

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

FTAA Section 51 and Section 53 Responses

7.1.1 EPA Commentor code #1 – [REDACTED]

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
1.001	Commenter is concerned that extending Saturday operating hours will reduce the rural amenity currently experienced at their property.	As stated in Section B2.8.2 of the AEE, the existing quarry is consented to operate on a 24-hour basis, but hours for general sales are restricted to between 6:00am and 5:30pm on Monday to Friday and between 6:00am and 4:00pm on Saturdays. It is not proposed to amend/restrict the hours of operation through this Proposal, given the need for operational flexibility but Winstone note that works generally cease at 1pm on a Saturday (if they are undertaken at all).
1.002	Request to retain existing Saturday cut-off time of 1.00pm rather than allowing longer Saturday construction/quarry-related hours.	
1.003	If conditions managing Saturday hours are amended, this commenter expects all related consent conditions to be updated consistently.	

EPA Commentator code #3: Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
3.010	Commentor reiterates interest in acquiring taonga, including rākau over 100 years old, fulfilling kaitiaki role through activities such as planting, salvage and relocation of native species.	There will be an opportunity to engage with Winstone on this matter though the Kaitiaki Forum required by the conditions of consent and it is proposed to include a condition requiring the preparation of the Cultural Management Plan, which will address matters such as: • protocols and contact arrangements for ongoing engagement and communication; • cultural monitoring procedures associated with vegetation clearance, topsoil removal, initial ground disturbance and any other activities identified through preparation of the CMP as warranting cultural monitoring; • procedures to be followed in relation to accidental discoveries; • opportunities for the Participating Iwi to comment on relevant draft Management Plans prior to those plans being submitted for certification; and • arrangements for providing relevant ecological, freshwater, rehabilitation and offset monitoring information to the Participating Iwi.
3.011	Commenter supports conditions that seek to recognise and protect cultural values.	Winstone note this support and also advises the addition of a condition requiring the preparation of a Cultural Management Plan to further reinforce the protection of cultural values.
3.012	Commentor expects that the Kaitiaki Forum will meet with greater frequency than existing arrangements, particularly during the review of management plans.	The frequency of meetings can be amended as required as per the conditions that provide for the Kaitiaki Forum.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
3.013	Commentor does not support reliance on the NZHPT authority process. Recording information on archaeological discoveries does not mitigate the adverse effects on cultural values.	The Archaeological Authority specifically addresses effects on cultural values including <i>That archaeological work must be undertaken in conformity with any tikanga Māori and Winstone must enable access for relevant iwi to any archaeological site encountered in order to undertake tikanga. The AA sets put proactive management of discoveries.</i> However, the Cultural Management Plan will enable Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc to have a level of input outside the NZHPT process on the management of archaeological discoveries and cultural values.
3.014	Commentor does not support reliance on the accidental discovery provisions in Auckland Unitary Plan Rule E12.6.1 (currently reflected in Condition 96).	A rule in a plan must be relied upon to manage effects, in this case to manage archaeological discoveries. Condition 104 provides for either compliance with the accidental discovery protocols set out in the Auckland Plan or an Archaeological Authority. Both are considered by Winstone to be appropriate.
3.015	Commentor seeks Specific Accidental Discovery Protocols be developed in consultation with Mana Whenua and incorporated into the consent conditions.	This is a matter that will be addressed in the Cultural Management Plan that will be prepared with Mana Whenua.
3.016	Commentor seeks an agreed protocol to address tikanga Māori specific to the site.	This is a matter that will be addressed in the Cultural Management Plan.
3.018	Commentor 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.	We understand that this is a standard requirement as per the Archaeological Authority conditions provided by NZHPT.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
3.019	Commentor seeks that the Archaeological Management Plans are prepared in stages and provided to Te Ākitai Waiohua for review and feedback prior to approval.	Given NZHPT confirmation the Panel will be able to approve the Archaeological Management Plan limiting the potential for input from Te Ākitai Waiohua. However, Te Ākitai Waiohua will be able to inform and provide comment on cultural values and tikanga through the Kaitiaki Forum and development of the Cultural Management Plan, and then through implementation of appropriate customary practices and protocols during the construction and development phases.
3.020	Discovery protocols be developed in consultation with Te Ākitai Waiohua to ensure that tikanga Māori processes are followed, assessments undertaken prior to decisions made regarding the destruction of a discovered site.	Discovery protocols are included in the Archaeological; Authority conditions and can be reinforced through the Cultural Management Plan.
3.021	The commentor is provided with opportunities to deliver cultural inductions prior to the commencement of earthworks and to undertake iwi monitoring during earthworks.	This will be a requirement of the Cultural Management Plan.
3.022	Commentor seeks that off-set mitigation for residual adverse effects occurs on the site or within the immediate environs of the area of impact.	It is not possible to accommodate all offsetting within the Site given the extent of the proposed future quarrying works. Winstone did an extensive search for possible offsite sites in proximity to Hunua Quarry, but available sites were limited. Furthermore, Winstone has a preference for offsetting on sites it owns as it has control over the offsetting works i.e. timing, extent, ability to legally covenant, rather than being subject to the landowner's programme / timeframes. It can also more readily protect offset planting on sites it owns.
3.024	Commentor 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.	Approximately 25% of indigenous forest revegetation is proposed to be at Meremere Quarry given the lack of suitable sites owned by and available to Winstone.

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
3.027	Commentor is concerned with the potential sedimentation effects on the downstream freshwater receiving environments caused by the stream realignment and bulk earthworks associated with removal of overburden in the initial stage of works.	It is proposed to establish erosion and sediment control measures as per Conditions 42 and 121. This is supported by seasonal restrictions on earthworks unless approval is obtained from Auckland Council, on-going monitoring of stream sediment loads and water quality monitoring following specified rainfall events, and the requirement to stabilise earthworks. These measures are considered to be sufficient to manage sedimentation effects.
3.028	Commentor seeks annual reporting requirement [regarding potential effects on the downstream freshwater receiving environment] should be amended to six monthly.	Six monthly reporting is not necessary given the measures set out above.
3.029	Commentor expects to be involved in all stages of the stream alignment and restoration.	This can be discussed through the Kaitiaki Forum and addressed in the Cultural Management Plan.
3.031	Commentor expects to participate in the development of the Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan.	Te Ākitai Waiohua will be able to inform and provide comment on the Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan prior to approval through the Kaitiaki Forum.
3.032	Commentor expects [the Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan] sets a clear requirement for restoration, particularly in SEA, the ONL, the ridgeline and those parts of the quarry operation most visible from Pukekōiwiriki pā occur at the completion of each stage.	The LRSMP includes a landscape rehabilitation strategy. A new condition has been recommended to involve Te Ākitai Waiohua in developing the rehabilitation outcomes for areas visible from the Pukekōiwiriki Pa (Refer section 3.1 of the Landscape Response to Conditions.
3.033	Commentor seeks further engagement around the principles and high-level outcomes for rehabilitation, and confirmation	Te Ākitai Waiohua will be able to inform and provide comment on the Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan prior to approval through the Kaitiaki Forum.

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	that this plan will be developed in collaboration with and approval of the commentor.	
3.034	Commentor seeks conditions incorporate opportunities for Te Ākitai Waiohū to exercise kaitiakitanga and mana motuhake within this significant area of its rohe.	This will be provided through both the Kaitiaki Forum and the Cultural Management Plan.
3.036	Commentor expects to be invited to participate in refining the final set of conditions.	Acknowledged and it is understood that all commenting parties will be invited to comment on draft conditions by the Panel under s70(1)(b) FTAA
3.037	Commentor is concerned with the diversion of the Mangapū Stream tributary.	This is noted but it is difficult to address this comment when there are no specific outcomes being sought.
3.038	Commentor is concerned with the amount of off-set mitigation that is outside the traditional Te Ākitai Waiohū area of interest	As noted above, it is not possible to establish all off-set mitigation within the Te Ākitai Waiohū area of interest as Winstone prefers that planting is on its land, so it can be in control of future management and protection.

EPA Commentator code #6:

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
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.	As stated in Section B2.8.2 of the AEE, the existing quarry is consented to operate on a 24-hour basis, but hours for general sales are restricted to between 6:00am and 5:30pm on Monday to Friday and between 6:00am and 4:00pm on Saturdays. It is not proposed to amend/restrict/extend the hours of operation through this Proposal, given the need for operational flexibility but Winstone note that works generally cease at 1pm on a Saturday (if they are undertaken at all). The current quarry operates in accordance with the Auckland Plan noise standards, which apply a noise standard at the notional boundary of any dwelling outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone that existed at 1 January 2001 (the pre-2001 notional boundary limits). The dwellings (and therefore the notional boundaries) nearest to the quarry were all established after 1 January 2001. Therefore, the only control on noise from the quarry at houses constructed after 1 January 2001 are the noise limits at the Quarry Effects Line (as identified in the Auckland Plan). It is proposed to apply the noise limits at the notional boundary of any site outside the Special Purpose – Quarry Zone. This will apply a much greater level of protection for residents living in proximity to the quarry.

EPA Commentator code #7: [REDACTED]

Comment or code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
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] Drive will be managed as quarry operations advance towards our boundary.	It is not proposed to expand onto the properties it owns on Judge Richardson Drive. Those properties that do not contain a dwelling will be planted as part of the offset mitigation for the quarry works. The properties that support dwellings are, and will continue to be, for the foreseeable future, rented to tenants. [REDACTED] will remain located in a generally residential area and separated from quarrying activities by Mangapū Stream and the extensive planting along its boundaries, which is protected by a covenant (not held by Winstone).
7.002	Commenter notes: The application does not provide sufficient assurance that dust effects will remain acceptable as quarry operations expand closer to surrounding properties over time. Ongoing property specific independent monitoring, transparent reporting, and enforceable response measures should be required where dust effects are greater than predicted or where complaints are received.	Property specific dust monitoring is not required. There will be dust monitors located in specific locations depending upon where quarrying is occurring and air quality standards that must be met. These monitors will generally be located at the edge of the quarry and as such if standards are met at that location, they will be met in the environment beyond. This monitoring will be undertaken for the life of the quarry.
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;	As noted above, the quarry will not expand onto the Richardson Drive properties. These properties will be protected from quarrying activities by on-going monitoring of air and water quality. The existing vegetation along both sides of the Mangapū Stream will be retained providing a buffer between the quarry and the residential properties.

