

APPENDIX I – TABLE OF CONDITION CHANGES REFLECTING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Hunua Quarry Proposal – FTAA-2603-1185

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
Resource Consents						
Part A – Abbreviations & Definitions						
Glossary – Key Project Terms						
N/A	<i>Offset and Compensation Sites:</i> Is the land identified as “potential offset sites” on plan “Offset/Compensation Site Locations” prepared by Boffa Miskell Limited at Appendix B12.4.5 Ecological Assessment. Refer to Figure 3 of Schedule A to the conditions.	The offset and compensation sites are not actually proposed. Winstone seeks to amend the definition of the key project term ‘Offset/Compensation Site Locations’ to refer to ‘offset sites.’ <i>Offset and Compensation Sites:</i> Is the land identified as “potential offset sites” on plan “Offset/Compensation Site Locations” prepared by Boffa Miskell Limited at Appendix B12.4.5 Ecological Assessment. Refer to Figure 3 of Schedule A to the conditions.	N/A	Panel: Mechanical change agreed to remove ‘potential’	N/A	Panel: Agreed Change made
N/A			Auckland Council The terms diversion and realignment have been used interchangeably through the conditions, and this is also the case in the Draft Decision Report. While both terms involve changing the way water flows, the diversion is more about redirection whereas realignment suggests a more permanent stream channel layout. <i>How does the Panel review the difference, and should it be consistent in the conditions?</i>	Panel: Martin to check where terms are used and determine whether to replace / change Wait on Applicant’s response	Given that the terms ‘diversion’ and ‘realignment’ are used in the decision, the Applicant defers to the Panel for a determination on the use of these terms. The Applicant itself does not have a strong view on the matter.	Panel: The matter raised by AC has been considered by the Panel and the matter raised is not considered material. The wording remains sufficiently clear to avoid future uncertainty No change made - Rejected
Part B – All Consents						
Advice Notes						
From Cond 12	N/A – All advice notes	N/A	Auckland Council Council practice is not to number advice notes so as to avoid any misunderstanding that they’re actually conditions. Also, when consent conditions are varied under Section 127, it’s common practice to add new conditions labelled [condition #]A. Hence this could lead to a consent having both a condition and advice note with the same number.	Panel: To remove numbering from advice notes	The Applicant states that the Panel requested that the Advice Notes be numbered, so the Applicant defers to the Panel for a final determination on this matter.	Panel: Agreed Change made
General In Accordance						
1	Except as provided for in the conditions below, the Project must be undertaken in general accordance with: - the information submitted with the Application (including updates to the Application documents dated 28 April, 22 June and 17 July 2026); - as referenced by the Council under consent reference number BUN60464053 and comprised of the following information (being documents, plans, drawings, reports, and management plans): TABLE - the Consent Holder’s responses to section 51 FTAA reports and	Request by the Panel to ensure these conditions clauses are correct. All Winstone’s comments and changes to conditions were referenced in a s55 report provided to the Panel on 18th August 2026. Conditions 1(a) and (d) have been updated to capture the additional information provided by the Applicant. To the extent that Minute 10 was seeking confirmation as to the final versions of the various documents relied upon, we can confirm that the material in Condition 1(b) is correct with the exception of the Lizard Management Plan which is now dated 29 September 2026 (see below for further explanation of changes).	Auckland Council <i>Recommend adding the Application Plans & Scheme Plan to the TABLE list for completeness & to ensure monitoring can be effectively carried out.</i>	Panel: Applicant comment: Mechanical change agreed and requested by Minute 10 to be confirmed by Applicant AC comment: Wait on Applicant’s response – if Applicant agrees then Applicant to provide	The Applicant considers this to be unnecessary given the inclusion of Schedule A that includes all the plans referred to in the conditions.	Panel: Agreed to the Applicant’s request as a mechanical change agreed to and requested by the panel The Applicant’s position in response to AC’s comment is as discussed previously that given Schedule A to the conditions the additional reference is not necessary Change made in respect of Applicant’s request and not AC’s comment

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
	comments received in relation to the Project dated 27 and 28 July 2026; and d. the Consent Holder's responses to the section 51 Reports, the section 53 comments, and to the Panel dated 24 August, 11 September and 15 September 2026.	a. the information submitted with Application (including updates to the Application documents dated 28 April, 22 June, 6 July and 17 July 2026); c. the Consent Holder's responses dated 18 August 2026 to section 51 FTA reports and s53 comments received in relation to the Project dated 27 and 28 July 2026; and d. the Consent Holder's responses to the Panel on 24 August, 26 August, 1 September, 3 September, 10 September, 11 September and 15 September 2026. section 51 Reports, the section 53 comments, and to the Panel dated 24 August, 11 September and 15 September 2026.				
Community Liaison Group						
9 to 13	N/A	N/A	G & R Giles (191 Judge Richardson Drive) We support the inclusion of the Community Liaison Group and the amendments requiring discussion of community concerns. We request that the conditions include: - Affected residents to receive relevant monitoring reports before meetings. - Actions arising from complaints or concerns to be recorded, tracked and reported back. - Transparent communication of investigation outcomes and any mitigation or corrective measures implemented. These requirements would strengthen confidence that community concerns will continue to be meaningfully considered throughout the life of the Project. We support the proposed requirement for advance notification of blasting where practicable. We request that the conditions provide for: - Mandatory advance notification to affected residents, except where immediate action is required for genuine safety reasons. - Access to blast monitoring results for affected residents upon request. - Communication of planned blasting schedules through the Community Liaison Group. These requirements would improve transparency and assist residents in managing the effects of blasting activities.	Panel: Some actions already covered by other conditions (i.e. Complaints Register Conditions 20 to 22 and the CLG conditions) Wait on Applicant's response and possible inclusion of additional conditions	Overall, the Applicant noted it is difficult to respond to these comments (which reflect the Giles' initial comments on the Project) as they have not made comments on specific conditions. However, the Applicant has addressed some key matters. The Applicant considers no further changes are required to the conditions that address the CLG The ONMP will include procedures for inviting, and if the invitation is accepted providing advance notification to the nearest residents prior to blasting occurring, as far as reasonably practicable. However, the Applicant is reluctant to provide monitoring result to landowners, although these will be available through the CLG. Overall, the Applicant considers no further changes are required to the conditions that address noise.	Panel: The Panel concludes that these matters are appropriately addressed within the condition set as drafted and are addressed within the Panel's decision. No change made - Rejected
Kaitiaki Forum						
15	The purpose of the Kaitiaki Forum is to: a. identify mana whenua communication and liaison procedures to be included in the QMP under Condition 39(i); ...	The Advice Note that reflects the one applied to the CLG to ensure it is clear that, whilst holding an important role in the development of the quarry, the purpose of the Kaitiaki Forum differs from that of Auckland Council and it does not hold an approval or certification function.	N/A	Panel: Include summary of Applicant's note in Condition 15 The matters contained within the advice note are to be reflected within condition 15	N/A	Panel: Agreed to the extent that the wording occur as a redraft of the chapeau to Condition 15 Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision												
		Winstone seeks to include the following Advice Note: 15A: For the avoidance of doubt, the scope of the Kaitiaki Forum is an advisory and consultative forum to: - facilitate the exchange of information between the Consent Holder and the members of Kaitiaki Forum and - for the Consent Holder to receive and take into account feedback from the members of Kaitiaki Forum.																
