the habitat of Arney's and Hochstetler's frogs throughout the forest areas. The CWOHI consider such dewatering is likely to have significant adverse impacts on their habitats, meaning the OGNZL's projected net gains in such frog populations are unlikely to result and these populations may sustain permanent loss.</p> <p>CWOHI also consider that mining vibration in terms of anthropogenic substrate vibrations is another significant effect which could be highly adverse to frog populations. CWOHI comment that academic literature on the impact of such vibration is limited but should not be ignored as frogs are highly sensitive to low-frequency ground vibrations, as addressed in the evidence of Mr Kendal, Dr Easton and Professor Waldman. CWOHI also commented that similar potential adverse impacts likely to be sustained by other species in the surrounding environment, such as nationally endangered and vulnerable wetland tree types and lizards.</p> <p><i>Significant Adverse Impacts from Hydrological Consequences</i> - CWOHI comment that flow reductions predicted by the OGNZL are ecologically significant even at levels of 10-20% uncertainty at low flows and effects within the OGNZL's model error are "effectively unquantifiable".</p>	<p>CWOHI comment that their evidence demonstrates that the Proposal fails the proportionality test in Section 85(3) of the Act, with the result being that the Panel should decline in whole (as a first preference), or in part (as a second preference), the Waihi North Project Application because: (a) the WNP's adverse impacts on the receiving environment, hydrology, impacts on highly vulnerable and nationally significant frog species and other invertebrate species inhabiting that environment substantially outweigh any regional or national benefits (even after taking into account proposed mitigation measures); (b) the WNP's regional and national economic benefits are overstated and do not undertake orthodox cost benefit analysis,</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p>CWOHI comment that predicted drying of unique extant warm springs, which the Applicant notes “cannot be accurately predicted at this time”, create unacceptable ecological impacts relating to recovery uncertainty and water-quality risks</p> <p>CWOHI also comment that OGNZLs own analysis suggests an identified risk, one that contradicts its conclusions on groundwater as “less than minor” and assessments on post-closure water chemistry are inconclusive and do not address sulphate risks.</p> <p><i>Regional and National Economic Benefits</i> - CWOHI comment that the economic benefits are not proven and are likely to be overstated and significantly lower than that proposed by OGNZL.</p> <p><i>Late Provision of Relevant Information and Information Gaps Cause Significant Uncertainties</i> - CWOHI comment that the effect of the information delays and gaps is to: (1) create significant uncertainty as to whether the Applicant’s reasoning and conclusions are correct, adequate and justified; (2) not allow any respondent, including CWOHI, the opportunity to evaluate those matters covered by information gaps either on a stand-alone basis or in relation to their cumulative impacts on the consentability of the WNP application; and (3) exacerbate procedural unfairness to respondents, who have a legitimate expectation that the quality, sufficiency and timeliness of information provided by the OGNZL should be of appropriate and meaningful quality with sufficient time given to enable respondents to substantively respond to that information in accordance with the processes permitted by the Act.</p> <p><i>Social Impacts</i> - CWOHI comment that the OGNZL have not considered, such as noise, dust, blasting and vibration, damage to homes and property, mental health issues, etc. CWOHI comment that OGNZL have not proposed any meaningful social impact support which will mean the risk of more of the same adverse social impacts, with greater magnitude, that Waihi people have experienced to date without relief. CWOHI also comment that there is an absence of a clear and consistent voice of support for the mining project from iwi, hapū, hāpori groups or others who represent the diverse range of interests and livelihoods of Māori and no Cultural Impact Assessment had been completed at the time of comments.</p> <p>CWOHI also comment that the WUG should not have been included in this application as the WUG, and TSF3 that would be required to store the waste it produces are a distinct project, with very different impacts and effects on an environment that is definitively separate from the rest of the project.</p>	<p>with the consequence that these assessments are flawed; and (c) the late provision of relevant information by the Applicant and considerable remaining information gaps reinforces significant uncertainties with the WNP Application.</p>
9	Department of Conservation (DOC)	DOC comment the WNP area contains significant conservation values, particularly within the Kaitiaki Foreland Forest Park, including critical habitat for two species of native frogs—Archey’s frog and Hochstetter’s frog—both classified as “At Risk – Declining,” with Archey’s frog also listed as “Critically Endangered” internationally. DOC comment the proposal poses uncertain but potentially significant adverse effects on these species, particularly from underground blasting	DOC recommends that the Panel adopt a precautionary approach and ensure that any approvals are subject to stringent, enforceable conditions.

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p>vibrations, dewatering, and vegetation clearance. DOC considers OGNZL's assessment of these effects to be overly optimistic and recommends a precautionary approach.</p> <p>DOC acknowledges that OGNZL has proposed a suite of mitigation, offsetting and compensation measures, including pest control, habitat enhancement and research funding. However, DOC has concerns about the scale, feasibility and effectiveness of these measures. In particular, DOC disputes the assumption that frog populations will triple as a result of pest control, on the grounds of limited evidence and overly optimistic modelling assumptions.</p> <p>DOC also identifies risks to other indigenous fauna, threatened flora, freshwater ecosystems, wetlands, and heritage and recreational values. The proposed stream diversions and wetland impacts raise concerns about ecological functionality and adequacy of offsetting. DOC notes inconsistencies in the application's data and a lack of clarity in how ecological gains will be secured in perpetuity.</p> <p>DOC has engaged with OGNZL through technical and conditions workshops and acknowledges progress made. However, several key issues remain unresolved, particularly in relation to the robustness of management plans, enforceability of consent conditions, and adequacy of monitoring and adaptive management frameworks.</p> <p>DOC concludes that without significant improvements to mitigation measures, clearer performance standards and stronger legal protections for offset areas, the proposal risks causing irreversible harm to high-value conservation areas and species.</p>	

SUPERSEDED

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
10	New Zealand Fish and Game Council (F&G)	<p>The F&amp;G comments focus on the significant adverse effects the WNP is expected to have on trout spawning habitat, aquatic ecosystem health, and water quality in the Ohinemuri catchment, particularly within and around the Mataura Stream and its tributaries.</p> <p>The specific parts of the application the F&amp;G comments relates to are the reclamation, diversion and modification of over 4 kilometres of natural stream habitat, that are tributaries of trout spawning habitat; the proposed discharge of high levels of suspended sediments into the Mataura Stream and its tributaries, which provide trout spawning habitat; the failure to appropriately recognise, assess, or provide for the habitat of trout and associated values, as required under section 7(h) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA); the inadequacy of proposed mitigation measures to avoid, remedy or offset adverse effects on freshwater ecosystems; the reliance on previously consented discharges as a baseline for determining the acceptability of new or expanded discharges, contrary to best practice environmental effects assessment.