

Memorandum

To: BOGP Expert Panel

From: Mark Chrisp and Nicolai Berry, Mitchell Daysh Ltd, on behalf of Matakanui Gold Ltd

Date: 28 August 2026

Re: BOGP Conditions

1. INTRODUCTION

As proposed at the concurrent hearing in relation to planning matters on 18 June 2026 in Wellington, Matakanui Gold Ltd (**MGL**) has undertaken technical planning workshopping in relation to the conditions of consent / authorisations with expert planners for Otago Regional Council (**ORC**), Central Otago District Council (**CODC**), Department of Conservation (**DOC**), and Kā Rūnaka.

Participation at the workshops was by planning experts who participated in expert conferencing. MGL also invited all parties without planning experts to provide written feedback on the conditions in advance of the workshops. Feedback received was then circulated to the planning experts participating in the workshopping for consideration.

Four face-to-face workshop sessions, covering 12 days, occurred in July and August as follows:

- > Workshop One - Monday 27 to Friday 31 July 2026 in Cromwell (attended by MGL, ORC, CODC, DOC and Kā Rūnaka);
- > Workshop Two - Wednesday 5 to Friday 7 August 2026 in Dunedin (attended by MGL, ORC and Kā Rūnaka);
- > Workshop Three – Wednesday 19 and Thursday 20 August 2026 in Dunedin (attended by MGL, ORC and Kā Rūnaka); and
- > Workshop Four – Wednesday 26 and Thursday 27 August 2026 in Cromwell (attended by MGL, ORC, CODC, DOC and Kā Rūnaka).

The timing of the workshops was arranged to accommodate the availability of the various parties and the timing of MGL's response to the Expert Panel's Request for Further Information #11 (**RFI 11**). Workshops Three and Four occurred after the circulation of MGL's response to RFI 11 on 17 August 2026 and primarily focused on those aspects of the conditions covered by RFI 11.

Despite the tight timeframes and the amount of information presented in response to RFI 11, the workshops were productive and we were able to address most of the relevant aspects of the conditions (discussed in more detail below).

The two workshops in Cromwell were variously facilitated by senior lawyers Sarah Scott and Hamish Harwood from Simpson Grierson. The parties attending the workshops in Dunedin agreed that no facilitator was necessary for those workshops.

In addition to the above:

- > A full day MS Teams meeting was held with DOC specifically in relation to the conditions of the Wildlife Authority and the DOC Concessions on Friday 14 August 2026;
- > Correspondence was entered into with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (**HNZPT**), and subsequent discussions held, in relation to the conditions of the Archaeological Authority;
- > Written comments on conditions provided by the Trevathan Family, Canyon Vineyard and Ross Hannon were taken into account as part of the workshops; and
- > Some feedback on the various management plans was also obtained during the workshops which will be addressed prior to the management plans being submitted to the relevant regulatory agencies for certification following the grant of consents (discussed in more detail in Section 4 of this memo).

The starting point for the workshopping was a clean version of the 22 June 2026 version of the conditions that were provided to the Expert Panel and the parties. Over the course of the workshops, Mitchell Daysh Ltd (**MDL**) on behalf of MGL, pre-circulated proposed amendments to the conditions to the participants to 'front-foot' matters and reduce the amount of time required to draft new or amended conditions by committee within the workshops. Specifically, updated versions of the conditions were circulated (with new changes highlighted) on 15 August 2026 and 22 August 2026 (the latter including proposed amendments to conditions in relation to RFI 11 matters).

2. OUTCOMES OF THE WORKSHOPS AND OTHER ACTIONS

2.1 RESOURCE CONSENT CONDITIONS

As a result of the workshops and other actions described above, attached to this memo is a post-workshop tracked change version of the resource consent conditions (D.01, D.02, D.03 and D.04) dated 28 August 2026 (**Attachment 1**).