Comment or code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	- 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.	
7.008	Commenter seeks robust and enforceable conditions that include: Property-specific dust, noise, vibration, blast overpressure, and air quality protections for [REDACTED]	Property specific monitoring is not considered necessary and there will be robust, enforceable conditions that will ensure that the quality of the existing environment is maintained.
7.009	Commenter seeks robust and enforceable conditions that include: Independent environmental monitoring is located at or immediately adjacent to our property.	
7.010	Commenter seeks robust and enforceable conditions that include: Public reporting of monitoring results, including dust, noise, vibration, and blast monitoring outcomes.	Annual reporting all monitoring data is required in accordance with the conditions of consent. This will include: - records of inspection and maintenance required in accordance with the conditions of these consents; - analysis of surface and groundwater use, level and flow, and water quality chemistry required in accordance with the conditions of these consents; - details of any response taken to achieve the geotechnical limits

Comment or code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		• recommendations on the forecast timing for stream augmentation, or amendments to augmentation rates, • records of complaints received and the responses to those complaints; • any non-compliance with the conditions of these consents, and reasons for that non-compliance; • measures taken to address compliance issues; • recommendations on alterations to any certified Management or Monitoring Plans required. • reporting would be shared to the CLG refer draft Condition 9(c) 'the results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with these consents.' Once lodged with Council, this Report will be publicly available.
7.011	Commenter seeks robust and enforceable conditions that include: Independent property condition surveys before further expansion, with periodic follow-up surveys as quarry operations move closer to residential boundaries.	To date, there is no evidence of effects on privately owned buildings in the vicinity of the quarry. Winstone confirm that there is no damage resulting from quarrying activities evident on the buildings it owns on Judge Richardson Drive. Furthermore, future quarrying activities will meet the relevant vibration standards. As such, it is not proposed to undertake property condition surveys.
7.012	Commenter seeks robust and enforceable conditions that include: Clearly defined trigger levels requiring investigation, corrective action, and review of mitigation measures.	Geotechnical stability, dust, water takes and water quality are all subject to on-going monitoring and trigger levels that will require investigations and corrective actions. For example: Without prejudice to limiting the generality of Conditions 163 – 166, if the monitoring shows that the TSP in ambient air at or beyond the boundary of the

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Comment or code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		Site, as measured in accordance with Condition 180, exceeds 80 µg/m³ as a 24 hour average at the sites listed in Condition 180(b) and or (c) and 100 µg/m³ as a 24 hour average at the site listed in Condition 180(b), the Consent Holder must initiate an investigation as to the probable cause(s) of the exceedance. If an investigation initiated by Condition 182 establishes the probable cause of the elevated levels of TSP is an activity undertaken on the Site, the Consent Holder must take action to reduce those discharges to the satisfaction of the Council. The Consent Holder must report any results of TSP in ambient air tests showing exceedances of the levels given in Condition 183 by mail to the Council as soon as practicable. A summary of all monitoring results for the previous 12 months, including references to wind and rainfall data, and any remedial action taken must be submitted as part of the Annual Monitoring Report required under Condition 72.
7.013	Commenter seeks robust and enforceable conditions that include: Transparent complaints, investigation, and dispute resolution process.	The conditions include the requirement to establish a Community Liaison Group that will provide a forum for residents to provide feedback to Winstone. Residents can also contact the Quarry Manager at any time to register a complaint and Winstone are required to maintain a Complaints Register.
7.014	Commenter seeks robust and enforceable conditions that include: Compensation and remedial measures where quarry operations cause property damage, loss of amenity, or adverse environmental effects.	The impacts of the Proposal have been robustly assessed by technical experts and mitigation measures, management plans and conditions imposed to ensure that impacts on the environment and surrounding properties are appropriately managed. There is no ability to require Winstone to compensate for damage to property under the RMA, noting that no damage is likely to occur.

Comment or code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
7.015	Commenter seeks robust and enforceable conditions that include: Periodic reassessment of environmental effects and mitigation measures as quarry operations progress through future stages of development.	Many of the works are subject to management plans that can be reviewed if issues arise to address these through changes to management and monitoring activities. The Council also has the ability to review consent conditions if issues arise or the operating or statutory environment changes and the conditions need to be amended, to ensure the impacts of the quarry on the environment are effectively managed.
7.016	Commenter notes they are not opposed to the continued operation of Hunua Quarry and acknowledge its importance to Auckland's infrastructure and economic development. However, the benefits of the project should not come at the expense of the health, wellbeing, amenity, and property rights of the small number of neighbouring residents.	The Applicant has been operating in this location for a long time and wants to maintain strong, good relationships with surrounding property owners and the wider community. As such, it has developed a Proposal that locks in robust on-going monitoring, management and remediation of potential and actual adverse effects (despite the pathway open to it under FTAA). The intent being to minimise any impacts on neighbours and the environment.
7.017	Commenter requests: that the Expert Panel either decline the application or impose meaningful, enforceable, and enduring conditions that provide certainty that the occupants of [REDACTED] will be protected from the adverse effects of dust, noise, vibration, blasting, and future quarry expansion throughout the life of the development.	Meaningful, enforceable, and enduring conditions are proposed and these will likely be amended (and reinforced) through the Panel process.

EPA Commentator code #8: Auckland Council – Ecology

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.004	Effects on headwaters - recommend the Panel satisfy itself that the approvals granted do not authorise works that would in practice adversely affect the headwater streams before that later application is lodged.	The application has been amended to provide for fish passage through the culvert at Tributary 3. Due to low flow and gradient, the culvert at Tributary 4 will continue to block fish passage. Accordingly, the loss of stream length associated with the 75m culvert at Tributary 3 and loss of stream length and fish passage at Tributary 4 have been provided in the proposed offset and compensation package. It is only with the removal of the tributaries during Stage 7 (expected to proceed in circa years 43-73) that the headwater streams are affected. It is proposed to compensate/offset this loss when regional consents are sought for this work in the future. A condition of consent is proposed to address this matter.
8.019	The Meremere site is also within a Quarry Zone under the Waikato District Plan and is therefore land identified for quarry purposes. The applicant proposes to secure it by covenant and has indicated no quarrying is planned. In my view that does not fully address the long-term (in perpetuity) outcomes principle, particularly given that this application itself proposes to remove offset planting established under a 2009 consent.	Proposed consent condition 156 requires that within one calendar year of the vegetation removal, the Consent Holder submit records to Council confirming conservation covenants have been completed. Failure to do so would result in compliance action. Any activity that is not undertaken in accordance with approved consent conditions is managed through a legislated compliance process.

EPA Commentator code #8: Auckland Council – Development Engineer and Geotechnical Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.022	Commenter notes the Stage 1 works will obstruct an existing watercourse, as the proposed earthworks are located within the watercourse corridor, proposed earthworks and diversion of the watercourse. These works may affect flow conveyance and may increase the volume, extent, or frequency of flooding on surrounding properties.	This issue is addressed in section 4.2 (pages 35 – 42) of the Mangapū Tributary Realignment Preliminary Design and Effects Technical Report (Appendix B12.4.6a) dated 30 March 2026 and submitted with the Substantive Application. Furthermore, an additional condition 66 was proposed on 22 July 2026 (and included in the August 2026 versions) which requires hydrodynamic modelling to inform detailed design of the channel and modelling outputs to demonstrate the stated flood levels are not exceeded.

EPA Commentator code #8: Auckland Council – Stormwater

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
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.	The expansion area will not include any industrial or trade activities, as defined in the Auckland Unitary Plan.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
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.	The Proposal has addressed all stormwater discharges within the Hunua Quarry site including that discharging through the OBDA and Managed Fill, recognising the holistic response required to manage stormwater.
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.	The expansion area will not include any industrial or trade activities, or any ancillary activities as defined in the Auckland Unitary Plan.
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 406(c) 116(c).	It is acknowledged that the cross-referencing within the conditions needs to be updated and is now correct in the condition set dated 18th August 2026.
8.042	Commenter notes that cross reference in Condition 199-205 (previously 182-188) need to be updated.	It is acknowledged that the cross-referencing within the conditions needs to be updated and is now correct in the condition set dated 18th August 2026.
8.043	Commenter seeks an amendment to Condition 65 to verify the outcomes of the detailed design of the channel prior to construction. <i>Downstream Flood Impacts</i> <i>Prior to finalising detailed design of the diversion channel, hydrodynamic modelling must be undertaken using the most up to date design to verify downstream flooding effects. Modelling outputs will need to demonstrate the following flood levels will not be exceeded:</i> <i>(a) 50mm in forested areas; and/or</i>	The following wording proposed by Auckland Council's Stormwater expert has been adopted and created a new condition that is included in the condition set dated 18th August 2026.

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	<i>(b) Up to 15mm in rural residential area; and/or</i> <i>(c) No flooding effects on existing buildings</i>	
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: <u>"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."</u>	The following wording proposed by Auckland Council's Stormwater expert has been rejected as the initial flood hazard assessment (Appendix B12.4.6a) showed little in the way of adverse effects downstream of the quarry for large flood events. Detailed design hydrodynamic modelling with either reaffirm this or highlight potential downstream effects, which will then be dealt with through the design process, as required under proposed conditions. It is unlikely that there will be significant changes in the design at construction phase for the key structures used to manage flood flows would prompt more modelling. Accordingly, we do not support the condition of as-built modelling. Additionally, we note that proposed condition 67 provides for an adaptive management process in response to unforeseen environmental effects. Although considered unlikely to eventuate, should adverse effects arise post-construction, this consent condition would provide the ability to respond.

EPA Commentator code #8: Auckland Council – Contaminated Land

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.056	Commenter provides a summary of the areas of potential contamination, intrusive investigation findings, soil	The following additional conditions have been included to address the concerns raised by the Contaminated Land Reviewer:

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	management requirements; and makes a recommendation regarding works completion reporting.	<i>If contaminated materials or soils are discovered as part of the DSI which require the preparation of a Remediation Action Plan (RAP), it must be prepared <u>by a SQEP</u> at least 6 months prior to the start of remediation work in Stages 7 and 8.</i>
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.	<i>If a RAP is not required, within three months of the completion of earthworks in Stages 7 and 8, <u>the Consent Holder must submit a Works Completion Report</u> must be submitted <u>prepared by a SQEP</u> to the Council for certification. The Works Completion Report must contain sufficient detail to address the following matters:</i>
8.065	Commenter recommend that the applicant produces a Works Completion Report following works in relevant AOPC, in accordance with Regulation 9(2) of the NES:CS.	<i>(a) A summary of the works undertaken, including the location and dimensions of the excavations carried out and the volume of soil excavated;</i>
8.69	Commenter recommends that Condition 108 is amended to include a Works Completion Report (WCR) to report on the works completed in accordance with the CSMP. This recommendation is also with the view that the PSI & DSI point to one localised area (PMS08 (0-0.3 m bgl)) that is to be excavated and disposed of off-site to avoid the need for a long-term discharge consent.	<i>(b) Conditions of the final site contamination profile, including details and results of any validation testing undertaken (with a map of sampling locations and tabulated sampling results) and interpretation of the results in the context of the NES:CS and the AUP(OP) for the proposed lot;</i> <i>(c) Records/evidence of the appropriate disposal for any material removed from the site;</i> <i>(d) Records of any unexpected contamination encountered during the works and response actions, if applicable;</i> <i>(e) Any on-going monitoring and/or management measures required to minimise risks to human health or the</i>

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		<i>environment as a result of the final site contamination profile.</i> <i>(f) Reports of any complaints, health and safety incidents related to contamination, and/or contingency events during the remedial works; and</i> <i>(g) A statement certifying that all works have been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the consent, otherwise providing details of relevant breaches, if applicable</i>
8.068	Commenter recommends for Condition 38 a SMP is required to comply with Regulation 9(2) of the NES-CS.	Condition 39 provides for the preparation of a Site Management Plan, which is referenced in the Contaminated Land conditions in the condition set dated 18th August 2026.

