

11 September 2026

Maggie Burns
Fast-track – Environmental Protection Agency

Email: [REDACTED]



Tēnā koe Maggie

**RE: FTAA-2603-1185 HUNUA QUARRY DEVELOPMENT SUBSTANTIVE APPLICATION
LODGED UNDER FAST-TRACK APPROVALS ACT 2024: RESPONSE TO MINUTE 8
(DATED 4 SEPTEMBER 2026)**

On 4 September 2026 Minute 8 was received outlining actions following a conference of ecological experts on 3 September 2026. The Minute also provides an opportunity for additional amendments and outstanding actions to be addressed. The Applicant's response to this Minute is set out below. As per the email received 10 September 2026, an extension of time was approved by the Panel to address Minute 8 matters relating to 3(f), 3(g) and 3(k). Accordingly, those matters are excluded from the table below.

Please let us know if you need any further clarification or assistance with the updated information provided.

Yours sincerely

BOFFA MISKELL LTD

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'L Deverall'.

Lucy Deverall
Planner / Associate Principal

[Appendix 1 – Updated Lizard Management Plan](#)

[Appendix 2 – Correspondence with DOC regarding Lizard compensation](#)

[Appendix 3 – Legal memorandum](#)

[Appendix 4 – Ecology Memo on Revised Indicative Performance Targets](#)

[Appendix 5 – Winstone Aggregates Site Selection Response](#)

[Appendix 6a – Landscape Response Minute 6](#)

[Appendix 6b – Appendix 1 to Landscape Graphic Supplement](#)

Table 1: Response to Minute 8 Matters

Matters Relating to Minute 8				
Item	Minute Paragraph	Matter from Minute 8	Applicant's Response	Proposed amendment (if relevant)
1.	Paragraph 3(a)	<i>amend the Lizard Management Plan to align with the agreed relocation locations with the Department of Conservation</i>	The applicant has amended Section 3.2.1 of the LMP to specify the agreed relocation locations for geckos (including the quantum of geckos to be received at locations) and other lizards. A copy of the updated LMP (dated 7 September 2026) is provided in Appendix 1.	Amend section 3.2.1 of the LMP <u>Two lizard release sites are proposed (see Section 6.4.3):</u> <u>Tiritiri Matangi Island for up to 75 elegant geckos (<i>Naultinus elegans</i>) into the Lighthouse Valley area (-174.895054⁰, -36.603120⁰) or elsewhere as directed by DOC staff.</u> <u>Hunua Ranges Regional Park for other lizard species and as a back-up site for elegant geckos. The exact release location is not known at present, but the coordinates of -175.169532⁰, -37.123853⁰ (NZTM), near Moumoukai Farms Track is close to several of the potential release sites.</u>
2.	Paragraph 3(a)	<i>added to Section 6.4.6 of the LMP following Auckland Council's comments as to the "<10%" applying to each stage and not the total clearance area.</i>	The applicant has updated Section 6.4.6 of the LMP to define minor adaptations and clarify that any changes to extent will be applied per stage (see yellow highlight in the adjacent column). A copy of the updated LMP (dated 7 September 2026) is provided in Appendix 1.	Amend section 6.4.6 of the LMP Minor ~~flexibility~~ or adaptations to the current methods proposed in this LMP may be made at the discretion of the Project Herpetologist. This will enable the appropriate management of lizard populations that are encountered during the lizard salvage within the site, habitat quality and type of species encountered. <u>Minor adaptations to the implementation of the LMP will only apply to lizard salvage effort and extent, and only where changes will increase the likelihood of capturing lizards. Specifically:</u> <u>Changes to effort can only increase the level of effort (i.e., increased trap density, increased number of checks, additional trap / salvage methods)</u> <u>Changes to extent can only respond to the extent and types of habitats available at the time of salvage (i.e., mapped grassland becomes shrubland and different methods are required, a slip on the quarry face removes habitat). Any changes to extent will be <10% of total clearance area per stage.</u> <u>Any changes implemented under the Adaptive Management criteria will be notified within 24 hours and will be included in permit reporting.</u> <u>For any changes required outside of these criteria, the Project herpetologist will seek advice from the Auckland Regional Operations Manager (auckland@doc.govt.nz) in the first instance.</u>
			If the amendment regarding minor adaptations is accepted, the applicant supports deleting proposed condition 37 of the Wildlife Permit (Part I).	Delete condition 37 of the Wildlife Permit (Part I) ~~37. Minor variations to the LMP may be made by a SQEP to improve management of Lizard populations. Any minor amendments must be notified in writing to DOC prior to any implementation of changes. If no response is received within 24 hours of notification, it will be considered agreement that the amendments are minor and are within scope of the LMP.~~

