

Hunua Quarry Development - Invitation to Comment						
EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing thespecific response to comment (where required)
1	0.001		Commenter is concerned that extending Saturday operating hours will reduce the rural amenity currently experienced at their property.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
1	0.002		Request to retain existing Saturday cut-off time of 1.00pm rather than allowing longer Saturday construction/quarry-related hours.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
1	0.003		If conditions managing Saturday hours are amended, this commenter expects all related consent conditions to be updated consistently.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
1	0.004		Commenter acknowledges the assessment and that their property is identified as experiencing a relatively high visual effect ("moderate-high"), and falls short of significant.	Landscape and Visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
1	0.005		Concern that the visual effects assessment may not accurately reflect effects because no site visit to the dwelling was undertaken.	Landscape and Visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
1	0.006		Request for detailed visual simulations from the property using both terrain-only and terrain-plus-vegetation LiDAR datasets to better understand potential effects.	Landscape and Visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
1	0.007		Request landscape assessors visit the commentor's site to develop and discuss mitigation planting options, effectiveness, and timing before consent is granted.	Landscape and Visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
1	0.008		Concern that mitigation planting should be established early enough to offset visual effects as quarry development progresses.	Landscape and Visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
2	0.001	Minister for Resources	Support for the project as a strategically important source of aggregate.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
2	0.002	Minister for Resources	Acknowledges project's role in providing secure, long-term aggregate supply to support Auckland growth and infrastructure delivery	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
2	0.003	Minister for Resources	Acknowledges supply of aggregate is central to the Government's Going for Growth and Going for Housing Growth strategies	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
2	0.004	Minister for Resources	Acknowledges projects role on demand for aggregate and the regional deficit	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
2	0.005	Minister for Resources	Acknowledges project's contribution to addressing forecast shortages in aggregate which is included on the Critical Mineral List.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
2	0.006	Minister for Resources	Acknowledges the strategic advantage of the quarry's location relative to Auckland markets and infrastructure projects.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
2	0.007	Minister for Resources	Supports for the project to address transport efficiency, affordability of aggregate supply, and reduced infrastructure cost	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.001	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Consultation started initially as a resource consent application but engagement at a governance level on this Project has yet to occur.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.002	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	The full application was not made available prior to lodgement.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.003	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Commenter opposes in principle the proposed quarrying activity as it will have significant adverse cultural effects that cannot be avoided or fully mitigated.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.004	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Commenter states the project will have significant adverse cultural effects with impacts on the whenua, awa and ngāhere cannot be avoided, remedied or fully mitigated including extensive realignment Mangapū Stream and removal of wetlands.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.005	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Acknowledges no Statutory Acknowledgement Areas within the Project site area but there are several Statutory Acknowledgement Areas and statements of association in the vicinity.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.006	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Mangapū and the nearby Kirikiri Awa were part of a complex network of settlements throughout the Hunua Ranges, connected by local waterways and valleys that contribute to the cultural landscape, demonstrating occupation and use of the Project site historically.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.007	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Recent initiatives to protect, celebrate, and enhance the Pukekoiwiriki pā have enabled the public access to this culturally significant place, the overburden area is very large and will occupy a considerable portion of the central view.	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
3	0.008	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Concerned that the proposed mitigation planting will take many years to become established	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
3	0.009	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Concerned that the Stage 7 will result in a noticeable lowering of the ridgeline, which has served as an important navigational marker.	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
3	0.010	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	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.	Cultural	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
3	0.011	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Commenter supports conditions that seek to recognise and protect cultural values.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.012	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Commenter expects that the Kaitiaki Forum will meet with greater frequency than existing arrangements, particularly during the review of management plans.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.013	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Commenter does not support reliance on the NZHPT authority process. Recording information on archaeological discoveries does not mitigate the adverse effects on cultural values	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.014	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Commenter does not support reliance on the accidental discovery provisions in Auckland Unitary Plan Rule E 12.6.1 (currently reflected in Condition 96).	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.015	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Commenter seeks Specific Accidental Discovery Protocols be developed in consultation with Mana Whenua and incorporated into the consent conditions.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.016	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Commenter seeks an agreed protocol to address tikanga Māori specific to the site.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.017	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Conditions 2, 7, 9 and 10 relating to the HNZPT process that specifically recognises Te Ākitai Waiohua are supported.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.018	Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Inc	Commenter is concerned that a 12 months' timeframe for filing of archaeological records is excessively long (condition 13) and should be reduced to no more than 6 months.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
3	0.019	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter seeks that the Archaeological Management Plans are prepared in stages and provided to Te Ākitai Waiohū for review and feedback prior to approval.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.020	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Discovery protocols be developed in consultation with Te Ākitai Waiohū to ensure that tikanga Māori processes are followed, assessments undertaken prior to decisions made regarding the destruction of a discovered site.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.021	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	The commenter is provided with opportunities to deliver cultural inductions prior to the commencement of earthworks and to undertake iwi monitoring during earthworks.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.022	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter seeks that off-set mitigation for residual adverse effects occurs on the site or within the immediate environs of the area of impact.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.023	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter supports off-site planting commencing with the granting of the resource consent	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.024	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter is not opposed to the indigenous forest revegetation at Meremere Quarry, however not more than 10% of the required off-set mitigation should be at Meremere Quarry.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.025	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter opposes reclamation or diversion of streams and wetlands, where reclamation occurs the commenter seeks significant enhancement, including any impacts on the downstream flows	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.026	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter supports the conditions relating to Stream Realignment Management Plan and stringent reporting.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.027	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter 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.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.028	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter seeks annual reporting requirement [regarding potential effects on the downstream freshwater receiving environment] should be amended to six monthly.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.029	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter expects to be involved in all stages of the stream alignment and restoration.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.030	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter supports the Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan (currently conditions 53 – 54).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.031	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter expects to participate in the development of the Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.032	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter 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 Pukekōiwhiri pā occur at the completion of each stage.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.033	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter seeks further engagement around the principles and high-level outcomes for rehabilitation, and confirmation that this plan will be developed in collaboration with and approval of the commenter.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.034	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter seeks conditions incorporate opportunities for Te Ākitai Waiohū to exercise kaitiakitanga and mana motuhake within this significant area of its rohe.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.035	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter supports the conditions requiring a Kaitiaki Forum, and records that Te Ākitai Waiohū will continue to assert its own position on matters.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
3	0.036	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter expects to be invited to participate in refining the final set of conditions.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.037	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter is concerned with the diversion of the Mangapu Stream tributary.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.038	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter is concerned with the amount of off-set mitigation that is outside the traditional Te Ākitai Waiohū area of interest.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
3	0.039	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter is concerned with the removal of vegetation and ridgelines that are directly in the sightline of Pukekōiwhiri pā.	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
3	0.040	Te Ākitai Waiohū Waka Taua Inc	Commenter seeks ongoing commitment from Winstone Aggregates to engage with Te Ākitai Waiohū to ensure that the Hunua Quarry Expansion respects and reflects the cultural values and aspirations.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
4	0.001	Minister for Climate Change	Support for projects that deliver significant regional or national benefits.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
4	0.002	Minister for Climate Change	Support for project's to secure long-term, proximate aggregate supply to support Auckland housing, transport and infrastructure markets, reducing reliance on more distant sources and supply chain efficiency.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
4	0.003	Minister for Climate Change	Support for the operational benefits from the western haul road with reduced haulage time, improved truck productivity and fuel savings and may also reduce transport related emissions.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
5	0.001	Minister for Infrastructure	Support for projects which deliver positive outcomes for New Zealand, including the Hunua Quarry Development project.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
6	0.001		Commenter seeks to ensure ensure that the pest management program is maintained and expanded to include the control of browsing animals.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
6	0.002		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.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
6	0.003		Commenter notes: "Those of us that live high up on the hill to the south may receive more noise than the monitoring station in our direction, which is situated low down in the Judge Richardson subdivision.	Noise and Vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
6	0.004		Commenter requests: "ask that the visual impact be kept to a minimum with planting. Even grasses in some areas would lessen the impact even if temporary. There may be many years before some areas are disturbed again."	Landscape and Visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
7	0.001		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 will be managed as quarry operations advance towards our boundary.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
7	0.002		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. Particular concern raised about potential for dust to affect residential amenity and enjoyment of outdoor living areas, cleanliness and maintenance of homes, vehicles, water tanks and other property improvements, human health and wellbeing, particularly for sensitive persons, and vegetation, gardens, pasture and stock grazing areas.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
7	0.003		Commenter notes: Residents living near the quarry already experience quarry-related noise. The expansion has the potential to increase [various aspects of noise listed in the comments]; and, notes "...application should place greater weight on preserving the amenity values of established rural residential properties, rather than relying solely on compliance with technical noise standards. Residents should not be expected to accept a progressive decline in amenity..."	Noise and vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
7	0.004		Commenter notes: The proposal involves continued drilling and blasting over an extended period as the quarry expands and deepens. [Various concerns related to blasting, over pressure and vibration are listed in the comments]; and "Of additional concern is that neighbouring Fletcher-owned properties are not subject to the same residential sensitivity considerations. This has the potential to reduce the level of practical protection afforded to the remaining independent landowners."	Noise and vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
7	0.005		Commenter notes: Repeated vibration and blast overpressure events may create ongoing concern for residents, particularly where there are fears of structural damage, cracking, land movement, or impacts on water infrastructure and other property improvements. Current blasting activities at Hunua Quarry already generate vibration effects at 191 Judge Richardson Drive that can feel comparable to a small earthquake; and, While these effects may fall within technical compliance limits, they nonetheless have a significant impact on residents' sense of wellbeing, security, and enjoyment of their property.	Noise and vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
7	0.006		Commenter notes: The application does not adequately demonstrate how...[vibration and blast overpressure]...effects will be avoided or reduced as quarry operations progressively deepen and move closer to neighbouring properties, nor does it provide certainty that the frequency or intensity of these events will not increase over the life of the proposed expansion.	Noise and vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
7	0.007		Commenter notes: A key unanswered question is what protections will remain for us as the occupants of as the quarry progressively advances toward our property and surrounding properties cease to operate as occupied residences; and, request that Winstone clearly explain: • how will remain protected if quarry operations ultimately approach our boundary; • what criteria are being used to determine whether neighbouring properties remain suitable for residential occupation; • whether equivalent assessments have been or will be undertaken for our property; • what mitigation, compensation, or protective measures are proposed for directly affected neighbouring landowners.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
7	0.008		Commenter seeks robust and enforceable conditions that include: Property-specific dust, noise, vibration, blast overpressure, and air quality protections for .	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
7	0.009		Commenter seeks robust and enforceable conditions that include: Independent environmental monitoring is located at or immediately adjacent to our property.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
7	0.010		Commenter seeks robust and enforceable conditions that include: Public reporting of monitoring results, including dust, noise, vibration, and blast monitoring outcomes.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
7	0.011		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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
7	0.012		Commenter seeks robust and enforceable conditions that include: Clearly defined trigger levels requiring investigation, corrective action, and review of mitigation measures.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
7	0.013		Commenter seeks robust and enforceable conditions that include: Transparent complaints, investigation, and dispute resolution process.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
7	0.014		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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
7	0.015		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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
7	0.016		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	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
7	0.017		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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.001	Auckland Council - Ecology	Terrestrial fauna and flora values - The valuation of the terrestrial values surrounding the quarry and of the impact areas of the proposed expansion are accepted.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.002	Auckland Council - Ecology	The methods used may result in an under assessment of wetland extent, although this may depend on the season and year of the aerial imagery used for delineation. Nevertheless, at the scale provided, I consider the wetland extent and values assessed acceptable, although this uncertainty would need to be refined should any future management plans require more detailed assessments.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.003	Auckland Council - Ecology	Stream values - 6 year old data re MCI scores considered limited.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.004	Auckland Council - Ecology	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.005	Auckland Council - Ecology	I have reviewed the applicant's response regarding the offsets established under the 2009 Symonds Hill Pit consent and the proposed relocation of the 'covenanted areas', and whilst there is some complexity in this regard, I am satisfied that the ecological objectives of that consent are upheld.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.006	Auckland Council - Ecology	The application considers salvage of fauna avoidance of harm and relocation as mitigation with no residual effects. I would consider avoidance to include only the protection area for native nesting birds and ensuring bats are not present in trees prior to felling. All salvage efforts (eg. Lizards) and relocation is considered mitigation. However - management plans proposed are accepted	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.007	Auckland Council - Ecology	Considers there is likely to be a larger shortfall in the offset calculations. See comment document for reasoning	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.008	Auckland Council - Ecology	The planting at Meremere does not meet the offsetting principles of the AUP, Appendix 8 (3) regarding proximity to the impact and effects management undertaken at this site I consider to strictly be compensation. See comment document for reasons.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.009	Auckland Council - Ecology	The application acknowledges the presence of threatened vegetation species (most regionally, not nationally threatened), however, there is no measures provided to address these. There is no pre-clearance survey to relocate threatened plant specimens, no salvage, no spore or cutting collection and no inclusion of any threatened species in the offset planting schedules.	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.010	Auckland Council - Ecology	Provided Fish Salvage and ESCP management plans are prepared and implemented in accordance with best practice these would be considered appropriate to address fauna impacts and the potential for sediment discharges,	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.011	Auckland Council - Ecology	Supports maintenance of MALF and threshold of flow reductions of 5% or more	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.012	Auckland Council - Ecology	I have some concern regarding the water quality of the augmentation flows as these are likely to be pumped from sumps in the base of the pit and could well carry contaminants from the works, have low dissolved oxygen being groundwater sourced. I have recommended monitoring of the groundwater to address these issues.	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.013	Auckland Council - Ecology	Stream diversion is the highest risk from an ecological effects assessment point of view in terms of certainty of achieving the proposed outcomes - does not agree that the proposed diversion will maintain the ecological values of the impact stream and that therefore it is only the length difference that is required to be addressed through effects management. Considers low likelihood of achieving equivalent ecological values. Considers there will be unaccounted loss of stream ecological value.	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.014	Auckland Council - Ecology	The SEV/ECR method has not been applied appropriately. If consent is granted, SEV should be incorporated into stream diversion monitoring, to enable adaptive management and quantification of additional offset and compensation actions in a robust and transparent manner, if the monitoring identifies shortfalls. Offset and compensation extents must be verified to ensure no net loss and net gain achieved. See comment document for full reasons	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.015	Auckland Council - Ecology	Questions the offset and compensation calculations due to the timing of stream classification assessments and desk top analysis	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.016	Auckland Council - Ecology	Disagrees that offset/compensation works (regarding fish barrier) at Meremere provide a critical stream connection.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.017	Auckland Council - Ecology	Disagrees with the application of BOAM to determine wetland offsets	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.018	Auckland Council - Ecology	Uncertainty over how the applicant has applied BOAM and whether this would impact offset calculations or at least provide more robust analysis (terrestrial and wetland).	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.019	Auckland Council - Ecology	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.020	Auckland Council - Ecology	Suggested s67 - update offset calculations via amended application of BOAM and SEV to accurately demonstrate no net loss net gain. Consent condition amendments to include details on targets, monitoring frequency and thresholds, adaptive management, certification and re-certification to ensure offsets and compensation envisaged is achieved in the timeframes offered.	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.021	Auckland Council - development engineer and geotechnical matters	Commenter notes that geotechnical assessment report gives confidence that the author has a great understanding of the geology of the site, the characteristics and behaviour of materials in the quarry, and the effect of the proposed staged expansion works.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.022	Auckland Council - development engineer and geotechnical matters	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.	Erosion and Sediment	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.023	Auckland Council - development engineer and geotechnical matters	Commenter notes the Flood Risk Assessment updated 18 June 2026, requires detailed flood modelling to be undertaken during the detailed design phase to confirm that the proposal will not result in adverse flooding effects and offers a condition of consent requiring this.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.024	Auckland Council - development engineer and geotechnical matters	Commenter notes the geotechnical report does not address the possibility of road works such as carriageway widening or modifications to the entrance and there are no concerns given the inherent overall stability of the greywacke rock mass present.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.025	Auckland Council - development engineer and geotechnical matters	The commenter concurs that the rules associated with overland flow paths do not apply to permanent streams but considers it relevant and required to consider the potential adverse flooding effects from this diversion.	Stream diversion design	No	Refer to Appendix 7 Stream diversion and design response to comments.
8	0.026	Auckland Council - development engineer and geotechnical matters	Commenter notes proposed earthworks and diversion of the watercourses and minor overland flow paths may adversely affect overland flow characteristics or increase the potential volume or frequency of flooding on the surrounding site. A condition of consent has been offered for detailed flood modelling at the detailed design stage.	Stream diversion design	No	Refer to Appendix 7 Stream diversion and design response to comments.
8	0.027	Auckland Council - development engineer and geotechnical matters	Commenter notes offered condition for a Stream Realignment Management Plan and the inclusion of a refined hydrological assessment and methods for managing and diverting upstream flows, and seeks an amendment that the methods for managing and diverting upstream flows should consider flooding matters as well as ecological.	Stream diversion design	Yes	Refer to Appendix 7 Stream diversion and design response to comments.
8	0.028	Auckland Council - development engineer and geotechnical matters	Commenter notes that minor overland flow throughout the site has not been commented on but concludes this can be adequately managed throughout works.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.029	Auckland Council - development engineer and geotechnical matters	Commentor concludes that proposed condition 66 (14 July version) is appropriate.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.030	Auckland Council - development engineer and geotechnical matters	Commenter notes Stream Realignment Management Plan (conditions 64 and 65) is considered appropriate and necessary to ensure the stream realignment is suitably managed and identifies an amendment to ensure flooding effects are taken into account: condition 65(e) "methods for diverting upstream flows during the streamworks, including <u>how upstream ponding and/or other adverse flooding effects up and downstream will be managed and avoided during works and</u> how sufficient..."	Stream diversion design	Yes	Refer to Appendix 7 Stream diversion and design response to comments.