</p> <p>F&amp;G comment the WNP poses substantial risks to the ecological health of the Ohinemuri catchment, particularly to trout spawning streams such as the Mataura Stream. F&amp;G consider the proposed total suspended solids and turbidity levels are likely to impair trout survival and spawning success, and the potential impacts of stream diversions and habitat loss are inadequately addressed through the mitigation proposed. F&amp;G also consider the proposed conditions are required to recognise or provide for trout habitat and trout spawning habitat and effective mitigation should focus on meaningful ecological restoration, rather than token enhancements.</p> <p>F&amp;G therefore urges the Panel to adopt a precautionary, ecosystem-based approach to ensure that all consent conditions are tightly aligned with the protection and enhancement of sensitive freshwater habitats.</p>	<p>F&amp;G seeks the following to be incorporated into WNP consent conditions:</p> <p>a) Full recognition of trout spawning habitats within the Mataura Stream and wider Ohinemuri catchment.</p> <p>b) Inclusion of enforceable water quality limits within the Mataura Stream in the consent conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Turbidity should not exceed 5 NTU above background levels when background is <math>\leq 50</math> NTU;</li> <li>o Turbidity increases should not exceed 10% above background where background is <math>&gt;50</math> NTU;</li> <li>o These thresholds should be measured after reasonable mixing in the receiving water, not solely at the discharge point.</li> <li>o No increased in deposited sediment related to discharge/activities listed in the consent within the Ohinemuri catchment, particularly within and around the Mataura Stream and its tributaries.</li> </ul> <p>c) Rejection of the use of previously consented discharges as a baseline for determining the acceptability of proposed discharges.</p> <p>d) Avoidance of stream reclamation and diversion of tributaries to high-value trout spawning habitats, or where unavoidable, the inclusion of</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
			<p>physical habitat improvements (e.g. downstream dam removal) as true mitigation.</p> <p>e) Real-time monitoring of discharge quality when discharging into the Mataura Stream (pH, turbidity, and flow), with data publicly available and tied to consent compliance.</p> <p>f) Removal or bypass of the historic masonry dam on the Ohinemuri River as meaningful mitigation for habitat loss and to improve fish passage; or alternatively, the establishment of a recreational put-and-take fishery in a constructed pond within the affected catchment.</p>
11	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of NZ (F&B).	<p><i>Preliminary issue</i> – Panel member has expressed concern that the correspondence referred to in their comments gives the impression the applicant influenced the selection of the decision-makers for its substantive application and that there is a relationship between counsel for the Applicant and one of the Panel members that is sufficiently close for counsel to have an understanding of that member available.</p> <p><i>Number of drill sites</i> – F&amp;B comment the number of drill sites proposed is outside the scope of the approvals that the substantive application can properly seek through this process. F&amp;B consider that the Panel is limited to granting no more than the number of drill sites referred to in Schedule 2 of the FTAA.</p> <p><i>Wildlife Act</i> – F&amp;B agrees with DOC that there are questions about the scope of approvals sought. F&amp;B note the updated conditions now refer to “any accidental/unintentional harm to wildlife that could arise from any of the activities undertaken in relation to the Waihi North Project”. F&amp;B comment that this purports to authorise killing native frogs and lizards, when the substantive application does not seek approval for killing native frogs and wildlife. F&amp;B also comment that there is significant uncertainty as to the effect of vibration on frogs. Vibration is likely to at least amount to “disturbing” wildlife.</p> <p><i>Scope of Access Arrangement</i> – F&amp;B comment that the application does not include an application for an access arrangement for activities carried out below the surface of the land. F&amp;B consider there is considerable uncertainty as to the effects of vibrations on frogs. If adverse effects result, this would mean that the exclusion for underground mining in s 57 would not</p>	<p>F&amp;B comment that the only reasonable conclusion is that the project’s adverse impacts outweigh its regional or national benefits, and that the project should be declined under s 85(3) FTAA.</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p>apply (as there would be a prejudicial effect on the use and enjoyment of the land by the Crown), and an access arrangement would be required under s 54.</p> <p><i>Meaning of Take into Account</i> – F&amp;B comment that while the East West Link case cited by the Bledisloe Wharf Panel concerned the phrase “have regard to” rather than “take into account” that approach is correct.</p> <p>Weighting – F&amp;B comment that a statutory requirement to give an Act’s purpose the most weight does not mean that it will always outweigh other considerations (in which case there would be no point in listing those other considerations). F&amp;B consider the same must be correct in relation to the FTAA. F&amp;B consider that interpretation is supported by s 5(3) of the Act.</p> <p><i>Clauses 17(1)(a) to (c)</i> - the F&amp;B comments address the legal interpretation of these clauses.</p> <p><i>The project’s national or regional benefits</i> – F&amp;B accepts that there are monetary benefits associated with mining and exporting gold, and that there are associated employment benefits. It accepts that these are likely to be considered at least regionally significant, but notes that the Applicant’s Canadian ownership means those benefits are very much reduced compared to what they would be if a New Zealand company were progressing this application.</p> <p>F&amp;B disagrees with the extent of benefit claimed for the biodiversity enhancement package. The measures proposed are almost entirely to offset or compensate for actual or potential effects of the project, and as such they are not a “benefit”.</p> <p><i>Frogs</i> – F&amp;B comment the science behind population estimates presented on behalf of the applicant is not robust and includes considerable uncertainties and overestimation. As stated by DOC the extrapolations are wide when considering the population at risk, despite the applicant acknowledging the lack of robustness in the preliminary analyses. F&amp;B agrees with the comments from DOC that the conclusions in the technical reports accompanying the application downplay potentially detrimental impacts of the proposal, despite a high degree of uncertainty of overall impact and outcomes. F&amp;B consider the potential effects are very high.</p> <p>F&amp;B comment that the risks cannot be adequately overcome by conditions of consent given the importance of the species, the level of uncertainty over the potential effects; including the fact that effects are potentially irreversible; and that effects may at first be subtle or delayed; and the lack of demonstrably successful mitigation, remediation or offsetting techniques (including the very limited success of frog salvage to date).</p> <p><i>Habitat loss / vegetation clearance / lizards</i> – F&amp;B comments the proposal involves vegetation loss within the Coromandel Forest Park which includes rare coastal forests and is valued for its diverse native flora and fauna and ecosystem services. F&amp;B comments the applicant seeks to downplay the impact of habitat loss and vegetation clearance by referring to the point that the vegetation proposed to be removed within the Coromandel Forest Park will be no more than</p>	