Matters Relating to Minute 8				
Item	Minute Paragraph	Matter from Minute 8	Applicant's Response	Proposed amendment (if relevant)
3.	Paragraph 3(b)	<i>Applicant and the Department are having an ongoing conversation as to compensation / adaptive management in relation to lizards.</i>	Following advice from project ecologists and experienced ecologists in the industry, the applicant has proposed a donation of \$200 per gecko, for up to 75 geckos (providing a maximum total contribution of \$15,000) directly to the Supporters of Tiritiri Matangi Incorporated. The donation would only apply if Tiritiri Matangi is selected as the release site. The key parameters of the donation are proposed as follows: • The applicant would make a voluntary donation directly to Supporters of Tiritiri Matangi Incorporated; • the donation would be calculated at \$200 for each lizard successfully relocated and released on Tiritiri Matangi, equivalent to \$2,000 for every 10 lizards; • the donation would apply to a maximum of 75 lizards, giving a maximum total contribution of \$15,000; • only live lizards salvaged from the approved Hunua Quarry project footprint and released on Tiritiri Matangi would count towards the donation; • recaptured animals, or animals otherwise counted more than once, would be excluded; and • the number of qualifying lizards would be confirmed through the salvage and relocation reporting required under the Lizard Management Plan and Wildlife Approval. It is the intention that this would sit separately from the Wildlife Approval and would not constitute a permit fee, a payment to DOC or a payment for permission to relocate the geckos. Therefore, section 6.5 in the Draft LMP is proposed to be deleted. This would not affect the applicant's responsibility for any legitimate DoC processing, monitoring or compliance costs properly recoverable in relation to the approval. The Applicant would also meet	Delete section 6.5 of the LMP ~~6.5 Compensation and Beneficial Actions~~ ~~<u>Tiritiri Matangi Island</u>~~ ~~If the release site at Tiritiri Matangi Island is used, Winstone propose to provide funding equivalent to the amount that would be spent on preparing the release site at Hūnua Regional Park, including predator control and fencing costs. This funding would be targeted to support the successful release of elegant geckos.~~ ~~<u>Hūnua Regional Park Site</u>~~ ~~If lizards are present, the mitigation described above (i.e., lizard salvage) is not considered sufficient to provide an overall protective benefit to the lizard population because imperfect salvage methods and complex habitats are likely to result in a net loss of lizards from the site.~~ ~~For this reason, Winstone propose to undertake the intensive mouse control in the Hūnua Regional Park Site release site over a minimum 5 ha area. This mouse control will supplement existing predator control in the Park.~~ ~~Winstone further propose to use the release site to test novel / developing gecko survey tools using drones to observe geckos in the canopy.~~ ~~As noted above, further engagement with Auckland Council Parks / Environmental Services teams is required to ensure this proposal aligns with long term goals for the Park.~~