8	0.031	Auckland Council - stormwater	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.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.032	Auckland Council - stormwater	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.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.033	Auckland Council - stormwater	Commentor notes the augmentation of stream flow is proposed to maintain baseflow characteristics within the Mangapū Tributary and Mangapū Stream to mitigate the effects of quarry dewatering. The proposed consent conditions require augmentation of stream flows where monitoring identifies a reduction in flow and includes provision for ongoing monitoring and adaptive management.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.034	Auckland Council - stormwater	Commentor notes the QMP put forward as part of the Application is a revision of the existing Hunua QMP and has been updated to incorporate the proposed Symonds Hill quarry expansion, associated staging, progressive rehabilitation, and environmental management measures.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.035	Auckland Council - stormwater	Commenter notes the eastern Stage 2 culvert is proposed within a permanent stream identified as being subject to High and Very High Flood Hazards and located within the 1% AEP floodplain. Additional information reduces concern regarding overtopping of the gully margins, it does not fully demonstrate culvert performance under defined blockage scenarios or provide sufficient detail to confirm available freeboard to the haul road embankment crest. Additional information should be provided to demonstrate the performance of the culvert under blockage conditions. Cross sections showing culvert configuration, modelled 1%AEP Flood Level and available freeboard to the haul road crest should be provided this information would clarify whether the predicted attenuated water remains confined behind the culvert within the gully system, or whether there is an increased risk of overtopping of the haul road embankment in larger events, leading to potential downstream flooding impacts.	Stream diversion design	No	Refer to Appendix 7 Stream diversion and design response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.036	Auckland Council - stormwater	Commenter notes the Mangapū Tributary Realignment – Preliminary Design and Effects Technical Assessment concludes that the proposed stream realignment will result in increases in flood levels of up to 50 mm within land owned by the Applicant and up to 15 mm within rural residential areas, with no effects on existing buildings. Proposed conditions of consent (no. 65) (version dated 22/06) requires a further hydrological assessment and provides an opportunity to confirm the hydraulic performance of the final design (prior to construction). A further condition requiring verification of flood effects based on as-built information following completion of the stream realignment is considered appropriate.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.037	Auckland Council - stormwater	Commenter notes the project will result in the loss of approximately 0.22 ha of natural wetland habitat, with a further 0.23 ha of wetland habitat potentially affected through drainage associated with quarry dewatering activities; and the proposal includes the permanent loss of approximately 527 m of intermittent and permanent stream reaches and the realignment of approximately 1,200 m of the Mangapū Tributary.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.038	Auckland Council - stormwater	Commenter requests confirmation of whether the application includes ancillary activities that would require consent under Chapter E33 (Industrial and Trade Activities) of the AUP.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.039	Auckland Council - stormwater	Commenter requests clarification on the Eastern culvert flood performance, including confirmation of upstream flood level effects during events greater than the 2% AEP, with consideration of partial and full blockage scenarios and available freeboard to the haul road crest.	Stream diversion design	Yes	Refer to Appendix 7 Stream diversion and design response to comments.
8	0.040	Auckland Council - stormwater	Commenter requests clarification on downstream flood impacts associated with the Mangapū Tributary realignment, including consideration of whether a condition requiring confirmation that the constructed channel achieves outcomes consistent with the preliminary flood modelling assessment	Stream diversion design	Yes	Refer to Appendix 7 Stream diversion and design response to comments.
8	0.041	Auckland Council - stormwater	Commenter 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(e) <u>116(c)</u> ."	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.042	Auckland Council - stormwater	Commenter notes that cross reference in Condition 199 - 205 need to be updated	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.043	Auckland Council - stormwater	Commenter seeks an amendment to Condition 65 to verify the outcomes of the detailed design of the channel prior to construction.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.044	Auckland Council - stormwater	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>	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.045	Auckland Council - Regional Earthworks	Commenter notes Winstone proposes to update the consent conditions and quarry management plans applying to the site to incorporate the changes and enable greater operational efficiency.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.046	Auckland Council - Regional Earthworks	Commenter notes the applicant's proposal to undertake earthworks of approximately 23,398 million m3 over an area of 108ha.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.047	Auckland Council - Regional Earthworks	Commenter notes that the applicant's assessments conclude that provided the earthworks are undertaken in accordance with the application documents, including a final Infrastructure Report and ESCP, and earthworks related conditions of consent, that the potential effects associated with all land disturbance will be appropriately managed.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.048	Auckland Council - Regional Earthworks	Commenter notes the various methods for managing erosion and sediment	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.049	Auckland Council - Regional Earthworks	Commenter notes the revision process for the ESCP and AC certification	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.050	Auckland Council - Regional Earthworks	Commenter notes the provision of a Chemical Treatment Management Plan (ChTMP) for Auckland Council approval prior to works commencing, and the chemical treatment of the SRPs throughout the earthwork's operation has been recommended and a condition has been included [in Table 1] below.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.051	Auckland Council - Regional Earthworks	Commenter notes consent for a duration of 35 years and seasonal restrictions, and supports the applicant's proposal in this regard.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.052	Auckland Council - Regional Earthworks	Commenter notes proposed range of generic control options that, depending on the nature of the works, and will be decided upon during construction and managed via the various proposed management plans. Notes the applicant's Streamworks proposal to be in accordance with GD05, and support the proposed methodologies.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.053	Auckland Council - Regional Earthworks	Commenter concludes resulting sediment related effects will be less than minor and an assessment of the technical aspects of the earthworks and sediment control methodology has been undertaken and provided the earthworks are completed in accordance with the application documents and all supporting information, concurs with the applicant's assessment and consider that the potential effects associated with sediment discharge will be appropriately managed.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.054	Auckland Council - Regional Earthworks	Commenter notes agreement with Table 1 appended to the regional earthworks comments with the related conditions proposed by the applicant. Noting these are "As per the Infrastructure Report included with the application documents"	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.055	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	Commenter notes overall, the site presents a low risk to human health and the environment; and is suitable for the proposed commercial/industrial use.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.056	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	Commenter provides provides a summary of the areas of potential contamination, intrusive investigation findings, soil management requirements; and makes a recommendation regarding works completion reporting.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.057	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	Commenter notes The remainder of the proposed pit area (Stages 1–6) does not contain identified HAIL land uses.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.058	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	Commenter notes the PSI & DSI has been prepared by a SQEP in general accordance with the Contaminated Land Management Guidelines Nos. 1 and 5 (MfE, revised 2021) and adequately details the likely soil contamination profile of the site.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.059	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	Commenter agrees with the PSI & DSI that further DSIs should be undertaken on the stockyard and any other identified HAIL areas that may develop in the next 35 years, prior to any soil disturbance in these areas	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.060	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	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.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.061	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	Commenter notes contamination profile is suitable for the proposed commercial/industrial land use and that there is a low risk to the human health of site workers and neighbours if the management processes outlined by a certified SMP are employed and draft conditions are adhered to.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.062	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	Commenter that the proposal does not require consent under the AUP(OP) Chapter E30 contaminant provisions.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.063	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	Commenter notes that soil disturbance activity is a CA under Regulation 9(1) of the NES:CS	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.064	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	Commenter notes the recommended consent conditions provided below and adherence to a certified SMP will suitably assist in mitigating potential adverse effects on human health during the proposed works and the recommended conditions of consent are within the matters of control.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.065	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.066	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	Commenter agrees with the recommendations of the PSI & DSI in that an intrusive investigation be undertaken in Stages 7 and 8 prior to the start of quarrying activities in these areas, to determine the need for future consents if future works	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.067	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	Commenter concludes there is a low risk to the human health of site workers and neighbours as a result of disturbing soils which may contain contamination at levels greater than typical background concentrations, if the management processes outlined by a certified SMP are employed and draft conditions are adhered to.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.068	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	Commenter recommends for Condition 38 a SMP is required to comply with Regulation 9(2) of the NES-CS.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.069	Auckland Council - Contaminated Land	Commenter recommends for 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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.070	Auckland Council - Parks	Commenter notes that there are no direct impacts on any existing parks, open space zoned land, or land administered by Parks and Community Facilities because of the quarry expansion itself.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.071	Auckland Council - Parks	Commenter notes interest in the proposed biodiversity offsetting and compensation within the Hunua Ranges Regional	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.072	Auckland Council - Parks	Commenter notes interest in the boundary adjustment which potentially triggers the esplanade reserve provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA').	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.073	Auckland Council - Parks	Commenter notes the in-principle written approval from the Regional Parks Team for proposed restoration and enhancement opportunities, including pest plant control, restoration planting, riparian and wetland restoration, and lizard release sites and that these projects would greatly benefit the regional park, enabling restoration of riparian, wetland and forest areas beyond the team's current capacity and funding and would be broadly consistent with the Regional Parks Management Plan 2022.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.074	Auckland Council - Parks	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.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.075	Auckland Council - Parks	Commenter notes the range of conditions that will require the review and approval of site-specific delivery plans for any works within the park, including pest plant and animal control, planting plans, and kauri dieback management.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.076	Auckland Council - Parks	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.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.077	Auckland Council - Parks	Commenter notes the lodged scheme plan shows the boundary adjustment in an atypical way, by creating a new allotment (proposed Lot 2, 3.56ha) which is then to be amalgamated via a condition with Lot 2 DP 115598 (part of the existing quarry landholdings). The creation of an allotment of less than 4ha triggers s230 of the RMA	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.078	Auckland Council - Parks	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	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.079	Auckland Council - Parks	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> "	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.080	Auckland Council - Parks	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 and safety requirements, staging and methodology of works, maintenance and monitoring obligations, long-term management responsibilities, and any cost recovery or funding arrangements.</u> "	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.081	Auckland Council - Parks	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 clarity, Auckland Council will not accept covenants or other legal instruments being registered on the records of title for its regional park land.</u> "	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.082	Auckland Transport	AT request a 1m road sholder widening and a road safety assessment of the existing bend on the eastern side of the vehicle access on Hunua Road. AT requests that the assessment demonstrates that adequate inter-visibility and sight lines between approaching vehicles at the bend can be achieved to avoid potential conflicts associated with increased truck movements. This information is necessary to determine whether the adverse safety effects arising from increased truck trips can be appropriately mitigated.	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.083	Auckland Transport	AT request additional mitigation measures to improve sightlines at the bend. May include benching of the cut slope on the inside of the curve to increase visibility between drivers travelling in opposite directions, in addition to the proposed ATP treatment, an updated sightlines assessment and a Preliminary Design Road Safety Audit report. These are to be approved by AT prior to commencement of activities on site.	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.084	Auckland Transport	AT supports the proposed road widening works, including the modification of the vehicle crossing. A Safe System Audit report should be provided at the future Engineering Approval (EA) stage.	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.085	Auckland Transport	s67 gap - AT is not satisfied with the applicant's response regarding the sightlines assessment at the existing bend on Hunua Road, where two serious crashes were recorded in 2023 and 2025.	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.086	Auckland Transport	Recommends the inclusion of an additional consent condition for Road Safety Mitigation – ATP Centreline Markings. See comment document for details of proposed condition	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.087	Auckland Transport	Recommends the inclusion of an additional consent condition for Road Safety Mitigation – Sight Distance Improvements. See comment document for details of proposed condition	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.088	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter disagrees that the identified bores (and some others) (identified as HUN5/2U, HUN4/12 and the Glasgow bore in Appendix B12.8.12) have not been affected by dewatering. In my view, based on the available monitoring data, there appears to be some groundwater drawdown taking place, although not significant, in the bores listed above. <u>considers it important that groundwater trends are identified to help plan for mitigation if required. Ongoing monitoring will confirm either way what the drawdown effects are.</u>	Groundwater Planning	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
8	0.089	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter disagrees with the use of AMRR for establishing groundwater trends in the Hunua Quarry environment. The methodology was developed for [a different context]. This disagreement does not have a significant bearing on my assessment of the proposal as offered conditions of consent alleviate any concerns.	Groundwater Planning	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
8	0.090	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter agree with the assessment discussion and support the mitigation offered to bore owners where quarrying related groundwater drawdown affects the ability of any bore owner to access their legal right to water.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.091	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter disagrees with the presentation of the drawdown effects presented in Table 11. The drawdown values assigned to 9 of the 20 bores in this table are not consistent with Schedule A and do not provide limits to the extent of groundwater drawdown north of the quarry.	Groundwater Planning	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
8	0.092	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter notes bores (ID5421 and LUC60317641) are located on the northern extent of the drawdown limit and are expected to experience less than 5m of drawdown using the Figure 20 assessed effects at RL-50m however Table 11 shows these bores having up to 114.9m of drawdown. In contrast bore ID20479 also in Table 11 and located 1.5km closer to the Symonds Hill pit, is indicated to have only 25m of drawdown.	Groundwater Planning	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.093	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter notes PDP have stated they are taking a conservative approach and have used the historic drawdown slope to justify the extent of drawdown in bores where little is known of the bores construction, commentor concern is that drawdown reached the level stated in Table 11 then there would be significant additional effects on stream baseflow	Groundwater Planning	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
8	0.094	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	The significant drawdown prediction in Table 11 is, however, modified by the trigger levels presented in Schedule A and in particular proposed condition 171(a) this condition provides that if the consent holder is unable to comply with Schedule A trigger levels, then an application will be required for a change to consent conditions to seek a greater assessed envelope of effects. This addresses any concerns around the presentation of Table 11.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.095	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter includes in Schedule A with missing drawdown trigger levels for four farm bores on a provisional basis until such time as new monitoring data is obtained, and has recommended an advice note regarding this approach.	Groundwater Planning	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
8	0.096	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter notes condition 63 and 64 (and other related conditions) requiring a Stream Realignment Management Plan (SRMP) requiring design, construction, long term establishment plan and appropriate monitoring to be detailed before commencement provides sufficient confidence that matters of discretion under E7.4.1 (A13) of the AUP	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.097	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter notes effects on Stevensons Drury Quarry Expansion -Sutton Block (Consent WAT60449477, 60449478, 60449479) and accepts of the assessment provided and have no concerns that the proposal will affect the operation of Drury Quarry	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.098	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter notes a key concern was many of the monitoring bores will not be sufficiently deep enough to monitor the full extent of the drawdown and replacement bores are to be constructed ahead of time. This concern has been addressed by condition 177.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.099	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter notes their review of revised condition set to the applicant for review and acceptance with a few minor changes. Most of the additional conditions are reflected in the revised Draft Consent Conditions dated 22 June 2026 with some further changes and corrections.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.100	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter notes from a groundwater perspective they have not identified any significant issues that would preclude granting of these consents.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.101	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter supports the groundwater take and diversion conditions proposed in revised Draft Consent Conditions dated 22 June 2026 but with the inclusion of additional conditions and changes outlined below. They note the changes presented below have been agreed with the applicant and there are no disagreements.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.102	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter notes a point of difference with the applicant is the reference to a new condition set dated 14 July provided to the panel on the 22nd July 2026. The applicant has responded to my changes with different condition numbers which the commenter has not sighted.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.103	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter notes the need to check the condition references within the groundwater conditions before issuing	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.104	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends for 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 474 <u>173</u> . The Review..."	Groundwater Planning	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
8	0.105	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends for 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."	Groundwater	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.106	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends for Condition 182(e) is amended to refer to condition 66 not 67.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.107	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends for Condition 184 is amended as follows: " The Consent Holder must: ... (b) <u>measure and record water levels in bore ID421 (or use best endeavours) at quarterly intervals from the date of commencement of this consent.</u> "	Groundwater	Yes	Refer to Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
8	0.108	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends for Condition 186 is amended to refer to condition 66 not 67.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.109	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends for Condition 187 is amended to refere to conditions 182 - 485 186, and 66 and 67.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.110	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter seeks clarification regarding cross references in Condition 191	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.111	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends for Condition 191 is amended to refer to Condition 489 <u>188</u> to 190.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.112	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends for Condition 193 is amended as it refers to Hays Stream and Symonds Stream - This should be referred to as Waipokapu, Mangapu.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.113	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends for Conditions 204 is amended to refer to 482 <u>199</u> and 485 <u>202</u>	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.114	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends for 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.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.115	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends for Condition 207 - 211 is amended as it refer to Symonds Stream when it should be Mangapu Stream.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.116	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends for Condition 208 is amended as it refers to Condition 2019 when it should be 177.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.117	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends for Condition 215 is amended as follows: "In the event that groundwater drawdown is such that <u>in either or both</u> monitoring bores HUN12/8U on Hunua Road <u>or</u> ID421 on Jack Paterson Drive equals or exceeds the trigger value in Schedule A then: (a) The Consent Holder must cease any further drawdown at the Symonds Hill Pit and within seven (7) days must notify the Council in writing and by telephone of the exceedance of trigger levels. Drawdown must not recommence without the Council's written approval; (b) Etc etc (a, b, c and d unchanged)	Groundwater	Yes	Refer to Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
8	0.118	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends a new condition 170(a) is included as at Page 8 of 13 of the Groundwater specialist comments	Groundwater	Yes	Refer to Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
8	0.119	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends a new condition 171(a) is included as at Page 9 of 13 of the Groundwater specialist comments	Groundwater	Yes	Refer to Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
8	0.120	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends a new condition 189(a) is included as at Page 9 of 13 of the Groundwater specialist comments	Groundwater	Yes	Refer to Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
8	0.121	Auckland Council - Groundwater specialist	Commenter recommends Schedule A is updated as set out at Page 10 - 12 of 13 of the Groundwater specialist comments	Groundwater	Yes	Refer to Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