EPA Commentator code #8: Auckland Council - Parks

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.072	Commenter notes interest in the boundary adjustment which potentially triggers the esplanade reserve provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA').	It has been agreed with Auckland Council that the boundary adjustment does not trigger the esplanade provisions of the RMA. An updated Scheme Plan was provided to Auckland Council and will be provided to the Panel as part of the s53 responses.
8.077	Commenter notes the lodged scheme plan shows the boundary adjustment in an atypical way, by creating a new	

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	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.	
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.	
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.	It is agreed that formal agreements will be required with Auckland Parks to enable offset/compensation works to be undertaken. it therefore accepts the Advice Note sought by Auckland Parks.
8.080	Commenter seeks the inclusion of an advice note to Condition 140 as follows: <u>"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</u>	

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	<u>and safety requirements, staging and methodology of works, maintenance and monitoring obligations, long-term management responsibilities, and any cost recovery or funding arrangements."</u>	
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.	It is efficient, where practicable, to ensure management plans required for works in the regional park are the same as, or consistent with, the management plans required by Auckland Council (Parks and Community Facilities) in its capacity as landowner. As such, it accepts the Advice Note and this will be included in the condition set dated 18 th August 2026.
8.079	Commenter seeks the inclusion of an advice note to Condition 24 as follows: " <u>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."</u>	
8.081	Commenter seeks the inclusion of an advice note to Condition 141 as follows: " <u>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</u>	This Advice Note is included for clarity as it agrees that it cannot apply covenants or other protections over the Hunua Ranges Regional Park.

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	<u>clarity, Auckland Council will not accept covenants or other legal instruments being registered on the records of title for its regional park land."</u>	

EPA Commentator code #8: Auckland Council – Groundwater specialist

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.104	Commenter recommends that Condition 174 is amended as follows: "A Technical Review must be undertaken no less than 3 months prior to commencing each of the two <u>three</u> successive steps of dewatering identified in Condition 174 <u>173</u> . The Review..."	This change is accepted and included in the condition set dated 18 th August 2026.
8.105	Commenter recommends that Condition 181 is amended as follows: "Monthly monitoring of bores ID 1218 and 20013 must recommence in the event that groundwater drawdown is detected in bore HUN12/4U or HUN12/4L, and monthly monitoring of bore ID 21817 must recommence in the event that groundwater drawdown is detected in bores ID421, HUN12/8U or HUN12/8L. Monitoring in these private bores is subject to access being available otherwise requirements under condition 177 apply."	This change is accepted and included in the condition set dated 18 th August 2026.
8.106	Commenter recommends that Condition 182(e) is amended to refer to condition 66 not 67.	It is acknowledged that the cross-referencing within the conditions needs to be updated and is now correct in the condition set dated 18 th August 2026.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.108	Commenter recommends that Condition 186 is amended to refer to condition 66 not 67.	It is acknowledged that the cross-referencing within the conditions needs to be updated and is now correct in the condition set dated 18 th August 2026.
8.109	Commenter recommends that Condition 187 is amended to refer to conditions 182 - 485 186, and <u>66 and</u> 67.	It is acknowledged that the cross-referencing within the conditions needs to be updated and is now correct in the condition set dated 18 th August 2026.
8.110	Commenter seeks clarification regarding cross references in Condition 191	It is acknowledged that the cross-referencing within the conditions needs to be updated and is now correct in the condition set dated 18 th August 2026.
8.111	Commenter recommends that Condition 191 is amended to refer to Condition 489 <u>188</u> to 190.	It is acknowledged that the cross-referencing within the c 18 th August 2026. The conditions need to be updated and are now correct in the condition set dated 18 th August 2026.
8.112	Commenter recommends that Condition 193 is amended as it refers to Hays Stream and Symonds Stream - This should be referred to as Waipokapu, Mangapu.	The naming of the streams has been updated in the condition set dated 18 th August 2026.
8.113	Commenter recommends that Conditions 204 is amended to refer to 482 <u>199</u> and 485 <u>202</u>	It is acknowledged that the cross-referencing within the conditions needs to be updated and is now correct in the condition set dated 18 th August 2026.
8.114	Commenter recommends that Condition 206(a) is amended as it refers to Hays, Symonds and Waihoihoi Streams.... This should be referred to as Waipokapu, Mangapu and Waihoihoi Streams.	The naming of the streams has been updated in the condition set dated 18 th August 2026.
8.115	Commenter recommends that Condition 207 - 211 is amended as it refers to Symonds Stream when it should be Mangapu Stream.	The naming of the streams has been updated in the condition set dated 18 th August 2026.

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.116	Commenter recommends that Condition 208 is amended as it refers to Condition 2019 when it should be 177.	It is acknowledged that the cross-referencing within the conditions needs to be updated and is now correct in the condition set dated 18 th August 2026.

EPA Commentator code #8: Auckland Council – Landscape specialist

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.160	Commenter notes for Condition 136: "Condition 136 should form a part of 135 as it is intrinsically linked to the understanding of the requirements of 135".	These conditions address the mitigation of effects on identified properties but are stand-alone matters and cannot be combined.
8.161	Commenter notes for Condition 137: "Condition 137 should form a part of 135".	
8.162	Commenter notes for Condition 137: "If the above conditions are rolled into one, then this reference would change of course.".	

EPA Commentator code #8: Auckland Council – Franklin Local Board

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.200	The commenter is concerned about the impact of moving the stream and requests that independent evidence be sought and considered.	The calling for independent evidence is at the discretion of the Panel and not the applicant. The Applicant notes that the Panel has technical expertise in this area, and the benefit of technical comments from Auckland Council and DOC's ecologists, as well as the Applicant's.
8.201	The commenter notes the removal of native bush and requests that the applicant provides flora and fauna corridors or islands of maintained bush through the site to maintain diversity over the wider area.	It is proposed to plant extensive areas of the Site including along the realigned stream tributary and on Winstone owned properties located on Judge Richardson Drive connecting to the covenanted vegetation along Mangapū Stream. Rehabilitation of the quarry will also provide further opportunities for corridor planting.

EPA Commentator code #8: Auckland Council – Policy Planner

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.209	Commenter notes although not commented on [NPS-I] Policy 6 is also relevant to infrastructure supporting activities. This policy directs recognising and providing for Māori interests.	The Applicant has actively engaged with Ngāti Tamaoho (who have statutory acknowledgement over the land), Te Ākitai Waiohū (within Area of Interest identified in the Deed of Settlement signed in 2021) and Ngāti Te Ata. This included workshops where Mana Whenua directly contributed to methodologies and techniques related to the stream alignment. Ngāti Tamaoho provided the team with a cultural induction and Te Ākitai Waiohū prepared a Cultural Values Assessment that has informed the LVEA, Stream Realignment Management Plan and the Ecological Offset programme. As such, the outcomes of engagement have been taken into account when designing the proposal.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		The Proposal will not affect a site of significance or issue of cultural significance to Māori. Refer to Attachment 1 to this appendix which updates Appendix B12.9 with reference to this Policy.
8.212	Commenter recommends Appendix B12.9 is amended to make explicit reference to NPS-I Policy 6.	Appendix B12.9 has been amended to refer to NPS-I Policy 6 and provide as part of this s53 response.
8.215	Commenter notes Policy 3 should require an assessment of the effects of the activity, including the loss of freshwater features and the generation of sediment associated with the quarrying activity on the catchment as a whole; and this is as opposed to the applicant's stated position that the policies (3 to 5) are directed at a higher level than the scale of the proposal.	<i>Policy 3: Freshwater is managed in an integrated way that considers the effects of the use and development of land on a whole-of-catchment basis, including the effects on receiving environments.</i> <i>Policy 4: Freshwater is managed as part of New Zealand's integrated response to climate change.</i> <i>Policy 5: Freshwater is managed (including through a National Objectives Framework) to ensure that the health and well-being of degraded water bodies and freshwater ecosystems is improved, and the health and well-being of all other water bodies and freshwater ecosystems is maintained and (if communities choose) improved.</i> The Objective and Policy analysis table in Appendix B12.9 states that whilst the policies are directed at a higher level, the Project is consistent with these policies by ensuring protection of freshwater values and reinstating freshwater habitats that will be lost and offsetting values whose loss cannot be avoided. Discharges to land and water will not adversely affect the health and well-being of groundwater, the Waipokapu Stream and the Mangapu Stream, nor their ability to provide for the health needs of people. It has therefore been determined that maintaining water quality and managing water takes at a stream level will ensure that this also occurs at a catchment level. It is also

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		noted that the take of groundwater has been assessed on the aquifer and has taken into account the impacts of and on the Drury Quarry. The impacts of climate change have been taken into account in the design of the realigned Mangapu Stream as per section 10.4.2 in the Ecological Effects Assessment and 3.1 of the Mangapu Tributary Realignment Preliminary Design and Effects Technical Report. Appendix B of the Erosion and Sediment Control Assessment states that no provision has been made for climate change due to the temporary and adaptive nature and duration of the works. Augmentation to maintain low flows in the Mangapu and Waipokapu Streams will adapt to climate change as the volume of water discharged will be dictated by volume in the stream i.e. lower water levels will require a greater volume of groundwater to be discharged. It is proposed to monitor water quality, with performance targets drawn from NOF (amongst other considerations) as stated in section 10.6.5 of the Ecological Effects Assessment.
8.216	Commenter concurs with the referencing of Section 3.22, provided the application can be demonstrated as being of regional or national benefit, and that there is a functional or operational need for the activity to be done in that location.	The Project is supported by a compelling economic case and will deliver significant and sustained benefits predominantly for the Auckland region across multiple dimensions. Assessed conservatively, the avoided cost analysis estimates regional economic benefits in excess of \$ 664M, alongside the significant value added and employment impacts with the spend level required by the Project. A (current) annual revenue of \$65m illustrates the scale of the project and the associated investment in plant and labour. Having particular regard to functional need, investigations have revealed that the area through which the Mangapū Tributary flows contains high quality greywacke that is readily accessible. There is a need to undertake the quarrying