Changes to conditions that were agreed at the workshops (by all parties in attendance) are shown as tracked changes on the clean version of the 22 June 2026 conditions. As discussed in

Section 6 of this memo, it is understood that the parties may wish to undertake a further review of those matters and provide any additional suggested amendments on 7 September 2026.

As can be seen from the track changes version of the conditions (**Attachment 1**), there has been a significant number of agreed changes to the conditions throughout the four documents. Collectively, we have tried to adopt a consistent structure to the conditions, particularly in relation to the conditions relating to the management plans.

Where the parties disagreed on any condition wording, this has been recorded in comment boxes including the alternative wording of conditions sought by each party for the benefit of the Expert Panel.

In addition, for the benefit of the Expert Panel, some of the comment boxes provide explanatory notes as to why changes have been made to conditions (e.g. as a result of additional information presented in RFI 11).

As can also be seen from the attached track changes version of the conditions (**Attachment 1**), the areas of disagreement have been refined with only a relatively small number of outstanding matters remaining, which are discussed in Section 3 of this memo (in the order in which they arise in the documents).

In addition to the above, there are a number of conditions that the parties variously advised they did not have time to fully review and/or obtain technical advice. These conditions have been highlighted with light grey shading. It is anticipated that the parties will provide further feedback on those conditions on 7 September 2026.

Also attached is a clean version the conditions having accepted all the tracked changes in the post-workshop tracked change version of the conditions dated 28 August 2026 (**Attachment 2**). The comment boxes setting out points of disagreement and the light grey shading of conditions requiring further review by the parties have been retained in the clean version.

2.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AUTHORITY

As a result of discussions and correspondence, HNZPT has provided comments and recommended conditions and asked that these two documents be conveyed to the Expert Panel. In line with that request, the two documents are presented in **Attachment 3**. HNZPT retains its position that the Archaeological Authority should be declined.

Having considered the comments and conditions provided by HNZPT, Dr Naomi Woods has updated the conditions of the Archaeological Authority and the Archaeological and Heritage Management Plan which are also presented in **Attachment 3**.

2.3 DOC CONCESSIONS

Following the MS Teams meeting with DOC on 14 August 2026, DOC took on the drafting responsibilities in relation to the conditions for the DOC Concessions. DOC subsequently provided MGL with a clean version of the DOC Concessions (including conditions) with various matters of detail to be completed by MGL, which has now been included in the documentation (presented as track changes).

The latest versions of the DOC Concessions, including MGL's additions in track changes (and some explanatory comment boxes), are presented as **Attachment 4**.

2.4 WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

MGL's response to RFI 11 has implications for the Wildlife Authority on the basis that the proposed effects management regime for lizards was changed. Specifically, the Ardour Sanctuary (38 Ha) has been replaced with the larger Battery Hill Sanctuary (52 Ha) and lizard salvage efforts have been refocused on Kowarau gecko and southern grass skink.

The MS Teams meeting held with DOC on 14 August 2026 (in relation to DOC Concessions and the Wildlife Authority) occurred prior to MGL's response to RFI 11 on 17 August 2026. The conditions of the Wildlife Authority have since been updated to reflect the changes to the lizard effects management regime proposed in MGL's response to RFI 11 (presented in **Attachment 5**). Various comment boxes in the conditions have been retained as *aide memoirs* for DOC in relation to matters that were discussed at the meeting on 14 August 2026, but which have yet to be resolved or drafting completed. It is anticipated that any further feedback from DOC in relation to the Wildlife Permit will be provided on 7 September 2026.

3. ASPECTS OF CONDITIONS IN DISPUTE

The following sets out and discusses the aspect of the conditions which remain in dispute (i.e. the matters that have been noted in comment boxes as points of disagreement) and sets out MGL's position in relation to those matters. It is anticipated that the other parties will provide feedback on these matters on 7 September 2026.