8	0.122	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes the [landscape and visual] assessment stresses that the extent to which the natural character values are ultimately restored depends heavily on the success of the realignment design and management, including channel geometry, stream function, hydrological performance, and the long-term establishment of indigenous vegetation	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.123	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes the importance of the long term focus required to ensure that the mitigation will be, and will continue to be, successful, and opines that the conclusions of the landscape effects assessment are reliable, and the level of effects predicted are accurate.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.124	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes the magnitude of adverse effect is as may be expected for a project of this scale and effects on a local scale for landscape, and natural character will remain more than minor after mitigation.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.125	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes that the applicant's LEA opines however, that when considering the level of landscape, and natural character effect on a wider landscape / catchment scale, the final level of effect is determined to be minor or less than minor after mitigation.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.126	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes Visual effects are expected to remain more than minor after mitigation for a limited number of individuals and these properties are targeted for the off-site mitigation planting.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.127	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes concerns regarding the Mangapū Tributary Realignment based on the fact that this is a complex project and reinstating the natural systems of the proposed realigned gully will be very challenging.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.128	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter is of the opinion that an appropriate methodology has been adopted and executed in the preparation of the LEA.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.129	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter concurs with the conclusions of the LEA regarding Statutory provisions and any relevant 'other matters', noting comments with regard to reliance on mitigation measures.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.130	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter is of the opinion that the description and interpretation of landscape and natural character and values sections is detailed and thorough.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.131	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	The commenter based on a site visit with the applicant's landscape architects, and the information provided in the LEA (including the ZTV analysis), is of the opinion that the identified catchment is accurate.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.132	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	The commenter considers approach and understanding of the effects on landscape and natural character values to be appropriate.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.133	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	The commenter concurs with the determination of physical landscape effects being low (adverse), decreasing to very low (adverse) at completion (after mitigation).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.134	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	The commenter concurs with the LEA descriptions of how across the offset sites, opportunities for native revegetation, when combined with the physical effects of the Project, these plantings will result in low-moderate (adverse) residual physical effects but notes due to timescales the elevated level of effect therefore will be present for some 40 - 50 years.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.135	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	The commenter concurs with the memorandum dated 16 June 2026 that the landscape effects of the Project as experienced from Pukekōiwi pā to be low-moderate (adverse), reducing to low (adverse) over time and as the rehabilitation planting establishes to re-green the quarried cut faces outside of the quarry zone.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.136	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes Table 7, in section 6.1.4 of the LEA does not provide indicative time scales for the reduction in the level of adverse effect. Inclusion of this information would be helpful to understand the duration of the elevated levels of adverse effects; and notes Similarly, this information would also be of assistance in the tables which summarize the visual effects in section 6.3.1 and in Appendix 3 of the LEA.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.137	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter opines that the rationale provided for the above determinations on the Effects on the landscape values of the ONL is credible and concurs with these conclusions.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.138	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes the lengthy period over which the level of adverse effect will remain 'significant' (up to 10 years), and is of the opinion that the rationale provided for the above determinations is credible and I concur with these conclusions.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.139	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter opines that the rationale provided for the above determinations on the Visual Effects is credible and concur with these conclusions.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.140	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commentor notes offsite planting appears to differ from the Area C mitigation planting (as shown on the Phase 1 Symonds Hill Pit Rehabilitation Plan - p25 of the above document). Area C is undertaken within the holding and is implemented under phase 1 (0-5 years of the project) and opines this is a practical solution to the elevated effects identified, but that the assessment of visual effects doesn't consider this mitigation in its assessment of the properties in question.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.141	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes the longer term predicted levels of (landscape, and also natural character and visual) effect rely on the successful and continued implementation on a suite of mitigation / management tools which are set out in section 7 of the LEA	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.142	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes the off-site mitigation planting forms a voluntary condition, has been developed to address moderate-high (adverse) visual effects on identified private properties within Viewing Groups (S1, S2, W1 and W2).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.143	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes with reference to natural character, the LEA states that success will be secured through condition of consent and has concerns that the conditions of consent relating to mitigation and rehabilitation appear to limit maintenance to a period of 5 years.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.144	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes concerns regarding the Mangapū Tributary Realignment and that success will require a relatively high input over a prolonged period and will require close ongoing monitoring.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.145	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes discussions with the applicant to date, from this understands that maintenance is intended to occur until certain health and sustainability outcomes are achieved, with 5 years being a minimum maintenance period only.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.146	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes that the ecological specialist has provided amendments to conditions [on planting maintenance requirements] to deliver this and these are recommended below.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.147	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter opines, whilst noting my concern regarding the importance of the long term management, the conclusions of the landscape effects assessment are reliable, and the level of effects predicted are accurate.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.148	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter concludes the magnitude of adverse effect is as may be expected for a project of this scale, and it is noted that the level of effect on a local scale for landscape, and natural character will remain (using RMA terminology) more than minor (but not significant within the FTAA context), after mitigation.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.149	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter concurs with the LEA on cumulative effects.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.150	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes potentially, the land use consent will run for 80 years, and mitigation measures will only become effective in the latter stages (50 years +) of the activity. The elevated level of effect therefore will be present for some 40 - 50 years, and notes Table 7 does not provide indicative time scales for the reduction in the level of adverse effect and inclusion of this information would be helpful	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.151	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes information would be of assistance in the tables which summarize the visual effects in section 6.3.1 and in Appendix 3 of the LEA.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.152	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes the longer term predicted levels of effect rely on the successful and continued implementation on a suite of mitigation / management tools which are set out in section 7 of the LEA.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.153	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes the LEA stresses that the extent to which the natural character values are ultimately restored depends heavily on the success of the realignment design and management, including channel geometry, stream function, hydrological performance, and the long-term establishment of indigenous vegetation (section 6.2).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.154	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes their opinion regarding reliance on long term and complex mitigation as a risk, is based on my area of expertise and should be considered in the light of other specialist reviews.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.155	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes for Condition 25 requires submission to AC 20 working days prior to commencement of Construction works	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.156	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes for Condition 56: "I question whether 5 years maintenance is sufficient from a project of this scale and risk. I would suggest amendments to this condition (56(i)) to align with the recommended wording of maintenance for Condition 131 below."	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.157	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes for Condition 57: "I question whether 5 years maintenance is sufficient from a project of this scale and risk. I would suggest amendments to this condition as follows:.." [refer page 13 of 20 for details]	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.158	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes for Condition 131: "I question whether 5 years maintenance is sufficient from a project of this scale and risk. I would suggest amendments to this condition as follows:.." [refer page 17 of 20 for details]	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.159	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes for Condition 134: "I question whether 5 years maintenance is sufficient from a project of this scale and risk. I would suggest amendments to this condition as follows:.." [refer page 18 of 20 for details]	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
8	0.160	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	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".	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.161	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes for Condition 137: "Condition 137 should form a part of 135".	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.162	Auckland Council - Landscape specialist	Commenter notes for Condition 137: "If the above conditions are rolled into one, then this reference would change of course..".	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.162	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter agrees the primary economic issues arising from the Hunua Quarry Expansion are: importance of aggregates as essential inputs to the economy, particularly for infrastructure (e.g. roading) and construction industry; their heavy and bulky nature, aggregate is costly to transport between locations and across regions.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.163	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter acknowledges that a supply shortfall may exist in the region, the methodology used to estimate demand may be overstate this.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.164	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes that the quarry operational and construction activities arising from the proposal are important in Auckland, however not regionally or nationally significant, as required under the FTAA.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.165	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter agrees that the scale of these benefits [from avoided haulage costs, and supplying aggregate from within the region] is likely to be regionally significant as required in criteria s22(1)(a) of FTAA.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.166	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes wider economic benefits, agrees that there will be some but considers that most of these benefits are likely to be small.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.167	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes the Economic Assessment does not quantify costs, instead relying on other technical experts to address potential adverse effects (including noise, dust, environmental impacts, and other externalities) and concludes such costs would be relatively small and unlikely to be out of proportion to the regional benefits identified; and opines that these effects are unlikely to meet the threshold for declining the project under s85(3)(b) of the FTAA.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.168	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes based on the information available, that it is likely that the benefits of the proposal would substantially exceed its costs and these factors indicate that the proposal is consistent with the purpose of the FTAA, and supports the development on economic grounds.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.169	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes that the Hunua Quarry Expansion is likely to result in a net positive economic outcome if approved under the FTAA process.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.170	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes the proposal will likely be regionally significant due to the scale of benefits associated with the avoidance of transporting aggregates into the Auckland region, which is likely to be material in the regional context.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.171	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter is of the view that certain components of the project such as the quarry construction, operation and wider benefits are not regionally significant when considered in isolation, there is agreement that the development is likely to be regionally significant when assessed as an integrated whole.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.172	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter agrees with the points raised in the Market Context section of the Economic Assessment. Aggregate demand is primarily driven by construction activity, including roads, infrastructure, and residential, commercial, and industrial development; and, aggregate is largely non-substitutable and has a low value-to-weight ratio, meaning that transport distance is a key determinant of its total cost and consumption patterns.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.173	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes the supply of aggregate is relatively inelastic in the short to medium term, as new resources can take time to develop, including land acquisition, resource consenting, extraction equipment, and processing facilities. There are a limited number of suppliers in the Auckland region.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.174	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes the Hunua Quarry has been a major supplier of aggregate over the last 100 years and the quarry is proximate to southern growth areas and SH1. That accessibility is a strong positive feature of the proposal.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.175	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter agrees that there are limitations associated with the available data, which make robust assessment of aggregate supply and demand challenging.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.176	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter agrees that there are three primary drivers of aggregate demand: new housing, infrastructure investment and renewals, and commercial and industrial development.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.177	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes the Economic Assessment utilises total population as the basis for estimating demand, despite acknowledging elsewhere that aggregate demand is closely linked to growth-related activity and providing growth related data; and, the use of a per capita approach risks overstating demand.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.178	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes the Economic Assessment does not utilise the product mix data provided in the application. Importantly, output from Hunua Quarry, and the projected resource from the expansion, is used predominantly for roading purposes.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.179	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes there is a high probability that demand is not well represented by the per capita assumption used in the Economic Assessment. As a result, actual demand may be either higher or lower than estimated, with corresponding implications for the magnitude of the regional shortfall; but, acknowledges that other indicators, such as price signals and revealed preferences, suggest a supply shortfall may exist.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.180	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter accepts the applicant's economist's position, as raised during the second engagement meeting, that it would be difficult to reliably establish demand based on a list of major infrastructure, roading, or housing development projects.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.181	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter acknowledges that they have not undertaken a detailed review of the supply estimates and therefore I accept that the Economic Assessment has relied on the best available data, including information from recently granted consents; and also accepts that some aggregate may be imported into the Auckland region.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.182	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter generally agrees with the counterfactual and the three scenarios applied in the assessment; and notes that there may be alternative sources of aggregate supply within the Auckland region; and considers it would be impractical for the applicant to assess all such options in detail.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.183	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter considers that the on-site operation and construction that will be enabled by Hunua Quarry Expansion will be relatively small and not significant at the regional or national level as required in s22(1)(a) of FTAA.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.184	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes that they have been able to replicate most of the results presented in the avoided haulage costs assessment and broadly agrees with the method applied. [With a number of aspects identified at pages 7 - 8 of the comments].	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.185	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter considers the approach to be reasonable and overall magnitude of the estimated benefits are likely to be regionally significant.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.186	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes the total resource is updated to 225 million tonnes, which is now consistent with the resource report and gives a value of \$5.4b; and notes, the applicant's economist has acknowledged that this is a hypothetical value, as it would be physically unachievable to extract this resource in one year and impossible to find enough customers to sell this volume on the market.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.187	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes applicant's economist has confirmed that the total resource of 255 million tonnes includes the resource currently authorised under the existing consent and has provided the data used to estimate its value. It is incorrect to include the value of resource that can be extracted under the existing consent, as this overstates the value attributable to the FTAA approval.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.188	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter considers the [currently consented resource] value needs to be discounted to account for the fact that the resource can only be extracted and sold to customers over time and the existing resource should not be counted as it can be extracted regardless of the FTAA application. I have used the data provided by the applicant's economist and applied a discount rate of 8%, which is appropriate for a purely commercial activity such as the aggregate sale by a private operator.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.189	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes the Economic Assessment does not quantify the potential costs associated with the Hunua Quarry Expansion; but, expects that quantified costs would be modest and unlikely to outweigh the estimated benefits.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.190	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes the avoided costs are material at a regional scale and are likely conservative, as the absence of Hunua Quarry would increase construction and infrastructure costs due to reliance on more remote supply.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.191	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes the Project also aligns with the Government's growth and infrastructure objectives and contributes positively to climate change mitigation by reducing haul distances, fuel use, and associated emissions over the life of the consent.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.192	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter agrees that Hunua Quarry Expansion is likely to deliver significant regional economic benefits from the avoided haulage, which is consistent with the FTAA requirement; and, note that the Economic Assessment does not mention the other benefits, and that those other benefits (i.e. on-site operation, quarry construction, and other wider benefits), by themselves are unlikely to be regionally significant, but acknowledges that they will be positive.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.193	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes the Economic Assessment does not provide an explicit conclusion in relation to s85(3)(b) of the FTAA as to whether costs are out of proportion to the regional benefits. This is likely because the Economic Assessment did not quantify the potential costs.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.194	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter notes it would be feasible to quantify these costs using standard economic valuation methods, it is expected that such costs would be relatively small in scale and unlikely to be disproportionate to the regional benefits identified. On this basis, in [the commenters] opinion, the Hunua Quarry Expansion would not be likely to meet the threshold for decline under s85(3)(b) of the FTAA.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.195	Auckland Council - Economist	The commenter generally agrees with the conclusions set out in the Economic Assessment, except where I have identified differences in this review.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.196	Auckland Council - Economist	Commenter considers it likely that if the economic costs were fully quantified they would be smaller than the estimated benefits. On this basis, the overall economic outcome would be positive for the community and wider society (s85(3)(b) of FTAA).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.197	Auckland Council - Economist	The commenter considers application would be more complete if the applicant had quantified the costs and compared them to the benefits of the proposal through a cost-benefit analysis. This would enable decision-makers to have greater confidence that all relevant impacts have been systematically identified and assessed.	Economics	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.198	Auckland Council - Franklin Local Board	The commenter supports the continued operation and expansion of the Hunua Quarry.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.199	Auckland Council - Franklin Local Board	The commenter notes the considerable increase in truck movements and has significant concerns about Hunua Road, which is narrow and windy with sight line issues between Papakura and the entrance to the quarry. Commenter notes that the community reports trucks regularly cross the center line and are a safety risk to other road users and asks for road widening and realignment to be considered.	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.200	Auckland Council - Franklin Local Board	The commenter is concerned about the impact of moving the stream and requests that independent evidence be sought and considered.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.201	Auckland Council - Franklin Local Board	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.202	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter agrees that the relevant NPS are those on Infrastructure (2025), Freshwater Management 2020 (amended 2025), and Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 (amended 2025).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.203	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes NPS for Urban Development and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement are not assessed as they are not considered substantive to the application.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.204	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes the NPS Infrastructure is to ensure the national, regional and local benefits of infrastructure are recognised and provided for. In this case, the quarry comes under the definition of an 'infrastructure supporting activity' which has specific policy direction.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.205	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes [NPS-I] Policy 2 sets out an inclusive set of tests for assessing the operational and functional needs for infrastructure to be located in particular locations or environments. This is useful for considering the operational and functional needs of the infrastructure supporting activity under [NPS-I] Policy 5.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.206	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes the proposal meets the tests for functional and operational need to be undertaken in the proposed location.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.207	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes Appendix B12.9 correctly identifies Policy 5 as the most relevant policy applying to the quarry expansion. It sets out the case where the quarry can be considered regionally significant in terms of aggregate extraction.