Management and Monitoring Plans																		
26	Table 1: Management and Monitoring Plan submission timeframes <table><tr><th>Management or Monitoring Plan</th><th>Cond ref</th><th>Submission timeframe to AC for certification / information purposes</th></tr><tr><td>Lizard Management Plan (LMP)</td><td>63 to 64</td><td>20 working days prior to commencement of Construction works</td></tr></table>	Management or Monitoring Plan	Cond ref	Submission timeframe to AC for certification / information purposes	Lizard Management Plan (LMP)	63 to 64	20 working days prior to commencement of Construction works	As per Paragraph 667 and the list of appendices, the Panel is approving the Lizard Management Plan as part of granting the Wildlife Act Authority, recognising that the LMP is also applicable to the resource consents. This needs to be recognised in <table><tr><th>Management or Monitoring Plan</th><th>Cond ref</th><th>Submission timeframe to AC for certification / information purposes</th></tr><tr><td>Lizard Management Plan (LMP)</td><td>63 to 64</td><td>20 working days prior to commencement of Construction works - where Conditions 30 to 32 apply and certification by Council is required; or - otherwise as approved by Condition 1(d) of this consent is provided for the purposes of information only. </td></tr></table> Table 2. Winstone seek to amend Take 1 as follows:	Management or Monitoring Plan	Cond ref	Submission timeframe to AC for certification / information purposes	Lizard Management Plan (LMP)	63 to 64	20 working days prior to commencement of Construction works - where Conditions 30 to 32 apply and certification by Council is required; or - otherwise as approved by Condition 1(d) of this consent is provided for the purposes of information only.	N/A	Panel: Mechanical change agreed – consequential changes required (i.e. Advice Note 26C)	N/A	Panel: Agreed Change made
Management or Monitoring Plan	Cond ref	Submission timeframe to AC for certification / information purposes																
Lizard Management Plan (LMP)	63 to 64	20 working days prior to commencement of Construction works																
Management or Monitoring Plan	Cond ref	Submission timeframe to AC for certification / information purposes																
Lizard Management Plan (LMP)	63 to 64	20 working days prior to commencement of Construction works - where Conditions 30 to 32 apply and certification by Council is required; or - otherwise as approved by Condition 1(d) of this consent is provided for the purposes of information only.																
27	Where any condition(s) requires the Consent Holder to submit a Management or Monitoring Plan to the Council for "certification", (including full or partial certification in accordance with Conditions 23 – 27, and amended certified or approved Management or Monitoring Plans in accordance with	Winstone wants to ensure that it is clear the certification process is not an opportunity to relitigate matters. Winstone seeks to strengthen Condition 27(b) as follows:	N/A	Panel: Agreed is the counterfactual to the current drafting of the condition	N/A	Panel: Agreed Change made												

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
	Condition 30), it means the process set out in the following paragraphs (a) to (b) and the terms "certify" and "certified" have the equivalent meanings: a. The Consent Holder submits the Management or Monitoring Plan to the Council, and the Council technically assesses the documentation submitted; and b. The certification process must be confined to confirming that the Management or Monitoring Plan gives effect to its objective, complies with the information requirements, and will achieve any performance standards specified in these condition(s).	b. The certification process must be confined to confirming that the Management or Monitoring Plan gives effect to its objective, complies with the information requirements, and will achieve any performance standards specified in these condition(s). <u>Certification does not constitute a reconsideration of the merits of the consent or approval of matters outside the scope of those conditions</u>				
Cultural Management Plan						
37A	The CMP records the engagement undertaken by the consent holder with mw in preparing the CMP	The amendment is required to provide clarity. The CMP records the engagement undertaken by the consent holder with <u>mana whenua</u> in preparing the CMP.	N/A	Panel: Agreed mechanical	N/A	Panel: Agreed • Change made
Quarry Management Plan and Operational (and Construction) Noise (and Vibration) Management Plan						
38 & 39	N/A	N/A	G & R Giles (191 Judge Richardson Drive) The draft decision concludes that the proposed blasting and vibration conditions will adequately protect neighbouring properties. However, given the increased scale, duration and proximity of quarry activities to residential properties, we consider additional safeguards are warranted. <i>We request that the conditions include:</i> - A pre-development condition survey of neighbouring dwellings, outbuildings and infrastructure where owners elect to participate. - Periodic follow-up inspections where requested by affected landowners. - A clearly defined and independently administered process for investigating and resolving claims of damage. - Timely provision of monitoring results to affected landowners. - Any proposed relocation of a blast vibration sensor should be discussed with affected property owners in advance. Where the new monitoring location is further from the dwelling than the original location, the relocation should be supported by an independent technical assessment confirming that the sensor will continue to provide measurements representative of vibration effects at the dwelling. Any required correlation factors, adjustments, assumptions or limitations should be documented and provided to the affected property owner. While the proposed vibration limits are intended to avoid damage, these measures	Panel: Reject for reasons as set out in decision – including the ONMP (Condition 41)	Overall, the Applicant noted it is difficult to respond to these comments (which reflect the Giles' initial comments on the Project) as they have not made comments on specific conditions. However, the Applicant has addressed some key matters. The ONMP will include procedures for inviting, and if the invitation is accepted providing advance notification to the nearest residents prior to blasting occurring, as far as reasonably practicable. However, the Applicant is reluctant to provide monitoring result to landowners, although these will be available through the CLG. Overall, the Applicant considers no further changes are required to the conditions that address noise. These matters are addressed above, and the Applicant considers no further changes are required to the conditions.	Panel: Rejected for reasons set out in decision, including the existence of the ONMP, and in consideration of similar comments by the Applicant • No change made - Rejected
40 & 41	N/A	N/A				

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
			would provide a practical and transparent mechanism for addressing concerns if damage is alleged. We support the proposed requirement for advance notification of blasting where practicable. <i>We request that the conditions provide for:</i> • <i>Mandatory advance notification to affected residents, except where immediate action is required for genuine safety reasons.</i> • <i>Access to blast monitoring results for affected residents upon request.</i> • <i>Communication of planned blasting schedules through the Community Liaison Group.</i> These requirements would improve transparency and assist residents in managing the effects of blasting activities.			