3.1 D.01 CODC LANDUSE CONSENT

3.1.1 Term of Landuse Consent (D.01 Condition 4)

CODC considers that all BOGP mining activities up until the active-closure phase should have a 16-year term of consent (comprised of the approximately 2-year site establishment / construction period and the approximately 14-year gold production period as indicated in the application), with only the post-closure activities having an unlimited term of consent. This is on

the basis that the substantive application does not anticipate an open-ended period in terms of the effects of the activity and the corresponding assessments in the application.

As is normal planning practice in relation to Landuse Consents, MGL seeks an unlimited term of consent in relation to the Landuse Consent within CODC's jurisdiction. As noted above, while 14 years is anticipated to be the life of the mine, this 14-year period is an indication (not an absolute certainty). The precise life of the mine will depend on the amount of gold discovered and other operational matters. The term of the consent, and the associated benefits arising from the exercise of the consent should not be arbitrarily limited based solely on current resource information. For example, it would be grossly inefficient to re-consent the mining aspects of the BOGP if another six months / 1 year + is required to re-assess the application.

3.1.2 Operational Noise Limits (D.01 Condition 11)

Condition 11 states:

“The noise rating level from operational activities, including all mining operations but excluding blasting activities, must comply with the following noise limits at or within the notional boundary of any existing dwelling that exists at the commencement date of this consent: ...”

CODC's Noise and Vibration expert does not agree with the noise limits in this condition only relating to any existing dwelling that exists at the commencement date of this consent (as noted in paragraph 21 of the Noise and Vibration JWS dated 20 May 2026).

MGL seeks that the wording of Condition 11 as set out above is retained. This is an increasingly common formulation of a noise consent condition in relation to large-scale capital-intensive activities. As a recent example, the same approach was adopted in relation to the establishment and operation of Te Mihi Power Station in the Taupō District. This approach is to ensure that the level of noise emitted does not become a moving target whereby the level of noise emission has to reduce because a neighbour decides to construct a new dwelling in proximity to an existing lawfully established activity with a particular pre-existing and lawfully established level of noise emission.

3.1.3 Blasting and Vibration Limits (D.01 Condition 17)

Amendments in Condition 17(a) and (b) are not agreed by experts as per para 33-35 of the Noise and Vibration JWS (20 May 2026). CODC's expert seeks an alternative condition. If the 95% / 5% approach is adopted by the Panel, the new text at the end of the condition is to be included as supported by CODC expert.

If the 95% / 5% approach is not adopted by the Panel, then CODC seek that Condition 17 should be replaced in its entirety with the following:

“Vibration from blasting activities affecting dwellings must be measured and assessed in accordance with Appendix J of Australian Standard AS 2187-2:2006 Explosives – Storage and use Part 2: Use of explosives, and the Consent Holder must ensure that:

- a. Blasting is managed to ensure that, in any calendar year, 95% of airblast levels do not exceed 115 dBLZ_{peak}, with a maximum of 120 dBLZ_{peak}, when measured and assessed at any point within the notional boundary of any rural dwelling; and*
- b. Blasting vibration must not exceed a peak particle velocity of 5mm/s measured and assessed at the foundation of any dwelling; and*
- c. Blasting is only conducted between the hours of 7am and 8pm.”*

MGL supports Condition 17 as drafted. The condition reflects the outcome of the expert conferencing process and appropriately recognises the inherent variability associated with blasting activities. Importantly, the condition requires 95% of blast events to comply with a peak particle velocity limit of 5 mm/s, while providing only a limited allowance for exceedances up to 10 mm/s where the blast was designed to comply with 5 mm/s and the exceedance resulted from an unforeseeable factor. This is a robust and conservative safeguard that prevents the higher limit from becoming a routine design target. The condition also includes additional protections, including overnight underground blasting limits and air blast controls. MGL considers that the drafted condition provides an appropriate balance between environmental protection and the practical realities of blasting operations and is supported by the technical evidence before the Panel.

3.1.4 Lighting Management Plan (D.01 Condition NEW1)

The condition includes the following requirement:

“Use lighting with a colour temperature of ≤3000K, except where a higher colour temperature is demonstrated to be necessary for operational safety”.