Matters Relating to Minute 8				
Item	Minute Paragraph	Matter from Minute 8	Applicant's Response	Proposed amendment (if relevant)
			any screening, quarantine, and transportation costs associated with this. A copy of the correspondence to DOC outlining this approach and seeking their feedback is provided in Appendix 2. The proposed deletion of section 6.5 of the LMP is identified in Appendix 1. If the donation approach is accepted, this will be formalised via a letter. This does not need to be referenced in the LMP or Wildlife permit conditions, as it relates to a voluntary action to a third party.	
4.	Paragraph 3(c)	<i>drafting of condition 157 / 162 (depending on versions) to confirm legality and intent (which all parties supported) of including the proposed offsetting now.</i>	A legal memo is provided in Appendix 3 . In summary, the conditions are considered lawful and the intent of the inclusion is to provide certainty around what is intended to occur in the future and clarity that these works do not form part of the current application or approvals.	Not applicable
5.	Paragraph 3(d)	<i>mechanism in the conditions (such as an advice note) that the Department is to be provided with the opportunity to review the Stream Realignment Management Plan prior to certification.</i>	The applicant supports the inclusion of an advice note to ensure DOC has the opportunity to review the Stream Realignment Management Plan. The applicant understands that DOC are also interested in the receiving monitoring and performance reporting. An advice note is offered in that regard.	Add an Advice Note to Condition 67 as follows: Advice Note: The Applicant must provide the Stream Alignment Management Plan to DOC for review prior to certification Auckland Council. Add an Advice Note to Condition 68 as follows: Advice Note: The Applicant must provide DOC with a copy of the report that details the monitoring and performance of the stream works.
6.	Paragraph 3(e)	<i>consider a MCI band for the monitoring conditions for the Mangapū Stream diversion that align with...</i> <i>quality bands published by Stark & Maxted (as referenced in the Stream Realignment Management Plan).</i>	A memo from the applicants ecologist is provided in Appendix 4 setting out updated indicative performance targets. The applicant proposes to amend condition 67 (a) to incorporate the updated targets.	Amend condition 67: (a) supports a healthy, resilient, and culturally aligned freshwater ecosystem that achieves the following indicative thresholds: (i) Habitat Quality Score band: <u>= or > good.</u> (ii) Deposited fine sediments (NOF Table 16): <u>= or > Band B (Bankside visual estimate % fine sediment cover): < 20% or within 10% cover of reference cover estimate</u> (iii) <u>Biotic Index (MCI score) Band (NOF Table 14): = (Band C; and. or > Good (MCI score = > 100) or within 10% of reference MCI score</u>
9.	Paragraph 3(h)	<i>Applicant will provide a succinct summary of the steps (with reasons) it took to identify appropriate offsite sites</i>	Please see the memo from Winstone Aggregates provided in Appendix 5 .	Not applicable
10.	Paragraph 3(i)	<i>DOC to provide legal opinion on the application of the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations to all</i>	A response is provided in the Memorandum of Counsel in Appendix 3 .	Not applicable

Matters Relating to Minute 8				
Item	Minute Paragraph	Matter from Minute 8	Applicant's Response	Proposed amendment (if relevant)
		<i>culverts, including prior to 1983. To be provided to Panel and Applicant by Wednesday 9 September. Applicant to provide its response by 4pm Friday 11 September.</i>		
11.	Paragraph 3(j)	<i>Applicant to consider providing additional / tighter wetland offset area monitoring to more robustly support future assessment ... the Applicant will also consider the robustness of the restoration planting monitoring too. The Applicant is to provide the Panel with any proposed condition drafting</i>	Section 4.5 of the Ecological Management Plan (EcMP, Appendix B12.8.10) sets out the monitoring and performance targets wetland offset areas and restoration planting. The applicant proposes to amend condition 59 to include the metrics specified in section 4.5 of the EcMP. The deletion of wording in (d) and (d)(i) are to aid the use of plain language and improve succinctness. The amendments at sub-clauses (i) and (j) are to replace general statements with specific performance measures.	Amend condition 59 59. The EcMP must include: (a) description of the terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity values to be addressed by the EcMP; (b) plans identifying the locations of all offset and compensation areas; (c) description of the approach to developing all offset and compensation areas, including staging of planting; (d) ~~best practice~~ actions to: ~~(i) undertake pre clearance surveys and salvage or propagule collection to minimize the loss of ecological values prior to and during vegetation removal;~~ (i) recover and propagate regionally at risk and threatened flora (refer Condition 15.3(l)); and (ii) minimise the loss of ecological values prior to watercourse and wetland works; and (iii) manage adverse edge effects on adjoining existing vegetation; (e) a description of the indicative source, species mix, size, spacing, density, and layout, of plants and planting methods to be used at each offset and compensation area; (f) framework for developing and implementing Site Specific Planting Plans on a staged basis at each offset and compensation area and the process for preparing and approving these plans prior to works commencing; (g) description of how all planting will be protected from stock; (h) timeframes for the implementation of Site Specific Planting Plans before Construction works occur in the staged area; ~~(i) description of how maintenance of planting areas, including replacement of plants that do not survive, will be undertaken and which as a minimum requires maintenance to continue.~~ <u>Performance measures for all restoration planting, including the following targets:</u> (i) <u>For terrestrial riparian and wetland revegetation will be assessed as completed when all of the following metrics are achieved:</u>