Air Quality Management Plan						
49	The AQMP must include...	This reflects the same approach taken for the ONMP, which is being approved by the Panel. <i>Winstone seeks to include the following Advice Note:</i> <u>49A: An AQMP was provided as part of the application package (Appendix B12.8.1) and approved as part of this consent (refer Condition 26 Table 2)). This achieves the purposes of Conditions 48 and 49 above and does not need to be certified in accordance with Conditions 23 to 27 if this is the version to be implemented in accordance with Condition 29. Should an amended version be developed, this will need to proceed through the amendment and revision certification process for approved Management or Monitoring Plans as set out in Conditions 30 to 32</u>	N/A	Panel: Agreed mechanical	N/A	Panel: Agreed • Change made
Ecological Management Plan						
60	The EcMP must include: a. description of the terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity values to be addressed by the EcMP; ... k. 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. ... p. 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:	The amendment to condition 60(k) ensures that the requirement to confirm the wetland offset extent is not misinterpreted as a new offset exercise. Winstone provided the wording for Condition 60(p) (i) to (vi) but now seeks an amendment to Condition (p)(i). On reflection, the proposed wording requires an overly onerous effort that is unnecessary to achieve the outcome of recovering and propagating regionally at risk and threatened flora (Condition 60(e)) and identifying such plants to repopulate worked areas. <i>Winstone seeks the following amendments to Condition 60:</i> k. 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	N/A	Panel: Accepted as mechanical (K) and agree to (P) changes	N/A	Panel: Agreed • Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
	(i) 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)). (ii) 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. (iii) Identify suitable sites within identified offset Focus Areas for establishment of each RTAR species, and site preparation required prior to planting out of specimens. (iv) Specify optimal timing of salvage and relocation to ensure successful survivorship and growth. (v) Specify protocols for seed collection/ root ball protection/ propagation/ hygiene. (vi) Specify performance criteria for survivorship and growth of planted RTAR specimens. ...	protocols to confirm the required wetland offset extent, <u>as set out in Condition 162 Table 2</u>, is achieved. p. 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 (i) Require a <u>representative</u> pre-clearance survey for threatened and at-risk plant specimens within the Project Footprint <u>to be undertaken by a SQEP</u>. ~~(noting location, number, age classes, size and relevant characteristics (maturity, presence of propagules, translocation viability)).~~				
Aquatic Fauna Salvage and Relocation Plan						
62	The AFSRP must include: a. a description of the aquatic fauna values to be addressed by the AFSRP; b. plans identifying the locations where salvage of fish and kōura will be undertaken, and in Tributary 3 restrict salvage to culvert installation sites only at Stage 2; and culvert installation sites and upstream reaches of Tributary 4 during Stage 2....	N/A	Department of Conservation (DOC) At the ecology workshop, Dr. Boothroyd and Dr. McEwan agreed that it was unnecessary to salvage fish from the upstream reach of Tributary 4. The fish that are upstream will most likely be able to migrate downstream when they need to, therefore salvaging beyond the culvert install sites is unnecessary, and poses more risk to fish safety than not disturbing them. <i>Amendments are proposed to align with the intention dictated at the ecology workshop.</i> The AFSRP must include: a. a description of the aquatic fauna values to be addressed by the AFSRP; b. plans identifying the locations where salvage of fish and kōura will be undertaken, and in Tributary Tributaries 3 and 4 restrict salvage to culvert installation sites only at Stage 2; ~~and culvert installation sites and upstream reaches of Tributary 4 during Stage 2~~	Panel: Question: <i>What is this achieving and why there was differentiating between two tributaries originally</i> Wait for Applicant's response	The Applicant agrees this change is acceptable and clarifies the approach to salvage of fish and kōura for the project.	Panel: Agreed Change made
Lizard Management Plan						
64	The LMP must include: ... Advice Note: 64A: Any capture and relocation of indigenous lizards must be undertaken in	This reflects the same approach taken for the ONMP, which is being approved by the Panel.	N/A	Panel: Agreed mechanical	N/A	Panel: Agreed Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
	accordance with the Wildlife Permit approved under the Wildlife Act 1953. The LMP matters to be addressed as required by Condition 63 should reflect and not conflict with the conditions of the Wildlife Permit.	<i>Winstone seeks to include the following Advice Note:</i> <u>64B: An LMP was provided as part of the application package (Appendix B12.8.4) and approved as part of this consent (refer Condition 26 Table 2)). This achieves the purposes of Conditions 63 and 64 above and does not need to be certified in accordance with Conditions 23 to 27 if this is the version to be implemented in accordance with Condition 29. Should an amended version be developed, this will need to proceed through the amendment and revision certification process for approved Management or Monitoring Plans as set out in Conditions 30 to 32.</u>				
Pest Management Plan						
65	The purpose of the Pest Management Plan (PMP) is to detail the measures and procedures for 35 years to control pest animals and pest plants to protect new plantings and existing mature bush areas within the Site and the offset and compensation sites and ensure compliance with Conditions 0 to Error! Reference source not found..	N/A	<i>Department of Conservation (DOC)</i> Condition 66 states that the purpose of the Pest Management Plan (PMP) is to control pest animals and pest plants to protect new plantings and existing mature bush areas within the Site and the offset and compensation sites for 35 years. The Department broadly agrees with this purpose but wants the duration for the life of the consent (if different). (note Condition 65 states the purpose) The Department stated in its section 53 comments that the 35 year timeframe is inappropriate because the PMP is required in the resource consent conditions to manage the adverse effects on indigenous flora and fauna for the duration of the activity, i.e. the vegetation clearance and rehabilitation of the site. [Section 53 comments from the Department, paragraphs 4.15 – 4.17]. To ensure the best possible chance for the offsetting and compensation sites to achieve a future mature forest functioning to replace what was cleared, weed and animal control will assist the plants to grow into a healthier ecosystem, and will assist in ensuring that Appendix 3 of the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 is implemented to the extent possible (understanding that it is overly onerous on the consent holder to achieve the same functioning of the ecosystem lost within the timeframe of the consent). The objectives in condition 67 clarify that the PMP will be implemented over the life of the consent (with emphasis added): (note Condition 66 states the objectives) (a) to protect and enhance ecological values and connectivity at Winstone's Hunua Quarry and adjacent sites in Hunua Road and Judge Richardson Drive, and at the Meremere Quarry, through achieving sustained suppression of key target predators / pests at or below desired abundance targets within set timeframes <u>over the lifespan of the consent</u> ;	Panel: Wait for Applicant's response	The Applicant agrees with DOC that the 35-year time constraint should be removed given that post management is continuous during the life of the quarry.	Panel: Agreed • Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
			(b) to protect new enhancement plantings from target pest animal browsers during establishment of the enhancement planting areas, from the initial enhancement planting installation until 5 years after final planting is completed by management area; (c) to achieve removal of target invasive pest plants within enhancement planting prior to planting installations; and (d) pest management areas within set timeframes <u>over the lifespan of the consent</u>. <i>It is requested that Condition 66 (note Condition 65) removes the reference to 35 years.</i> The purpose of the Pest Management Plan (PMP) is to detail the measures and procedures ~~for 35 years~~ to control pest animals and pest plants to protect new plantings and existing mature bush areas within the Site and the offset and compensation sites and ensure compliance with Conditions 167 to 169.			