CODC seeks that the exception in relation to maintaining operational safety be deleted unless more parameters can be provided on what is defined as ‘operational safety’ and what is being proposed to minimise the effects of any additional lighting with higher temperatures.

MGL seeks to retain this exemption in the condition on the basis that the safety of people (mine employees working at nighttime) is of paramount importance and should not be compromised by inadequate lighting.

3.1.5 Recreation (D.01 Condition NEW, following Condition 32)

At the completion of the workshops, this was a matter in progress (rather than a point of disagreement). DOC has since confirmed that it is willing to have the easements in favour of itself instead of CODC as it relates to providing access to DOC administered Public Conservation land. The condition has been updated accordingly.

3.1.6 Transport / Roothing Conditions (D.01 Conditions 39, 42, NEW 3, NEW 4 AND NEW 6)

As previously noted,¹ the 22 June 2026 version of the conditions relating to the State Highway 8 / Ardour Road intersection reflected wording that was fully agreed with Waka Kotahi / New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA). That includes a requirement that the upgrading of the State Highway 8 / Ardour Road intersection occurs within 12 months of the commencement the BOGP consents with suitable temporary traffic management arrangements being in place as required in the interim.

A point of disagreement is that CODC seeks that no mine construction activities commence until various roading upgrades have been completed including the State Highway 8 / Ardour Road intersection. Given the timeframes associated with securing approval from CODC in relation to the relevant management plans, detailed design and safety audits, CODC approval of detailed design, entering into a Development Agreement and the subsequent construction of the proposed roading upgrades, MGL is concerned that this could cause a delay of up to a year before any mine construction activities could occur. This in turn would delay the overall mine programme including the point which the company begins generating revenue from gold sales.

As per the agreement reached with NZTA, MGL proposes that timeframes be specified by when the various roading upgrades must be completed. Until that occurs, other conditions specify the nature of any temporary traffic management measures that must be implemented in accordance with the Access Road Construction Traffic Management Plan. Traffic generation during the first 12 months will involve the delivery of plant and equipment and the delivery of building materials and not full operational mine traffic. The delivery of large plant and equipment will require temporary traffic management measures (especially oversized loads) irrespective of the nature of the roading network. The first 12 months of the BOGP will also involve a lower level of employment (and therefore traffic generation) than subsequent stages of mining operations.

¹ Mitchell Daysh Ltd Memo to the Expert Panel dated 22 June 2026.

3.2 D.02 ORC CONSENTS

There are no points of disagreement in D.02.

3.3 D.03 CODC AND ORC COMMON CONDITIONS

3.3.1 Peer Review Panel (D.03 Condition NEW)

The proposed scope and expertise of the Peer Review Panel is not agreed by all parties.

MGL seeks the expertise is as listed in the condition. This is based on the distinction between key highly technical disciplines that require adaptive management approaches and Condition C131 Administration which allows for Councils to commission any required technical reports and reviews with all costs met by the Consent Holder.

DOC considers that ecology covers a broad range of disciplines and 6 people across the three disciplines listed may not be sufficient.

MGL does not consider it necessary to have every specialisation of ecological experts forming part of the Peer Review Panel.

3.3.2 Soil Stockpiling and Protection of Stockpiled Assets (D.03 Condition New, above Condition C44)

Kā Rūnaka advice is that soil buried at depth should have its fertility tested prior to its use at rehabilitation areas to ensure it can support plant growth.

MGL does not support the proposed requirement for fertility testing of buried soils prior to rehabilitation. Soil fertility can be effectively managed through standard rehabilitation practices, including the application of fertiliser and other soil amendments where required. Rehabilitation success is best assessed through vegetation establishment and performance monitoring, which allows adaptive management if issues arise. MGL therefore considers that mandatory fertility testing would add unnecessary complexity without a corresponding environmental benefit.