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		and associated activities such as vegetation clearance and stream reclamation (realignment) where the aggregate is located so that it can be accessed. From an operational perspective, it is efficient and cost effective to utilise the existing processing facilities rather than relocating or re-establishing the equipment elsewhere. This would introduce quarry activities into a new location rather than consolidating in this location, where adverse impacts are already being effectively managed. The Project is also vital to the ongoing development of the Auckland region, providing a much needed local, high quality and readily accessible aggregate resource.
8.218	Commenter opines the effects of the activity are proposed to be managed via offsetting and compensation via riparian planting, thereby addressing value. It doesn't appear the extent of the loss is addressed in the proposed approach.	This is addressed in section 10 of the Ecological Effects Assessment, although the stream realignment is deemed to be a remediation not a loss. However, the report acknowledges residual adverse effects and recommends an offset. Sites within WA ownership were considered as these are easier to manage, and the availability of waterways on other properties is limited i.e. in the Hunua Ranges some waterways are managed for water supply.
8.221	The commenter notes the policy specialist for the NPS-IB has reviewed the proposal and provides a series of remarks at page 5 of 8 of the comments. <i>The assessment acknowledges that not all IB on the subject site will be protected or maintained, however, overall there will be no net loss (and the aim is for an overall net gain) in biodiversity as a result of this project.</i> <i>The proposal relies on application of the effects management hierarchy (EMH) to manage adverse effects of the proposal (under cl 3.10(3)&(4)),</i>	The commenter's comments are noted. Policy 4 seeks that indigenous biodiversity is managed to promote resilience to the effects of climate change. The Proposal will result in additional areas of indigenous vegetation providing a greater opportunity for survival of a species and enabling connectivity between fragmented areas of vegetation. Furthermore, it is proposed to manage pests and weeds that may benefit from climate change to increase the survival rates of indigenous vegetation. Policy 9 provides for certain established activities are provided for within and outside SNAs. The Policy links through to Regulations 3.10(2) and 11. Regulation 3.15 (2) relates to 'managing adverse effects of established activities on SNAs' and that local authorities must include objectives, policies, and

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	<i>particularly through the pathway provided for quarrying activities under cl 3.11.</i> • <i>Managing the proposal in accordance with the specific clauses of the NPS -IB, including the EMH, is an appropriate approach to meet the objective of the NPS -IB. Application of the EMH is discussed further below.</i> • <i>I generally concur with the assessment of policies, albeit noting that:</i> ○ <i>I have not reviewed the details of mana whenua engagement.</i> ○ <i>With regards to Policy 4 – the assessment does not make a clear connection to climate change.</i> ○ <i>I defer to the council ecologist to consider the resilience of the proposed mitigation and offset.</i> ○ <i>Policy 9 – I do not consider Policy 9 particularly relevant to the proposal. The proposal does not meet or rely on related clause 3.15(2) for established activities.</i>	methods in their policy statements and plans to enable specified established activities, or specified types of established activities, to continue where the effects of the activity on an SNA (including cumulative effects): • are no greater in intensity, scale, or character over time than at the commencement date; and • do not result in the loss of extent, or degradation of ecological integrity, of an SNA. This is not a matter to be addressed as part of this application.
8.223	Commenter notes that the applicant must demonstrate how each step of the hierarchy will be applied, and that the appropriate principles in Appendix 3 and 4 have been complied with or given regard to provides a series of remarks at page 5 and 6 of 8 of the comments.	Points 1 and 2 appears to seek further detail on how the design has avoided the removal of vegetation. Extraction below the groundwater table enables a greater volume of material to be quarried from within the same disturbed footprint area. At Symonds Hill Pit, this means that Winstone can avoid clearing much of the

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	<i>The Assessment of Ecological Effects sequentially discusses application of the EMH. The assessment notes that "Avoidance of impact on indigenous vegetation, riparian areas and streams, and wetlands is provided to some extent through project design" but no further detail is provided on how the design has considered avoiding vegetation removal</i> <i>Discussion is provided on how other adverse effects on terrestrial IB (such as on lizards, bird and bats) will be avoided where practicable, then minimised and remedied. Offsetting is proposed to address residual adverse effects, as well as compensation to address shortfalls in the offsetting. A summary table is provided on pages 6 and 7. The applicant has generally demonstrated how each step of the EMH will sequentially be applied, except for limited discussion on the effort to avoid indigenous vegetation removal in the first place. I rely on council's ecologist to consider the suitability of the actions proposed, including whether all of the specific adverse effects listed in cl3.10(2) of the NPS -IB have been considered.</i> <i>The applicant has assessed each of the biodiversity offsetting and compensation principles in tables 23 and 24. Provided council's ecologist concurs with the assessment, I am satisfied that the applicant has addressed this requirement of the NPS -IB to demonstrate how the principles have been applied.</i> <u>Other considerations</u>	indigenous vegetation that remains, and has been planted by Winstone, on the Site. Points 2 and 4 note that the commenter is relying on council's ecologist to consider the suitability of the actions proposed, including whether all of the specific adverse effects listed in cl3.10(2) of the NPS -IB have been considered and whether significant adverse effects on IB outside SNAs will be managed in accordance with the EMH. These matters will be addressed in the ecology response. Point 3 notes that the commenter is satisfied that the applicant has addressed the requirement of the NPS -IB to demonstrate how the principles have been applied, provided the council's ecologist concurs with the assessment. This point is noted.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	4. <i>The proposal involves the removal of 4.15 ha of exotic scrub. The NPS -IB is relevant to the management of indigenous biodiversity and so is concerned with the loss of exotic scrub to the extent that it impacts IB, such as through loss of habitat for indigenous species. The NPS -IB requires that significant adverse effects on IB outside SNAs must be managed in accordance with the EMH. I defer to the council 's ecologist to consider whether this has appropriately been factored into the ecological assessment.</i>	

EPA Commentator code #8: Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.238	Commenter agrees that confirmation should be sought regarding whether any additional lighting is proposed for the new haul roads and that any new lighting should comply with the relevant Auckland Unitary Plan lighting standards and that this could be addressed as a note or through future detailed design rather than as a specific information requirement for the current application.	A Lighting condition is proposed to ensure lighting is measured and assessed in accordance with Standard AS 4282-1997 Control of the Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.241	Commenter recommends regarding Condition 76 – Material Deposited on Hunua Road, to minimise adverse effects on the surrounding road network and maintain road safety, that Draft Condition 76 be amended as follows (additional wording shown in underline): "Any material deposited onto Hunua Road must be removed <u>immediately or as soon as practically possible</u>...	This deposition of material on public roads is addressed in two conditions as follows: <i>The Project must be managed to avoid deposition or tracking of soil, mud, sediment, or other material from the Site onto Hunua Road. The Consent Holder must implement the following measures to meet this requirement:</i> <i>(a) At least the first 50m of the Site access road must be inspected daily and sediment and debris vacuumed as required;</i> <i>(b) The edges of the Site access road must be inspected and maintained, particularly where potholes emerge. Before they are filled, potholes must be coned off to avoid further damage and likelihood of tracking material onto Hunua Road;</i> <i>(c) Heavy vehicles must be inspected (which may be by camera) at the weighbridge with the purpose of identifying and minimising the risk of materials being deposited on nearby roads;</i> <i>(d) Loaded heavy vehicles arriving at the Site must have their load covered;</i> <i>(e) Heavy vehicles with aggregate or other quarry material leaving the Site must either have their load covered or have the load dampened with water spray before leaving the Site; and</i> <i>(f) vehicles that have soil, mud, or sediment on their tyres must use the wheel wash facility prior to leaving the Site.</i> <i>Any material deposited onto Hunua Road must be removed immediately or as soon as practically possible. Roads must not be washed down with water without appropriate erosion and sediment control measures in place to</i>

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		<i>prevent contamination of any stormwater drainage system, watercourses or receiving waters.</i>
8.242	Commenter recommends an additional condition: "Protection of Public Assets - Unless specifically authorised by this consent, the consent holder shall ensure that no damage occurs to public roads, footpaths, berms, kerbs, drains, reserves, or other public assets as a result of earthworks or construction activities. Should any such damage occur, Auckland Council shall be notified within 24 hours of its discovery. The consent holder shall be responsible for all costs associated with reinstating the affected asset."	This matter is addressed by the following condition, which is worded slightly differently from that sought by Auckland Council for clarity: <i>Unless specifically provided for by this consent approval, there must be no damage to public roads, footpaths, berms, kerbs, drains, reserves or other public asset as a result of the earthworks and construction activity. In the event that such damage does occur, the Council will be notified within 24 hours of its discovery. The costs of rectifying such damage and restoring the asset to its original condition must be met by the Consent Holder.</i>
8.245	Commenter recommended that additional consideration be given to the operational design of the internal haul roads to minimise reversing manoeuvres by heavy vehicles, but I acknowledge the position that this is outside the scope of this resource consent.	It is acknowledged that for operational efficiency, the internal haul roads will be designed to operate safely and with minimal (if any need) for reverse manoeuvring.

EPA Commentator code #8: Auckland Council - Watercare

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.282	If Watercare Services Limited (WSL) notifies the Consent Holder and the Council that either WSL's or the Consent Holder's monitoring indicates that the drawdown authorised by this consent is having a potential adverse effect on the dam structure, the yield from the reservoir, or the stream flows, the Consent Holder must, within one month, commission an independent expert mutually agreed with WSL to review the relevant monitoring data, and, if the expert considers it necessary, procure further data, to enable a report to be prepared by the expert forthwith. The report is to state whether or not the potential adverse effects at WSL's facilities or the variations in WSL's or the Consent Holder's monitoring information are a result of the dewatering authorised by this consent. If the report states that the dewatering is: (i) not causing the adverse effect or not causing the variation in monitoring information, no further action will be required of the Consent Holder; or (ii) likely to be causing the adverse effect or causing the variation in monitoring information, the Consent Holder must, in consultation with the Council and WSL, identify options for avoiding, remedying or mitigating the potential adverse effects, and implement the method that represents the best practicable option for doing so-, <u>with all costs associated with the investigation, assessment, monitoring, mitigation and implementation of any required measures to be met by the Consent Holder.</u>	The Applicant accepts responsibility if it is proven that an amendment the operation of the Quarry is adversely impacting on Watercare's facilities. However, it prefers that any reference to costs associated with the investigation, assessment, monitoring, mitigation and implementation of adverse effects not be included in the conditions but addressed outside of the FTAA process.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8..283	New recommended condition: <u>(a) The Consent Holder shall provide WSL with copies of monitoring reports prepared in relation to Condition 214 at the same time as they are submitted to Auckland Council.</u>	The requested monitoring reports can be provided to WSL.