Matters Relating to Minute 8				
Item	Minute Paragraph	Matter from Minute 8	Applicant's Response	Proposed amendment (if relevant)
				(a) <u>80% canopy closure, in general accordance with composition and densities specified in detailed planting plans;</u> (b) <u>Minimum plant survival rate of 90% planted specimens (or the original planting density); and</u> (c) <u>All planting areas free of invasive weed species (<5% vegetation cover).</u> (ii) <u>Infill planting in indigenous forest and scrubland will be assessed as completed when the following metrics are all achieved:</u> (a) <u>Plant specimens established in general accordance with composition and densities specified in detailed planting plans;</u> (b) <u>Minimum plant survival rate of 90% planted specimens (or the original planting density); and</u> (c) <u>All planting areas free of invasive weed species (<5% vegetation cover).</u> (j) <u>Description of how ecological management actions will be monitored, including timeframes, and measures of success; Specifications for maintenance, monitoring and progress reporting with respect to performance targets, and to enable timely identification and remedy of defects;</u> (k) <u>Prior to confirmation of wetland offset and compensation locations and preparation of the EcMP, all prospective wetland features to be enhanced are to be delineated using NPS-FM wetland delineation protocols to confirm the required wetland offset extent is achieved.</u> (l) <u>All prospective wetland features to be enhanced shall also be assessed using wetland condition indices relevant to the wetland type. Methods shall follow Clarkson, B.R., Sorrell, B.K., Reeves, P.N., Champion, P.D., Partridge, T.R. and Clarkson, B.D., 2003. Handbook for monitoring wetland condition. Coordinated monitoring of New Zealand wetlands. A Ministry for the Environment SMF funded project. Ministry for the Environment, Wellington (or subsequent revisions).</u> (m) <u>procedures for reporting on the performance of planting through the Annual Report required by Condition 72;</u> (n) <u>methods to ensure integration with the following associated Management Plans:</u> (i) <u>Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan;</u> (ii) <u>Stream Realignment Management Plan;</u> (iii) <u>Aquatic Fauna Salvage and Relocation Plan;</u> (iv) <u>Lizard Management Plan; and</u> (v) <u>Pest Management Plan; and</u> (o) <u>a process for review and amendment of the EcMP (and any subsequent re-certification in accordance with conditions 23 – 27 and 30 – 31) to implement</u>

Matters Relating to Minute 8				
Item	Minute Paragraph	Matter from Minute 8	Applicant's Response	Proposed amendment (if relevant)
				adaptive management provisions in response to any changes in the receiving environment. including the identification and implementation of corrective actions where monitoring indicates that the anticipated outcomes, management objective or performance criteria of the EcMP are not being achieved. (p) <u>...see text and explanation below</u> <u>Advice note: The purpose of the wetland condition assessment is to demonstrate that selected features are degraded and in need of enhancement, and have restoration potential. Not all WCI parameters are useful for assessing changes related to site-specific management over practical monitoring timeframes and are therefore a WCI score is not proposed as a performance measure.</u>
12.	Paragraph 3(l)	<i>Applicant to provide new condition drafting for threatened and at-risk species.</i>	The applicant proposes a new sub-clause to condition 59 – being condition 59(p).	Amend condition 59 to insert the following: (p) <u>a process for incorporating specimens of all regionally threatened and at risk (RTAR) flora species identified within the Project Footprint into planting plans for Focus Areas, in sufficient numbers to establish self-sustaining populations. The EcMP shall:</u> (i) <u>Require a pre-clearance survey for threatened and at-risk plant specimens within the Project Footprint (noting location, number, age classes, size and relevant characteristics (maturity, presence of propagules, translocation viability).</u> (ii) <u>Specify that material shall be eco-sourced from populations within the relevant Ecological District. Where practicable, plant material will be translocated or propagated from the Project Site to the Hunua Focus Area.</u> (iii) <u>Identify suitable sites within identified offset Focus Areas for establishment of each RTAR species, and site preparation required prior to planting out of specimens.</u> (iv) <u>Specify optimal timing of salvage and relocation to ensure successful survivorship and growth.</u> (v) <u>Specify protocols for seed collection/ root ball protection/ propagation/ hygiene.</u> (vi) <u>Specify performance criteria for survivorship and growth of planted RTAR specimens.</u>