3.3.3 Ardour Restoration Area Management Plan (D.03 Condition C87)

Some of DOC's suggested wording / comment has been accepted by MGL. However, DOC technical advisor comments for each clause that have not been accepted by MGL's ecologist are set out below (followed by MGL's response):

- (a) *Providing the predicted extents as total areas rather than % increases is an improvement, but still highly contingent on the methods used to define and map the vegetation types. The question as to how much of this 59 hectares of shrubland is additional (in the biodiversity offsetting /compensation sense of additionality) remains in contention.*

MGL ecologist disagrees with the comment above and considers all 59 hectares are additional.

- b) *The diversity of native tree, shrub and liane species in existing native scrubland have increased so that ~~on average there are at least five~~ native woody species (comprising at least two tree, two shrub and one liane species) have doubled in monitoring transects in LMUs 1 and 2;*

MGL ecologist considers the original wording is clearer and better aligns with the objective and intent of the ARAMP.

- c) *For non-woody areas of LMUs 1, 2 and 3 (excluding cushionfields), at least 30% of this area has well established, regenerated native woody vegetation ~~regenerating~~ at least 1 m tall*

MGL ecologist considers the original wording is clearer and better aligns with the objective and intent of the ARAMP.

- (f) *condition would be met by single seedlings within 100 m of five kowhai groves. May already be the case. Could be strengthened by requiring seedling to be a certain height, and persisting for x consecutive monitoring rounds.*

MGL ecologist has added requirement for persisting but without additional specific details.

3.3.4 Biodiversity Outcome Monitoring Plan (D.03 Condition C96)

DOC is concerned that the biodiversity metrics proposed to be collected at Year 0 are not available now to inform the setting of interim targets and rehabilitation outcomes in the conditions.

MGL considers that sufficient baseline data has been collected which has informed the targets specified in the conditions. The interim targets are to assist with monitoring the achievement of the ultimate 35-Year outcomes which would not change with additional baseline data.

3.3.5 Covenant (D.03 Condition 113)

MGL proposes a covenant over 2,219 ha of the BOGP Consent Area to provide certainty of legal protection in perpetuity in relation to a range of specified environmental outcomes. MGL has consistently proposed that the covenant be in favour of CODC being the relevant territorial authority (in accordance with s.108(2)(d) of the RMA) – an outcome that has been consistently opposed by CODC.

This matter is the subject of a memo from Lane Neave in response to Question 20 of RFI 11 which concluded:

“... MGL considers that a Section 108 covenant represents the most robust and reliable option to create enduring certainty that the management outcomes will be maintained. It is also the mechanism expressly contemplated by the RMA for

securing long-term obligations imposed by consent conditions, including obligations that are intended to run with the land and bind successor owners. As such, the proposed covenant is consistent with the regulatory framework and established resource management practice.

In the event that the Expert Panel is not minded to impose a Section 108 covenant condition, reliance on the consent conditions would still provide a high degree of certainty. MGL seeks land use consents with an unlimited duration, and the conditions of those consents would remain legally enforceable by the Councils for as long as the consents remain operative and are not surrendered. Further Section 138 of the RMA provides that consent obligations may continue to be enforceable even where a consent is surrendered.”

3.3.6 BOGP Biodiversity and Heritage Enhancement Fund (D.03 Condition C114)

It is our understanding that DOC and Kā Rūnaka are generally supportive of the concept of the BOGP Biodiversity and Heritage Enhancement Fund (**Fund**) and are considering their respective potential roles in the administration of the Fund. MGL agrees for the administration of the Fund to be similar to what was originally proposed by MGL whereby the annual amount of money is provided to DOC (now potentially in conjunction with Kā Rūnaka) to invest in off-site biodiversity and heritage projects. We will await DOC and Kā Rūnaka’s position on this matter (anticipated by 7 September 2026).

In terms of the detail of the consent condition relating to the Fund, DOC considers that the amount of the Fund should be larger, it should not be linked to gold production and the life of the Fund should be longer than 10 years.