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p>0.66ha in total area. F&amp;B comment that where ecological features are very rare, an impact on those features over even a very small area will be a very significant impact. The spatial extent of the impact, without that context, is meaningless. The Panel would be in error if it were to place weight on the 0.66 ha area of impact rather than the ecological assessment of the magnitude of that impact.</p> <p><i>Waterbodies</i> – F&amp;B comment that the application will result in long term effects on freshwater values, including a reduction in the water table and changed wetland hydrology. A key concern regarding water quality and wetlands arises from the proposed dewatering. Dewatering could result in a decline in the groundwater level in connected aquifers. This, in turn, could reduce water availability to streams and wetlands. Potential adverse effects include drying, changes in plant composition, and declines in ecological function. The scale of these effects is highly uncertain.</p> <p><i>Reclamation</i> – F&amp;B comment the proposal will lead to reclamation of stream habitat, reduced aquatic connectivity and instream works. F&amp;B note the application says this will be offset with the creation of 13,573m of stream diversion channels and stream restoration; with an overall permanent loss of some 16% of extent (length) of streams. F&amp;B consider the loss of these streams is a significant impact and the resulting effects include a prediction that the reclamation of the upper reaches of the headwater gully will reduce groundwater and surface flows to the Gladstone Wetland.</p> <p><i>Construction and Operational Water Management Effects</i> – F&amp;B comment that it is critical that the control and treatment of rainfall runoff from areas subject to mine related activities at the surface and from seepage from proposed work sites, and treatment of surplus processing water is undertaken in a way that protects water related values and does not affect groundwater or surface water quality. F&amp;B comment some of the conclusions reached in the technical reports do not give sufficient reassurance that this will be achieved.</p> <p><i>Effects associated with tailing storage</i> – F&amp;B comment application records that the processing of the recovered ore will produce approximately 8.66 million tonnes of additional tailings. F&amp;B consider the environmental risks associated with tailing storage are significant and includes risks to freshwater and ecosystems and risks to downstream drinking water sources and communities.</p> <p><i>Part 2 – RMA</i> – F&amp;B comment that application in this case is contrary to Part 2 RMA including the purpose of sustainable management and the need to safeguard the life-supporting capacity of water and ecosystems.</p> <p><i>National Environmental Standards for Freshwater (NES FW)</i> – F&amp;B functional need has not been identified, and the effects management hierarchy has not been applied, and as such consent should not be granted. F&amp;B comment that Regulation 57 is again a very directive provision, deserving significant weight</p>	

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p><i>National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPSFM)</i> – F&amp;B comment the application is inconsistent with Policy 1 and 6 and contrary to Policies 7 and 8.</p> <p><i>National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB)</i> – F&amp;B comment the application does not meet Policy 3, and is contrary to Policy 7 and Clause 3.11.</p> <p><i>Other Planning Instruments</i> – F&amp;B consider the application is contrary to the objectives and policies of other relevant planning documents, including Objectives LF-01 and LF-03 of the RPS, Policy 5 (section 3.2.3) and Policy 1 (Section 3.7.3) of the WRP.</p>	
12	Gloria Sharp	<p>Ms Sharp commented that the FTAA has been viewed by the majority of New Zealanders as a retrograde step against our democratic system, removing the rights of people to lodge comments and be heard on such applications. Only her side of Barry Road, if that, has been offered this opportunity, when it not only will affect the properties across the road, but all of Waihi. Ms Sharp fails to see any advantage to the use of this so called 'fast tracking', other than to limit the time needed for consideration and consultation. Ms Sharp considers it appears to be an extremely expensive duplication of what already exists with the Councils'.</p> <p>Ms Sharp questions if the Fast Track Team have confidence in using any of the information provided by the consultants which have been engaged by the applicant to prepare their reports. Ms Sharp also notes that at the time of writing her comments, Council is still preparing its comments, so it is impossible for the people affected, to gain knowledge from a supposedly 'unbiased' comments for the people. She also term lightly as the Council is in favour of the mining and in conflict.</p> <p>Ms Sharp noted that she experienced the tail end of the underground blasting on Barry Road, roughly two years of it. Although she was aware blasting was to cease reasonably soon where they purchased, it was an experience they would not like anyone else to have.</p> <p>Ms Sharp questions whether the Mining Company's should be permitted to erode the Waihi Community's well-being with its mining activities, by stealth, such as undermining the property values etc. Ms Sharp also reminds the Panel that the mining operations can pollute local waterways with sediment and has/will create waste rock stacks (tailings dams) prone to acid mine drainage. With respect the Gladstone Pit, Ms Sharp comments that the blasting and vehicle noise for this undertaking will be immense and questions whether it can be guaranteed the residents will not be affected by this.</p> <p>Ms Sharp questions whether alarmed telemetry monitoring is appropriate for everything.</p> <p>With respect to water, Ms Sharp comments that simply stating "will not result" is an insufficient argument. Ms Sharp considers we should not be taking any risks regarding tampering with our</p>	<p>Ms Sharp requests the application be declined on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Application is in contravention of the District Plan.</li> <li>2. That the concerns of the Waihi Citizens have not been called for and that only a chosen few were given a mere 20 days to comment upon such a vast project.</li> <li>3. That there are no reports on CO2 emissions.</li> <li>4. It does not comply with Council's Sustainability Policy.</li> <li>5. There is a high possibility of severe impacts on the Townships water tables and water supply.</li> <li>6. That there will be too great a number of Tailings Storage Facilities in close proximity.</li> <li>7. If my proposed permanent Waihi Based Monitoring Officer is not engaged it will again, and more so, be open slather for self-monitoring determinations, this time on a far greater scale.</li> </ol>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p>water supplies and it is hard to believe that the amount of water this OGNZL propose to dewater will have no impact on the various ground waters and rivers.</p> <p>Ms Sharp also questions if CO2 emissions have been assessed in the application. She considers this is imperative as this industry emits large amounts of CO2. She considers this is one of the big ethical downsides of gold mining it is extraordinarily energy intensive.</p> <p>With respect to social impact, Ms Sharp comments the residents of this area have had the quality of their lives impacted upon, including significant health issues caused by stress and other adverse effects of the impending expansion of mining in her area.</p> <p>Ms Sharp also comments that there will be a negative impact on property values at a time when they may urgently need to sell, and for the neighbourhood. She considers the effects on property values have never received the importance and scrutiny it demands.</p> <p>There will no doubt be a resumption in dust pollution and damage to her property from dust and toxic dust on cars, home exteriors, household items. She is concerned about the potential for increased traffic due to the proximity of the sites, vibration causing damage, vibration increasing due to underground tunnelling, blasting, and heavy machinery.</p> <p>With respect to economic impact, Ms Sharp notes that since 1988, the people of Waihi and surrounds have evidenced an industry that has left its town offering very little in exchange for the upheaval to the community.</p>	