Stream Realignment Management Plan						
68	The objective of the Stream Realignment Management Plan (SRMP) is to detail the process for the design, construction, and long-term establishment of the Mangapū Tributary realignment in a way that: a. as far as practicable, creates a channel form and functioning watercourse with characteristics of the restored reach upstream, and the natural stream downstream; and b. achieves no net loss of value; and incorporates 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 LRSMP required by Condition 24(a) and 24(f); c. supports a healthy, resilient, and culturally aligned freshwater ecosystem that achieves the following indicative thresholds: (i) Habitat Quality Score band: = or > good; (ii) Deposited fine sediments (Bankside visual estimate % fine sediment cover): <20%; and (iii) Biotic Index (MCI score): = or > Good (MCI score = > 100 d. ensures compliance with Conditions	The reason for the qualifiers to the thresholds (ii) and (iii) is to provide a 'control' or 'reference' site for comparative purposes. A stand-alone threshold risks failure even if the failings are occurring elsewhere in the catchment or out of the control of Winstone. An example would be a landslip upstream (such as on Tributary 2) pulsing sediment into the stream which would breach the threshold in the realignment but is in fact also being recorded at the 'reference' site. The habitat quality score is different as that is more established as part of the design and can generally be rectified through adaptive measures. <i>Winstone seeks the following amendment to Condition 68:</i> c. supports a healthy, resilient, and culturally aligned freshwater ecosystem that achieves the following indicative thresholds: (i) Habitat Quality Score band: = or > good; (ii) Deposited fine sediments (Bankside visual estimate % fine sediment cover): <20% <u>or within 10% cover of reference cover estimate</u>; and (iii) Biotic Index (MCI score): = or > Good (MCI score = > 100 <u>or within 10% cover of reference MCI score</u>.	Department of Conservation (DOC) Support the inclusion of indicative thresholds as a compromise finding between the Department and the applicant Support the inclusion that DOC has the opportunity to review the plan prior to lodgement with the Council through Advice Note 68A <i>No changes requested.</i>	Panel: Applicant's changes add degree of uncertainty by using a reference cover estimate – added after workshop – reject – refer to decision	The Applicant acknowledges DOC's support	Panel: The Panel agrees that there needs to be a change in respect of (b) with reference to no net loss of values, in that it is accepted that there are will be some loss of values. However, for the reasons set out in the decision the Panel does not agree to the additional wording in subparts (c) Change made to the start of Condition 68(b), but no change to Condition 68(c)(ii) and (ii)

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
	118 – 121 and 136 - 139. Advice Note: 68A: The Consent Holder has agreed with DOC that the Stream Realignment Management Plan will be provided to DOC for review prior to certification by the Council. Any comments received from DOC prior to lodgement with the Council will be recorded in the SRMP. Advice Note: 68A: <i>The Consent Holder has agreed with DOC that the Stream Realignment Management Plan will be provided to DOC for review prior to certification by the Council. Any comments received from DOC prior to lodgement with the Council will be recorded in the SRMP.</i>	Winstone notes that at Paragraph 442 of the draft decision, the Panel has stated, 'We consider that the effects management approach for freshwater issues proposed by the Applicant will not achieve no net loss across all areas.' Condition 68 which sets out the requirements for the Stream Realignment Management Plan (SRMP), one of matters to be achieved is 'no net loss of value' as highlighted below. Winstone is bringing this to the Panel's attention as it seems there is a potential disconnect between the Panel's findings and the outcome sought by the condition. Condition 68 The objective of the Stream Realignment Management Plan (SRMP) is to detail the process for the design, construction, and long-term establishment of the Mangapū Tributary realignment in a way that: (a) as far as practicable, creates a channel form and functioning watercourse with characteristics of the restored reach upstream, and the natural stream downstream; and (b) achieves no net loss of value; and incorporates 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 LRSMP required by Condition 24(a) and 24(f)...	Auckland Council Council wish to reiterate here for completeness that Council's Ecologist remains of the view that offset and compensation has not been shown (on an evidential basis) to be sufficient to address the adverse effects assessed. The BOAM has been used incorrectly. The SEV calculations are hypothetical for the Meremere offset site. There is no SEV for values lost in the diversion stream. Council's comments on ecological conditions have therefore been provided on the basis of the Panel's conclusions as set out in the draft decision. a. Use of "Diversion" and "Realignment" interchangeably through the draft decision and conditions. While both terms involve changing the way water flows, the diversion is more about redirection whereas realignment suggests a more permanent stream channel layout. We would recommend the panel consider how they view the difference, and whether the wording should be consistent through the decision and conditions. b. Condition 68(b): This condition as drafted retains wording that requires the SRMP to demonstrate that the realignment will achieve "no net loss of value." This has tracked through from previous Council feedback and recommendations, however based on the draft decision it is understood that the Panel has accepted that there will be a loss of value associated with the stream realignment, but has determined that loss is acceptable (i.e.: does not require additional mitigation, offset or compensation to be delivered to ensure no net loss of value). There is therefore an inherent compliance issue with this condition as drafted that would create monitoring issues. <i>The panel has accepted there is loss of value of the diversion stream (draft decision report para 431 and 442), however, this clause requires the SRMP to demonstrate that there will be no net loss of value. This therefore raises ambiguity & challenges for monitoring.</i> <i>There is no associated effects management in Table 2 in the conditions and as no method is proposed in condition 68 to determine if there is a loss of value or not. The issue is likely to resurface as the applicant position was (is?) that there was no loss of value with what was proposed - but the panel and Council consider otherwise. The components in condition 68 (c) do not provide an encompassing evidence base of stream value, so for monitoring to determine there is no net loss of value and in turn compliance with this will be challenging, especially with the existing disagreement.</i>	Panel: AC noted and no action taken – Panel has made a decision (a) Panel are looking at this one (b) Panel are looking at this one	The Applicant has already raised this matter in its comments on conditions. For clarity, and given the Panel's determination in the decision, the Applicant suggests removing the wording 'no loss of value' relying on the: • The requirements in Condition 68(c) which establish indicative thresholds of ecosystem value that are to be achieved; and • Offsetting and compensation approach set out in later conditions that the Panel deems to be appropriate and proportional.	