In response, MGL’s position is that the Fund should be linked to gold production, reflecting the commencement of mining operations and the generation of revenue. The amount of the Fund and its duration are what is proposed, noting that the Fund has been advanced on an *Augier* basis.

3.3.7 Matakinui Trust (D.03 Condition NEW 6)

This condition proposes a sum of up to \$50 million to accrue to fund the activities on the Matakinui Trust. MGL has agreed that the Trust should be established at Year 6 of gold production to now coincide with the commencement of the transfer of money to the Trust.

Ka Rūnaka, CODC, ORC and DOC are unable to confirm whether this amount is sufficient to provide for all post-closure functions of the Trust in the absence of detailed cost modelling.

MGL's response to this issues is to note that clause (b) of the same condition states:

(b) If at the time the Trust Land is transferred to the Matakinui Trust and there are insufficient funds to fulfil its obligations in relation to any transferred or held resource consents and / or the covenant relating the Trust Land (or both) (as demonstrated through the annual bond calculation which includes the post-closure obligations required in Condition C123), the Consent Holder must provide additional funding to the extent required.

Furthermore, as noted in this condition, the bond calculation is the key consent condition that will resolve the question around quantum, on an annual basis especially as real-world data from monitoring begins to emerge.

3.4 D.04 SCHEDULE TWO – ORC GENERAL CONDITIONS

3.4.1 Secondary Seepage Collection System (D.04 Condition 39A)

At the conclusion of the last workshop, this was a matter in progress (rather than a point of disagreement). It has since been resolved.

MGL agrees with ORC and Kā Rūnaka that the Secondary Seepage Collection System be installed (along with the Primary Seepage Collection System) prior to mine tailings being discharged to the TSF. The consent condition has been amended accordingly.

3.5 D.05 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AUTHORITY

Following discussions with HNZPT, two main points of disagreement were encountered regarding the proposed Archaeological Authority conditions. HNZPT propose a condition for a detailed investigation prior to works commencing, as guided by a research strategy (also subject to a separate condition). Dr Woods has included the research strategy within the Archaeological and Heritage Management Plan (**AHMP**) and is proposing a detailed investigation of each recorded archaeological site within the DDF as part of the AHMP. Logistics of mine phasing and other considerations regarding ecological concerns and dust mean that it is not feasible to investigate all sites or entire site complexes before the main works commence. The research strategy is focused on understanding the site complexes and the overall heritage landscape which requires a detailed investigation of each site followed by post-investigation analysis and reporting of results.

The second point of disagreement regards the structure of reporting of the results of the archaeological investigations. HNZPT have proposed that a report on the investigations be produced within 18 months of the completion of the detailed investigation. As mentioned above, mine phasing does not allow for entire site complexes or all sites in the landscape to be



investigated in full prior to works commencing. NZHP's proposed reporting condition of a report equivalent to a standard final report every five years from issue of the authority ensures that results are collated and shared in a timely manner and avoids the potential outcome of a single report at the end of the 35-year authority life. This approach also allows for reconsideration of the landscape and our understanding of it as the project progresses and will result in a better-quality output than the approach proposed by HNZPT.

3.6 D.06 – D.10 DOC CONCESSIONS

As noted above in Section 2.3 of this memo, MGL has made only minor tracked changes to the DOC Concessions to address requests for additional detail made by DOC and/or respond to issues noted. Subject to any further feedback from DOC on 7 September 2026, it is MGL's understanding that there are no points of disagreement in relation to the conditions relating to the DOC Concessions.

3.7 D.11 WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

At this point in time, MGL is not aware any points of dispute in relation to the conditions associated with the Wildlife Authority. If DOC identifies any issues of concern with aspects of the Wildlife Permit as part of its feedback on 7 September 2026, MGL will seek to resolve those concerns by way of discussions and/or correspondence with DOC. MGL's final position on the Wildlife Permit (hopefully reflecting full agreement with DOC) will be presented on 14 September 2026.