13	Hauraki District Council ( <b>HDC</b> )	<p>HDC staff actively monitor conditions of consent issued by the Council and provisions of the mining licence and the extended Martha Mine consent that live on via the District Plan. The current level of compliance is very high, with non-compliance issues only of a minor or technical nature. HDC emphasises that it has extensive experience in monitoring of mining consents in the Wahi Area and has experienced staff and expert contractors engaged in this work.</p> <p>There are ongoing social-economic challenges for Waihi Town. HDC has a focus on improving the economic and social wellbeing of their communities, to ensure residents have jobs, liveable income levels, and the resources needed to achieve a better standard of living.</p> <p>HDC recognises that mining is a legitimate activity in New Zealand so long as potential adverse effects are able to be managed via consent conditions and by maximising the likely benefits/positive effects.</p> <p>Consent Conditions - HDC notes the breath of approvals sought and the complexity of existing conditions across 6 Areas proposed with those consents/authorisations that already exist across some of those Areas. Despite this every effort will be made to ensure conditions are robust, streamlined and able to be monitored so that, as much as possible, potentials for adverse effects on landowners and the wider community are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p>	<p>HDC hopes the comments are of use to the Panel in its consideration of the proposal and is willing to participate in ongoing communications with the applicant and the Panel to assist the Panel in coming to a decision on the application.</p> <p>HDC finds there are some outstanding issues with the Applicant's proposed draft consent conditions, together with the management plans that relate to some of these. If the Council's concerns and recommendations regarding these matters are satisfactorily addressed, the HDC is satisfied that consent can be</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p>This has been a major focus for the HDC in providing detailed comments on the application and proposed conditions.</p> <p>Rehabilitation and Closure – HDC note that if WNP is approved, then additional land will be added to the Rehabilitation and Closure Plan (<b>RCP</b>) for the existing mine site. HDC recognise that this may lead to increased opportunities for community, recreation and tourism activities together with a need for additional environmental monitoring. HDC consider the RCP for OGNZL’s existing mining operations should integrate with the RCP for the WNP, approved. The HDC envisages bonds will incorporate all mining activities undertaken by OGNZL in the Waihi area.</p> <p>Social benefits – HDC consider there is a need to maximise skills and training development for the local community (via local procurement, youth skills development, etc) and to minimise potential negative effects from increased demand for housing.</p> <p>Biodiversity Project – HDC supports this. HDC consider it is important DOC and iwi are involved and available funds are used for actual pest control activities, with targets, monitoring and reporting to demonstrate effectiveness.</p> <p>Council Water Supply – HDC requires assurance that the quantity and quality of the Council’s water supply (which originates from the upper reaches of Dhinemuri River) will not be adversely affected by the proposal, particularly given the ongoing growth that is anticipated in Waihi township. HDC supports the proposed WWC consent conditions which have rigorous monitoring and reporting focus.</p> <p>The HDC comments includes detailed legal and planning feedback which is informed by several technical experts. The final submissions find that the Council’s assessment has not identified any adverse effects that cannot be addressed through sound conditions. The Planning comment includes the following:</p> <p><i>Contamination / Heritage</i> – no additional consent conditions or changes to conditions that are considered necessary;</p> <p><i>Hazardous facilities</i> – HDC have identified inconsistencies in the quantities of hazardous substances identified in the technical reports and the proposed conditions.</p> <p><i>Social Effects</i> – HDC request the proposed consent conditions be amended to be more effective, with the aim of increasing the likelihood of achieving the proposed uplift in positive effects that has been identified as an outcome by the applicant; and a decrease in potential negative impacts (regarding potential housing effects).</p> <p><i>Geotechnical</i> – subject to the recommended HDC conditions being incorporated, overall surface stability across Areas 1, 2, 3 and 5 will be able to be maintained.</p> <p><i>Vibration</i> – HDC consider that the VMP should be renamed the Blast Management Plan incorporating (as separate sections) the matters of blast-induced ground vibration, air overpressure, flyrock, and nitrous oxide fume, and that the Risk Assessment matrix contained in this document be amended to include the risks associated with high and noncompliant air</p>	<p>granted. To that end, the Council’s experts are available to participate in expert conferencing on the conditions, and/or the Council is open to taking part in conditions workshops or a hearing.</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p>overpressure levels. If this is not achievable for the issuing of the VMP as a consented document, then HDC consider that the decision should require (by way of a suitable condition) an updated VMP to be prepared and submitted to HDC for certification. This has not been crafted by HDC.</p> <p><i>Lighting</i> – HDC request a new consent condition requiring a Lighting Management Plan to be submitted to HDC for certification.</p> <p><i>Acoustics</i> - The proposal to establish construction noise limits (as distinct from operational noise limits), and a process for managing the exceedance of these through a Construction Noise Management Plan (CNMP) is appropriate, provided the conditions and CNMP requirements that control this process are robust, including requiring the consent holder to demonstrate that it has identified and adopted the BPO for minimising the noise effects (not just managing them) and to ensure that the noise effects are reasonable. The proposed conditions dealing with helicopter noise by the applicant require amendment (so they are consistent with the Marshall Day Report), and further amendment (and new conditions) are required to manage the use of helicopters for the construction and operational phases (particularly as they relate to Area 1) to provide a mechanism to manage the effects, and increase clarity, certainty and enforceability.</p> <p><i>Landscape, natural Character and Visual</i> – HDC comment that the fragmented structure to the management plans and the proposed conditions reduces certainty, and complicates implementation and future compliance monitoring, which will make it more difficult for HDC to administer the consent effectively. HDC recommend that the mitigation framework be strengthened by rationalising the proposed conditions, consolidating all mitigation requirements into revised versions of the ELMP-WUG and ELMP-WA, and introducing appropriate performance standards to guide implementation and support effective implementation monitoring.</p> <p><i>Ecology</i> - HDC's assessment of the terrestrial ecology impacts is that overall, there are likely to be net positive outcomes for indigenous terrestrial biodiversity. However, to achieve such outcomes, HDC consider that the measures proposed (to avoid, remedy, minimise, offset or compensate for adverse effects) in the form of the proposed conditions and management plans (ELMP-WUG, WAPMP, and ELMP-WA), and their integration are not sufficient or suitable to achieve the biodiversity outcomes forecast.</p> <p><i>Economics</i> - HDC's assessment is that the project will generate regional (and local) and national benefits.</p> <p>The HDC comment also include tracked changes version of the proposed conditions for the HDC land-use consents and the proposed conditions common to the HDC and WRC.</p>	
14	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT)	<p>HNZPT find that Oceana Gold has utilised the CVA/CIA reports provided to guide their processes with the project with regard to implementing iwi cultural advice. OGNZL is also involved in ongoing discussions with iwi and have stated that they wish to create opportunities for cultural engagement. HNZPT considers an Iwi forum to be an appropriate means to facilitate this. Some Iwi have written their support for the proposal.</p> <p>HNZPT find that the project area does not contain any sites entered on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rāngi Kōrero or sites contained on the Schedule of Historic Heritage Inventory of the</p>	That the resource consent application be approved in accordance with the documentation lodged with the Substantive Application, particularly B.49 & B49.a-B49.b and the updated proposed resource conditions dated 28th July 2025.