EPA Commentator code #8: Auckland Council – Strategic and Planning Memo

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
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.	The expansion area will not include any industrial or trade activities, or any ancillary activities as defined in the Auckland Unitary Plan.
8.297	Commenter notes: reliance on a preliminary channel design associated with a challenging construction environment, conditions have been offered by the applicant to ensure the final hydraulic design limits flood effects to no greater than those detailed in the application. Further amendments are therefore suggested to these conditions.	These amendments have generally been agreed to with some refinements as shown in the updated condition set dated 18 th August 2026. Further detail is provided in the Ecologist's response to s53 comments.
8.336	Commenter notes: concerns with the realistic delivery of these outcomes, particularly the Mangapū Stream Tributary realignment works. This is a complex scope of works, and reinstating the natural systems of the proposed realigned gulley will be a very challenging prospect.	Amendments to Conditions 117 to 119 are proposed to include specific targets to assist in ensuring monitoring and maintenance achieve anticipated outcomes and to clarify that maintenance is required until such time as those targets are met.
8.338	Commenter notes: Minor changes to the recommended conditions of consent are recommended to ensure that the maintenance timeframes for all mitigation elements are strengthened	These amendments have generally been agreed to with some refinements as shown in the updated condition set dated 18 th August 2026. Further detail is provided in the Landscape Planners response to s53 comments.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.342	Commenter notes: that formal third-party approvals will be required prior to these works being undertaken, but the in-principle approval submitted with the application provides sufficient certainty with respect to that formal process.	It is agreed that formal agreements will be required with Auckland Parks to enable offset/compensation works to be undertaken.
8.343	Commenter notes: To ensure there are no esplanade reserve issues, Council encourage the Panel to ensure this revised scheme plan is received and treated as the final scheme plan for the proposed boundary adjustment.	It has been agreed with Auckland Council that the boundary adjustment does not trigger the esplanade provisions of the RMA. An updated Scheme Plan was provided to Auckland Council and is provided at Appendix 16).
8.354	Commenter notes: that while the AEE and Iwi Engagement Summary report confirm a Cultural Management Plan will be prepared and is proposed to be conditioned, this has not been included	A proposed condition for a Cultural Management Plan is provided in Appendix 10 and suggested wording is as follows: <u>Cultural values and Cultural Management Plan</u> <u>In recognition of cultural values, the Consent Holder must:</u> a. <u>At least 6 months prior to the Commencement of Construction, invite Mana Whenua to prepare a Cultural Management Plan in conjunction with the Consent Holder that will record the preferred engagement and partnership protocols going forward for Mana Whenua.</u> b. <u>The purpose of the CMP is to record the preferred engagement and kaitiakitanga arrangements between the Consent Holder and Mana Whenua and to provide a framework through which cultural values can be recognised and provided for during the construction, operation, rehabilitation and ecological restoration associated with the Project.</u> c. <u>The CMP must, to the extent developed through engagement with Mana Whenua to address:</u> i. <u>protocols and contact arrangements for ongoing engagement and communication;</u>

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		ii. <u>cultural monitoring procedures associated with vegetation clearance, topsoil removal, initial ground disturbance and any other activities identified through preparation of the CMP as warranting cultural monitoring;</u> iii. <u>procedures to be followed in relation to accidental discoveries;</u> iv. <u>opportunities for Mana Whenua to comment on relevant draft Management Plans prior to those plans being submitted for certification; and</u> v. <u>arrangements for providing relevant ecological, freshwater, rehabilitation and offset monitoring information to Mana Whenua.</u> vi. <u>opportunities for Mana Whenua to receive and use native vegetation or other cultural materials arising from vegetation clearance, where practicable and subject to applicable statutory requirements;</u> vii. <u>arrangements for providing relevant ecological, freshwater, rehabilitation and offset monitoring information to Mana Whenua, and</u> viii. <u>processes for reviewing and updating the CMP during the duration of the Project.</u> <u>The Consent Holder must submit the CMP to the Council for certification at least 20 working days prior to the Commencement of Construction.</u> <u>Certification must be limited to confirming that:</u> a. <u>the requirements of Condition XX (the number of the condition set out above) have been addressed;</u>

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		b. <u>the CMP records the engagement undertaken with Mana Whenua and, where applicable, other iwi, hapū or Māori groups under Condition 25(e), including the matters raised and how they have been addressed;</u> c. <u>the CMP is consistent with the conditions of these consents and the approved Project; and</u> d. <u>appropriate processes have been established for ongoing engagement, implementation, review and updating of the CMP.</u> e. <u>The CMP may be amended in accordance with Condition X and Conditions 30-32. Any proposed material amendment affecting cultural engagement or cultural values must be provided to the Participating Iwi for comment before being submitted for certification.</u>
8.355	Commenter recommends: that final responses from Te Aakitai Waiohua and Ngati Tamaoho be provided prior to making a determination on this application to ensure potential cultural value effects have been fully understood and addressed.	The Applicant has undertaken consultation with identified iwi as set out in Appendix A6.7 of the substantive application. Additionally, Winstone intend to have on-going engagement with Mana Whenua both informally and through the Kaitiaki Forum. A condition of consent requiring the preparation of a Cultural Management Plan alongside Mana Whenua is also proposed. This will enable Winstone to ensure that potential cultural value effects have been fully understood and addressed.
8.356	Commenter notes: The proposal incorporates activities that have the potential to generate significant adverse effects on cultural values. Given the incomplete nature of consultation to date, a proportionality assessment is considered appropriate to be undertaken.	The Applicant does not agree with Auckland Council's characterisation that consultation with mana whenua is incomplete, or that insufficient consultation has been undertaken to understand the nature and potential scale of effects on cultural values.
8.369	Commenter notes: Potential Cultural Values Effects – The Applicant has not completed consultation with relevant iwi	Significant engagement with mana whenua has occurred over a number of years and has continued throughout the development of the Hunua Quarry Development Project. This engagement is comprehensively documented in

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	groups to confirm the potential scale of adverse cultural effects from the proposed development.	Appendix A6.7 – Cultural Values and Consultation Summary Report and its supporting engagement record. All tangata whenua entities identified as having an interest in the Project area were either directly consulted or formally notified. In addition, Winstone has maintained established relationships with mana whenua through the Hunua Kaitiaki Forum, which has operated since 2015 and provides for regular quarterly hui together with additional project-specific meetings, workshops and site visits. Project-specific engagement has included hui with Ngāti Tamaoho, Te Ākitai Waiohū, Ngāti Te Ata Waiohū, Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki and Ngaati Whanaunga; technical workshops with Ngāti Tamaoho, Te Ākitai Waiohū and Ngāti Te Ata Waiohū; site visits; cultural inductions; and extensive ongoing correspondence and information sharing. The technical workshops specifically addressed matters including the Mangapū tributary realignment, hydrology, ecological values, cultural values, landscape effects, archaeology and mitigation. This engagement has also been supported by substantive cultural values information. Te Ākitai Waiohū prepared a Cultural Values Assessment in 2024 and subsequently provided a project-specific addendum addressing the proposed quarry expansion. Ngāti Te Ata Waiohū provided a cultural memorandum setting out its values, concerns and recommendations for the Project. Ngāti Tamaoho has also provided project-specific cultural input and a memorandum addressing cultural, environmental and Treaty matters. Accordingly, the Applicant has a substantial body of information identifying the cultural values associated with the Project area and the matters of concern to mana whenua. These include, among other matters, effects on whenua and wai, the mauri and natural function of waterways, the Mangapū tributary realignment, wetlands, indigenous vegetation and taonga species, cultural

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		landscapes, archaeology, kaitiakitanga, ecological restoration and the location and form of mitigation. Importantly, the consultation has not simply identified those matters; it has informed the development of the Project. Appendix A6.7 records that cultural values identified through engagement have informed the design of the Mangapū tributary realignment, stream and water-management approaches, rehabilitation and revegetation, and the development of relevant management plans. It is acknowledged that engagement with mana whenua is ongoing and will continue through detailed design, management-plan development, implementation and rehabilitation. That ongoing relationship should not, however, be characterised as evidence that consultation undertaken to date is incomplete or that the potential cultural effects of the Project have not been identified. It is not accepted that a further proportionality assessment is required on the basis advanced by Auckland Council. If Auckland Council considers that a specific cultural value or potential effect has not been identified or assessed, Winstone requests that Council identify that particular information gap so that it can be addressed directly. In Winstone's view, a general assertion that consultation is incomplete is not supported by the extensive engagement record and cultural values information forming part of the application.
8.357	Commenter notes: Based on the location of the Project, the supporting assessments and the proposed conditions, Watercare agrees that the dewatering associated with the Project is unlikely to have any effect on the Hays Creek Dam; and, Minor changes to conditions are recommended.	Watercare's comments are noted. Whilst the Applicant accepts responsibility if it is proven that the operation of the Quarry is adversely impacting on Watercare's facilities, it prefers that any reference to costs associated with the investigation, assessment, monitoring, mitigation and implementation of adverse effects not be included in the conditions but addressed outside of the FTAA process.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
8.360	Commenter notes: Auckland Transport have outstanding concerns with respect to the adverse safety effects of the proposed development on the surrounding roading network. The Applicant's position is that this is out of scope of this application and is an existing effect that cannot be directly correlated to this proposal. At this stage insufficient information is available to reach a planning conclusion from Council's perspective in this regard. We would welcome further planning and legal comment from the Applicant in this regard for further consideration.	Commute has provided additional commentary on the traffic safety aspects of the Proposal including looking at an additional 10 years of accident data, noting two accidents in that time period involved quarry trucks, but were the result of cars crossing the centreline. It is interesting that Auckland Transport is expressing concern that Hunua Road cannot safely accommodate the additional trucks given this section of the road is part of the Auckland Strategic Freight Network. Surely this means that Auckland Council has recognised its importance in linking the quarry to the wider traffic network and that, presumably, it can carry high volumes of trucks. The number of trucks travelling along Hunua Road will increase as a result of the Proposal but the 111% is a peak volume that will rarely be achieved i.e. only when the quarry is operating at peak capacity. However, Auckland Transport are wanting Winstone to substantially upgrade the road including benching on the curve near the quarry entrance. This would require substantial earthworks that would be required on private property, whose owners have not been considered an affected party through the FTAA process. E27.3 Policy 1 of the AUP <i>requires subdivision, use and development which generate trips resulting in potentially more than minor adverse effects on the safe, efficient and effective operation of the transport network (outside of identified zones) that do not already require an integrated transport assessment or have been approved based on an integrated transport assessment to manage adverse effects on and integrate with the transport network by measures such as undertaking improvements to the local transport network.</i> The Proposal will not result in more than minor adverse effects on the safe, efficient and effective operation of Hunua Road. Therefore, the works sought by

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		Auckland Transport are not necessary to manage any effect resulting from the expansion of Hunua Quarry, accepting that it is proposed to upgrade the access to support the safe and efficient movement of goods and improve safety for road users by providing an access that provides appropriate turning facilities for trucks.
8.367	Commenter notes: Potential Road Safety Effects – The proposed development may exacerbate road safety risks and effects from the on-going and increased heavy vehicle trips along the narrow Hunua Road corridor.	Road safety risks have been addressed by Commute (Appendix 8). In summary, additional safety analysis was undertaken over the last 20 years which identified 2 additional crashes involving trucks. The assessment identifies that the crashes were caused by passenger vehicles (not trucks) and that four crashes over a 20 year period does not constitute a trend. The applicant has voluntarily offered the implantation of Audio-Tactile Pavement rumble strips which have proven effective in overseas studies at reducing collisions.
8.377	Commenter notes: Auckland Transport have identified an existing safety risk that they consider will be exacerbated by the increase in truck movements this application will generate. If unresolved, these effects have the potential to be significant.	
8.364	Commenter notes: There are outstanding concerns with the adequacy of the offset and compensation package proposed, as discussed in more detail above. As such, there is a concern that the application will not be consistent with the various provisions of the NPS: FW, NES: FW, NPS: IB, AUP: RPS and AUP	As set out in the Ecology memo (Appendix 3), the proposed offset and compensation package has been updated in response to additional surveys undertaken at tributaries 3 and 4. As a result, the proposed offset and compensation is amended to apply to stages 1 – 6 and is confirmed to provide for no net loss of terrestrial and freshwater ecological values within those stages. With regards to stages 7 and 8, an additional consent condition is proposed (Appendix 10) which specifies the anticipated stream loss during those stages and requires a Stream Offset and Compensation Plan to be submitted for certification prior to the commencement of Stage 6. Overall, it is considered there is sufficient offset and compensation such that there will be no net loss of ecological values and the proposal is considered
8.365	Commenter notes: Panel is satisfied this is achieved by the proposed mitigation, offset and compensation package then the application could be determined to be consistent with these statutory provisions [referenced in comment 8.364].	