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
			<i>If the panel is satisfied that the remaining components of (a)-(c) are appropriate to manage effects acceptably, which seems to be the conclusion reached in the draft decision (?), then perhaps this “achieves no net loss of value; and” needs to be deleted from this section?</i> <i>Alternatively (if the panel thinks this is a critical component of the outcomes being acceptable) can the panel provide a condition with improved clarity as to how this would be delivered/what would be expected to be included to show this noting we understand there would need to be additional offset/compensation to achieve no net loss of value that hasn't been proposed. Or are they anticipating that Council will require/address this through the certification of the plan - in which case again this would benefit from clarification in an advice note?</i>			
69	The SRMP must include the following: ... <i>Advice Note:</i> <i>69A: The Consent Holder has agreed to provide DOC with a copy of the report that details the monitoring and performance of the stream works.</i>	N/A	Department of Conservation (DOC) Support the inclusion that DOC will receive a copy of the report. No changes requested.	N/A	The Applicant acknowledges DOC's support	Panel: No Action
Pre-Start Meeting						
71	Stages 1 – 8 of the Project must not commence until one of the following has occurred within 15 working days of the offer to Council as per Condition Error! Reference source not found. The Council's assigned monitoring officer: - has attended a pre-start meeting, or - has provided a response in writing indicating that their attendance at any pre-start meeting is not required, or - has not provided a response.	N/A	Auckland Council The new drafted wording of this condition has included what is in effect an element of 'deemed certification.' Auckland Council are strongly opposed to all forms of deemed certification conditions – related in respect to (c) <i>Is strongly opposed to all forms of conditions which allow for a non-response to constitute approval for a consent holder to undertake an activity or activities such as, in this case, earthworks and erosion and sediment control measures.</i> Pre-start meetings are an essential means of avoiding adverse effects by ensuring consent holders and their contractors are aligned with Council's environmental monitoring officers as to how consent conditions must be complied with, or, where there are differences in interpretation, to afford an opportunity to resolve these ahead of the commencement of works. The proposed 'no response' option allowed for by this condition is akin to the deemed certification of management plans which has been considered by the Courts as follows (advice from Brookfields Lawyers): In Meridian Energy Ltd v Wellington City Council,[1] Meridian sought conditions that if it did not hear back from the Council as to the approval of a management plan within a specified timeframe then the management plan would be deemed to be approved. The Court held that “this approach is not sound environmental management (or we suspect	Panel: The case law cited relates to Management Plans, whereas condition relates to pre-start meeting. Management Plans play a fundamental role to conditions and Panel has not allowed any Management Plans to be approved by default timing Condition relates to pre-start meeting not Management Plan and if Council doesn't respond within 15 wd then Applicant can proceed	The Applicant's concern is that in the past, there has been a delay to Council undertaking pre-start meetings, which has led to delays in starting works with consequential effects on contractors' timeframes and contractual arrangements.	Panel: Rejected AC's comments for reasons set out in decision, including that the case law cited relates to Management Plans, whereas condition relates to pre-start meeting. Management Plans play a fundamental role to conditions and Panel has not allowed any Management Plans to be approved by default timing / deemed certification. Condition relates to pre-start meeting not Management Plan and if Council doesn't respond within 15 wd then Applicant can proceed No change made - Rejected

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
			good project management), and we do not accept Meridian's approach".[2] Subsequently, in New Zealand Transport Agency – Waka Kotahi, the Environment Court did not see any reason to depart from the findings in Meridian Energy and it directed the parties to delete conditions providing for 'deemed certification' of management plans.[3] [1] Meridian Energy Ltd v Wellington City Council [2011] NZEnvC 232. [2] Ibid, at [402]. [3] New Zealand Transport Agency – Waka Kotahi [2024] NZEnvC 133, at [124] – [128].			
Part C – Specific Conditions – Construction Works & Mineral Extraction Activities						
Access Upgrade from Hunua Road						
78	Prior to operational use of the Western Haul Road, the Consent Holder must upgrade the Site access on Hunua Road in general accordance with Figure 11 of Schedule A. The upgrade works must be certified by the Council prior to commencing use of the Western Haul Road and must include the following: a. Provision of a full right-turn bay on Hunua Road for vehicles turning right into the Site; b. ... h. Removal of the existing stonewall near the existing gate to achieve sight lines. i. At the location shown the map shown in Figure 8 of Schedule A to the consent, the installation of audio tactile profiled centreline markings (rumble strips) along the centreline at this corner on Hunua Road: j. ... o. Retention and maintenance of the existing "Trucks Crossing" warning signage located at the eastern side of the vehicle crossing onto Hunua Road.	A minor grammatical change <i>A minor amendment is sought to Condition 78:</i> Prior to operational use of the Western Haul Road, the Consent Holder must upgrade the Site access on Hunua Road in general accordance with Figure 11 of Schedule A. The upgrade works must be certified by the Council prior to commencing use of the Western Haul Road and must include the following: ... i. At the location shown <u>on</u> the map shown in Figure 8 of Schedule A to the consent, the installation of audio tactile profiled centreline markings (rumble strips) along the centreline at this corner on Hunua Road:-	Auckland Council A minor change for clarity Prior to operational use of the Western Haul Road, the Consent Holder must upgrade the Site access on Hunua Road in general accordance with Figure 11 of Schedule A. The upgrade works must be certified by the Council prior to commencing use of the Western Haul Road and must include the following: ... o. Retention and maintenance of the existing "Trucks Crossing" warning signage <u>located at the eastern side of the vehicle crossing onto Hunua Road.</u>	Panel: Applicant comment: Agreed AC comment: Wait on Applicant's response	The Applicant agrees with this change	Panel: Agreed to both Applicant's and AC's comments / changes Changes made
Safe System Audit Report: Hunua Road Carriageway Upgrade Works						
79	Prior to commencing the Access Upgrade works commencement of the proposed quarry activity, the Consent Holder must engage an independent and suitably qualified Safety Engineer to undertake and complete an independent Preliminary Design Road Safety Audit of Hunua Road carriageway upgrade works near the Site entrance and benching on the inside of the curve on Hunua Road as shown in Figure 11 in Schedule A to the consent. (a) The Preliminary Design Safe System Audit must be completed in accordance with the New Zealand Transport Agency Procedure Manual ("Safe System Audit (SSA) Procedures for transport projects") by an independent and appropriately	The minor change to the chapeau is to remove unnecessary wording and improve legibility. The more substantive changes to Condition 79(e), (f) (g) and (h) are as follows: Condition 79(e) should be an Advice Note as conditions cannot require additional consents to be sought or be reliant upon the agreement of third parties. Condition 79(f) is more appropriately included as an Advice Note as it relates to construction works. Condition 79(g) is more appropriately addressed via an amendment to Advice Note80A to Condition 80, which relates to engineering approval.	Auckland Council The sentence does not make sense as drafted. It is understood that the access upgrade works are required prior to commencement of the quarry activity, so "and" included for clarity. Prior to commencing the Access Upgrade works <u>and</u> commencement of the proposed quarry activity, the Consent Holder must engage an independent and suitably qualified Safety Engineer to undertake and complete an independent Preliminary Design Road Safety Audit of Hunua Road carriageway upgrade works near the Site entrance and benching on the inside of the curve on Hunua Road as shown in Figure 11 in Schedule A to the	Panel: Question: To have off-line meeting so wording read as advice notes vs conditions – i.e. alter 'must' and Applicant to come back with wording <i>Safe System Audit Report: Hunua Road Carriageway Upgrade Works Condition 79 subparts (e) to (h) are proposed to be advice notes. As they are currently constructed, the notes do not read as advice notes but as conditions, particularly with reference to the use of 'must'. Please reconsider the wording so they are constructed as advice notes and provide such amendments</i>	The Applicant has reworded the Advice Notes attached to Condition 79 as follows: Advice Notes: ~~79C: If any agreed mitigation measure(s) require a s~~ Separate resource consent or third-party approval, ~~it must be the sole responsibility of the Consent Holder to may be required prior to implementing any agreed mitigation measures obtain such consents and/or approvals prior to any Construction works and implementation of such measure(s).~~ ~~79D: Construction works within the road reserve must occur prior to~~ The complete implementation of agreed recommendations, adopted changes and approval(s) (where	Panel: Agreed to both Applicant's and AC's comments / changes Changes made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