4. MANAGEMENT PLANS

The Expert Panel's Minute 47 appears to convey an expectation that updated management plans would be provided on 28 August 2026 along with the updated conditions. While, as noted above, some limited feedback on the management plans has been provided by the parties during the course of the workshops, MGL has not updated the management plans since the 22 June 2026 versions circulated to the Expert Panel and the parties (apart from the Archaeological and Heritage Management Plan forming an integral part of the Archaeological Authority attached as part of **Attachment 3**). The reasons for this are:

- (a) At the Concurrent Hearing in relation to Planning Matters on 18 June 2026 in Wellington, MGL advised that it would no longer seek that the Expert Panel certify the management plans (apart from the Archaeological and Heritage Management Plan);
- (b) The Expert Panel has the benefit of the 22 June 2026 versions of the management plans which provide a comprehensive understanding of the nature, scope, content and level of detail proposed to be presented in the management plans;

- (c) The parties at the workshopping agreed that that it was important that the consent conditions clearly specify what is to be included within, and achieved by way of, the management plans (which has now occurred, with a very high level of agreement, as a result of the recent workshops);
- (d) With the focus of the workshops being on the conditions, there has not been time to update the management plans – our preference is to agree the content of conditions with the parties before updating management plans given the conditions need to inform the management plans;
- (e) The updating and finalisation of the management plans will therefore need to be undertaken with the benefit of the final version of the conditions which will only be available once the Expert Panel releases its final decision (assuming a decision to grant the consents sought by MGL); and
- (f) The Councils (and DOC in some respects) will have the role of certifying the management plans once they are finalised following the grant of any consents (whereby it is expected that there will be no lack of scrutiny in relation to the adequacy of the management plans prior to their certification and implementation).

5. OTHER DOCUMENTS

MGL has included the following document which is relevant to an aspect of the conditions being provided to the Expert Panel today (**Attachment 6**):

Document	Relevance
“Ardgour Rise Road Safety Review” dated 30 July 2026 prepared by Stantec New Zealand.	This document sets out the proposed new alignment and design standards for Ardgour Rise (referred to in Condition 45 of D.01). MGL is currently awaiting feedback from CODC in relation to the contents of the report.

6. CLOSING

MGL and its consultants trust that the attached versions of the conditions will be of assistance to the Expert Panel for the purposes of its deliberations and decision-making. We note that the parties will have two further opportunities to provide additional feedback on the conditions – on 7 September 2026 and when the Expert Panel issues its draft decision (assuming a decision to grant the consents sought by MGL).



To the extent that the parties have not had sufficient time to provide feedback on aspects of the conditions (which are shaded in light grey wash) or otherwise wish to revisit aspects of the conditions previously agreed in the workshops, it is understood that they intend to provide feedback on those aspects on 7 September 2026. To the extent that some of that feedback may be beyond the scope of the Expert Panel's directions in Minutes 46 and 47, MGL has (today) filed a Memorandum of Counsel seeking directions that parties can make comments on 7 September 2026 on all conditions.

To the extent that the parties wish to propose changes to the conditions of the resource consents, MGL request that this is presented by way of tracked changes to the clean versions of the resource consent documents (D.01, D.02, D.03 and D.04) presented in **Attachment 2**. These documents have been provided as Word documents for that purpose.

Finally, MGL and its consultants wish to express their gratitude to the other parties for the professional and constructive manner in which they have participated in the workshops.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 Tracked Change Version of Resource Consent Conditions

Attachment 2 Clean Version of Resource Consent Conditions

Attachment 3 Archaeological Authority and Archaeological and Heritage Management Plan

Attachment 4 DOC Concessions

Attachment 5 Wildlife Authority

Attachment 6 Ardgour Rise Road Safety Review



Attachment 1 Tracked Change Version of Resource Consent Conditions

Attachment 2 Clean Version of Resource Consent Conditions

Attachment 3 Archaeological Authority and Archaeological and Heritage Management Plan

Attachment 4 DOC Concessions

Attachment 5 Wildlife Authority

Attachment 6 Ardgour Rise Road Safety Review