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		consistent with the various provisions of the NPS: FW, NES: FW, NPS: IB, AUP: RPS and AUP.
8.368	Commenter notes: Ecological Effects – The proposal results in a significant loss of stream extent, vegetation clearance and wetland loss. There are unresolved questions with respect to the adequacy of the mitigation, offset and compensation package proposed	The comments from Council's ecologist have been addressed in the Ecology memo (Appendix 3) and as mentioned above, the proposal has been amended to provide for fish passage within the tributary 3 culvert and apply the offset and compensation to stages 1 – 6.
8.400	Commenter notes regarding Condition 24 an advice note is included regarding management plans.	Winstone Aggregates support the inclusion of the advice note as follows: <i>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.</i>

EPA Commentor code #9 – Department of Conservation

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
9.015	Regarding the proposed blocking of fish passage at tributaries 3 and 4, DOC finds the offsetting and compensation measures confusing. For example, the Applicant includes effects management measures for 'loss of fish passage' due to proposed culverts on tributaries 3 and 4 and includes offsetting and compensation for the loss of the tributaries, although this is not consented or currently sought. Overall, DOC finds that a resource consent application cannot consider a potential future effect that has not been applied for, and it is inappropriate to offset or compensate for an activity that may or may not be consented in the future.	As discussed further in the ecology memo (in Appendix 3), the proposal has been amended to provide fish passage within the tributary 3 culvert. As set out in in Appendix 15, designs would need to consider a range of matters including: modifications to provide places to rest; constructed baffles to create pools; design features that channel flow to create more depth; debris screens and modifications and operational practices to provide access for maintenance and assessments of blockages or the presence of trapped fish. As set out in section B4.2 of the AEE and the compliance table in Appendix B12.10 of the lodged application, resource consent is already applied for the culverts as a Discretionary Activity under Regulation 71 of the NES-F and pursuant to E3.4.1(A33) of the Unitary Plan. While it is acknowledged that some design features would change, it is anticipated that the reasons for consent still apply. Additionally, as set out in the Ecology Memo (Appendix 3), the proposed offset and compensation is amended to apply to stages 1 – 6 and is confirmed to provide for no net loss of terrestrial and freshwater ecological values within those stages. Offset and compensation for stages 7 and 8 will be confirmed at the time approvals for those stages are being sought (Appendix 10).
9.019	DOC recommends these standards and triggers be included as condition 1 says that “the Project must be undertaken in general (emphasis added) accordance with [...] the management plans”.	As set out in Appendix 10, a number of proposed consent conditions have been amended to insert key standards and triggers within the condition.
9.020	DOC is concerned that if the performance standards are not being achieved by the management plan, the Applicant will amend the management plan to reduce the standards. Instead, they should be increasing the measures to meet the	

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	performance standards. Including standards within the conditions will ensure effects are appropriately managed.	
9.034	DOC comments that the new resource consent conditions should require that the covenants be Conservation Covenants as the RA specifies what values of the land are protected and what activities are prohibited in the Conservation Covenants. Suggested edits: 139. The Consent Holder must ensure <u>Conservation Covenants pursuant to section 77 of the Reserves Act 1977</u> are imposed on the Records of Title of sites that provide for the ongoing protection of the areas identified in the "Formal Legal Protection" column of Table 2.	It is generally agreed and suggested the following wording to align with changes discussed with Auckland Council: Condition 154. The Consent Holder must ensure <u>Conservation</u> covenants are imposed on the Records of Title of sites, identified in Focus Areas 1 and 2, in accordance with Section 106 of the RMA and section 77 of the Reserves Act 1977 that provide for the ongoing protection of the areas identified in the "Formal Legal Protection" column of Table 2. Records confirming this has been completed must be submitted to the Council within one calendar year of the vegetation removal. The covenant must: - protect and maintain indigenous vegetation on-site - be drafted by the council's nominated Solicitor at the consent holder's cost; and - be registered against the Computer Register(s) (record of title) to the affected land by the consent holder at their cost; and - require the consent holder to: - be responsible for all legal fees, disbursements and other expenses incurred by the council in connection with the covenant, and procure its

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		solicitor to give an undertaking to the council for payment of the same; and b. indemnify the council for costs, fees, disbursements and other expenses incurred by the council as a direct or indirect result of the council being a party to this covenant.
9.046	The Commenter presumes all proposed barrier remediation relates to culverts that the applicant does not have an existing statutory responsibility to fix, or are already likely to be remediated as part of Auckland Council's wider barrier remediation programme (crossover could risk additionality).	In preparing the substantive application, a desktop review was undertaken of historic aerial photographs and relevant property files. Through this process we were not able to ascertain whether any approvals have been obtained for existing barriers. Regarding the Hunua Road offset sites, the review of historic photos indicated that the barriers were established between 2000 – 2016, prior to the notification of the Auckland Unitary Plan and the NPS-FM and NES-F, and most prior to the establishment of the unified Auckland Council. There is no information on any of the property files indicating resource consent was obtained. Given the historic planning regulations that are likely to have applied, it is unknown whether resource consent was required. There is no records on file to indicate approvals or dispensations were obtained under the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations 1983. Regarding the Meremere culvert, the review of historic aerial photos showed the area as being covered in vegetation for the whole period of aerial photos available. Accordingly, it was not possible to identify when the culvert was constructed and whether the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations would have applied or whether resource consent was required or obtained. In the time available, we have been unable to find any information on Auckland Council's wider barrier remediation programme to understand whether remediation would be applicable.

EPA Commentor code #10 – [REDACTED]

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
10.017	Commenter notes: The air quality assessment identifies [REDACTED] as a residential receptor; and, The greatest dust risk is identified at Stage 4...The modelling may be sound, but the conclusions depend on operational controls being maintained consistently over decades and on there being an enforceable response when monitoring or residents' experience shows controls are inadequate. We ask for the conditions in section 8 covering independent monitoring, public reporting, triggers, and suspension of high-dust activity in adverse conditions.	All monitoring data will be reviewed by Council via the quarterly and annual monitoring requirements set out in the proposed consent conditions. Additionally, consent conditions associated with the air discharge specify air quality management measures to be undertaken on site, with triggers stipulated in the management plan (which is required to be complied with via consent conditions) and the monitoring reports and air quality management plan are required to be provided to the Community Liaison Group.
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.	The Community Liaison Group is mandated through the conditions of consent.
10.020	Commenter notes: proposal removes a high-value reach of the Mangapu Stream tributary and replaces it with an engineered channel, supported by a temporary bridge and heavy haulage for several years. We support strong, independent monitoring and transparent reporting of these enabling works.	The draft Stream Realignment Management Plan (SRMP) is proposed to assist in managing the construction of the stream realignment channel and sets out the key targets and monitoring measures. The SRMP is required to be implemented by proposed conditions, which also set out additional triggers and actions with regards to planting of areas within and around the proposed channel.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
10.029	Commenter requests that conditions require: That dust be independently monitored near W1 receptors, with results made readily available to residents, defined triggers, enforceable corrective action, and suspension of high-dust activities in specified wind or dryness conditions, particularly during Stage 4.	The proposed air quality monitoring locations are considered appropriate to monitoring and measure dust as it relates to identified receptors. The Air Quality Management Plan stipulates the relevant triggers and process for corrective action. Part D of the Proposed Consent Conditions relates to the air discharge consent and sets out bottom lines in terms of air quality management measures to be undertaken on site, as well as monitoring and reporting requirements. In particular, Condition 183 requires records to be provided to Council on a quarterly basis and which will also be captured in the Annual Monitoring Report to Council required by Conditions 72 – 74.
10.033	Commenter requests that conditions: That the conditions be able to be reviewed before later stages if actual effects exceed predictions, with the ability to require additional mitigation.	It the activities cannot comply with consent conditions this will need to be dealt with via existing legislated pathways for managing compliance issues. The proposed consent conditions include a number of mechanisms for addressing instances where unforeseen environmental effects arise, such as actual effects exceed predicted levels, including Condition 75 which enables review of the consent and conditions. There are options available via various conditions relating to management plans which provide for adaptive management responses where targets are not being met, or unexpected environmental circumstances arise whilst still ensuring acceptable environmental outcomes are achieved.
10.035	Commenter notes: We are not seeking to stop the supply of aggregate. We are asking that, if this expansion proceeds, the effects on our home over the coming decades be properly assessed and firmly conditioned, and that the mitigation offered to us be made real, enforceable and durable.	The Air Quality Assessment (Appendix B12.4.1) has assessed all receptors within 1,000m of the subject site. It is noted that [REDACTED] is identified as Receptor 124 in Appendix A of the Air Quality Assessment, and therefore the effects on this property have been considered. The proposal includes a comprehensive suite of conditions relating to the air discharge, including the conditioning of the proposed Air Quality Management Plan.