	qualified safety audit team (b) The completed Safe System Audit Report must be provided to the Council for certification and must address the proposed roading widening works at Hunua Road near the vehicle entrance. The Consent Holder must adopt and address any recommendations made in the certified Safe System Audit (SSA) which is agreed with the Council (in consultation with Auckland Transport). (d) The Consent Holder must undertake remedial measures where the findings of the SSA identify any serious or significant traffic-related concerns, that in the opinion of the Council, in consultation with Auckland Transport, constitute an unreasonable disruption to the transport network and/or exacerbate traffic safety risk. Any remedial measures must be agreed by the Council, in consultation with Auckland Transport, and must be incorporated into the finalised design. (e) If any agreed mitigation measure(s) require a separate resource consent or third-party approval, it must be the sole responsibility of the Consent Holder to obtain such consents and/or approvals prior to any Construction works and implementation of such measure(s). (f) Construction works within the road reserve must not occur prior to the complete implementation of agreed recommendations, adopted changes and approval(s) (where required) agreed in the SSA. (g) The Consent Holder must provide to the Council for engineering application approval, the detailed design which implements the recommendations of the Preliminary Safe System Audit. (h) All work in the road reserve must be carried out in accordance with the general requirements of The National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors http://nzuag.org.nz/nationalcode/ApprovedNationalCodeFeb13.pdf and Auckland Transports Code of Practice https://at.govt.nz/about-us/auckland-transportcode-of-practice/.	Condition 79(h) should an Advice Note because The National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors is a non-RMA and non-statutory document. <i>The following amendments are proposed to Condition 79:</i> Prior to commencing the Access Upgrade works commencement of the proposed quarry activity, the Consent Holder must engage an independent and suitably qualified Safety Engineer to undertake and complete an independent Preliminary Design Road Safety Audit of Hunua Road carriageway upgrade works near the Site entrance and benching on the inside of the curve on Hunua Road as shown in Figure 11 in Schedule A to the consent. (a) The Preliminary Design Safe System Audit must be completed in accordance with the New Zealand Transport Agency Procedure Manual ("Safe System Audit (SSA) Procedures for transport projects") by an independent and appropriately qualified safety audit team. (b) The completed Safe System Audit Report must be provided to the Council for certification and must address the proposed roading widening works at Hunua Road near the vehicle entrance. (c) The Consent Holder must adopt and address any recommendations made in the certified Safe System Audit (SSA) which is agreed with the Council (in consultation with Auckland Transport). (d) The Consent Holder must undertake remedial measures where the findings of the SSA identify any serious or significant traffic-related concerns, that in the opinion of the Council, in consultation with Auckland Transport, constitute an unreasonable disruption to the transport network and/or exacerbate traffic safety risk. Any remedial measures must be agreed by the Council, in consultation with Auckland Transport, and must be incorporated into the finalised design. ~~(e) If any agreed mitigation measure(s) require a separate resource consent or third-party approval, it must be the sole responsibility of the Consent Holder to obtain such consents and/or approvals prior to any Construction works and implementation of such measure(s).~~ ~~(f) Construction works within the road reserve must not occur prior to the complete implementation of agreed recommendations, adopted~~	consent.	AC comment: Agreed	required) agreed in the SSA <u>are to be completed prior to commencing construction works within the road reserve.</u> 79E: All wWorks in the road reserve <u>must</u> <u>are</u> to be carried out in accordance with the general requirements of The National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors http://nzuag.org.nz/nationalcode/ApprovedNationalCodeFeb13.pdf and Auckland Transports Code of Practice https://at.govt.nz/about-us/auckland-transportcode-of-practice/	

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
		~~changes and approval(s) (where required) agreed in the SSA.~~ ~~(g) The Consent Holder must provide to the Council for engineering application the detailed design which implements the recommendations of the Preliminary Safe System Audit.~~ ~~(h) All work in the road reserve must be carried out in accordance with the general requirements of The National Code of Practice for Utility Operators'~~ ~~Access to Transport Corridors~~ http://nzuag.org.nz/nationalcode/ApprovedNationalCodeFeb13.pdf and ~~Auckland Transports Code of Practice~~ Advice Notes: ... <u>79C: If any agreed mitigation measure(s) require a separate resource consent or third-party approval, it must be the sole responsibility of the Consent Holder to obtain such consents and/or approvals prior to any Construction works and implementation of such measure(s).</u> <u>79D: Construction works within the road reserve must not occur prior to the complete implementation of agreed recommendations, adopted changes and approval(s) (where required) agreed in the SSA.</u> <u>79E: All work in the road reserve must be carried out in accordance with the general requirements of The National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors</u> http://nzuag.org.nz/nationalcode/ApprovedNationalCodeFeb13.pdf and <u>Auckland Transports Code of Practice</u> https://at.govt.nz/about-us/auckland-transportcode-of-practice/				
80	The Consent Holder must submit final plans and specifications of the final design of the updated Site access (including a 3D design of the access that demonstrates compliance with the level and gradients in the AUP access standard) in Conditions 78 to 79 to the Council for certification in accordance with Conditions 23 – 27 and 30 - 31, 20 working days prior to the commencement of construction of the access upgrade. Advice Note: 80A: A separate engineering plan approval and vehicle crossing approval must be obtained from the Council for the detailed design of the vehicle access upgrade, prior to construction of the upgrades commencing.	The Consent Holder must submit final plans and specifications of the final design of the updated Site access (including a 3D design of the access that demonstrates compliance with the level and gradients in the AUP access standard) in Conditions 78 to 79 to the Council for certification in accordance with Conditions 23 – 27 and 30 - 31, 20 working days prior to the commencement of construction of the access upgrade. Advice Note: 80A: A separate engineering plan approval and vehicle crossing approval <u>which implements the recommendations of the Preliminary Safe System Audit</u> must be obtained from the Council for the detailed design of the vehicle access upgrade, prior to construction of the upgrades commencing.	N/A	Panel: Agreed	The Applicant has reworded the Advice Notes attached to Condition 80 as follows: Advice Note: 80A ~~A separate engineering plan approval and vehicle crossing approval which implementation of the recommendations of the Preliminary Safe System Audit will be subject to separate engineering plan approval and vehicle crossing approval must be obtained from the Council for the detailed design of the vehicle access upgrade, prior to construction of the upgrades commencing.~~	Panel: Agreed Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
Construction Vibration and Blasting Noise & Vibration						