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p>Hauraki District Plan. However, the HNZPT note the proposed activity is in close proximity to the Martha Mine and associated historic heritage features.</p> <p>HNZPT acknowledge that the substantive application includes an approval for an archaeological authority and they refer the Panel to the report provided under s51(2)(a) of the FTA for comments on archaeology and any recommendations.</p>	<p>HNZPT have reviewed the proposed conditions contained in the application and seek HDC condition 89, TDC Condition 47 and WRC/HDC condition C29 be retained as worded.</p>
15	Martha Trust (MT)	<p>The MT has convened and considered the invitation to comment on the WNP and in accordance with clause 8.2 of the MT Deed, the Trustees have resolved to await all formal requests from the HDC and the WRC regarding potential recommendations for amendments to the MT Deed arising from the WNP application.</p>	<p>No decision requested.</p>
16	Martin Barber	<p>Mr Barber commented, that at this stage, he has no negative comments. He further commented that OGNZL has kept them well informed regarding their plans and how these may affect their property and household.</p>	<p>As long as OGNZL continues with regular and accurate monitoring of vibration, noise, and dust, as they have indicated, they will be satisfied.</p>
17	Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment (MBIE)	<p>MBIE notes that the substantive application by OGNZL for the WNP project does not include an application for a mining permit as it currently holds the necessary permits under the Crown Minerals Act. However, MBIE retains a strong interest in the outcome of the substantive application because OGNZL's ability to secure the required consents, approvals and access arrangements is required for it to comply with and give effect to its existing permits. MBIE notes the conditions or restrictions attached to the approvals (if granted) may also directly affect the project's economic outcomes and royalty payments. For this reason, MBIE welcomes the opportunity to comment on the draft conditions when they are available.</p> <p>MBIE consider the WNP is recognised as a gold mining project of national and regional significance, which has considerable economic significance to New Zealand.</p> <p>MBIE note that due to the environmental sensitivity of the surface area, the Wharekurauponga resource has been scoped as an underground mining operation since its first grant. MBIE comment that while open pit mining would almost certainly have offered greater economic returns and higher gold recovery, the location of the resource beneath the Coromandel Forest Park made it environmentally untenable.</p> <p>MBIE considers this development, using underground decline option, to be both pragmatic and environmentally responsible. MBIE consider this minimises surface impacts as much as possible, particularly in relation to the public conservation estate and the surrounding community. MBIE further note it also requires a substantial upfront financial commitment from OGNZL to develop the resource in this way. MBIE considers this option reflects a balance between economic viability and minimising environmental impacts.</p>	<p>If the Panel proposes to grant the approvals, MBIE considers care should be taken to ensure the conditions of the approvals appropriately balance the management of environmental and conservation effects with the project's potential to deliver significant economic benefits without undue constraints.</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
18	Minister for Economic Growth (MEG).	<p>The MEG comments that the WNP has direct economic benefits supported by OGNZL's economic assessment. The MEG also comments that WNP will generate substantial economic benefits at the regional and national level through the short and long-term impacts on increased employment, total operation and capital expenditure, and nationally significant foreign direct investment and capital investment that will be allocated to this project.</p> <p>The MEG also comments that another substantial economic benefit of the WNP is its contribution to exports, which aligns with the Government's current economic growth ambitions of doubling exports by 2040 and the WNP would also progress goals set out in the Government's Mineral Strategy, which is part of the Going for Growth work programme.</p>	No decision requested.
19	Ministry for Culture and Heritage (MCH)	<p>The MCH finds that the WNP does not identify any actual or potential impacts on the wider Arts, Culture and Heritage portfolio. The MCH comments note that the role of the Ministry under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 is limited to a policy role, while Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) is responsible for administering the Act's regulatory functions. The MCH understands that HNZPT has been invited to comment on the application under ss53 and 54 of the FTAAT. In this instance, the MCH will refer to HNZPT's statutory role and its expertise and does not expect to be consulted separately on the matter of archaeological authorities.</p>	No decision requested.
20	Minister of Resources (MR)	<p>The MR considers the project will contribute to regional development beyond 2030 and will have nationwide impacts over the life of the project. The MR considers the project would expand and extend the life of the mine from 2030 to 2040, enabling 859 highly paid and stable jobs, including direct and indirect roles, and a regional spend of \$1,093 million in the Hauraki District.</p> <p>The MR also considers the OGNZLs have a history of responsible mining practices, demonstrating high environmental, social, and governance performance, and whose continued presence is a benefit to New Zealand. The MR view is based upon OGNZLs commitment to net zero emissions by 2050, contributions to local communities, such as funding to local schools, and rehabilitation of mine sites, among the other activities in the application.</p>	The MR considers approval of the Waihi North project aligns with Government priorities for natural resources, and, if granted, the project will be of great regional and national benefit.
21	Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki (NPkH)	<p>NPkH is opposed to the WNP application and consider there are compelling reasons why the Panel should decline the approvals sought.</p> <p>NPkH consider it is unclear from the maps provide whether the application is in fact ineligible as it may be restricted by s61(1A) of the Crown Minerals Act or within an area for which a permit cannot be granted under that Act. NPkH also consider the WNP is incompatible with their interests in the land the WNP will be situated on, and with their interests in land that is adjacent to it and will be affected by the WNP (including land that they currently own and land that will be transferred to them when their Treaty settlement is completed).</p> <p>NPkH find that the WNP will potentially have significant adverse cultural, environmental, economic and social impacts on them, te taiao, and the local community. They comment that the supposed regional and national benefits appear overstated and to the extent they do eventually, will primarily flow overseas.</p>	<p>The application be declined.</p> <p>The WNP is fundamentally incompatible with the interests of NPkH, including their interests in: (a) ancestral whenua the project is the proposed to access, occupy and mine; (b) land (including land we own currently and land we will own following our Treaty settlement) that is adjacent to or will be impacted by the project.</p> <p>If the Panel is unable or does not agree to decline the application,</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p>NPKH consider there have been significant process flaws that mean the application material does not reflect their cultural values and does not assess the effects or impacts of the projects on their values, interests, culture, world view or the impacts on these matters. NPKH also note they were incorrectly not identified as an iwi authority and not notified of the application, nor were they invited to the convenor's conference.</p> <p>NPKH consider application lacks an integrated assessment of cumulative effects, adopts a technical; lens that presumes certain impacts are negligible, but overlooks cultural significance of those features, particularly where they contribute to the mauri, the landscape or support taonga species.</p> <p>NPKH comment there is much uncertainty relating to the environmental effects of the activities, which will be left to monitoring and compliance, for example, the dewatering effects associated with the Wharekirauponga underground mine (WUG) will not be known until activities commence.</p> <p>NPKH also comment that no noise or vibration studies have been conducted from their Mataora block which is adjacent to the subject site. The cumulative effects of noise or vibration are concerning particularly given the construction phase of the proposal is stated to last up to 13 years.</p>	<p>then the deficiencies in the AEE and technical reports need to be addressed before any approvals are granted and additional mitigation will be required to address the issues that have been raised by NPKH.</p>