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.208	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes It also sets out rationale applicable to an operational and functional need (close proximity to market allowing (cost) effective supply to support infrastructure services to people and communities).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.209	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes although not commented on [NPS-I] Policy 6 is also relevant to infrastructure supporting activities. This policy directs recognising and providing for Maori interests.	Planning	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.210	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes Appendix A6. 7 of the application addresses Iwi Engagement and is comprehensive in coverage and detail, having been undertaken by a reputable practitioner.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.211	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes the application states that the applicant continues to have an ongoing relationship with those mana whenua groups with interests covering the subject site. The application claims that design concessions have been made, and management plans developed in response to iwi concerns and aspirations.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.212	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter recommends Appendix B12.9 is amended to make explicit reference to NPS-I Policy 6.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.213	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes Auckland Council's freshwater policy specialist has reviewed the application and concurs that Appendix B12.9 Table 3 has been correctly applied in regard to how the NPS-FM applies to this proposal.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.214	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter agrees the Resource Management (Freshwater and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2024 removes the requirement to consider the hierarchy of obligations contained in clauses 1.3(5) and 2.1 of the NPS-FM from resource consent applications, and resource consent decisions.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.215	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.216	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.217	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes the application of the Effects Management Hierarchy (EMH) is appropriate and consistent with the policy direction of the NPS-FM, however the extent to which the offsetting and compensation proposed through the EMH considers the 'loss of potential value' of the wetlands and rivers is a matter for the consideration of council's ecologist.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.218	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.219	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes the NPS-FM also has several appendices, and of particular relevance to this proposal are Appendix 6 - Principles for aquatic offsetting and Appendix 7 - Principles for aquatic compensation; and that these principles have been addressed in Appendix B12.4.5 of the application.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.220	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter opines that consideration should be given to what level of assessment was undertaken to determine what an available site is; and, whether it was limited to sites under the control and/or ownership of the applicant or were other matters considered.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.221	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.222	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes that while the NPS-IB specifies that certain adverse effects must be avoided on an SNA (cl 3.10(2)), exceptions are provided for quarrying activities under cl 3.11(1).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.223	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.224	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes the proposal is consistent with the [Special Purpose Quarry Zone] provisions.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.225	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes Rural - Mixed Rural Zone seeks to accommodate rural production activities and associated non-residential activities whilst also ensuring good amenity levels for residents that use their land for rural lifestyle purposes.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.226	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes Rural production activities are defined in the AUP as 'Activities that involve the production of primary products such as those from farming, intensive farming, horticultural, or forestry activities, and which have a functional need for a rural location'; and that, 'mineral extraction activities' are considered to meet the common definition of the 'production of primary products' and are therefore anticipated in the zone.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.227	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes Mineral extraction activities are identified as being typical features of the Rural - Mixed Rural Zone	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.228	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter opines that ideally, the application would occur in tandem with a proposed rezoning of the affected area of Mixed Rural Zone to the Special Purpose Quarry Zone; and notes that [rezoning] not possible under a Fast Track Approvals Process.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.229	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes the purchase of surrounding properties to minimise such future effects is consistent with the policy direction applying to enabling mineral extraction activities.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.230	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes other key chapters of the AUP which are engaged by this proposal are those that relate to Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) (Chapters B4 and D10) and Significant Ecological Areas (Chapters B7 and D9).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.231	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter notes The application states that the development does not diminish the defining values of the ONL, which include its elevated ridges and extensive indigenous forests; that there is a temporal aspect to these effects, where the quarry will be progressively rehabilitated; and, Mana whenua groups have been actively engaged in the project	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.232	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter opines that the proposal is inconsistent with, or possibly contrary to directive policies seeking to avoid the adverse effects of inappropriate land use on the natural characteristics and qualities that contribute to the values of ONL, these are considered against a backdrop of other national and regional policies recognising the functional operational need for infrastructure supporting activities	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.233	Auckland Council - Policy Planner	Commenter opines that In their view, there is a policy pathway for the approval of the application.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.234	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	Commenter notes the proposal has the potential to generate adverse effects on the surrounding transport network and on road user safety; and, agrees with the transport issues and deficiencies identified in AT's assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.235	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	Commenter notes subject to the matters identified in this memorandum and the recommended conditions of consent; and they support the proposal from a traffic engineering perspective.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.236	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	Commenter refers to surveyed operational data for the existing quarry as to traffic movements generated. See memo for figures. Commenter notes the proposal includes the construction of a dedicated right-turn bay at the existing quarry access on Hunua Road; and also includes the installation of Audio-Tactile Profile Markings (ATPM) (rumble strips) on the approach to the sharp bend near the quarry entrance.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.237	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	Commenter agrees with the proposed consent condition requiring the first 50 metres of the internal access road to be sealed (Condition 71) adequately addresses the matter they raised.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.238	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.239	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	Commenter also recommended that consideration be given to including a consent condition requiring the internal haul roads to be designed so that truck movements can be undertaken without reversing manoeuvres to access quarry material; but that, outside the scope of matters that can reasonably be addressed through this consent, noting that the haul roads will be used solely by quarry operators and staff, with no public access. It was considered that the safe and efficient management of the internal haul road network is an operational matter that is appropriately managed by the quarry operator.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.240	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	Commenter recommends regarding Condition 50 - Lighting Plan, in response to Council's preliminary request for further information, that additional consent conditions would be offered to address internal lighting; they support this approach and further recommended that the lighting plan be prepared and certified by a suitably qualified lighting engineer prior to submission to Auckland Council.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.241	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	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> ...	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.242	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	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."	Transport	Yes	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.243	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	Commenter notes, subject to the matters identified in this memorandum and the recommended consent conditions, they are satisfied that the proposed internal transport infrastructure can be designed and operated to support the quarry activities in a safe and efficient manner.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.244	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	Commenter agrees with Auckland Transport's assessment of the wider transport network and acknowledge the transport mitigation measures proposed by the applicant, including the right-turn bay at the quarry access and associated road safety improvements on Hunua Road.	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.245	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	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 acknowledges the position that this is outside the scope of this resource consent.	Planning	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.246	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	Commenter notes that they support the proposal, subject to the recommended consent conditions and the implementation of the proposed transport mitigation measures.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.247	Auckland Council - Historic Heritage	Commenter notes the proposed works will not impact any scheduled historic heritage sites nor any recorded unscheduled archaeological or historic heritage sites.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.248	Auckland Council - Historic Heritage	Commenter notes that the applicants have applied for an Archaeological Authority under the FTAA Act and have provided Archaeological Authority conditions; and they are supportive of these conditions.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.249	Auckland Council - Historic Heritage	Commenter notes the applicant has offered a condition to manage the potential for further unrecorded archaeological material or historic heritage sites to be impacted by the proposed works and they are supportive of this condition.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.250	Auckland Council - Historic Heritage	Commenter supports the conditions proposed in the archaeological assessment, archaeological management plan, and the archaeological authority; and notes they will provide effective management for the effects on unrecorded archaeological material.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.251	Auckland Council - Historic Heritage	Commenter supports condition 84 Archaeological Accidental Discovery Protocol, as offered.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.252	Auckland Council - Historic Heritage	Commenter supports the addition of final reporting supplied to Auckland Council Heritage Unit as an Advice Note in PART H – ARCHAEOLOGICAL AUTHORITY CONDITIONS	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.253	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter notes: the Project will generally retain [the currently consented] hours but will include occasional early morning activity during periods of high demand, when purchasing trucks will access the Site from 5:00 am; and, noise assessments and calculation have shown that noise from the purchasing trucks complies with the proposed operational noise limits and will not exceed a reasonable level.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.254	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter agrees with the reason for the suggested changes to the current operational noise and vibration compliance criteria and consent conditions and that the proposed consent conditions should apply to the consent.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.255	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter opines: the proposed conditions provide better controls than the operative AUP standards for all the surrounding residents in terms of potential noise and vibration effects. The proposed conditions include the requirement for an ONMP; and that a draft Operational Noise Management Plan has been submitted.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.256	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter opines subject to the inclusion of recommended conditions and adherence to the Operational Noise Management Plan (ONMP) overall operational noise and vibration effects will be unlikely to exceed a reasonable level at the neighbouring properties.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.257	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter agrees with the acoustic report that, due to the substantial separation distances between the works and receivers, the predicted construction noise and vibration levels will comply with the relevant AUP limits by significant margins.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.258	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter supports the conditions proposed in the Acoustics and Vibration Assessment, subject to the changes recommended.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.259	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter has shown Condition 38 in strikethrough and notes: The ONMP has been provided and adequately addresses all noise and vibration management issues.	Noise and Vibration Planning	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
8	0.260	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter has shown Condition 39 in strikethrough and notes: The ONMP has been provided and adequately addresses all noise and vibration management issues.	Noise and Vibration Planning	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
8	0.261	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter agrees with Condition 78 and recommends an advice note as follows is added: <u>Construction work includes (without limitation) temporary activities associated with vegetation clearance, stream realignment, rehabilitation work, and the construction of sediment retention ponds, haul roads, drainage networks, culverts, and earth bunds.</u>	Noise and Vibration Planning	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
8	0.262	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter supports Condition 79.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.263	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter supports Condition 80.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.264	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter supports Condition 81.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.265	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter supports Condition 82.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.266	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter supports Condition 83.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.267	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter supports Condition 84.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.268	Auckland Council - Acoustics and Vibration	Commenter recommends Condition 85 is replaced with new text as at page 8 of 8 in the comments.	Noise and Vibration	Yes	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
8	0.269	Auckland Council - Air Quality	Commenter notes is there no evidence from the existing environment to suggest significant adverse human health effects arising from PM10 emissions associated with the quarry.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.270	Auckland Council - Air Quality	Commenter agrees agree with PDP's assessment that, provided the proposed dust mitigation measures continue to be implemented consistently throughout the project, PM10 concentrations will continue to be effectively controlled	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.271	Auckland Council - Air Quality	Commenter notes the proposed monitoring framework, including continuous particulate and meteorological monitoring, clear trigger levels, and adaptive management requirements, provides an appropriate level of assurance that any emerging risks can be identified and addressed early.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.272	Auckland Council - Air Quality	Commenter opines that the proposal is acceptable, subject to the proposed conditions and ongoing implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan, the air quality effects of the quarry expansion are expected to be no more than minor, and supports the application on this basis.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.273	Auckland Council - Air Quality	Commenter notes the compliance history and Auckland Council's air discharge compliance inspection which assigned the site an overall rating of fully compliant; that there are no substantiated dust complaints were recorded during the most recent monitoring period. Collectively, this information indicates that the existing receiving environment is stable and that current dust management controls are functioning effectively.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.274	Auckland Council - Air Quality	The proposal represents a continuation of an existing quarry operation, and no substantial change to baseline air quality conditions is anticipated when standard controls are applied.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.275	Auckland Council - Air Quality	Commenter notes the greatest potential for dust effects is expected during periods of intensive earthworks and newly exposed surfaces, particularly during earlier phases of pit advancement. Any dust effects that arise are predicted to be temporary and localised in nature...On this basis, air quality effects beyond the site boundary are anticipated to be less than minor.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.276	Auckland Council - Air Quality	The commenter opines that the proposal is consistent with the Auckland Unitary Plan (E14) provisions governing discharges to air, quarry activities, and effects management. Predicted particulate concentrations comply with the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality, and the assessment methodology applies the Ministry for the Environment's Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing Dust, including use of FIDOL framework; and that, the draft conditions require ongoing monitoring, reporting, and adaptive management, ensuring that air quality effects remain appropriately controlled over time.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.277	Auckland Council - Air Quality	The commenter notes potential air quality effects associated with the continued development of the Symonds Hill Pit are primarily related to dust and are predictable, localised, and manageable. The proposed mitigation framework is comprehensive and proportionate to the scale of the activity; and that it is supported by enforceable consent conditions.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.278	Auckland Council - Air Quality	Commenter notes there are no section 67 information gaps.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.279	Auckland Council - Air Quality	Commenter concludes in view of the [their] assessment, [they] support the application.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.280	Auckland Council - Watercare	Watercare has considered the potential effects of groundwater drawdown and changes in stream baseflow on Watercare's water supply interests at Hays Creek Dam. 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.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.281	Auckland Council - Watercare	Condition 214 proposed in the Application is generally supported by Watercare subject to amendments	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.282	Auckland Council - Watercare	Condition 214. 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-, with all costs associated with the investigation, assessment, monitoring, mitigation and implementation of any required measures to be met by the Consent Holder.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.283	Auckland Council - Watercare	New recommended condition: (a) <u>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>	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.284	Auckland Council - Watercare	Watercare recognises the importance of quarry infrastructure to Auckland's growth and infrastructure delivery. Watercare's primary interest is ensuring that the Project does not adversely affect Watercare assets, water resources, source water interests or public water supply; and Based on the information reviewed, Watercare agrees that the Project is unlikely to have any effect on the Hays Creek Dam.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.285	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter confirms that the proposed erosion and sediment control measures are generally appropriate, and that the preparation of final staging plan and ESCPs for certification by Council is acceptable; and, recommended conditions of consent are considered appropriate and fit for purpose.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.286	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: consent condition for a maximum duration of 35 years with a seasonal restriction for the earthworks has been sought by the applicant, and this is considered appropriate in this case.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.287	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: There are no significant residual sedimentation impacts that require proportionality assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.288	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: broad agreement with the assessments [regarding geotechnical matters including land stability] undertaken and conclusions reached that the site is generally stable and suitable for the proposed quarrying activities, and stability can be suitably managed throughout works; and, concurs with the applicant with respect to landslide hazards.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.289	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: provided the recommended additional conditions are imposed, there are no significant Geotechnical and Land Stability impacts that require proportionality assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.290	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes [regarding groundwater diversion and dewatering effects] while there are areas of disagreement with the methodology and detail of the submitted assessment of effects, subject to the proposed consent conditions (with amendments), groundwater effects can be appropriately managed/ mitigated	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.291	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: The conditions relating to groundwater matters has been an on-going point of discussion to tidy up through consultation with the applicant to date. Generally, the conditions have been agreed to between parties, however there are some minor final amendments	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.292	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: There are no significant residual groundwater impacts that require a proportionality assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.293	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Some minor information insufficiencies have been identified by Council's Stormwater Specialist, however these primarily relate to flooding effects	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.294	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	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.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
8	0.295	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: There are no significant residual impacts on stormwater that requires proportionality assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.296	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Council's Development Engineer (Annexure 1) and Stormwater Specialist (Annexure 15) have reviewed the proposal with respect to potential flooding effects from the overall works package. Both are satisfied that the identified changes to downstream flood levels are acceptable, provided they are limited to the extent detailed in the application package.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.297	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	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	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.298	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes proposed culverts, Council's Stormwater Specialist has commented that there is currently insufficient assessment of the performance of the proposed culverts in blockage conditions with the application package; and Further information is recommended via a s67 FTAA request	Stream diversion design	No	Refer to Appendix 7 Stream diversion and design response to comments.
8	0.299	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: amendments to the Stream Rehabilitation Management Plan condition of consent are recommended to demonstrate to Council that those works will manage potential adverse upstream ponding or flooding effects are avoided throughout the duration of works.	Stream diversion design	No	Refer to Appendix 7 Stream diversion and design response to comments.
8	0.300	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Further information is recommended to be requested with respect to the design of the proposed culverts and their performance during blockage scenarios.	Stream diversion design	No	Refer to Appendix 7 Stream diversion and design response to comments.
8	0.301	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Council recommend that this be resolved via a s67 request to provide adequate certainty both with respect to downstream flooding effects, and the ability to implement the consent as proposed.	Stream diversion design	No	Refer to Appendix 7 Stream diversion and design response to comments.
8	0.302	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recognises: that there likely would be design solutions to ensure that the culverts and haul road are designed to avoid such overtopping, and as such this could be resolved via a condition of consent.	Stream diversion design	Yes	Refer to Appendix 7 Stream diversion and design response to comments.