94 & 95	N/A	N/A	G & R Giles (191 Judge Richardson Drive) The draft decision concludes that the proposed blasting and vibration conditions will adequately protect neighbouring properties. However, given the increased scale, duration and proximity of quarry activities to residential properties, we consider additional safeguards are warranted. <i>We request that the conditions include:</i> • A pre-development condition survey of neighbouring dwellings, outbuildings and infrastructure where owners elect to participate. • Periodic follow-up inspections where requested by affected landowners. • A clearly defined and independently administered process for investigating and resolving claims of damage. • Timely provision of monitoring results to affected landowners. • Any proposed relocation of a blast vibration sensor should be discussed with affected property owners in advance. Where the new monitoring location is further from the dwelling than the original location, the relocation should be supported by an independent technical assessment confirming that the sensor will continue to provide measurements representative of vibration effects at the dwelling. Any required correlation factors, adjustments, assumptions or limitations should be documented and provided to the affected property owner. While the proposed vibration limits are intended to avoid damage, these measures would provide a practical and transparent mechanism for addressing concerns if damage is alleged.	Panel: Reject for reasons as set out earlier in respect of Giles' comments and in the decision	Overall, the Applicant noted it is difficult to respond to these comments (which reflect the Giles' initial comments on the Project) as they have not made comments on specific conditions. However, the Applicant has addressed some key matters. The ONMP will include procedures for inviting, and if the invitation is accepted providing advance notification to the nearest residents prior to blasting occurring, as far as reasonably practicable. However, the Applicant is reluctant to provide monitoring result to landowners, although these will be available through the CLG. Overall, the Applicant considers no further changes are required to the conditions that address noise.	Panel: Rejected for reasons set out in decision and in consideration of similar comments by the Applicant • No change made - Rejected
98	N/A	N/A				
Stream Works Associated with the Stream Realignment						
120	The Consent Holder must ensure that all pumps are not used to dewater the existing section of the Mangapū Tributary being realigned.	The staged transition of flows from the Mangapū tributary to the created realigned channel, using a temporary weir structure to gradually divert a greater proportion of the flow (as described in the SRMP), is the mechanism for the livening of the realignment (and not pumping). Winstone agrees with the Panel that pumping is not the mechanism to be applied to the transition of flow from the Mangapū tributary to the realigned channel. However, it may be necessary to carefully pump water from residual pools remaining within the Mangapū tributary for the purposes of fish and aquatic fauna salvage – this is not 'dewatering' in the sense of transitioning flows and functionality but is for the purpose of salvage and translocation of aquatic fauna. The condition has been amended to clarify	Department of Conservation (DOC) Support Conditions 120 to 124 (Reviewer note: Conditions 118 to 122 fall under the “Stream Works associated with Stream Realignment” conditions – Conditions 123 and 124 address “Seasonal Restriction on Earthworks” and “Erosion and Sediment Controls”, respectively) <i>No changes requested to the “Stream Works associated with Stream Realignment” conditions</i>	Panel: Martin to check decision paragraph and determine if more specific wording is required to be added to condition Agreed as provides clarity	The Applicant agrees that pest management is to occur for the duration of quarrying.	Panel: Agreed with suggested edits by the Applicant to reword condition • Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
		this. Winstone seeks the following change to Condition 120: The Consent Holder must ensure that all pumps used to ~~dewater~~ <u>remove residual pools</u> in the existing section of the Mangapū Tributary being realigned <u>for the purposes of fish and aquatic fauna salvage must have a 3mm mesh screen to prevent fish from entering the pump</u>				
Rehabilitation of Manglapus Stream Tributary Realignment						
136	Riparian planting along the realignment of the Mangapū Tributary must be: - implemented in accordance with the certified SRMP required by Conditions Error! Reference source not found. and Error! Reference source not found.; - undertaken using native plants sourced from the Manukau Ecological District, where practicable. - implemented immediately following completion of construction of the realigned stream channel, except where construction is completed outside the planting season in which case it should occur in the next planting season; and - completed no later than the completion of Stage 2.	N/A	Department of Conservation (DOC) There is adequate lead up time ahead of the needed planting season as the planting should be implemented immediately following the completion of construction or potentially be postponed until the next planting season. If it is postponed until the next planting season, there is sufficient time for the consent holder to plan for adequate supply of native plants. <i>Condition 136 Remove the section “where practicable”, otherwise, the condition is supported.</i> Riparian planting along the realignment of the Mangapū Tributary must be: - implemented in accordance with the certified SRMP required by Conditions Error! Reference source not found. and Error! Reference source not found.; - undertaken using native plants sourced from the Manukau Ecological District, ~~where practicable.~~ ... Support Conditions 137 to 139 <i>No changes requested to the remainder of the Rehabilitation of Mangapū Stream Tributary Realignment conditions</i>	Panel: Reject for reasons as set out in decision Wait on Applicant's response	The Applicant respectively disagrees with DOC's change as the supply of plants from specific ecological districts has been an issue for a number of projects. This is especially when planting at such a large scale and may require supply from further afield. The Applicant acknowledges DOC's support	Panel: Rejected for reasons set out in decision and in consideration of similar comments by the Applicant No change made - Rejected
Rehabilitation of Quarry Faces and Slopes and OBDA Areas						
142	All planting required by Conditions Error! Reference source not found. must be maintained for 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% shrub and tree cover is achieved, planting density meets or exceeds those specified in the Detailed Design and Landscaping Plan (required by Condition Error! Reference source not found.), 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. Maintenance must include replacement of dead, dying, or diseased plants; and any additional works required to ensure successful establishment.	N/A	Auckland Council There is an inconsistency in this condition with other landscape and ecological planting conditions – requiring 90% canopy cover to be delivered where all other conditions required 80% canopy cover and 90% survival rate. Council recommend aligning the planting requirements across conditions, unless there is a particular reason the panel specified this requirement in this condition. <i>Is there a reason for 90% cover being specified here, noting other conditions require 80% cover (and 90% survival rate)?</i> <i>Recommend this condition is amended to be consistent with condition 58 which requires 80% canopy closure or maintenance for 5 years, whichever comes first, and 90% plant survival rate unless there is a particular reason the</i>	Panel: Martin to check consistency of all conditions to cover / survival rate and determine why higher rate required by Condition 142 to other conditions Wait on Applicant's response	The Applicant recognises that different conditions apply different planting outcomes as it is intended that the offset and compensation areas will achieve substantial planting with canopy closure, whereas for the stream realignment and quarry faces, the planting is more likely to achieve groundcover rather than height/canopy. <i>As such, the Applicant seeks a change to Condition 58 as follows to address both outcomes given that the LRSMP addresses all areas of planting:</i> 58. The LRSMP must include.... (j) a description of how maintenance of <u>offset and compensation</u> planting areas, including replacement of plants that do not survive, will be undertaken and which as a minimum requires maintenance to continue: (i) for at least five (5) years, or until	Panel: The Panel notes the Council's query and accepts the Applicant's position that different targets for specific planting areas and purposes are appropriate. The amendment to condition 58(k) is accepted as it provides greater clarity on the purpose Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