22	Ngāti Tara Tokanui, Ngāti Koi (NTTNK)	<p>NTTNK are tangata whenua at Waihi and in the immediate vicinity of the WNP, with a whakapapa relationship founded on mana and kaitiakianga that has existed since time immemorial. Their connection to the land is deeply rooted in their ancestry, with significant sites and settlements established by their ancestors through time.</p> <p>NTTNK comment, given the GOR's proximity to Motukehu (a taonga and site of significance for NTTNK, the area surrounding Motukehu is a battle - wāhi tapu site including Gladstone Hill), and its approximate location to their rāhe, in a geologically complex area, careful geotechnical assessment and design are essential to ensure stability and safety of the activities proposed.</p> <p>NTTNK consider they must be actively involved in all stages of the WNP and this application. They seek to appear before the Panel to inform its decision in respect of the WNP and, in particular, ensure that if the WNP is to proceed that any conditions reflect an engagement process aligned with the NTTNK and OceanaGold Partnership Agreement.</p> <p>NTTNK call for direct engagement in this Fast Track process, adequate resourcing for their participation, and a reset of the conditions to establish a transparent, balanced, and inclusive approach. NTTNK also seek a sunset clause for the Iwi Advisory Group forum (IAG), to be replaced by an engagement group aligned with the Partnership Agreement, and legally binding impact assessment processes for all permits and activities.</p> <p>NTTNK's comments are provided with the intention of protecting the taonga of NTTNK, and to ensure that they are involved in management processes. They are committed to ongoing</p>	<p>While NTTNK support the WNP, they consider there are a number of adverse effects which must be addressed in line with the comments they provide. They consider the starting point of doing this is the proper consultation with mana whenua to gain an understanding of the interests and taonga and identifying how these can be protected.</p> <p>NTTNK seek feedback on the comments provided, along with a face-to-face hui with the OGNZL to discuss how engagement and the mitigation of any adverse effects for NTTNK should be managed. In recognition of the connection that NTTNK share with the whenua within the WNP area,</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p>discussions with OGNZL to implement recommendations that recognise their interests and uphold a holistic view of the environment (te taiao), encompassing the effects of the WNP on air, water, and land.</p> <p>NTTNK comment that the WNP impacts them for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The Ngāti Koi Reserve, home of Ngāmarama settlements for a millennium, is now buried. Urupā, wāhi tapu, pā kāinga, and mahinga kai sites have been obliterated or severely degraded as a result of environmental degradation, severing cultural whakapapa connection preventing kaitiakitanga (stewardship) to care for this land.</li> <li>(b) De facto loss of control over Motukehu. Motukehu was returned in the Simple under the Ngāti Tara Tokanui Treaty settlement negotiations. In practical terms, this restricts the use and control of the Domain by NTTNK. Restrictions include impact on ceremonies, restoration, and risks contamination (dust, water runoff – subsidence). For example, the repo and wetland face irreversible loss due to environmental degradation.</li> <li>(c) The Crown guaranteed undisturbed possession of their lands, yet over the years, mining has disrupted this promise. Sacred landscapes, such as Ruahorehore, Waione Awa, Motukehu, the bend in the Ohinemuri, honor their tūmuna and Atua. These sites are now altered. Ruahorehore, once a sacred stream, has been repurposed to divert 'vagrant' streamlets for TS3 stability. Its failure could trigger catastrophic dam collapse. Motukehu (225m) will be dwarfed by tailings dams, never recontextualised by industrialisation.</li> </ul> <p>NTTNK seek to engage with its partners in good faith and have a strong desire to be involved in the subsequent parts of the FTA approvals process.</p>	<p>such an approach is a minimum expectation for NTTNK.</p> <p>NTTNK advise that a number of documents their comments refer to contain sensitive information and, as a result, NTTNK are reluctant to file the complete documents as a part of the comments process. However, given NTTNK's desire to be involved throughout this process, NTTNK are committed to providing more information from these documents through the comments process and subsequent meetings with NGNZL and/or the Panel, if required.</p>
23	New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)	<p>NZTA has had previous pre-application engagement with OceanaGold in August 2021, March to June 2022.</p> <p>Following this engagement, NZTA recommended that the following measures be included as part of any subsequent application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The detailed design of the proposed intersection upgrade is required to be reviewed and approved by NZTA prior to construction.</li> <li>▪ The intersection upgrade design being subject to an independent detailed design and NZTA Safety Audit Procedures.</li> <li>▪ The inclusion of street lighting at the upgraded intersection.</li> <li>▪ The provision of a 2.5m wide Diagram E left-turn shoulder and inclusion of a Right Turn Bay treatment.</li> </ul> <p>In January 2025, OGNZL lodged a Corridor Access Request (CAR) for the completion of four pavement pits. NZTA note that the purpose of this work was to determine aspects of the detailed design of the State Highway 25 and Willows Road intersection upgrades. Following a review of the relevant technical assessments, NZTA can confirm that the applicant has addressed and incorporated the previous feedback within their application regarding transportation related matters.</p>	<p>NZTA supports the intent of the proposed conditions, however, NZTA seeks that the Panel include the conditions and advice notes as proposed within Section 4.0 of their comments. NZTA consider that the proposed amendments and inclusions are necessary to ensure that NZTA is suitably informed of transport and geotechnical matters, and NZTA assets are suitably protected within the general vicinity of the proposal.</p> <p>NZTA welcomes further discussions with OGNZL regarding the intersection upgrades at SH25 and Willows Road.</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
24	Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE).	<p>The PCE commented that the Panel should be wary of relying solely on an applicant's economic analysis given the incentives for applicants to overstate the benefits and underestimate costs. In this case, the applicant's economic analysis appears to be based on a multiplier model. The PCE recommends the Panel seeks clarification on the methodology used.</p> <p>The PCE notes that multiplier models have known limitations. While they can generate results that may be more accurate at a very local level, they have been demonstrated to overestimate the impact of projects at a regional or national level. This is because the model assumes that any resources, including labour and capital, used in the project were sitting idle before the project happened. The PCE considers, in reality, this will rarely be the case. Resources will be diverted from other economic activities and, depending on what those activities are, there may be relatively little net economic gain. Multiplier effects (indirect and induced), export revenue and total project spend (capex and opex) are of limited value in demonstrating benefit.</p> <p>On the cost side, the PCE considers the applicant's analysis completely overlooks environmental costs. These should be set out in full. The biodiversity impacts and loss of ecosystem services from the entire mine area should be included as a cost in the economic analysis, based on the best available information.</p> <p>The PCE also considers, as part of its decision making, that the Panel needs to consider how and to what extent adverse impacts (costs) can be managed. The PCE comments that the potential adverse effects on biodiversity, conservation and other areas may be manageable through the setting of conditions. The PCE comments that it will be up to the Panel to determine which environmental effects, such as noise impacts, should be subject to conditions. The PCE considers the Panel will need to assure itself that it is sufficiently informed to set conditions appropriately and, more importantly, is clear on the points at which monitoring converts into action.</p> <p>The PCE also comments that when drafting its conditions, the Panel should try to be specific about what sort of effects might trigger a need for the applicant to change, or cease, its operations. For example, if monitoring showed significant disruption in the feeding or breeding habits of endangered or threatened species as result of noise or vibrations, the conditions should comment clearly with actions the applicant would be expected to take. Importantly, The PCE considers the Panel should be clear as to who is responsible for ensuring compliance.</p>	<p>In lieu of more accurate estimates, the PCE recommends that the Panel only consider the direct economic benefits created by this project (197 jobs + 192 contractors).</p> <p>The PCE recommends a more accurate estimate of the benefit of the WNP at a national level, it could consider using a computable generalised equilibrium model.</p> <p>The PCE finds that the Panel has significant powers to seek additional information, advice and expertise. The PCE recommends, given the shortcomings of the applicant's cost-benefit analysis, that the Panel commission a more detailed assessment of the costs of the WNP so that it can judge the relative costs and benefits.</p> <p>The PCE further notes that it is possible, and probably likely, that even after receiving comment from those invited to comment, the Panel will still lack information. The PCE considers if the Panel is in that situation, he would encourage the Panel to use the powers they have to commission further expertise in whatever time remains.</p>