EPA Commentor code #11 – [REDACTED]

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
11.002	Commenter notes: The application does not, in my view, provide sufficient assurance that dust emissions can be effectively controlled, particularly during dry and windy conditions when dust generation and dispersal may be at their greatest. Refer to page 2 of 11 of the comments for a list of dust effects identified by the commenter.	As set out in section B7.5 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects, and in the Air Quality Assessment (Appendix B12.4.1), the Proposal is anticipated to result in no more than minor adverse effects as a result of dust as it is proposed to continue implementing the existing (and proven) mitigation measures and any others that become available during the life of the quarry. In addition to specified limits, the Air Quality Management Plan sets out a range of dust suppression measures, and recommendations to not undertake certain activities during strong winds, stabilise and revegetate exposed land, undertake processing activities within buildings and manage the height of stockpiles. These recommendations are included via consent conditions and management plan content.
11.009	Commenter notes: proposal raises wider environmental concerns, including • cumulative degradation of the surrounding environment; • effects on native vegetation and wildlife habitat; • increased sediment and stormwater runoff; • increased heavy vehicle movements; • increased emissions associated with quarrying and transportation; and • further industrialisation of a rural area. And requests Panel consider the combined and cumulative effects of the proposal.	The Proposal has been designed to avoid, minimise and mitigate adverse effects on neighbouring residents and the surrounding rural environment to the extent possible. The comprehensive suite of proposed consent conditions and management plans (including on-going monitoring and reporting requirements) will ensure the on-going management of environmental effects, such that there is no net loss of ecological values and no more than minor adverse effects on the wider environment.
11.010	Commenter notes: Further expansion of quarrying activities risks substantially diminishing [rural amenity and quality of life] values.	The policy framework explicitly recognises that mineral extraction activities are a typical feature of the identified rural zones including the Mixed Rural zone. This is consistent with the current environment that includes established quarries within the wider landscape and supports the continued operation of these. The quarry development area will increase the scale and duration of landform modification locally; however, the rural character effects are largely managed through staging, containment within landform and vegetated elements, and progressive rehabilitation, which collectively reduce the perception of the quarry reading as an

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		uncontained or sprawling element across the hill country. Where the quarry development area interfaces with the Mixed Rural Zone, the re-establishment of native vegetation through the rehabilitation phases assists in maintaining rural amenity by reducing visual contrast, softening edges, and retaining a coherent pattern of vegetated hill slopes that is characteristic of the receiving landscape. Noise, odour, dust, traffic and visual effects will be effectively managed through a range of management plans and consent conditions.
11.012	Commenter notes: concerns regarding noise, dust, blasting, visual effects, and property damage arise from living next to the existing quarry operations. These experiences should be carefully considered when assessing predictions about the effects of an expanded operation.	The substantive application includes detailed technical assessments on noise and vibration (including blasting), dust / air quality and landscape and visual. Each technical report assess the potential and actual adverse effects anticipated from the proposal and recommends measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate those effects and these recommendations have either been included in the design of the proposal, included in draft management plans and or addressed via consent conditions. Overall, subject to the implementation of the proposed consent conditions and management plans, the proposal is considered to have less than minor adverse noise and vibration effects, minor visual effects and no more than minor dust effects.
11.014	Commenter requests that conditions require: stricter controls on blasting frequency, timing, and vibration;	As set out in section B7.10 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects and the Acoustics and Vibration Assessment (Appendix B12.4.11), the proposed operational noise limits are more stringent than the AUP limits set out in H28 and apply at all relevant notional boundaries in the rural zone. Construction noise will comply with the relevant AUP standards by a considerable margin and is not expected to cause unreasonable noise effects. Construction vibration will also comply with the relevant AUP limits and is unlikely to be perceptible within any neighbouring dwelling.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		Overall, subject to the implementation of the Proposal in accordance with the recommended limits any adverse noise and vibration effects will be less than minor.
11.015	Commenter requests that conditions require: independent pre-operation and ongoing structural/condition surveys of potentially affected neighbouring properties;	Proposed conditions 92 – 93 stipulate the limits for construction and operational vibration, including blasting. Proposed conditions 37 and 38 require an Operational Noise Management Plan to assist in the implementation of those limits. Blasting and vibration limits are set at an appropriate level to mitigate potential adverse effects to neighbouring properties.
11.018	Commenter requests that conditions require: comprehensive dust monitoring, including monitoring at appropriate neighbouring properties, with enforceable limits and trigger levels	Part D of the proposed consent conditions relates to the air discharge permit and sets out the relevant parameters within which the consent holder is required to operate. Additionally, the Air Quality Management Plan (Conditions 43 and 44) specifies the concentrations and limits anticipated at each of the automated air quality monitoring sites, as well as the quarterly reporting requirements. This quarterly reporting requirement is in addition to the annual reporting requirements set out in Conditions 72 – 74.
11.020	Commenter requests that conditions require: ongoing independent noise monitoring, noting that I have heard quarry-related noise from approximately 5:30 a.m	Proposed conditions 89 – 93 stipulate the limits for construction and operational noise and vibration. Proposed conditions 35 and 36 require an Operational Noise Management Plan which includes requirements for undertaking noise and vibration monitoring and procedures for managing noise complaints and corrective actions in response to complaints. Conditions 72 – 74 require an annual monitoring report to be provided to Council which includes an overview and analysis of all monitoring data required by consent conditions and records of complaints.
11.021	Commenter requests that conditions require: independent groundwater and surface-water monitoring, including	A significant amount of baseline information already exists given the existing and authorised groundwater take consents. The proposed consent conditions include a comprehensive suite of conditions relating to both groundwater and surface water. Additional baseline monitoring is proposed via conditions relating to the ongoing

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	baseline monitoring before expanded operations commence	Water Quality Monitoring and Management Plan and also for the Stream Realignment Management Plan. All groundwater and surface water monitoring is required to be recorded and reports provided to Council and the Community Liaison Group.
11.022	Commenter requests that conditions require: clear groundwater trigger levels requiring investigation and corrective action	Part E of the proposed draft conditions includes a suite of conditions relating to the management and monitoring of groundwater.
11.023	Commenter requests that conditions require: regular independent environmental audits	Proposed consent conditions 72 – 74 set out the requirement for annual monitoring reporting. The purpose of the annual monitoring report is to provide an overview and analysis of the monitoring and reporting work required by other conditions and to identify any environmental issues that have arisen during the project. The report is required to include recommendations to alter any management or monitoring plan in response to monitoring data. The monitoring report is to be provided to Council's Team Leader Environmental Monitoring.
11.024	Commenter requests that conditions require: a robust, transparent, and independently reviewable complaints process	Proposed consent conditions 20 – 22 set out requirements for the consent holder to maintain a complaints register, a summary of which is required to be provided to the Community Liaison Group at each meeting and be included in the Annual Monitoring Report required by Condition 70.
11.025	Commenter requests that conditions require: meaningful and enforceable mechanisms for addressing non-compliance and adverse effects;	Non-compliance with consent conditions is dealt with via existing legislated pathways for managing compliance issues. The proposed consent conditions include a number of mechanisms for addressing instances where unforeseen environmental effects arise, including Condition 75 which enables review of the consent and conditions, as well as various conditions relating to management plans which provide for adaptive management responses where targets are not being met, or unexpected environmental circumstances arise.

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
11.026	Commenter requests that conditions require: clear financial responsibility for remediation or compensation where quarry activities are determined to have caused or materially contributed to damage to neighbouring properties	Such matters are more appropriately dealt with via existing legislated pathways for managing compliance issues.
11.027	Commenter requests that conditions require: periodic review of conditions and monitoring requirements where actual adverse effects exceed those predicted in the application.	Proposed consent conditions 72 – 74 set out the requirement for annual monitoring reporting. The purpose of the annual monitoring report is to provide an overview and analysis of the monitoring and reporting work required by other conditions and to identify any environmental issues that have arisen during the project. The report is required to include recommendations to alter any management or monitoring plan in response to monitoring data. Condition 75 enables Council to review the consents and makes changes in response to any unforeseen environmental effect or in response to results of monitoring or changed environmental knowledge.

EPA Commentator code #12:

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
12.002	Commenter considers: “End of Quarry” strategy...should be part of this consideration in assessing this consent approval as the effects of the quarrying operation will endure beyond any consent.	The proposed Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan provides for the rehabilitation of the site following the completion of Stage 8 of the proposed quarry development.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
12.008	Commenter requests: The extension of the quarry zone into this area and the diversion of the Mangapū stream should not be approved. A range of reasons are specified at page 2 - 3 of 5 of the comment.	The Proposal includes a comprehensive offset and compensation package in response to vegetation removal (including as it relates to the ONL) and stream works, with no net loss of ecological values being the overall outcome. Additionally, a thorough package of draft consent conditions including rehabilitation management and the stream realignment management plan will ensure the effects of the proposed quarry development are appropriately managed. It is noted that with regards to traffic management, Auckland Transport and Auckland Council's Traffic Expert generally agree with the effects assessment as it relates to the wider transport network, with the main area of contention being limited to safety within the immediate area of the quarry access on Hunua Road.
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.	There is a preference for offsetting on sites it owns as it has control over the offsetting works i.e. timing, extent etc, rather than being subject to the landowner's programme / timeframes. It can also more readily protect offset planting on sites it owns.
12.012	Commenter requests: Offset mitigation planting and pest control initiatives must be undertaken on land immediately adjacent to the quarry, and not out of region areas as proposed, with the objectives of enhancing the Ponga Road ONL mitigating for the loss of the indigenous forest, as proposed by this application, and the historic loss of Symonds Hill significant landscape forest cover.	The Proposal does involve mitigation planting and pest control initiatives on land immediately adjoining the Ponga Road ONL, located at Judge Richardson Road. It is not possible to accommodate all offsetting within the immediately adjacent area given the extent of the proposed future quarrying works. Winstone did an extensive search for possible offset sites in proximity to Hunua Quarry, but available sites were limited. Furthermore, Winstone has a preference for offsetting on sites it owns as it has control over the offsetting works i.e. timing,

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		extent etc, rather than being subject to the landowner's programme / timeframes. It can also more readily protect offset planting on sites it owns.

EPA Commentator code #13: Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
13.006	Commenter notes: HNZPT recommends that condition 2 of the agreed conditions appended to its s51 Report is updated as follows: " Archaeological Management Plan All works must be undertaken in accordance with the Archaeological Management Plan prepared by Ellen Cameron titled "Archaeological Management Plan: Hunua Quarry, Auckland Prepared for Winstone Aggregates dated March 2026 August 2026 (AMP).	This amendment was adopted in the 14th July 2026 version of conditions and remains in the 18th August 2026 version of conditions.

EPA Commentator code #14: Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
14.004	Commenter notes: Given the nature and scale of the proposed quarry expansion and extraction activities, we expect the potential effects on these environmental values [freshwater, whenua, biodiversity, natural resources, cultural heritage, restoration and rehabilitation] to be appropriately addressed through the consent conditions.	The Proposal includes a comprehensive package of draft consent conditions in order to manage the actual and potential effects of the proposed quarry development. The draft conditions include requirements relating to management plans as well as specifying bottom lines to be achieved for certain activities. In particular, the draft conditions associated with the Archaeological Authority includes conditions requiring archaeological work to be undertaken in conformity with agreed tikanga protocols (Condition 4), the protocols if any kōiwi are discovered (Condition 5) and for monitoring, investigation and annual reporting in accordance with the Archaeological Management Plan. Additionally, the draft consent conditions require works to be undertaken in accordance with draft management plans including the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, the Water Quality Monitoring and Management Plan, the Groundwater Monitoring and Contingency Plan, the Trigger Action Response Plan, the Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan, the Ecological Management Plan, Aquatic Fauna Salvage and Relocation Plan, Lizard Management Plan, Pest Management Plan, and Stream Realignment Management Plan. The conditions specify the information, monitoring and maintenance requirements to be addressed within the final certified management plans. Overall, the draft consent conditions are considered to appropriately manage potential effects of the proposal on the identified environmental values.