8	0.303	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Subject to amendments to and additional conditions of consent, there are therefore no significant residual flooding effects that require proportionality assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.304	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter confirms: they are in broad agreement with the Applicant that all works can be carried out in accordance with the permitted standards, provided the mitigation measures suggested by the Applicant are adhered to.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.305	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding the deletion of the Operational Noise Management Plan this has not been accommodated into the 14 July 2026 version of conditions. From a planning perspective I can confirm that I agree with retaining this condition to enable this document to be finalised and certified, and to enable a suitable process for adaptive changes to this document over time as required.	Noise and Vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
8	0.306	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: recommended changes to the Blasting Noise and Vibration condition (now condition 90) have been accommodated in the revised condition set. This has been agreed with the Applicant.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.307	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: an additional advice note [to Condition 78] has been recommended that hasn't been accommodated into the updated condition set.	Noise and Vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.308	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: There are no significant residual construction noise and vibration impacts that require proportionality assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.309	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter agrees: with the conclusions reached in the Applicant's assessments and that the proposed dust management plan incorporates appropriate measures to control the potential adverse effects associated with the proposed discharges.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.310	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: There are no significant residual air quality impacts that require proportionality assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.311	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: contaminated land matters have been reviewed by Council's Contaminated Land Specialist (Annexure 13) who agrees with the conclusions reached in the Applicant's assessments.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.312	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: a condition of consent requiring a works completion report to be prepared, which has been agreed to by the applicant, and accommodated in the latest version of recommended conditions dated 14 July 2026.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.313	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: There are no significant residual contaminated land impacts that require proportionality assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.314	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: a new internal haul road is proposed within the site...will only be accessible by quarry operators, and internal traffic management measures will be utilised to manage use and safety of this haul road.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.315	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Council's Traffic Engineer (Annexure 3) has identified a range of information that would be beneficial to be provided [and] includes lighting details and more detailed design drawings of the proposed new internal haul road; and, With respect to lighting, the applicant has confirmed that existing lighting will be retained, and where any upgrades may be required to comply with the relevant lighting requirements...A condition of consent has been offered to this degree...	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.316	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: On-site truck movements are currently managed by quarry management procedures and will continue to be managed accordingly. On-site management is considered appropriate for an activity of this nature to ensure safety is maintained internally within the site.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.317	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Auckland Transport (Annexure 4) are generally in agreement with the Applicant with respect to effects on the roading network. However they have an outstanding concern with respect to roading safety at the corner on Hunua Road.	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.318	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: They have recommended that a road safety assessment of the existing bend located on the eastern side of the vehicle access on Hunua Road be provided; and In lieu of this, a condition has been recommended that the applicant provide a 1m road shoulder in this location.	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.319	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter acknowledges: the applicant's position in this regard and generally concur with respect to the nature of the crashes and the implications of the Strategic Freight Network. It was discussed through consultation processes	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.320	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Delivering Auckland Transports' recommended condition would likely pose an implementation issue; and From a planning perspective, it therefore would not be appropriate to include the condition recommended by Auckland Transport to mitigate these effects	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.321	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter: recommend the Panel first consider whether this is an effect that can be directly correlated to this application (i.e. is within scope); if considered necessary, we recommend that a s67 request for a more comprehensive road safety and intervisibility assessment	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.322	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: the significance of the effect here is potentially high as it includes the potential for increased risk to human life. Additionally, transport safety along Hunua Road is understood to be a key concern for local residents, Councillors and the Local Board (Annexure 17).	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
8	0.323	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: all other comments from Auckland Transport on conditions in Annexure 4, Council confirm that the current drafted conditions dated 14 July 2026 are agreed upon	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.324	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Council's Traffic Engineer supports the proposal noting he has deferred assessment of effects on roading infrastructure to Auckland Transport.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.325	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Auckland Transport are not supportive of the proposal in its current state, considering there are safety effects of concern along Hunua Road with the increased trip generation the proposal would generate.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.326	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: There are potentially significant adverse effects on road safety and efficiency from the proposal, and as such it is considered appropriate that a proportionality assessment be undertaken.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.327	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Council's ecological assessment has identified a number of key outstanding technical matters with the submitted ecological assessments. Refer to comments page 16 and 17 of 43.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.328	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Cumulatively, these matters all contribute to an unresolved question as to the extent of offset and compensation provided in the application, and whether this adequately addresses the ecological effects of the proposal.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.329	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: on-going consultation to date, and a resolution has not yet been reached. It is understood that the Applicant considers the calculations are all appropriate and accurate.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.330	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: potentially significant residual ecological effects. It is recommended that further information is requested in this regard via a s67 request,	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.331	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: The Ecologist (along with other Council specialists) has additionally flagged the challenging nature of the stream diversion and the realistic delivery of the outcomes proposed; and, encourage the Panel to satisfy themselves that these works can be reasonably undertaken and deliver the outcomes put forward in the application package.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.332	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Council's Ecologist has also confirmed that, from an ecological perspective, the proposed sediment and erosion control measures and augmentation of flows to manage potential effects from dewatering are generally appropriate; and, Minor changes to conditions of consent are recommended	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.333	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: there remain unresolved concerns with the proposed effects-management package and as such there are residual adverse effects that are not considered to have been adequately addressed by the application in its current form; and, this arises from the adequacy of the effects management package as presented, not the project in principle.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.334	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: The scale of such residual effects is dependent on the effect the inadequacies in the assessment would have on the scope of the necessary offset and compensation package, and as such cannot be confirmed at this stage.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.335	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Council's Landscape Architect is satisfied that the submitted Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment is thorough, based on an appropriate rationale and methodologies, and generally concurs with the conclusions with respect to magnitude and nature of effects, including potential cumulative effects.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.336	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.337	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: It is therefore accepted that a visual outcome of unnatural horizontal benches that would result from such a quarrying activity is likely anticipated by the statutory context of the site.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.338	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Minor changes to the recommended conditions of consent are recommended to ensure that the maintenance timeframes for all mitigation elements are strengthened	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.339	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding landscape and visual effects: these will be moderate-high (more than minor) in the long-term after mitigation, but, provided the mitigation proposals can be delivered as proposed, will not be significant in the context of the FTAA.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.340	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Provided the recommended conditions are imposed, there are no significant residual landscape and visual impacts that require proportionality assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.341	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Council's Parks Planner is overall supportive of the proposed biodiversity offsetting and compensation outcomes that are proposed within the Hunua Ranges Regional Park.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.342	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	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.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.343	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.344	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Adverse Parks planning effects are not anticipated by the proposed development, subject to the revised scheme plan and implementation of proposed conditions of consent; and, There are no significant residual Parks planning impacts that require proportionality assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.345	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Council's review with respect to archaeological matters has been restricted to RMA matters.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.346	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: there are no affected scheduled historic heritage sites or unrecorded unscheduled archaeological or historic heritage sites that would be affected by the proposed development. The applicant has offered an Accidental Discovery Protocol condition of consent which is considered appropriate	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.347	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Council's Archaeologist is supportive of the cautious archaeological authority approach taken by the Applicant, and the associated management of mitigation of potential effects associated with unrecorded sites via this authority process.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.348	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Adverse archaeology effects are not anticipated by the proposed development; and, there are no significant residual archaeology impacts that require proportionality assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.349	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: We are in broad agreement with Boffa Miskells' conclusions that input from mana whenua groups is fundamental in enabling an assessment of the effects on cultural values of an application to be completed.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.350	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter: supports the applicant's dedication to on-going engagement and consultation with interested mana whenua groups and to prepare a Cultural Management Plan, as well as to continue the implementation of the Kaitiaki Forum.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.351	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: We would therefore encourage the consultation process to be completed with relevant mana whenua groups prior to a decision being made to ensure that an appropriately informed assessment of the scale of cultural value effects can be completed.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.352	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: the information provided to date from mana whenua groups is comprehensive and provides a good understanding of the cultural values as they relate to the site and scope of proposed works.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.353	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Based on the consultation and feedback received to date it is understood that no fundamental issues have been raised by Mana Whenua with the application in its current form. The consultation process to date has identified that there are known cultural values	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.354	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	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	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.355	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends: that final responses from Te Akitai Waiohau 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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.356	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.357	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	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.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.358	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Adverse effects on existing public water supply infrastructure are not anticipated by the proposed development; and, There are no significant residual impacts that require proportionality assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.359	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: we confirm that we concur with the applicant's assessment of the application against the relevant Mixed Rural Zone provisions and have nothing further to add.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.360	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: 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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.361	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: As the relevant transport provisions of the AUP are directly related to adverse effects, should the Panel reach a conclusion that the adverse transport effects of concern...[are not within scope or can be mitigated with rumble strips]...should the Panel reach a conclusion that the adverse transport effects of concern	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.362	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: The applicant has provided a detailed assessment of the functional requirement and consideration of practicable alternatives in sections B9.4.2, B9.5.2, and B9.5.3 of the submitted AEE. We generally concur with the applicant's assessment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.363	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: such, we are comfortable there is no practicable alternative for the proposed reclamations, with the exception of the quarry not expanding beyond its existing consents (i.e.: if these applications are declined).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.364	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	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	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.365	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	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].	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.366	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: has not identified any reasons why the application must be declined in terms of section 85(1) of the FTAA.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.367	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	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	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.368	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	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	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.369	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Potential Cultural Values Effects – The Applicant has not completed consultation with relevant iwi groups to confirm the potential scale of adverse cultural effects from the proposed development.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.370	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding economic matters: There are reservations with the methodology used for calculating demand for aggregates, however it is accepted that the demand for aggregates in Auckland is likely to continue to grow	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.371	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding economic matters: Avoided transport costs and emissions are benefits likely to arise from the proposed expansion. There are some minor issues with the Applicants assessment in this regard that may mean benefits have been over or under stated,	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.372	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding economic matters: Economic benefits from on-site operation and construction will not be significant at a regional scale.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.373	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding economic matters: No costs are identified in the report, however there are foreseeable costs such as environmental effects that, if acknowledged and addressed in the cost-benefit analysis, would provide a more complete understanding of economic effects.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.374	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding economic matters: Economic Impact Analysis has significant limitations for assessing the Proposed Development and this part of the analysis should be treated with caution.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.375	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding economic matters: "the Hunua Quarry Expansion would likely generate regionally significant economic benefit (s22(1)(a) of FTAA).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.376	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding economic matters: We accept that the provision of local aggregate will contribute to the development of land and infrastructure for urban land uses in Auckland, and that this will likely be regionally significant.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.377	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	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	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.378	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Conditions as recommended by Auckland Transport would not be appropriate as there are likely implementation issues with such conditions given consenting obligations and issues with practical delivery of the identified mitigation measures	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.379	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: The identified area of concern is restricted to a single corner on the Hunua Road corridor, and as such is limited in extent. The applicant has also offered an Augier condition to install mitigation in the form of rumble strips at this corner, which Council agree will contribute to improving safety	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.380	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: there are unresolved concerns with the adequacy of this package and the realistic delivery of the outcomes purported to be achievable, such that there is the potential for this to be insufficient to adequately achieve the expectations of the effects management hierarchy and statutory framework.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.381	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: A comprehensive mitigation, offset and compensation package has been proposed by the applicant to manage potential adverse effects on terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems. The proposed offsetting and compensation measures are, however, questioned with respect to the adequacy of the details and there are unresolved concerns	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.382	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Further information is recommended to be requested to provide greater confidence with the proposed [ecological effects management] package.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.383	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: The proposal has the potential to generate significant adverse residual ecological effects. Insufficient information is available to confirm the scale of these effects.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.384	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: The applicant has not completed consultation...Mana Whenua consultation plays a critical role in understanding the potential cultural values of a site/area, the effects a proposal may have, and how those effects could be mitigated or avoided. Without completion of the consultation, it is difficult to reach conclusions on the scale of potential effects on cultural values.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.385	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: There is inadequate information to allow an assessment of effects or determination of necessary management/mitigation measures to be undertaken.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.386	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: The offered conditions will ensure on-going consultation is undertaken with mana whenua post-approval, with respect to development of management plans, and throughout works, which will allow for on-going input into procedures to manage such effects.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.387	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Insufficient information is available to confirm the scale of [the cultural] effects. These are considered unlikely individually be to out of proportion with the benefits of the proposal, however, given the insufficiency of the information, we cannot reach a final conclusion at this stage.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.388	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter concludes: Having noted the above matters, we consider it unlikely that there will be a proportionality concern with the application, however there is currently insufficient information to reach a suitably informed conclusion in this regard.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.389	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Comment concludes: If these matters can be adequately resolved through the provision of the identified additional information, then we do not foresee there being a proportionality concern in this regard.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.390	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes information gaps as: Updated Offset calculations	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.391	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes information gaps as: Consultation with Mana Whenua	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.392	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes information gaps as: Updated road safety and intervisibility assessment	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.393	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes information gaps as: Culvert Performance Assessment	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.394	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Due to tight timeframes Council has not had a chance to review the SMART review edits undertaken by the Panel	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.395	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes on conditions recommended that this: does not include the recommended condition of consent from Auckland Transport that has not been agreed between Council and the Applicant	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.396	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Condition numbering and cross-referencing will need a careful once-over	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.397	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends: 1. "must" is used instead of "shall" 2. All references to the Council is detailed as "The Council," not "Team Leader XXXX"/"Monitoring"/etc..	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.398	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: It is the Council Ecologist's recommendation that water quality monitoring should, where possible, be through the use of continuous monitoring equipment.	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.399	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes Part A Conditions: Add abbreviation to this table as follows: CMP – Cultural Management Plan	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.400	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding Condition 24 an advice note is included regarding management plans.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