25	Perrins Robertson Partnership (PRP)	<p>PRP comments that previous applications have not recognised the acute reputational and operational vulnerability of equine breeding operations to the threat of mining. PRP asserts that the new AEL presented does not even recognise such operations and no buffers, protection or preservation orders are proposed to be implemented to protect the Equine Industry and particularly the AJ Arabians stud (AJ), given the economic and time investment the industry.</p>	<p>The application in its entirety should be rejected, or, alternatively OGCL should provide suitable compensation that reflects actual loss.</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p>PRP considers OGNZLs current application for mining poses significant serious risks for the environment (particularly water, noise and air quality) and similar damaging risks to the reputation and business operations of the adjoining stud, and the neighbouring properties.</p> <p>PRP comment that the assessments undertaken by economic experts commissioned by OGNZL do not address the potentially significant costs to AJ associated with the proposal. On close examination, and by using sensitivity scenarios to test key economic variables, PRP consider the claimed economic benefits will result in a net loss to AJ of \$5M-\$8M. PRP note this is without accounting for other social impacts on the residents and, other externalities (including heritage, climate change) long term water impacts and other legacy issues for future generations.</p> <p>PRP also note that although OGNZL engaged an expert in the field of equine management, they have not submitted his evidence, or evidence from any animal welfare or veterinary specialists. PRP consider in other areas, where mining effects on horses and livestock have been investigated, experts have unanimously found that the risks presented by similar applications are unacceptable, cannot be managed or mitigated and cannot be conditioned. PRP consider the risks of permanent damage and harm are high and once done cannot be undone.</p> <p>PRP consider the approval of the GOP would put the Rogers Robertson partnership in the position of having their property unusable for the purposes that it has been developed. The added value of the property from the equine investment and development over 3 decades would be lost and any suggestion that the OGNZL "top up" scheme could compensate for this is ludicrous as, given that any prospective buyer as an equine property (fair price) would be in the same position, the property could only realise an offer of value for grazing which is considerably less.</p>	
26	Peter and Jessie Rogers	<p>The Rogers have four dwellings on their land, in which members of their family reside. They have never been approached directly and asked if they would agree to exceeding the proposed noise and vibration levels. The Rogers note that the application comments OGNZL can mitigate the noise, and that they have investigated this. The Rogers note the WNP is not operational and the noise assessment reports based on expected averages and 'hearsay'. The Rogers consider the report has no major assumptions. The Rogers maintain noise effects are not minor for the occupants who will have to deal with it all the time, especially when they start having their own babies.</p> <p>The Rogers consider that extending the Martha Mineral Zone Area will detract people from coming into the town of Waihi and purchasing homes in this area (other than new employees). The Rogers consider that it will also cause a significant devaluation to their new builds, their kids new 3 bedrooms, and existing dwellings located in this vicinity.</p>	The Rogers request full recognition of their four properties as directly affected within all of the reporting including but not limited to vibration, noise, dust, visual effects, inclusion on the GOP Top Up area map for future compensation/value protection, adequate/additional mitigation and consultation for the strong objection to conveyor reactivation and mine expansion, especially the Gladstone project and adjacent activities.
27	Rodney Malone	Rodney completely agrees with application, and has no objection.	Mr Malone looks forward to the application being approved.

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
28	Thame-Coromandel District Council (TCDC)	<p>The proposed application extends into land which is within the control of TCDC. The application correctly identifies this land as being within the Conservation Zone and Rural Zone and subject to the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes overlay.</p> <p>The TCDC comment that the application has assessed the relevant rules under the Section 42 Conservation Zone rules and the Section 29 Biodiversity rules. The TCDC do not agree that this is the correct approach to assessing the proposal against the District Plan. The TCDC comment that the District Plan has a hierarchical structure and activities are set out as rules within zones, or grouped within district wide activities or specifically referred to within overlays used to identify the special values of the district and special purpose provisions. The TCDC consider, in this instance, the definition of mining is structured to capture all components of mining activity, in particular, the activities which would be occurring on the subject sites being the piezometers that will be drilled using a portable drilling rig and the associated vegetation removal. Overall, TCDC consider that the proposal would be a non-complying activity pursuant to Rule 4.4 as the activity is within an overlay and takes on the activity status in Rule 8 Table 1A.</p> <p>The TCDC notes the proposed conditions address monitoring of the activity in the adjacent Hauraki District which generally cover the types of conditions TCDC would anticipate for monitoring the activity. TCDC consider the conditions regarding the WUG-ELMP and Ecological Survey are not structured and worded in a way which would allow for effective monitoring. TCDC does not have any inhouse experts and the certification of management plans would have a significant cost burden on TCDC if there was no opportunity to pass those on.</p>	<p>TCDC request that consideration be given to the wording of the conditions regarding the WUG-ELMP and the Ecological Survey as they are not structured and worded in a way which would allow for effective monitoring. TCDC seek to reduce the certification requirements on the Council.</p> <p>The TCDCs tracked changes to the conditions are attached to their comments.</p>
29	Waihi Community Forum (WCF)	<p>The WCF consider the letters sent to residents was unhelpful and confusing. Whilst they understood the need for procedural compliance, the letters were legalistic, and offered no simple outline of the WNP and steps that recipients should take.</p> <p>The WCF has received feedback from residents that the list of those invited to comment missed out some residents who are clearly affected. The WCF expressed concerned that there are no scheduled blasting times for the COP, Borrow Pit, Willows Access Tunnel and the WUG production blasting. The WCF supports OGI/LL plans to reduce the effects of dust.</p> <p>The WCF have concerns about the lighting outside of daylight hours for the establishment of the Gladstone Open Pit, Willows Road area, and potentially the NRS and TSF3. The WCF understands that this is necessary.</p> <p>The WCF appreciates that OceanaGold Waihi has addressed concerns about helicopter flight paths and noise by using a different flight path and by flying at a significantly higher altitude than before.</p> <p>The WCF understands that the NRS will be built up to a maximum height of 85 meters. The WCF has received several concerns from residents regarding the height of this rock stack and its impact on the natural topography of the land during the NRS construction.</p>	<p>The WCF suggests that, for future FTAA processes, Notices of Application and other documents are reviewed to ensure they are more 'user-friendly', taking into account the readership.</p> <p>The WCF suggests that, when the draft conditions of consent are provided for comment, the Panel requires that future applicants resource and make available independent experts to assist residents in understanding and commenting on the draft conditions</p> <p>The WCF requests that a condition be set to ensure that light spill is minimised and a</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p>The WCF also express concern about the necessity of the GOP altogether, and this part of the WNP has received the most feedback from residents. Concerns include potential property damage, noise, and vibration, as well as impacts on amenity, and, most importantly, loss of the natural topography of the land.