EPA Commentator code #15: Auckland Conservation Board

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
15.002	The commenter recommends conditions to ensure the applicant is required to monitor and report on all terrestrial ecological enhancement initiatives for the duration of the project.	The conditions require the development of management plans that require Winstone to monitor and report on all terrestrial ecological enhancement initiatives. Furthermore, the conditions include specific success measures and the Annual Report that will record all monitoring records will be provided to Auckland Council, the Community Liaison Group and the Kaitiaki Forum.
15.003	The commenter recommends conditions to ensure the applicant is required to implement additional agreed ecological enhancement where predicted net impacts are less positive than expected.	The ecological management plans required through conditions of consent must include specific provisions to address situations where success measures are not met. Any actions will be varied and likely develop over time as technology and understanding evolves, and the management plans can be updated to reflect this.
15.004	The commenter identifies that it will be critical that the effectiveness of the relocation of any salvaged lizards is monitored.	There is a requirement through the conditions of consent and management plans to monitor and report on the success of lizard relocation.
15.005	The commenter requests that a survey for shortjaw kokopu must be concluded prior to initiating any works, to resolve issues identified in the section 51(2)(e) complex freshwater fisheries activity approval report and the Freshwater Technical Advice Report.	The ecology memo (Appendix 3) addresses this matter. In summary, additional surveys have been conducted and demonstrates that no shortjaw kokopu has been found in Tributaries 3 and 4.
15.006	The commenter recommends conditions to ensure the applicant is required to monitor and report on all freshwater ecological enhancement initiatives described in the project resource consenting documents.	The conditions require the development of management plans that require Winstone to monitor and report on all freshwater ecological enhancement initiatives. Furthermore, the conditions include specific success measures and require an Annual Report that will record all monitoring records will be provided to Auckland Council, the Community Liaison Group and the Kaitiaki Forum.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
15.007	The commenter recommends conditions to ensure the applicant is required to implement additional agreed ecological enhancement where predicted net impacts are less positive than expected.	The ecological management plans required through conditions of consent must include specific provisions to address situations where success measures are not met. Any actions will be varied and likely develop over time as technology and understanding evolves, and the management plans can be updated to reflect this.
15.008	Commenter notes in light of uncertainty the applicant has adopted a strategy of over-offsetting and the commenter considers this commendable and acknowledges the need for aggregate supplies given the associated ecological impact mitigation and offsetting.	All impacts on the environment will be effectively managed including by offsetting and environmental compensation, recognising that the long-term nature of the Proposal means that some measures will need to be re-confirmed prior to works being undertaken in Stages 7 and 8 as provided for through additional conditions of consent.
15.009	Commenter requests, a best practice adaptive management approach is adopted, monitor the effectiveness of the proposed offsets and inform revised improved actions if required.	Winstone has adopted a robust management and monitoring process with triggers and success measures. This also includes a requirement to address triggers that are exceeded or are not met, depending on their purpose.
15.010	Commenter recommends that project approvals include specific conditions for the applicant to take an adaptive management approach to the proposed offset provisions for mitigating predicted adverse impacts.	The conditions require the development of management plans that require Winstone to measure success rates and address any shortfalls. Any additional mitigation measures are likely to change over time to adapt to issues such as climate change and technological advances, so setting these in the management plan provides for flexibility and adaptability. Noting that amended management plans need to be certified by Auckland Council and require engagement with Mana Whenua and the Community Liaison Group.
15.011	Commenter requests conditions that require the applicant for the duration of the project monitor and publicly report on the results of all terrestrial ecological and freshwater enhancement initiatives, including the effectiveness of lizard relocations.	These measures will be monitored, and the Annual Report that will record all monitoring records will be provided to Auckland Council, the Community Liaison Group and the Kaitiaki Forum.

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
15.012	Commenter requests conditions that require the applicant for the duration of the project implement additional agreed ecological enhancement where predicted net impacts are less positive than expected.	The ecological management plans must include specific provisions to address situations where success measures are not met. Any actions will be varied and likely develop over time as technology and understanding evolves, and the management plans can be updated to reflect this.

EPA Commentator code #s.51: Department of Conservation

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
s.51.001	Commenter notes that "DOC preference is that a project herpetologist and entomologist be named in conditions, which has not been provided within the LMP."	The recommendation for including herpetologists is supported. It is not clear as to why an entomologist would be required or suitable for the LMP and accordingly this is not supported. Suggested amendment to Condition 5 of the Wildlife Permit: 5. <i>Lizards must only be handled by <u>Katherine Muchna or Matt Turner, or by others under the direct supervision of a SQEP and following prior approval by the Department of Conservation.</u></i>
S51.004	Commenter note "Any changes to the LMP would require a variation of the wildlife approval to update the conditions to amend the reference to a later-dated LMP version. Adopting an adaptive management approach could lead to changes in methodology necessitating an update to the LMP." and "DOC recommends that reference to "adaptive management" is removed from the LMP."	The applicant does not support removal of the adaptive management approach. Based on the experience of Boffa Miskell's herpetologist Katherine Mucha, the types of 'minor changes' that may come about during a lizard salvage include increasing survey effort in a particular habitat type based on the habitat assessment immediately prior to works, or using survey tools and traps in a different layout better suited to the habitat (vegetation species and complexity). In general, these changes are made when a management approach as described in the LMP is not working efficiently. We consider changes of this nature minor, and

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		may not need approval / notification from DOC. Indeed, requests for approval are not responded to in a timely manner, it may reduce salvage efficiency. Accordingly, the LMP wording is retained and an additional condition is proposed: <u>Minor variations to the LMP may be made by a SQEP to improve management of Lizard populations. Any minor amendments must be notified in writing to DOC prior to any implementation of changes. If no response is received within 24 hours of notification, it will be considered agreement that the amendments are minor and are within scope of the LMP.</u>
s.51.006	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."	These recommendations are supported and notes the suggested amendment to condition 5 above.
s.51.007	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."	
s.51.010	Commenter notes: "The applicant has provided a thorough set of conditions for the wildlife approval. DOC has recommended minor tracked changes and recommended conditions aligned with best practice."	The applicant has agreed to the additional conditions identified in Schedules 1 and 2 of the s51 Wildlife report and have amended the Part I conditions set to incorporate additional conditions.

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
s.51.014	Commenter recommends an amendment to a condition related to methodology: "2. Methodology, In accordance with 'Hunua Quarry Development Lizard Management Plan (Boffa Miskell)' dated 17 July 2026."	
s.51.015	Commenter recommends an amendment to a condition related to the release site: "...The exact release location is not known at present, but the coordinates of 37.038873, 175.170135 (NZTM) are a central point in the park. Location will be confirmed <u>in consultation with DOC</u> prior to any capture.	
s.51.016	Commenter recommends an amendment to a condition related to the personnel authorised to undertake the Authorised Activity: "a) <u>to be confirmed</u> "	
s.51.017	Commenter recommends an amendment to a condition related to the personnel authorised to undertake the Authorised Activity: " <u>(insert date of Approval)</u> "	
s.51.018	Approval for associated fish salvage and relocation activities is also sought (under s26ZM of the Conservation Act 1987) as provided for in the amended section 42(4)(j) FTAA. DOC's view is that permission is not required under the FTAA for relocation activities as the Application does not include the transfer of aquatic life to a new location where the species does not already exist pursuant to s26ZM(3) of the Conservation Act.	As set out section E4.10 of the Part E Complex Freshwater Fisheries Activity Authority dated 30 March 2026, approval is sought under s26ZM(2)(a) of the Conservation Act 1987. Under s26ZM(2)(a), the prior approval of the Minister of Fisheries is required for the movement of live aquatic life between locations where the species already exists. The Proposal includes salvage of fish from Mangapū Tributary 1 and relocation to a location within Mangapū Stream, downstream of the new confluence so fish can climb up into the new diversion channel. Additionally, fish salvage and relocation is associated with the culvert at tributary 4, as it relates to the culvert only. The proposal has been amended so that fish salvage for the upper catchment will be

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
		addressed as part of a future application and regarding tributary 3 culvert, this will be designed to provide for fish passage. As set out in section E4.7 of Part E Part E Complex Freshwater Fisheries Activity Authority, all the aquatic fauna identified within tributary 1 are also found within the Mangapū Stream. Accordingly, s26ZM(2)(a) is considered the appropriate section to apply. DOC are the administering agency for this approval.
s.51.025	Clarification sought on location of culverts: Section B1 of review document 1 clearly refers to the culverting of two tributaries of the Mangapū Stream (Tributaries 3 and 4). However, Section E1 of review document 2 notes the installation of two culverts on Tributaries 3 and makes no mention of culverting on Tributary 4.	We confirm that the Proposal is for one culvert on tributary 3 and one culvert on tributary 4 and that the reference in Part E1 is an error. The reference to one culvert in each tributary is also described in Part B Assessment of Environmental Effects, the Ecological Effects Assessment (Appendix B12.4.5a and b) and the Mangapū tributary realignment – preliminary design and effects technical report (Appendix B12.4.6a).
s.51.036	Commentor notes it is difficult to comment on the proposal to block fish passage into the tributaries because the alignment of this with best practise and the NZFPGs is dependent on the future possibility of removing these tributaries. The commentor is not aware if this tributary removal has been consented or not, and it seems problematic to justify an activity based primarily on something that may not happen. If the tributaries are to be removed, the commentator would agree blocking fish passage would not significantly add to the harm associated with the removal of the tributaries. If the tributaries were not to be removed in the future however then the Commentator would consider that greater emphasis on avoiding affecting fish passage into these streams would be in line with best practise (based on them being headwater streams that are	As mentioned above, the proposal has been amended to provide for fish passage within the tributary 3 culvert and the offset and compensation package now applies to Stages 1 – 6 only. Given the referral project listed under Schedule 2 of the FTAA specifically provides for 80 years, the application is still required to relate to the whole 80 years, despite resource consents being limited to the same duration as provided for under s123 of the RMA (s96(1) of the FTAA). Accordingly, consent conditions are proposed which will require a stream offset and compensation plan to be submitted for certification no later than the commencement of Stage 6, which will align with submissions of approvals for Stages 7 and 8. <u>What is the Department of Conservation required to assess:</u> The Department of Conservation only needs to assess the proposal for a stream realignment and fish salvage and relocation associated with the realignment and in the immediate vicinity of the tributary 4 culvert.

Appendix 2: Response to Comments Relating to Planning Matters

Commentor code reference	Summary of Comment	Planning Response
	comparatively close to reference condition in a heavily deforested and otherwise impacted catchment that seems vulnerable to continued piecemeal, cumulative loss of remaining forested headwaters).	