8	0.401	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding Condition 25: Add reference to Cultural Management Plan into Table 1	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.402	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding Condition 46: Council's ecologist requests that baseline monitoring be included; and Long-term monitoring should be implemented (through this condition or another)	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.403	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding Condition 55: Council have concerns with the 5-year maintenance period and suggest amendments to 55 (i) to align with the maintenance requirements of Condition 129 (further comments on this below)	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.404	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding Condition 57: Council have concerns with the 5-year maintenance period for a project of this scale and delivery risk. We suggest amendments...[as described above comment 8.157]	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.405	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding Condition 64 matters for inclusion into the SRMP: b) <u>achieves no net loss of value; and b)</u> achieves no net loss of value <u>or potential compared to the impacted reach and the maintenance of value is demonstrated using the Stream Ecological Value (SEV) assessment or equivalent.</u> The impact stream has an SEV of 0.91 and 0.83 and the diversion target is thus >0.83; and	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.406	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding Condition 65 an amendment as follows: (e) methods for diverting upstream flows during the streamworks, including <u>how upstream ponding and/or other adverse flooding effects up and downstream will be managed and avoided during works and how sufficient ...;</u> and	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.407	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding Condition 65 an amendment as follows: clause (i)(iii) description of how maintenance of planting areas, including replacement of plants that do not survive, will be undertaken, <u>to achieve compliance with the requirements of conditions 124 and 125 – 127;</u> and additional matters: <u>(iii) existing baseline monitoring; and (iv) turbidity and sediment deposition monitoring; (v) water quality monitoring (including DO, temperature); (vi) ecological monitoring; (vii) frequency of monitoring;...(ix) management actions to address any success measures not being met;</u>	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.408	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes regarding Condition 65 an amendment as follows: (viii) Timeframes and measures of success, <u>noting the following must target measures of success: MCI ≥ Band B (NPS:FM attribute tables); Habitat Quality Score band ≥Good; Deposited fine sediments (NOF Table 16) ≥ Band B</u>	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.409	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends a new Condition 65A and B as follows: Add Cultural Management Plan conditions. Suggest Applicant provide recommended wording given it has been detailed in other application documents as offered by the applicant.	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.410	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends a new Condition 66A as follows: <u>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 must 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>	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.411	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends a new Condition 66B: that requires the applicant to provide to Council for certification finalised culvert and haul road designs that include suitable supporting information on the eastern culvert flood performance, including confirmation of upstream flood level effects during events great than the 2% AEP, with consideration of partial and full blockage scenarios and available freeboard to the haul road crest. This must demonstrate that in such situations there is no risk of embankment overtopping.	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.412	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends a new advice note to Condition 83: <u>Construction work includes (without limitation) temporary activities associated with vegetation clearance, stream realignment, rehabilitation work, and the construction of sediment retention ponds, haul roads, drainage networks, culverts, and earth bunds.</u>	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.413	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends an amendment to Condition 118: All water samples must be analysed for total suspended solids (TSS) and nephelometric turbidity units (NTU), within one week of collection. <u>Any responses required by Conditions 119-120 below must be implemented within 2 weeks from sampling (i.e.: 1 week from completion of sampling analysis).</u>	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.414	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends an amendment to Condition 126: All planting required by Conditions 123-126 must be maintained for <u>at least a minimum of five (5) years after planting is completed or until it is demonstrated that the revegetated areas have been established to a point where 90% canopy cover is achieved, planting density meets or exceeds those specified in the SRMP, there are no fruiting or flowering weed species present and long-term health and sustainability is ensured without the requirement for intensive management, whichever is the latest...</u>	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.415	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends an amendment to Condition 129: All planting required by Conditions 115-116 must be maintained for a minimum of five (5) years after planting is completed <u>or until it is demonstrated that the revegetated areas have been established to a point where 80% canopy cover is achieved, planting density meets or exceeds those specified in the Detailed Design and Landscaping Plan (required by Condition 126), there are no fruiting or flowering weed species present and long-term health and sustainability is ensured without the requirement for intensive management, whichever is the latest...</u>	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.416	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends an amendment to Conditions 131 and 132 to combine with Condition 130.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.417	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends an amendment to Conditions 140 to update the table to: (a) set out the target ecological values to be achieved for each freshwater and terrestrial offset and measuring methods (b) include clarity of staging/timing of delivery of each offset.	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.418	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends a new advice note to Condition 140: <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>	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.419	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends a new advice note to Condition 141: <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 clarity, Auckland Council will not accept covenants or other legal instruments being registered on the records of title for its regional park land.</u>	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.420	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends the following amendment to Condition 173A: <u>The daily abstraction from the Symonds Stream augmentation bore (HUN 14/8 or any replacement) must not exceed 1,400m³.</u>	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.421	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends the following new Condition 174A: <u>In the event that groundwater drawdown is such that any of the deep monitoring bores operated by the Consent Holder equal or exceed any trigger values in Schedule A then the Consent Holder must cease any further water level drawdown at the Symonds Hill Pit and within seven (7) days notify the Council in writing and by telephone of the exceedance of trigger levels. The notification must specify which bore trigger(s) have been exceeded, and the quantum of the exceedance for each bore. The Consent Holder must not recommence drawdown unless it is demonstrated that the trigger levels can be complied with to the written satisfaction of the Council.</u> <u>Advice note: The drawdown trigger levels in Schedule A define a consented "Envelope of Effects". If the Consent Holder is unable to comply with Schedule A triggers, then an application will be required for a change to consent conditions to seek a greater assessed envelope of effects.</u>	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.422	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends amendments to Condition 177 as follows: Should refer to the three successive steps of dewatering, not two.	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.423	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends Condition 184 is amended as follows: "...and monthly monitoring of bores ID 421 and 21817 21817 must recommence in the event that groundwater drawdown is detected in bores <u>ID421, HUN12/8U or HUN12/8L...</u> "	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.424	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends Condition 187 is amended as follows: "(b) <u>measure and record water levels in bore ID421 (or use best endeavours) at quarterly intervals from the date of commencement of this consent.</u> "	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.425	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends Condition 196 is amended as follows: This condition refers to Hays Stream and Symonds Stream - This should be referred to as Waipokapu Stream and Mangapu Stream respectively	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.426	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends Condition 202 is amended to refer to: Recommended measure is to increase dissolved oxygen > 8mg per litre in part b of the condition.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.427	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends Condition 202 is amended as follows: This condition refers to Hays, Symonds and Waihoihoi Streams - This should be referred to as Waipokapu Stream, Mangapu Stream and Waihoihoi Stream respectively.	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.428	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends Conditions 211 - 214 are amended as follows: Conditions refer to Symonds Stream when it should be Mangapu stream for consistency across conditions.	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.429	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends Conditions 214 is amended as follows: "...ii. 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> <u>The Consent Holder must provide WSL with copies of monitoring reports prepared at the same time as they are submitted to Auckland Council.</u>	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.430	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends Conditions 219 is amended as follows: "In the event that groundwater drawdown is such that <u>in either or both</u> monitoring bores HUN12/8U on Hunua Road or ID421 on Jack Paterson Drive equals or exceeds the trigger value in Schedule A then:"	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.431	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends Schedule A is amended as detail at page 39 of 43 of the comments.	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.432	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends an advice notes is included under Schedule A as follows: <u>Advice Note Schedule A Prior to finalising the trigger levels for bores ID421, 1218, 20013, and 21817 in Schedule A, the Consent Holder shall undertake a minimum of two baseline water level measurements in each bore - one during dry season conditions (January - April) and one during wet season conditions (July - October) — to establish current baseline levels. Trigger levels shall then be set based on these measurements, plus an allowance for seasonal variation.</u>	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.433	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends Conditions 221 is amended as follows: The Consent Holder must submit to the Council for approval under section 223 of the RMA, a survey plan of the approved subdivision. The survey plan must <u>be generally in accordance with the Scheme Plan entitled "Proposed Boundary Adjustment between Lot 6 DP 152736 & Lot 2 DP 115598 – Proposed Site Layout" rev 3, prepared by CKL and dated 24/07/26 and</u> show all easements and any amalgamation conditions, and be in accordance with the approved subdivision plan, and include the following:	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.434	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter recommends Conditions 218 is: incorrectly numbered and should be Condition 222; and, This condition can be deleted, subject to the amended Scheme Plan referenced in the recommended amendments to Condition 221 being the final approved version.	None	Yes	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.435	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: A number of adverse impacts have been identified in the Council's reporting which either can be addressed adequately through conditions of consent, or which do not outweigh the project's benefits.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.436	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Council's assessment has identified the following residual adverse impacts that, collectively, may meet the section 85(3) threshold (i.e. where the adverse impacts could be significantly out of proportion	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.437	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes with regard to s85(3): Potential Road Safety Effects – There is a risk that the proposed increase in truck movements to/from the quarry will exacerbate an existing safety issue along Hunua Road	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.438	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes with regard to s85(3): Potential Ecological Effects - There is a key information gap in the application resulting in adverse ecological effects not being fully assessed; and whether the measures proposed by the Applicant are appropriate to mitigate, offset and compensate for these effects.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.439	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes with regard to s85(3): Potential Cultural Values Effects - There is a key information gap in the application resulting in adverse cultural values effects not being fully assessed; and whether the proposed measures proposed by the Applicant are appropriate to mitigate these effects.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.440	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: The insufficiencies identified in the information mean that a conclusive finding in this regard cannot be made at this stage with respect to combined effects, however Council consider the likelihood of these effects collectively being out of proportion with the regional benefits is low.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.441	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter considers: the identified potential adverse impacts, if left unresolved, cannot be found to meet the section 85(3)(b) threshold solely because they are inconsistent with provisions of specified Acts or other documents.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.442	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: The identified information gaps (detailed above) create a level of uncertainty in the assessment; and, Collectively the adverse impacts identified above are very unlikely to meet the section 85(3) threshold,	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.443	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter concludes: Based on our assessment we cannot reach a recommendation on the Application at this stage on the grounds that we have insufficient information to reach a final position.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.444	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Should these information gaps be adequately addressed, however, we do not consider it likely that these will be individually or collectively out of proportion with the significant regional benefits.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.445	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: Our assessment has been made in accordance with the FTAA; and, While that purpose [of the FTAA] directs decision-makers to place greatest weight on enabling such projects, it does not override the requirement to assess whether adverse impacts are sufficiently significant to outweigh those benefits.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.446	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter considers their: position at this stage to be consistent with the purpose of the FTAA, which is to enable significantly beneficial projects, not those where adverse impacts are so significant as to outweigh the benefits; and, we have taken into account that the RMA's purpose is afforded lesser weight than the FTAA's purpose (in section 3, FTAA).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.447	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes their: assessment that the proposal has not yet demonstrated that it can meet the purpose of the RMA	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.448	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: proposal does result in the loss of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats, and there are unresolved questions with respect to the proposed mitigation, offset and compensation package	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.449	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: proposal achieves the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources (section 7(b)).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.450	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: proposal could maintain and enhance amenity values (section 7(c)) within the context of the Special Purpose – Quarry and Mixed Rural zoning	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.451	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: proposal does result in the loss of the quality of the environment (section 7(f)) within the boundaries of the subject site, however the Applicant has demonstrated that this loss is unavoidable.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.452	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter notes: proposal will likely contribute to the management of climate change through improving local accessibility to aggregates and the associated reduction in transport emissions.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
8	0.453	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter concludes: application is considered to have the potential to meet the relevant provisions of Part 2 of the RMA and achieve the purpose of the RMA, being sustainable management of natural and physical resources.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.454	Auckland Council - Strategic & Planning Memo	Commenter concludes regarding the consideration of Part 2 of the RMA that: this has not yet been definitively demonstrated by the Applicant due to insufficiencies in the information provided (and reviewed) to date.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
8	0.455	Auckland Council - Ecology	There is a shortfall of about 1,000 m of stream length and a shortfall of 42 m² in area. The offset length and area are calculated from proxies and are therefore unverified.	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.456	Auckland Council - Ecology	Seeks that all on-going water quality monitoring where possible (ESCP, WQMMP and Flow Augmentation), should be through use of continuous monitoring equipment	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.457	Auckland Council - Ecology	Seeks additional on-going water quality monitoring of ecological values (including DO and temperature) at "areas of potential impact". Monitoring should be in situ and with continuous logging systems, preferably IOT or telemetry functions.	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.458	Auckland Council - Ecology	Regarding Condition 63: seeks the inclusion of the SEV and performance targets as a means to ensure that the final design provides sufficient offset. Commenter considers it very high risk that the diversion will not achieve the ecological, hydrological and biodiversity values (existing and potential) of the impact stream and therefore a loss of value is likely.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.459	Auckland Council - Ecology	Recommended amendment to Condition 65(b): achieves no net loss of value <u>or potential compared to the impacted reach and the maintenance of value is demonstrated using the Stream Ecological Value (SEV) assessment or equivalent. The impact stream has an SEV of 0.91 and 0.83 and the diversion target is thus >0.83.</u>	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.460	Auckland Council - Ecology	Condition 64 should be amended to include success measures/targets. The proposed success measures are lower than that of the impact stream and are not supported. Disagrees that this will result in no net loss.	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.461	Auckland Council - Ecology	Recommended addition to Condition 64(viii) <u>The following are target measures of success. MCI ≥ Band B (NPS:FM attribute tables). Habitat Quality Score band ≥ Good Deposited fine sediments (NOF Table 16) ≥ Band B</u>	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.462	Auckland Council - Ecology	Condition 117 ESCP water quality monitoring - Upstream and downstream monitoring should be automated with threshold alarms that will allow timely responses to exceedance events. Analysis of samples by a lab within 1 week of collection does not permit the reactive response for an exceedance. Seeks addition: <u>Upstream and downstream monitoring is to be by continuous monitoring for the duration of the quarry works</u>	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.463	Auckland Council - Ecology	Condition 202 - The value of 6 mg/l for dissolved oxygen is considered to be low for this watercourse. The impact stream would have a value likely exceeding 9mg/l and the applicants choice of 6 mg/l is that it is survivable for freshwater fish. I consider augmentation water of this low DO value would impact the freshwater values of the stream. Recommended measure is to <u>increase dissolved oxygen > 8mg per litre in part b of the condition.</u>	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.464	Auckland Council - Ecology	Tabl 2 in conditions - This table must be updated (or an additional table developed) to set out the target ecological values to be achieved for each freshwater and terrestrial offset and compensation actions. This is critical as it relates to the loss in value and extent being considered. As outlined in my technical memo, there remains uncertainty that the offset and compensation offered demonstrates no net loss of freshwater values or net gain in terrestrial indigenous biodiversity. Recommended addition: <u>Ecological value targets for each offset and compensations site and measuring methods.</u>	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
8	0.465	Auckland Council - Traffic Engineering	Commenter notes they advised that additional information should be provided to enable an appropriate assessment of the internal haul road geometry. In particular plans to identify the width of the temporary haul roads servicing each extraction stage and demonstrate how bends will be designed and treated to ensure the safe operation of truck and trailer units.	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
9	0.001	Department of Conservation	DOC comment that the mature secondary forest types proposed to be removed are high-value indigenous ecosystems that are not easily replaceable within the proposed duration of the Project.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.002	Department of Conservation	Several native plant species of regional conservation significance are present within the Project site. Vegetation surveys recorded the regionally endangered Black maire (Nestegis cunninghamii), Poataniwha (Melicope simplex), and Forster's sedge (Carex forsteri). The surveys also recorded Kauri (Agathis australis) and King fern (Ptisana salicina), both of which are classified as At Risk – Declining nationally.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.003	Department of Conservation	The Project includes a proposal to infill 1770 m2 of the Mangapū tributary 2 and create a new 693 m2 channel between the upstream and downstream reaches of Slippery Creek. The Mangapū tributary is of very high ecological value, and as such is also rare in the Slippery Creek catchment and the Manukau Ecological District.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.004	Department of Conservation	The eDNA sampling detected longfin eel, shortfin eel, banded kōkopu, kōura, and two species of Zephlebia that are classified as At Risk – 'Naturally Uncommon' in Mangapū tributary. The application misclassified the threat classification of banded kōkopu as 'Not-Threatened' whereas the current classification is 'At-Risk – Naturally Uncommon'. The Auckland region is classified as a banded kōkopu stronghold and is home to more than 20% of the national population.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
9	0.005	Department of Conservation	Generally, there remains uncertainty around the extent to which values associated with mature indigenous forest and forest seepage wetlands can be replaced, and the time required for replacement habitats to develop comparable ecological functions. It cannot be confirmed whether the offsetting and compensation areas will be able to meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (both amended December 2025) offsetting and compensation appendices, for ensuring that time lag is minimised.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.006	Department of Conservation	DOC finds the application of the effects management hierarchy on terrestrial vegetation, riparian margins and wetland function and flora values to be appropriate and the proposed restoration, offset and compensation package is broadly consistent with accepted ecological practice and is likely to provide substantial ecological benefits over time.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
9	0.007	Department of Conservation	While DOC find the offset and compensation package appropriate, the loss of mature indigenous vegetation is still considered ecologically significant. There is inherent uncertainty regarding the extent to which equivalent ecological outcomes can be achieved within ecologically meaningful timeframes.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.008	Department of Conservation	DOC seek offset and compensation planting occur prior to vegetation clearance and consent conditions should reflect this.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.009	Department of Conservation	DOC notes the wetland offset and compensation package is appropriate and likely to provide meaningful ecological benefits.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
9	0.010	Department of Conservation	Nevertheless, the permanent loss of forest seepage wetlands remains a significant aspect of the proposal. DOC seek the inclusion of performance standards for the offsetting and compensation sites to ensure the outcomes stated in the application are implemented and achieved as a requirement of the consent conditions.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.011	Department of Conservation	DOC notes the proposed revegetation, offset and compensation package appears broadly proportionate to the scale of riparian habitat loss and should, over time, provide substantial replacement and enhancement of riparian ecological values.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
9	0.012	Department of Conservation	DOC notes the proposed monitoring and maintenance programme is also reasonably comprehensive, including regular inspections, ecological monitoring, adaptive management, weed control and replacement planting.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
9	0.013	Department of Conservation	However, DOC note some uncertainty remains regarding whether the realigned channel will ultimately achieve the ecological functions of the existing densely forested stream corridor. Greater certainty is sought around whether future riparian width, canopy cover, stream shading and other performance outcomes would provide stronger confidence compared to simply establishing riparian vegetation cover.	landscape and visual / ecology	No	Refer to Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments and Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
9	0.014	Department of Conservation	Overall, DOC considers that moderate to high residual adverse effects on terrestrial vegetation and wetland values are likely to remain in the short to medium term and will need further conditions to ensure that similar ecological values can be potentially realised.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.015	Department of Conservation	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
9	0.016	Department of Conservation	DOC extends its appreciation to the Applicant for the amendments made to the Wildlife Approval application lizard management plan and lizard relocation to ensure that the elegant geckos are managed in accordance with the purpose of Wildlife Act 1953.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
9	0.017	Department of Conservation	Overall, the Department has some concerns about the Project, subject to appropriate conditions. DOC has provided some preliminary comments on conditions where appropriate, but requests that further work on the conditions be undertaken by the Applicant, in collaboration with the Department, particularly in relation to freshwater ecology.	Ecology / Planning	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.018	Department of Conservation	DOC welcomes the provision of draft management plans but seeks the proposed performance/ environment standards, trigger responses and monitoring triggers be included in the conditions. DOC says that as these are already proposed, it is no more onerous to capture these as conditions	Ecology / Planning	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.019	Department of Conservation	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".	Ecology / Planning	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.020	Department of Conservation	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 performance standards. Including standards within the conditions will ensure effects are appropriately managed.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
9	0.021	Department of Conservation	DOC generally support the Ecological Management Plan condition (condition 55-56), however recommend additional performance standards be included to ensure the ecosystem values can be achieved. Paragraph 4.10 lists suggestions for performance standards.	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