</p> <p>The WCF views the WNP as an opportunity to improve local employment statistics by entering into contract agreements with contractors to employ local labour, as mentioned in the Social Impact Assessment (SIA).</p> <p>The WCF understands that OGNZL will implement a Top-Up scheme for the properties identified in the WNP assessment. The WCF notes that the AEP, which aims to offset perceived loss of amenity, is voluntary for Martha operations, but is mandatory for Correnso and any other CEPA operations.</p> <p>Whilst the WCF notes support from some residents for the WNP, it also acknowledges some residents' concerns about how the WNP will impact the existing community and well-being in Waihi. Over the past 12 years that the Forum has been in existence, it has managed a 'Streets Ahead' scheme, which initially received funding from Newmont Waihi (the original Correnso Consent holder). The WCF would like to continue working on the Outdoor Recreation Hub and enhance other amenities in the Waihi area.</p>	<p>planting screen is used where possible, to protect the amenity of nearby residents.</p> <p>The WCF request flight times be limited to between 7:30 am and 8:00 pm.</p> <p>The WCF request that residents outside the proposed Top-Up scheme area, but who may also be affected, be able to apply to the scheme. The Forum suggests it could engage the services of its Independent Review Panel, currently charged with Property Purchases in the Correnso Underground Mine area, to determine whether a resident outside the proposed area is clearly affected, based on the set parameters.</p> <p>The WCF requests the AEP scheme be included in the conditions for the WNP as a mandatory requirement.</p> <p>The WCF suggests that OGNZL contribute annually to the Streets Ahead fund, so that the Forum (which has now become a Charitable Trust) can use any funding as seed-funding and continue to improve the area and well-being of the community where mining takes place.</p>

SUPERSEDED

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
30	Waikato Conservation Board ( <b>WCB</b> )	<p>The WCB appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on the WNP application and acknowledges the complexity of balancing conservation values with development proposals. However, the WCB maintains that the proposal, as currently presented, does not sufficiently uphold the statutory purpose of conservation land under the Conservation Act nor does it align with the objectives of the Waikato CMS. The WCB considers ecological uncertainties, particularly regarding endemic frog populations and groundwater impacts, warrant a precautionary approach.</p>	<p>The WCB urges the Panel to consider the long-term integrity of Coromandel Forest Park and the irreplaceable biodiversity it supports. The protection of this unique landscape must remain paramount.</p> <p>The WCB also recommends that any consent granted be subject to stringent conditions, including robust ecological monitoring, adaptive management, and full alignment with DOC's conservation priorities.</p>
31	Waikato Regional Council ( <b>WRC</b> )	<p>The WRC note that the WNP remains largely unaligned with the WRC back in June 2022 (with the exception of the Service Trench Aerea being removed and the inclusion of some borrow pits near proposed TSF3).</p> <p>With respect to air discharge effects, the WRC consider the proposed management and mitigation measures associated with the discharge to air activities are sufficient to ensure low level effects on the environment and people over the course of the activities.</p> <p><i>Gladstone Pit, Tailings Storage Facility, Northern Rock Stack, Willows Road Rock Stacks</i> - The key issues for these aspects of the proposal are the design criteria.</p> <p><i>Geochemistry</i> - WRC has focused on the geochemistry effects from the proposal being the potential pathways during on-site activities (e.g. rock movement and storage) and the associated risk to the environment. For this reason, the focus has been on understanding where within the system there may be pathways and how to avoid any risk of downstream effects from activities.</p> <p><i>Groundwater effects</i> - WRC has no issues with the proposed consent conditions provided by the applicant on 5 August 2025. These conditions came about following a number of meetings between WRC representatives and OGNZL on the groundwater effects.</p> <p><i>Freshwater effects</i> - If an effect on the surface waterways is detected then the length of time to provide supplementary water is a concern. WRC consider this needs clarification and more certainty to ensure that the supplementary water can be initiated once an issue is detected (most likely if the volume of groundwater increases during underground operations).</p> <p><i>Wetlands</i> - WRC note that TB1 has been assessed as a wetland and it is suggested that like for like replacement is required. WRC suggest changes to some conditions and propose some new conditions.</p>	<p>With respect to air discharge effects, WRC request comment from the OGNZL on whether the suggested changes to the consent conditions are acceptable or whether further clarity is required.</p> <p>Comment is requested on where the piezometer network system around the GOP is provided for within the consent conditions.</p> <p>With respect to geochemistry effects, WRC request comment on whether the suggested changes by Dr Weber are acceptable or whether further clarity is required.</p> <p>With respect to groundwater effects, there are no outstanding matters with respect to the effects on the groundwater.</p> <p>With respect to freshwater effects, WRC consider more detail</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
		<p><i>Planning matters</i> – The WRC comment that there remain a couple of planning issues that need to be addressed relating to the taking of monitoring water from waterways and wetlands within Area 1 and providing for the NES for sources of drinking water.</p>	<p>is required to ensure that supplementary water will be implemented within a timely manner if required. Some matters relating to clarity of specific consent conditions</p> <p>With respect to wetland effects, WRC request comment from the OGNZL on whether there is scope for the suggested like for like replacement for the wetland aspect of TB1 within the overall site. WRC also request comment from the applicant on whether the suggested changes to the consent conditions and the new conditions are acceptable or whether further clarity is required.</p> <p>With respect planning matters, the WRC request comment from the OGNZL on proposed water take within Area 1 for monitoring purposes. A condition addressing the NES for sources of drinking water is requested. Minor changes to the stated insurances and values are suggested.</p>
<b>INVITED COMMENTS (ACCEPTED LATE)</b>			
32	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of NZ (F&B).	Refer #11 above. The purpose of this memorandum is to bring to the Panel's attention the decision of the High Court in <i>Ngati Kupu Hapu Trust v Environmental Protection Agency</i> [2025] NZHC 2453, 27 August 2025. That decision is relevant to the scope issues raised by F&B in their comments. The decision was not released until after the deadline for comments which is why this is being raised now by way of memorandum.	Refer #11 above.
33	Michael and Carol Hayden	The Hayden's express concern that given Transport Tunnell Corridor passes beneath their property, that there may be negative effects on them during construction and in the future. They consider vibration may cause disturbance to their water supply (stock and plantings), animals and building foundations.	<p>The Hayden's request that a vibration monitor be near their property to monitor vibration effects.</p> <p>The Hayden's also request OGNZL prevent leakage by fitting a pond liner to their pond area before</p>

No.	Party / Agency	Summary of Comments / Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
34	Hako Tūpuna Trust (HTT)	<p>HTT object to the WNP as the potential impacts of underground mining will have a significant cultural impact on the whenua (land), moana (sea), awa (rivers and streams), puna (springs), taonga species and urupa/waahi tapu (sacred places).</p> <p>HTT believe that although the technical reports acknowledge that a precautionary approach should be taken, there are gaps in the technical reports that does not provide a high level of confidence to Ngāti Hako. Until such evidence is provided, then there is uncertainty as to the potential impacts of the project.</p> <p>HTT support the comments of Coromandel Watchdog.</p>	<p>blasting starts under their property.</p> <p>HTT request the Panel decline the WNP as it will have a significant cultural, ecological, environmental impacts on the environment and its ecosystems.</p>
<b>UNINVITED COMMENTS</b>			
35	Vaughan Jensen	<p>Mr Jensen is very supportive of the application, provided there is no damage in the DOC area, no damage felt to frogs and no contamination of drill holes. MR Jensen also comments that knowledge of the area by OGNZL will be helpful in search and rescue missions.</p>	Support.

SUPERSEDED