

Gerald Masters and Anita Masters

[REDACTED]

11 August 2026

The Expert Panel, Hunua Quarry Development
c/- Environmental Protection Authority
By email: substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz
Private Bag 63002, Waterloo Quay, Wellington 6140

Re: Invited comments on the Hunua Quarry Development (FTAA-2603-1185), sections 53 and 54, Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

We are the owners and occupiers of [REDACTED] We have been invited by the Expert Panel (Minute 2, 14 July 2026) to comment on the Hunua Quarry Development, because our property is assessed in the application as subject to moderate-high adverse visual effects and is offered off-site mitigation planting. We appreciate the opportunity to comment and set out our comments below within the time allowed.

Please note

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.

1. Our position

We recognise that aggregate is an important resource and that the applicant has a genuine case for the quarry. We are not trying to oppose that case in principle. Our 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.

Our position is straightforward. 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. For each concern we raise, we have set out the specific condition we are asking for, as the Panel invited commenters to do.

2. Our property and its relationship to the quarry

[REDACTED] is on the western side of the proposed Symonds Hill Pit expansion, in the applicant's Western W1 viewing group, roughly 125 to 500 metres from the works. We look toward the quarry to the east and north-east, across the Symonds Stream valley. Our property is directly across the private road from [REDACTED] While [REDACTED] sits partly between us and the quarry, the application still identifies [REDACTED] as separately affected. 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.

3. Visual and amenity effects

The applicant's own Landscape Effects Assessment names [REDACTED] 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. We ask the Panel to weigh the following points.

- **There is no visual simulation taken from [REDACTED]** The nearest one (Visual Simulation B) was taken from the road junction near [REDACTED] 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. We ask that a site-specific assessment be done from our house and outdoor living areas.
- **The 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.
- **The 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]
- **The 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. The difference between the raw and the softened Stage 8 images comes mostly from that bench planting, which is decades away. So for a very long time our actual view will be closer to the unmitigated images.
- **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 [REDACTED] and leaf-off (winter) simulations, or at least state the base photograph dates.

4. Off-site mitigation planting

We 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. Our reasons are below, and we ask that the offer be strengthened and made enforceable.

- **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. By contrast, the applicant's own conditions apply a five-year maintenance period and a 90

percent establishment standard to the quarry's own offset and rehabilitation planting. We ask that the same standard apply to planting on our property.

- **The offer should be enforceable, not optional.** Off-site planting for ■ 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.
- **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 where year-round screening is required.
- **We 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.

5. Dust and air quality

The air quality assessment identifies ■ as a residential receptor, and Judge Richardson Drive properties are frequently downwind. The greatest dust risk is identified at Stage 4, during major overburden removal. 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.

We also want to 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. We value that honesty, and it has built trust. Because it is voluntary at present, 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.

6. Noise, blasting and vibration

A quarry of this scale 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.

7. Stream, ecology and cumulative effects

The 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. More generally, we ask the Panel to keep in mind that this is not a short construction project but decades of changing operational effects on our property, and that conditions should be able to respond as effects actually emerge.

8. Conditions we request

If consent is granted, we ask that the following conditions (or conditions to similar effect) be imposed.

Visual mitigation planting for [REDACTED]

1. That off-site mitigation planting for [REDACTED] be an enforceable consent obligation, able to be implemented before the stage that materially increases visibility, rather than an optional offer.
2. That a site-specific visual assessment be undertaken from the dwelling, principal outdoor living areas and key viewshafts at [REDACTED] (not from a road-level viewpoint) to inform the planting design.
3. That the 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.
4. That 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.
5. 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.
6. That the funded planting be able to be wider or denser than the 5 metre default where the assessed effects justify it.
7. That, if planting cannot provide effective mitigation without unacceptable effects on the property, an alternative mitigation process be available.
8. 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.

Dust, noise and operations

9. 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.
10. That blasting conditions set blast frequency and airblast and vibration limits, require advance notification to [REDACTED] specify monitoring at or near the property, limit operating hours, and require a pre-commencement property condition survey.

Rehabilitation, review and liaison

11. That rehabilitation be completed as benches become available, with stage-specific time limits and annual public reporting, rather than open-ended deferral.
12. That the 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.
13. That the conditions be able to be reviewed before later stages if actual effects exceed predictions, with the ability to require additional mitigation.
14. That the applicant provide an unmitigated Stage 7 simulation, a simulation representative of the view from [REDACTED] and winter (leaf-off) simulations, and confirm the exact location of Visual Simulation B.

9. Conclusion

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. We would welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft conditions of consent in due course, and we confirm we wish to be sent those draft conditions.

Thank you for considering our comments.

[Redacted signature block]