9	0.022	Department of Conservation	DOC note that the ecological assessment has already established a useful dataset through the vegetation plots and surveys completed for the project. Setting up plots in the restoration/enhancement areas and comparing them over time with suitable reference areas of mature forest nearby and the previously collected data, would provide a way of assessing whether the restoration areas are meaningfully progressing towards the type of forest and the values that are cleared.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.023	Department of Conservation	DOC recommends that the Applicant provide a condition that includes the requirement for mature forest values to be achieved within the life of the consent, and performance standards that must be achieved. The condition would help enforce the Ecological Management Plan as a long-term programme designed to achieve no net loss of indigenous biodiversity from the Project. The Department is willing to assist the Applicant with drafting such a condition/s.	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.024	Department of Conservation	DOC recommend the following amendment to Condition 56(h) timeframes for the implementation of Site Specific Planting Plans <u>before Construction works occurs in the staged area;</u>	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.025	Department of Conservation	DOC seek condition 63 is amended as the objective is not consistent with the objective in the draft management plan: The objective of the Stream Realignment Management Plan is to detail the process for the design, Construction, and long-term establishment of the Mangapū Tributary realignment in a way that: realign and rehabilitate the Mangapū Stream Tributary in a manner that restores natural stream processes and form, enhances ecological values, and protects and strengthens the natural character of the waterway and its margins, while supporting long-term freshwater health and resilience and a culturally aligned freshwater ecosystem. This will be achieved by: (a) as far as practicable, replicate the channel form and function of the restored reach upstream, and the natural stream downstream; and mimicking natural channel morphology, hydrology and habitat diversity; and (b) incorporates incorporating riparian planting along the full extent of the realigned stream corridor, and revegetation on the quarried benches above using native species to enhance natural character and ecological function consistent with the certified Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan required by Condition 52; (c) Supports a healthy, resilient, and culturally aligned freshwater ecosystem; and (d) Ensures Ensuring compliance with Conditions 106 – 108 and 121 – 124.	Ecology / Planning	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.026	Department of Conservation	DOC notes the Pest Management Plan is proposed to be implemented for 35 years but that the project is anticipated to be ongoing for 80 years. The plantings proposed by the Applicant are to be staged over the course of the 80 years, meaning that there will likely be young plants still requiring protection when the 35 year period ends, and therefore will require additional pest plant and animal control for a longer period. While the ecological values of mature indigenous forest cannot be immediately reproduced or created, pest management should continue past 35 years to ensure measures are in place for the life of the quarry.	Ecology / Planning	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.027	Department of Conservation	DOC acknowledge that approaches to pest control could vary over the course of 80 years. However, instead of limiting the pest control for 35 years, condition 63(k) should be updated to provide the ability to update the plan for changes in best practice for pest management. [Amended conditions provided on Pages 10 - 12 of DOC submission]	Ecology / Planning	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.028	Department of Conservation	The PMP condition 62 should implement the Table 6 and Table 8 from the Boffa Miskell Pest Management Plan submitted in support of the application. The targets within the Applicant's tables 6 and 8, have been stated to achieve the overall objective of the ecological management plan, to achieve no net loss of biodiversity. To assist monitoring of the consent conditions, and to ensure the activities are meeting the no net loss objective, the tables should be included in the consent conditions. [Amended conditions provided on Pages 10 - 12 of DOC submission]	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.029	Department of Conservation	DOC requests an amendment to the PMP conditions for the threshold for Feral Cats to match the response at section 10.1.1 of the PMP , and there should be a specific link to the Auckland Council Regional Pest Management Plan, and its subsequent versions, to ensure that all applicable pest plants are included. [See pages 10 - 12 of the DOC submission]	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.030	Department of Conservation	Pages 10 - 12 set out amended and new conditions recommended by DOC for the Pest Management Plan	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.031	Department of Conservation	DOC recommends a new condition that all indigenous plants included in visual mitigation planting are sourced from the Hunua Ecological District. <u>131A. Native plants proposed in any Visual Mitigation Plan must be sourced from the Hunua Ecological District.</u>	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
9	0.032	Department of Conservation	DOC seek [Condition 137] be simplified by instead referring to the Department of Conservation Bat Roost Protocols. As vegetation clearance will be staged throughout the lifetime of the quarry being approximately 80 years, there is a possibility that bats return to the Hunua ranges. Referring to the Bat Roost Protocols allows the consent holder to implement the best practice method, which may change over the 80 years.	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
9	0.033	Department of Conservation	Recommended amendment to Condition 137: Prior to any vegetation clearance being undertaken must in accordance with the methodology specified in Protocols for minimising the risk of felling bat roosts (Bat Roost Protocols) Version 4: October 2024 approved by the New Zealand Department of Conservation's Bat Recovery Group or any subsequent version. (a) all vegetation must be visually assessed by a Bat Specialist to identify any potential bat-roosting areas; and (b) if trees are identified as potential bat roost features (i.e., cavities, deadwood, loose bark and epiphytes), then acoustic surveys must be undertaken to confirm the presence/absence of bats; and (c) if any bat roosts are identified all vegetation removal within 20 m of that roost tree must cease until it can be confirmed that the roost is no longer occupied. No felling must be undertaken of any tree with an active bat roost.	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.034	Department of Conservation	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.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
9	0.035	Department of Conservation	DOC acknowledges there are only limited concerns about the activities of the Project under the resource consents sought, as the assessment of environmental effects provided is thorough.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
9	0.036	Department of Conservation	The commenter notes an assessment on the removal of tributaries 3 and 4 is not provided as approval is not currently being sought. However, the commentator clarifies this does not indicate a lack of concern at the matter and notes there would be concern if the tributaries were to be quarried.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
9	0.037	Department of Conservation	The commenter considers that that the surveying carried out by the applicant in relation to the Mangapū tributary is adequate but could be improved by the addition of physical survey methods, as recommended by Melchior & Baker (2024). While it is agreed that Mangapu tributary is 'Very High' ecological value, the addition of a further 'At Risk' and regionally significant species should increase the ecological value (but may not be required to in this situation, which highlights a problem with classification 'ceilings'.)	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.038	Department of Conservation	The commenter agrees with the application that the loss of stream extent and value is a 'significantly adverse effect' but also considers the total and permanent loss of 'Very High' value habitat to be – at the point of impact – as adverse as an impact could possibly be.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
9	0.039	Department of Conservation	The commenter assesses the Mangapu tributary proposed to be diverted as being of high ecological value and rare in the Slippery Creek catchment and the Manukau Ecological District. Accordingly, the commentator seeks the application assess the cumulative impact of the loss of headwater extent and value [taking into account rarity] related to ongoing quarrying activities. The commentator presumes the reassessment would result in avoidance requirements which should be acknowledged and taken into account during planning and decision-making.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.040	Department of Conservation	The commenter notes that the EcIA appropriately discusses the potential effects of [pit dewatering] on habitat availability, periphyton, fish, invertebrates, and buffering capacity in relation to water quality, temperature, and turbidity. The report describes the effects of dewatering as a 'significant adverse effect', which I agree with, although I would add that cumulative effects of flow reduction in the catchment could also warrant consideration if quarrying activities have caused this effect previously, and may cause further similar effects in future.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.041	Department of Conservation	The Commenter notes the EcIA characterises the constructed channel as remediation for the effect of infilling the natural channel, whereas DOC's position regarding stream realignment is that the infilling of a stream reach represents a total loss that requires like-for-like offsetting. The application explicitly refers to the infilling as "unavoidable loss" but then proposes to remedy this loss by "moving the stream". This view seems less suitable than viewing the infilling as a loss to be offset - particularly given the uncertainties associated with habitat recreation in the constructed channel and the low suggested indicative performance targets for the new channel. Commenter provides detailed explanation of difference between mitigation and offsetting approaches to managing effects of stream realignment	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.042	Department of Conservation	The commenter notes that while the staged livening has merit, there is no certainty that no net loss of stream value and extent will occur during the transition period. There is a risk that the new channel will not provide equivalent ecological value for quite some time – and possibly never based on the relatively low indicative performance targets suggested in Section 10.6.5 [of the Ecological Assessment]. Additionally, the progressive flow reduction in the impact reach may also temporarily reduce value there. The converging nature of these outcomes is one of the principles that supports the investigation of staged livening as a process, and comprehensive monitoring and reporting of the process could contribute to improving future management of the adverse effects of stream realignments.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
9	0.043	Department of Conservation	The Commenter found the description of the approach to proposed offset and compensation measures to be confusing and was not able to confidently assess what offset and compensation actions were proposed to manage which effects. Examples include confusing cross-referencing within the Ecological Assessment and incorporating measures related to effects of activities that are not part of the activities currently being considered (i.e. the removal of tributaries 3 and 4).	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.044	Department of Conservation	The Commenter presumes the quantification process counts 'woody weed removal and replacement with native vegetation' and 'riparian planting' separately, so as not to risk double counting	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.045	Department of Conservation	The Commenter presumes the comment regarding less quantifiable enhancement activities ¹¹ does not mean that 'benefits for threatened species' or 'enhancements to spawning sites' are being counted separately, because they are outcomes that will occur as a result of the more quantifiable activities (riparian and barrier rehabilitation), so counting them as providing additional benefit could risk double counting.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.046	Department of Conservation	The Commenter presumes all proposed barrier remediation relates to culverts that the applicant does not have an existing statutory responsibility to fix ¹² , or are already likely to be remediated as part of Auckland Council's wider barrier remediation programme (crossover could risk additionality).	Ecology	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.047	Department of Conservation	The Commenter presumes barrier remediation activities will both 1) meaningfully increase the ability of more migratory native fish species (compared to the status quo) to access higher value upstream habitats, and 2) not increase the ability of introduced fishes to access more habitats. More detailed planning may be necessary to ensure that barrier remediation achieves its intended objective and does not cause secondary effects in relation to species' distributions.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.048	Department of Conservation	The Commenter considers it appropriate that the ECR calculations are revisited to include the significance of banded kokopu, and the potential value of the impact site – with the latter based on the possibility that it may contain a higher diversity of native fishes in future as a result of downstream barrier remediation.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.049	Department of Conservation	The Commenter is unsure if cumulative loss of high-quality stream reaches has contributed to the ECR value. Clarification is sought as to whether specific measures are proposed to manage this effect.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.050	Department of Conservation	With regards to the proposed mitigation of maintaining flows at or above MALF in response to dewatering - the Commenter considers that ecological effects associated with flow reduction are not necessarily confined to flows approaching MALF and may occur at higher flows where dewatering results in a substantial departure from the natural flow regime.....if dewatering significantly reduces flows but they remain above MALF, adverse ecological effects could occur before the proposed augmentation trigger is reached. This is particularly relevant given the range of permanent and intermittent habitats within the predicted zone of influence.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
9	0.051	Department of Conservation	The Commenter finds that the dewatering management and monitoring framework should therefore provide for the identification and management of adverse ecological effects arising from dewatering across relevant levels of flow reduction, rather than relying solely on MALF as the threshold for intervention. Effects should be mitigated or otherwise managed as necessary.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
10	0.001		Commenter notes: We are giving these comments so that the effects on our property can be considered by the Panel. They are NOT written approval of the application, NOT a waiver of any concern or future right, and NOT agreement that the effects on our property have been, or will be, adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated. Any future dealings or planting agreement with the applicant should be treated the same way.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
10	0.002		Commenter notes: that aggregate is an important resource and that the applicant has a genuine case for the quarry; and, concern is with the direct, long-term effects of the expansion on our own property, and whether the proposed conditions are strong enough to manage them.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
10	0.003		Commenter notes: We are not asking the Panel to turn the quarry down. We are asking that, if it is approved, the conditions we set out in section 8 be made part of that approval. Where an effect on our property cannot be properly fixed by a condition, we oppose the application on that point.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
10	0.004		Commenter notes they: look toward the quarry to the east and north-east, across the Symonds Stream valley; and, The existing screening between us and the quarry includes mature poplars, which are deciduous, so they give much less screening in winter, which is when the quarry is most visible.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.005		Commenter notes: 68 Judge Richardson Drive among the W1 properties with moderate-high adverse visual effect during operation, easing to moderate only after mitigation and only over a ten-year establishment period. We accept that rating.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.006		Commenter notes: There is no visual simulation taken from [REDACTED] and (Visual Simulation B) was taken from the road junction near 68, 80 and 144 Judge Richardson Drive, at a surveyed ground level of 104.8 metres, looking east across the 108 Judge Richardson Drive paddock. Our house and main outdoor living areas sit well above that road-level point. Because the camera is lower than our house and set away from it, it does not show what we actually see: from our house we look over the tops of the trees in between and see more of the pit and the quarry faces.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.007		Commenter requests: We ask that a site-specific assessment be done from our house and outdoor living areas.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
10	0.008		Commenter considers: applicant's documentation is inconsistent about this viewpoint. It is described in the location plan and baseline panorama as Viewpoint 15 at the entrance to 108 Judge Richardson Drive, but the montage figures are titled 80 Judge Richardson Drive, and the two carry different photography dates. We ask the applicant to confirm exactly where Visual Simulation B was taken and to confirm the viewpoint is representative of affected W1 dwellings.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.009		Commenter notes: mitigation shown is not planting on our land. Each mitigated montage is captioned as planting on the Judge Richardson Drive offset site (land the camera looks across), plus rehabilitation planting on the quarry benches. The simulations do not depend on, or depict, any screening on [REDACTED]	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.010		Commenter considers: effect is real and long-lasting. Even the applicant's best-case Stage 7 image shows a broad, pale quarry face dominating the skyline. The biggest change happens at Stages 7 and 8, which the applicant puts at around year 35 and later. Noticeable replanting is not expected until those stages, and planting on the quarry benches does not even begin for at least 35 years, then takes decades to grow; and, So for a very long time our actual view will be closer to the unmitigated images.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.011		Commenter considers: Key panels are missing, and seasonality is not addressed. There is a Stage 7 image with mitigation but none without, so the effect of mitigation at the governing stage cannot be tested. The base photographs are summer views, so they understate the winter outlook when the deciduous screening thins. We ask that the applicant provide an unmitigated Stage 7 simulation, a simulation representative of the view from 68, and leaf-off (winter) simulations	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.012		Commenter notes they: welcome the offer of off-site mitigation planting in principle, and we would work constructively with it. But as it stands, the offer is not enough to deal with the effects of a quarry this large, running for this long.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.013		Commenter considers: The maintenance obligation is far too short. The current methodology only requires the consent holder to replace dead plants for the first three months, after which maintenance falls to the landowner. Three months is not a credible establishment period for planting intended to screen a quarry operating for decades.	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.014		Comenter considers: offer should be enforceable, not optional. Off-site planting for [REDACTED] should be a binding consent obligation, not a promise the consent holder may or may not honour, and it should be able to be implemented before, not after, the stage that materially increases visibility.	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.015		Commenter requests: Design should be led by effect, not by a fixed 5 metre width. Screening depends on height and density, and on a screen placed to intercept the actual sightlines from our dwelling. Where the assessed effects justify it, the funded planting should be able to be wider or denser than the 5 metre default, and should be evergreen	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.016		Commenter requests they: should approve the design. The species, location, height, density and design should be approved by us and should not unreasonably remove valued non-quarry views.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.017		Commenter notes: The air quality assessment identifies 68 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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
10	0.018		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.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
10	0.019		Commenter notes the project involves: blasting, crushing and haulage over the life of the operation. We ask that the conditions address blast frequency, airblast and ground vibration limits, advance notification to our property, the location of monitoring, permitted hours, and a pre-commencement property condition survey so that any later damage can be assessed against a baseline.	Noise and vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
10	0.020		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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
10	0.021		Commenter requests that conditions require: That off-site mitigation planting for 68 be an enforceable consent obligation, able to be implemented before the stage that materially increases visibility, rather than an optional offer.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.022		Commenter requests that conditions require: That a site-specific visual assessment be undertaken from the dwelling, principal outdoor living areas and key viewshafts at 68 (not from a road-level viewpoint) to inform the planting design.	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.023		Commenter requests that conditions require: owners approve the species, location, height, density and design; that planting be evergreen where year-round screening is required; and that it not unreasonably remove valued non-quarry views or interfere with normal use of the property.	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
10	0.024		Commenter requests that conditions: the consent holder fund all design, ground preparation, stock protection and fencing, watering, weed and pest control, and replacement, for at least five years or until defined performance standards are met, mirroring the standard the conditions set for the quarry's own planting.	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.025		Commenter requests that conditions require: That performance standards include at least 90 percent healthy establishment, height and density sufficient to achieve year-round screening of agreed viewshafts, and independent landscape-architect certification.	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.026		Commenter requests that conditions require: That the funded planting be able to be wider or denser than the 5 metre default where the assessed effects justify it.	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.027		Commenter requests that conditions require: That, if planting cannot provide effective mitigation without unacceptable effects on the property, an alternative mitigation process be available.	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.028		Commenter requests that conditions require: That acceptance of planting not constitute written approval of the application, settlement of effects, or waiver of any right, including the right to make complaints.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
10	0.029		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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
10	0.030		Commenter requests that conditions require: That blasting conditions set blast frequency and airblast and vibration limits, require advance notification to ■■■, specify monitoring at or near the property, limit operating hours, and require a precommencement property condition survey.	Noise and vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
10	0.031		Commenter requests that conditions require: That rehabilitation be completed as benches become available, with stage-specific time limits and annual public reporting, rather than open-ended deferral.	Landscape and visual	Yes	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.032		Commenter requests that conditions: applicant's existing community meetings (at least six-monthly) and its open sharing of dust and vibration monitoring results, including any exceedances, be secured as conditions and continued for the life of the expanded operation, together with a complaints process with named contacts, logging, response times and reporting to Auckland Council.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
10	0.033		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.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
10	0.034		Commenter requests that conditions: That the applicant provide an unmitigated Stage 7 simulation, a simulation representative of the view from 68, and winter (leaf-off) simulations, and confirm the exact location of Visual Simulation B.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
10	0.035		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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
10	0.036		Commenter requests: the opportunity to comment on the draft conditions of consent in due course, and we confirm we wish to be sent those draft conditions.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
11	0.001		Commenter notes they: do not consider the proposed mitigation measures sufficient to adequately protect neighbouring residents, particularly if quarry operations are expanded for Operational noise. Refer to page 1 of 11 of the comments for a list of noise effects identified by the commenter.	Noise and vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
11	0.002		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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
11	0.003		Commenter notes they: has a direct view into the quarry pit, making visual effects a particularly significant concern; and Expanded quarry faces, stockpiles, machinery, lighting, earthworks, and associated infrastructure will further alter the visual character and amenity of the surrounding area; and, While mitigation planting may be proposed, vegetation can take many years to mature and may never fully screen large quarry faces, exposed rock, machinery, stockpiles, and other quarry infrastructure.	Landscape and visual	No	Refer to Appendix 5 Landscape and visual response to comments.
11	0.004		Commenter notes: One of my most serious concerns relates to blasting and its effects on neighbouring properties. Commenter list the blasting effects and describes damage	Noise and vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
11	0.005		Commenter notes they: submitted a remediation proposal to Winstone regarding this damage. However, Winstone did not accept responsibility, advising that its blasting was within monitored limits	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
11	0.006		Commenter requests requirements associated property damage assessment and mechanisms to investigate and remediate / compensate. Refer page 3 of 11 in the comments for details.	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
11	0.007		Commenter notes concern: that expansion and deepening of quarrying activities could alter groundwater systems and underground water tables. Refer page 4 of 11 in the comments impacts and concerns identified.	Groundwater	No	Refer to Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
11	0.008		Commenter notes: if granted, groundwater monitoring should be independently undertaken before, during, and after quarrying activities, with clearly defined baseline conditions and enforceable trigger levels.	Groundwater	No	Refer to Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
11	0.009		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	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
11	0.010		Commenter notes: Further expansion of quarrying activities risks substantially diminishing [rural amenity and quality of life] values.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
11	0.011		Commenter notes they are: concerned that the Fast-track Approvals process provides more limited opportunities for public participation	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
11	0.012		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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
11	0.013		Commenter requests: that the Expert Panel decline the Hunua Quarry Development application.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
11	0.014		Commenter requests that conditions require: stricter controls on blasting frequency, timing, and vibration;	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
11	0.015		Commenter requests that conditions require: independent pre-operation and ongoing structural/condition surveys of potentially affected neighbouring properties;	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
11	0.016		Commenter requests that conditions require: independent monitoring of blasting and vibration	Noise and vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
11	0.017		Commenter requests that conditions require: transparent provision of relevant blast-monitoring information to affected residents	Noise and vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
11	0.018		Commenter requests that conditions require: comprehensive dust monitoring, including monitoring at appropriate neighbouring properties, with enforceable limits and trigger levels	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
11	0.019		Commenter requests that conditions require: stricter operational noise controls, including appropriate restrictions on early-morning operations	Noise and vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
11	0.020		Commenter requests that conditions require: ongoing independent noise monitoring, noting that I have heard quarry-related noise from approximately 5:30 a.m	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
11	0.021		Commenter requests that conditions require: independent groundwater and surface-water monitoring, including baseline monitoring before expanded operations commence	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
11	0.022		Commenter requests that conditions require: clear groundwater trigger levels requiring investigation and corrective action	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
11	0.023		Commenter requests that conditions require: regular independent environmental audits	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
11	0.024		Commenter requests that conditions require: a robust, transparent, and independently reviewable complaints process	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
11	0.025		Commenter requests that conditions require: meaningful and enforceable mechanisms for addressing non-compliance and adverse effects;	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
11	0.026		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	Winstone (operational / corporate)	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
11	0.027		periodic review of conditions and monitoring requirements where actual adverse effects exceed those predicted in the application.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
11	0.028		Commenter requests the Panel to consider my experience with suspected blasting-related damage to my property; and that this demonstrates why reliance on monitored compliance alone is insufficient and why an independent property-damage assessment and resolution process is necessary.	Noise and vibration	No	Refer to Appendix 6 Noise and vibration response to comments.