Table 2: Additional Matters

Other Matters																
Item		Topic	Applicant's Comment	Proposed amendment (if relevant)												
13.		Trigger Action Response Plan (TARP)	An email was received from the Panel on 10 September 2026 asking for a copy of the TARP as it was referenced in Table 1 of Condition 24(f) as being certified by the Panel. This reference in Table 1 is an error. It is the applicant's intention that a TARP will need to be certified by Council in the first instance. A draft copy of a TARP has not been submitted with the application. The Geotechnical Assessment provides an initial analysis of ground conditions to identify potential adverse effects in terms of stability as a result of the proposed activity. However, the Geotechnical Assessment identifies that additional investigations are required prior to designs being finalised to provide greater certainty in terms of ground conditions and provide the opportunity for designs to be refined where ground conditions differ from those anticipated. The purpose of the TARP is to guide that process to ensure final designs align with the anticipated effects assessment. We note that this is a common approach to consenting quarry developments and that Kings Quarry Fast Track Application took a similar approach in conditioning a Slope Stability Management Plan, without providing a draft copy as part of the application. Condition 24(f), Table 1 is proposed to be amended to delete reference to Panel certification.	Amend Condition 24(f) Table 1 Table 1: Management and Monitoring Plan certification timeframes <table><tr><th>Management or Monitoring Plan</th><th>Condition reference</th><th>Submission timeframe to AC for certification / Information</th></tr><tr><td colspan="3">[...]</td></tr><tr><td>Trigger Action Response Plan (TARP)</td><td>54 to 55</td><td>20 working days prior to commencement of Construction works for information only as certified by the Panel, and every 5 years thereafter for re-certification.</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">[...]</td></tr></table>	Management or Monitoring Plan	Condition reference	Submission timeframe to AC for certification / Information	[...]			Trigger Action Response Plan (TARP)	54 to 55	20 working days prior to commencement of Construction works for information only as certified by the Panel, and every 5 years thereafter for re-certification.	[...]		
Management or Monitoring Plan	Condition reference	Submission timeframe to AC for certification / Information														
[...]																
Trigger Action Response Plan (TARP)	54 to 55	20 working days prior to commencement of Construction works for information only as certified by the Panel, and every 5 years thereafter for re-certification.														
[...]																
14.		Minute 6 (6)(d) – Landscape queries	These outstanding matters are addressed in Appendix 6a and Appendix 6b. It is noted the landscape memorandum recommends amendments to proposed conditions 143, 151 and 152 (as per number from the 2 September version of conditions) and insertion of two new conditions.	Amend conditions 143, 151 and 152 (new numbering to become 153) Insert two new conditions 143. ~~If~~ <u>Where</u> the landowner agrees to the mitigation planting being offered, the mitigation planting plan must be agreed in writing ~~between~~ <u>by</u> the Consent Holder and the relevant landowner no later than 12 months after the date this consent is granted. The Consent Holder must implement all planting specified in the agreed plan, at its cost, during the next available planting season following written agreement of the plan. 151. Where temporary hydroseeding and/or revegetation is assessed as reasonably practicable and capable of providing a visual benefit, the Consent Holder ~~must undertake hydroseeding or temporary revegetation of the identified area where an appropriate and proven method is~~												

Other Matters				
Item		Topic	Applicant's Comment	Proposed amendment (if relevant)
				~~available. The work must be undertaken during the first planting season following completion of the assessment. Shall during the first suitable planting season, implement the recommended treatment or any approved establishment trial.~~ 152. <u>Where a trial is undertaken and it confirms that:</u> (a) <u>vegetation will likely establish successfully, the treatment must be extended to the remaining identified area during the next suitable planting season.</u> (b) <u>vegetation will be unlikely to establish successfully, no further planting or hydroseeding must be undertaken, and the trial area and possible reasons for the lack of success must be recorded. Future trials may be undertaken in the same location if new technologies and/or methodologies become available.</u> 153. ~~Temporary revegetation must consist of~~ <u>use vegetation suited to the substrate and exposed quarry conditions and may include</u> hardy pioneer species such as mānuka and kānuka or other vegetation ~~suited to the substrate and exposed quarry conditions.~~ Any indigenous vegetation used must be eco-sourced from the Hunua Ecological District. 154. <u>The findings of the assessment required under Condition 150 and the results of any trials undertaken in accordance with Condition 152 must be recorded in the Annual Monitoring Report required by Condition 72.</u>
15.		On-going consultation	Appendix 3 includes a legal memo which provides an update on mana whenua consultation.	Not applicable