12	0.001		Commenter notes: meeting with Winstone planners in March 2026; and, we are on the Quarries contact list for blasting notification and neighbour consultation, regularly attending meetings at the quarry	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
12	0.002		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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
12	0.003		Commenter notes: development of the Symonds Hill pit, has seen substantial change in the landscape with the Hill being quarried to what is now a deep pit. The quarrying/excavation has had a significant impact on the residual flow in the Mangapū c	Groundwater	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
12	0.004		Commenter notes: as operators of a farming operation requiring a “take” for stock watering, this has been obvious and noticeable, especially during periods of low flow during summer and other dry spells – not necessarily defined 1 Dec to 31 March.	Groundwater	No	Refer to Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
12	0.005		Commenter notes: high flows also result in flooding Kauri View Road, Jack Paterson Road, Sutton Road and are a matter of record with Council. To us the stream response time in high flows has increased significantly. These issues have been raised at quarry consultation meetings; and, the purposed diversion of the Mangapū Stream and the steepening of the stream gradient will further exacerbate high flows response.	Groundwater	No	Refer to Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
12	0.006		Commenter notes: that the consent requires that the stream be monitored twice only during periods 1 Dec to 31 March at nominated locations and that if flows drop 5% below MALF then the pumped compensation system at Coalmine Road be brought into service.	Groundwater	No	Refer to Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
12	0.007		Commenter requests: A properly designed and engineered stream monitoring and compensation control flow system should be a minimum requirement of any consent, including a compressive steam hydrology characterisation and environment assessment, albiet retrospective, correcting a flaw in the current consent.	Groundwater	No	Refer to Appendix 4 Groundwater response to comments.
12	0.008		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 specifed at page 2 - 3 of 5 of the comment.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
12	0.009		Commenter requests: any offset planting and associated pest control should be undertaken within the region proximate and adjacent to the quarry with the objective of offsetting the degradation of the Ponga Road ONL resulting from the loss of the once prominent Symonds Hill landscape feature and other historic land use activities including Papakura Council refuse dump.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
12	0.010		Commenter notes: Our property a [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.	Winstone	No	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
12	0.011		Commenter notes: significant population of feral cats and rats impacting on native bird species. Whilst not Winstone responsibility, it is Auckland Council reasonability to mitigate the long-term effects of the refuse dump operation. A joint effort of pest management in the wider interest of future protection and enhancement by Council and Winstone should be considered.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
12	0.012		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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
12	0.013		Commenter notes: application projects an 111% increase in traffic volumes on the Hunua, Settlement and Beach Roads, but concludes that these roads have been constaructed and maintained adequately to carry this capacity. Missing from these assessments is the impact on the alternative “rat-run” routes used by query trucks, Boundary, Opaheke, Sutton and Great South roads. These roads are all at capacity at peak times with significant congestion and associated safety issues.	Transport	No	Refer Appendix 8 Transport response to comments.
12	0.014		Commenter notes: they feel that this Fast Track process does no allow or enable adequate consultation or opportunity for communication and does not collective encourage community inputs, rather a divide and conquer approach.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
12	0.015		Commenter notes: creeping nature of this quarry development since 2009 that has diminished the rural nature and our surrounding environs with the loss of significant indigenous forest cover that characterised the Ponga Road ONL. The clear and obvious impact on the Mangapū stream flows and health during the frequent extended periods of low flow have directly impacted on us.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
12	0.016		Commenter notes: We are prepared to make personal submission to the panel in support of this submission.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
13	0.001	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Commenter notes: HNZPT has provided comment in relation to the archaeological authority in its s51 Report dated 28 July 2026.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
13	0.002	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Commenter notes: HNZPT has recommended that the archaeological authority be granted subject to recommended conditions; and that Ellen Cameron is approved as the person to undertake the archaeological work under this authority.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
13	0.003	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Commenter notes: HNZPT and the applicant worked together to achieve an agreed set of conditions, which are included in Appendix A of the s51 Report.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
13	0.004	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Commenter notes: While compiling our s51 report, HNZPT noted an inconsistency in the proposed buffers within the archaeological management plan (AMP) included in the application (Appendix B12.8.2 Hunua Quarry Development Archaeological Management Plan).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
13	0.005	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Commenter notes: The applicant was advised of the inconsistency and have sent through an amended management plan dated August 2026, appended to these comments (Appendix One).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
13	0.006	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	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). The Authority Holder may update the AMP by submitting the amended AMP in writing to HNZPT for its written approval.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
14	0.001	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated	Commenter notes: Waikato-Tainui has outstanding and unresolved Treaty of Waitangi claims, including those specific to the Manukau Harbour; and, While settlement redress is not yet finalised, these claims underpin Waikato-Tainui's recognised interests and authority over West Coast coastal waters, harbours, waterways, and their connected catchments. These matters are relevant to the consideration of the project and management of its potential effects	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
14	0.002	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated	Commenter notes: Waikato-Tainui acknowledges the applicant's assessment of these cultural values and the various measures proposed to respond to the matters raised by mana whenua, including the proposed management plans, cultural management measures, ongoing engagement, monitoring and establishment of a Kaitiaki Forum.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
14	0.003	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated	Commenter notes: Waikato-Tainui acknowledges the cultural values, concerns and recommendations raised by the mana whenua groups engaged in relation to the Project. Should the fasttrack application be consented, we request that the applicant continue to engage meaningfully and directly with the relevant mana whenua throughout the life of the Project	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
14	0.004	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
14	0.005	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated	Commenter notes: Conditions should be consistent with, and where applicable give effect to, the relevant objectives, policies and methods of Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao, including in relation to the protection of waterways and ecological systems, management of land and natural resources, and the rehabilitation and restoration of affected areas.	Cultural	No	Refer to Appendix 9 Iwi Engagement, Cultural Values and Matters response to comments.
14	0.006	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated	Commenter requests: Waikato-Tainui wishes to remain involved as the substantive application progresses, including in relation to matters relevant to our interests, the development and refinement of proposed conditions and management measures.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
14	0.007	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated	Commenter considers it important that its interests, authority and aspirations in relation to the Manukau Harbour and its connected catchments are recognised in the consideration of the Project and reflected in any conditions of consent where appropriate	Cultural	No	Refer to Appendix 9 Iwi Engagement, Cultural Values and Matters response to comments.
15	0.001	Auckland Conservation Board	The commenter commends the applicant's commitment to implement substantive ecological restoration and improvement initiatives that to go beyond offsetting adverse impacts, to restoring and enhancing the natural environment.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
15	0.002	Auckland Conservation Board	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
15	0.003	Auckland Conservation Board	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
15	0.004	Auckland Conservation Board	The commenter identifies that it will be critical that the effectiveness of relocation any salvaged lizards is monitored.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
15	0.005	Auckland Conservation Board	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
15	0.006	Auckland Conservation Board	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
15	0.007	Auckland Conservation Board	The commenter recommends conditions to ensure the applicant is required implement additional agreed ecological enhancement where predicted net impacts are less positive than expected.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
15	0.008	Auckland Conservation Board	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
15	0.009	Auckland Conservation Board	Commenter requests, a best practice adaptive management approach is adopted, monitor the effectiveness of the proposed offsets and inform revised improved actions if required.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
15	0.010	Auckland Conservation Board	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
15	0.011	Auckland Conservation Board	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,	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
15	0.012	Auckland Conservation Board	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
s.51	0.001	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Commenter notes: "The granting of an archaeological authority for this application would be consistent with the matters set out in section 59(1)(a) of the HNZPTA."	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.001	Department of Conservation	Commenter notes that "DOC preference is that a project herpetologist and entomologist be named in conditions, which has not been provided within the LMP."	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
s.51	0.002	Department of Conservation	Commenter concludes that, subject to recommended conditions, the proposed activities are broadly consistent with the purposed of the Wildlife Act 1953. The LMP appears to include appropriate methodologies for salvage and relocation, proposes habitat enhancement measures, appropriate for elegant gecko (Naultinus elegans).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.002	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Commenter notes: "HNZPT considers that the conditions, with the suggested amendments, for the Authority will work with any fast-track approval for the land use activity to effectively manage the identification and recovery of archaeological information within the application site."	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
s.51	0.003	Department of Conservation	Commenter notes that "DOC's Technical Advisor raised concerns about the suitability of the release site in the Hunua Ranges Regional Park proposed in earlier iterations of the LMP (for elegant geckos in particular), but also other species. DOC note the applicant has amended the application to include Tiritiri Matangi as the release site.	none	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.003	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Commenter notes: "The Applicant provided a set of draft conditions with its application. Following this, HNZPT and the Applicant have worked together to achieve an agreed set of conditions. HNZPT considers this set of conditions will ensure that the archaeological works" with reasons set out at paragraphs 30 - 34.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.004	Department of Conservation	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."	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
s.51	0.004	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Commenter notes: "HNZPT considers that Ellen Cameron has the appropriate qualifications and sufficient skill and competency to undertake the work required if the authorities are granted and has access to appropriate institutional and professional support."	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.005	Department of Conservation	Commenter notes "None of the native herpetofauna recorded within 20 km of the Project Site (Table 1 of the LMP, page 8) are classified as 'Threatened' in the New Zealand Threat Classification System."	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.005	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Commenter has attached "Appendix A: Agreed authority conditions" refer to comments pages 5 - 7 of 9	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
s.51	0.006	Department of Conservation	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."	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
s.51	0.007	Department of Conservation	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."	Winstone (operational / corporate)	Yes	Refer to Appendix 2 Planning response to comments and Appendix 10 Winstone Operational / Corporate response to comments.
s.51	0.008	Department of Conservation	Commenter notes: "DOC accepts a term of 10 years to be appropriate."	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.009	Department of Conservation	Commenter notes: "DOC takes the view that, in general, the proposed management actions are aligned with the Wildlife Act's purpose of wildlife protection. Subject to recommended conditions being imposed and complied with, there may be a net benefit for the populations, even if there are some incidental deaths."	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.010	Department of Conservation	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."	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
s.51	0.011	Department of Conservation	Commenter notes: "This recommendation includes consideration of section 83 of the Act - DOC considers that each condition would not be more onerous than necessary to address the reason for which it is set."	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.012	Department of Conservation	Commenter notes: "The applicant has proposed conditions relating to lizard management in their wildlife approval conditions (Appendix B12.7 Conditions) and DOC is satisfied with the condition set provided."	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.013	Department of Conservation	Commenter notes: "DOC has proposed Schedule 1 list and additional conditions in Schedule 2 to facilitate ongoing management of the approval. If this condition is accepted along with the recommendations identified in this report, DOC would be satisfied that the approval would be in line with the purpose of the Wildlife Act and provide for the protection of absolutely protected wildlife."	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.014	Department of Conservation	Commenter recommends an amendment to a condition related to methodology: "2. Methodology, In accordance with 'Hunua Quarry Development Lizard Management Plan (Boffa Miskell)' <u>dated 17 July 2026</u> ."	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
s.51	0.015	Department of Conservation	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.	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
s.51	0.016	Department of Conservation	Commenter recommends an amendment to a condition related to the personnel authorised to undertake the Authorised Activity: "a) <u>to be confirmed</u> "	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
s.51	0.017	Department of Conservation	Commenter recommends an amendment to a condition related to the personnel authorised to undertake the Authorised Activity: "(insert date of Approval)"	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
s.51	0.018	Department of Conservation	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
s.51	0.019	Department of Conservation	DOC considers that the proposed activities are consistent with best practise and the New Zealand Fish Passage Guidelines (NZFPGs) for the most part.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.020	Department of Conservation	Regarding Tributaries 3 and 4: if robust and species-specific survey methods detect shortjaw kōkopu in these tributaries, DOC considers the preservation of populations and their habitats to be of high importance and would warrant changes relating to presently proposed culverts and future consideration of removing these tributaries.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
s.51	0.021	Department of Conservation	Regarding Tributaries 3 and 4: If surveying does not detect shortjaw kōkopu, the tributaries are still valuable habitat in a context where such is rare.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
s.51	0.022	Department of Conservation	DOC considers the proposed staged livening process in line with best practice because – despite causing prolonged instream disturbance – the research opportunity this method presents has the potential to generate valuable information for future improvement of relevant practices such as fish salvage, stream channel design, and mitigation of instream works effects on resident stream fauna.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.023	Department of Conservation	Aquatic fauna salvage and relocation will be undertaken in accordance with best practice. 'Review document 7' provides details and notes that additional site-specific planning will be prepared closer to the time. DOC considers it important that plans include a certification requirement and that they direct any salvage that may be carried out in Tributaries 3 and 4 to only work in the immediate vicinity of culvert installation sites, because aquatic fauna does not need to be salvaged from other parts of these tributaries in association with the activities presently under consideration.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
s.51	0.024	Department of Conservation	DOC considers that risks to freshwater values and habitat in relation to fish passage (including migration associated with spawning) is adequately managed in relation to Tributary 1 (diversion, new channel creation, prolonged instream works), although it is noted that risk assessments may need to be updated with the latest threat classifications (see memo section 5).	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
s.51	0.025	Department of Conservation	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.	Planning	No	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
s.51	0.026	Department of Conservation	Based on site topography and description of activities, Dr McEwan (DOC's technical expert) agrees with the applicant's assessment that there is no associated risk of spreading introduced species that are present in the lower reaches of Slippery Creek.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.027	Department of Conservation	DOC assesses that the provided documents do not address regional threat classifications and the applicant has applied superseded national threat classifications for fish.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
s.51	0.028	Department of Conservation	The characterisation of fauna values in Tributaries 3 and 4 are less clear, and DOC is uncertain if the fish noted as present in Tributary 3 (and thus Tributary 4 by assumption) is based on eDNA or on extrapolation from nearby data. 'Figure 30 of review document 3' seems to indicate that eDNA site 1 is downstream of Tributary's 3 confluence (so presumably in part reflects eDNA originating from Tributary 3). 'Table 12 of review document 3' notes that eDNA sampling at eDNA site 1 detected mostly the same species as at eDNA sites 2 and 3 (i.e. multiple native species – 4 of which are nationally or regionally 'At Risk').	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
s.51	0.029	Department of Conservation	If the case is that no information regarding fauna values was specifically collected from Tributaries 3 and 4, then DOC would agree with the applicant's reasonable conclusion that these tributaries are likely to contain the same species as Tributaries 1.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.030	Department of Conservation	Fish surveying commissioned by Auckland Council in 2015 ⁸ recorded shortjaw kōkopu in the Waihoi Stream (also in the Slippery Creek catchment) in forested habitat potentially quite similar to that in the Mangapū Tributaries (Fig. 3). Shortjaw kōkopu are classified as 'Threatened – Nationally Vulnerable', and in the Auckland region are classified as 'Threatened – Regionally Critical' ⁹ . This is the highest threat classification possible, and the regional notes that barriers to fish passage are considered a key pressure for this species.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
s.51	0.031	Department of Conservation	Regardless of data source, DOC considers that the species likely to be affected by the activities in terms of fish passage are longfin eel, shortfin eel, banded kōkopu, and potentially shortjaw kōkopu.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
s.51	0.032	Department of Conservation	The applicant has provided sufficient information to understand that there is significant advantage to maintaining fish passage in relation to the staged diversion and quarrying of Tributaries 1 and the creation of the new channel.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.033	Department of Conservation	Regarding Tributaries 3 and 4, DOC is unable to assess the potential effects of providing fish passage due to the lack of detail regarding the current values of the habitat. In E5.1 of Part E the applicant notes in relation to Tributaries 3 and 4 there is a lack of suitable upstera habitat. However, other parts of the reporting describe features that suggest that maintaining fish passage into these tributaries would be an advantage. The descriptions of the tributaries in the AEE indicate valuable headwater habitats in a highly modified catchment, (DOC is unable to be certain regarding extent) likely contain nationally and regionally 'At Risk' species and may – pending further survey work – also contain a species that is Nationally Vulnerable and Regionally Critical (shortjaw kōkopu).	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.

EPA Commentor code	Individual comment sub-code	Commenting Party	Summary / excerpt of comments (read complete comments for details)	Technical experts / Winstone required to provide a memo (choose from: None, Air Quality, Archaeology, Contaminated land, Cultural, Ecology, Economics, Erosion and Sediment, Geotechnical, Groundwater, Landscape and visual, Legal, Noise and Vibration, Planning, Stream diversion design, Transport, Winstone (resource matters), Winstone (operational / corporate))	Change to conditions (yes / no)	Appendix to the Response to Comments - Section 55 Report containing the specific response to comment (where required)
s.51	0.034	Department of Conservation	DOC considers that a survey for shortjaw kokopu must be concluded prior to initiating any works, rather than at salvage as proposed by the Applicant. This is because the outcome of the survey is required before robust decisions can be made regarding the proposal to block fish passage on Tributaries 3 and 4.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
s.51	0.035	Department of Conservation	Recommend a range of amendments to Part J conditions	Ecology	Yes	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
s.51	0.036	Department of Conservation	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 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).	Planning	Yes	Refer Appendix 2 Planning response to comments.
s.51	0.037	Department of Conservation	The constructed channel has been designed to provide fish passage for climbing species via the inclusion of appropriate habitat features that match unimpacted reaches, and the applicant provides details and drawings that are in line with best practise and the NZFPGs. Monitoring conditions should require adherence to the provided information and should facilitate effective data collection that can robustly inform whether fish passage remains unaffected compared to baseline information (particularly given that the constructed channel is proposed to have a steeper gradient than the existing reach).	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.038	Department of Conservation	Wetland values: regarding previous correspondence with the applicant, DOC's query was in relation to aquatic fauna and additional surveys for fish and aquatic invertebrates only. The applicant has resolved concerns relating to fish and aquatic invertebrates values only - a wetland ecologist will be providing comment on behalf of DOC on wetland values other than native fish and aquatic invertebrates.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.
s.51	0.039	Department of Conservation	Shortjaw kokopu: DOC clarify surveys at tributaries 3 and 4 are considered inadequate given the shortjaw kokopu context. DOC do not support undertaking a survey for shortjaw at the time of salvage. The survey is required prior to decisions regarding the blockage of fish passage.	Ecology	No	Refer Appendix 3 Ecology response to comments.
s.51	0.040	Department of Conservation	Notes previous correspondence between DOC and applicant regarding pit dewatering and proposed mitigation to augment to MALF if necessary. Notes DOC's intention to address this issue further through s53 comments.	None	No	No formal response is considered necessary.