			<i>panel/applicant has specified a different degree of canopy cover here.</i>		80% canopy closure is achieved; and (ii) until a plant survival rate of at least 90% planted specimens (or the original planting density) and composition has been achieved; and (k) <u>a description of how maintenance of Mangapū Stream Tributary Realignment and Quarry Faces and Slopes and OBDA Areas planting including replacement of plants that do not survive, will be undertaken and which as a minimum requires maintenance to continue until 90% shrub and tree cover has been achieved.</u>	
Off-Site Visual Mitigation Planting						
143 to 151	N/A	N/A	G & R Giles (191 Judge Richardson Drive) We acknowledge the proposed visual mitigation planting and rehabilitation requirements. However, the effectiveness of these measures will depend on successful implementation and long-term maintenance. <i>We support the Panel's amendments extending maintenance requirements and request further provision for:</i> <i>Ongoing replacement of failed planting until agreed performance standards are achieved.</i> <i>Property-specific planting designs developed in consultation with affected landowners.</i> <i>Periodic review of planting effectiveness as quarry stages progress.</i> The visual effects of Stages 7 and 8 are acknowledged as being among the most significant for nearby residents. It is therefore important that mitigation is successfully established well in advance of these stages.	Panel: Already 24 months replacement agreed to by Panel so first bullet point addressed Second bullet point addressed by Condition 145(c) Third bullet point – effectiveness managed by SQEP to ensure done right first time	Overall, the Applicant noted it is difficult to respond to these comments (which reflect the Giles' initial comments on the Project) as they have not made comments on specific conditions. However, the Applicant has addressed some key matters. These matters are already provided for in the conditions, and the Applicant considers no further changes are required to the conditions that address landscaping.	Panel: The Panel recognised that the visual effects of Stages 7 and 8 and amended the conditions for off-site mitigation planting accordingly. No further changes are required Rejected for reasons set out in decision and in consideration of similar comments by the Applicant No change made - Rejected
145	The SQEP must visit each participating property to: a. confirm the nature and extent of adverse visual effects on the dwelling and curtilage; and b. identify and recommend appropriate mitigation planting (including necessary heights and densities of planting to reflect the intended outcome of screening, filtering or redirecting views) within the property boundary; and c. develop, with the landowner, a site-specific planting layout that responds to views, topography, existing vegetation, and landowner preferences.	N/A	G & A Masters (68 Judge Richardson Drive) Condition 145(a) does not state the vantage point from which the effects are to be confirmed, so an assessment taken at the property boundary or the road frontage would satisfy it. Where a dwelling sits materially above the road, as ours does, those vantage points give different answers, and the planting would then be designed to a sightline the occupants do not use. The Applicant's landscape experts accepted that the visual simulation was a representative western viewpoint rather than the view from our property, and that an elevated dwelling may see more (draft decision, paragraph 319(f)(i) and (ii)). The seasonal wording aligns 145(a) with the evergreen preference the Panel has adopted in Condition 148, which exists precisely because existing screening in this receiving environment is substantially deciduous. The Applicant's experts accepted that deciduous trees provide only limited screening in winter	Panel: Likely to reject - for reasons that existing condition is general in nature / scope and undertaken by SQEP Wait on Applicant's response	The Applicant disagrees with this change as it is unnecessary given a SQEP will be visiting each property to determine the location and extent of planting required.	Panel: Rejected for reasons set out in decision and in consideration of similar comments by the Applicant No change made - Rejected

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
			(paragraph 319(f)). <i>The Masters seek to amend Condition 145(a) as follows:</i> The SQEP must visit each participating property to: a. confirm the nature and extent of adverse visual effects on the dwelling and curtilage, <u>assessed from the principal internal living areas and the principal outdoor living space of the dwelling, and taking into account seasonal variation in the screening provided by existing vegetation</u>; and			
147	The Consent Holder must maintain the planting for 24 months after establishment, or as long as required thereafter, to ensure a minimum 90% plant survival rate. Maintenance must include replacement of dead, dying, or diseased plants; and any additional works required to ensure successful establishment. This condition does not apply if damage to the planting is caused by the landowner	<i>The change is required as the 24-month duration in Condition 147 does not align with the 12-month requirement in Advice Note 149A to Condition 149.</i> <i>Winstone seeks to amend Condition 147 as follows:</i> The Consent Holder must maintain the planting for <u>12</u> months after establishment, or as long as required thereafter, to ensure a minimum 90% plant survival rate. Maintenance must include replacement of dead, dying, or diseased plants; and any additional works required to ensure successful establishment. This condition does not apply if damage to the planting is caused by the landowner	G & A Masters (68 Judge Richardson Drive) Condition 147 requires the Consent Holder to maintain the planting for 24 months. Advice Note 149A states that maintenance becomes the landowner's responsibility after 12 months. The two cannot both operate, and as drafted the advice note undoes half of the condition. At paragraph 331(g) of the draft decision the Panel records that it increased the maintenance period in Condition 147 deliberately, '<i>given the importance of the planting.</i>' The 12-month figure in the advice note appears to be a carry-over from the Applicant's earlier proposal (draft decision, paragraph 319(f)(vi)) Cross-referencing the condition rather than restating a figure also prevents the same conflict arising again if Condition 147 is further amended. <i>The Masters seek to amend Advice Note 149A as follows:</i> 149A: Maintenance of mitigation planting after ~~12 months~~ <u>the maintenance period required by Condition 147</u> (unless the minimum survival rate has not been achieved) is the responsibility of the landowner, unless an alternative arrangement is mutually agreed in writing between the Consent Holder and the landowner Neither "establishment" nor "establishment period" is defined in the conditions or in the definitions table. As drafted it is unclear whether the 24 months in Condition 147 runs from completion of planting or from some later point at which the planting is regarded as established, and the certification required by Condition 149 has no fixed date at all. Tying both to completion of the planting under Condition 146 gives the obligation a certain start and end and makes it monitorable by the Council. No change of substance is intended. <i>The Masters seek to amend Conditions 147 & 149 as follows:</i> 147: The Consent Holder must maintain	Panel: Agreed all maintenance periods to be consistent by staying at 24 months <i>Condition 147: The Applicant's position is that 24 months of off-site planting maintenance is too onerous and the 12 months volunteered by the Applicant is preferred. We note that this is an Augier condition (albeit that all other changes suggested by the Pane have been accepted). The Panel would have introduced a similar condition with 24 months specified in any event. Given the level of potential adverse visual effect on neighbours, and critically the time until on-site mitigation occurs, ensuring the planting is appropriately established, this period is critical in the Panel's opinion. Therefore, if the Applicant does not accept the 24 months, then the Panel will need to re-consider the on-site mitigation and remediation requirements.</i> <i>The Applicant is requested to provide a revised suggested condition drafting for on-site remediation that is more in line with what the neighbour are seeking for on-site rehabilitation. The Panel will then exercise its discretion to consider which of the conditions to address this issue is more appropriate.</i> Wait on Applicant's response	Noted conflicting response between the tabled comment response and the response to the Panel's question Response to Parties' Comments The Applicant has previously commented on this in its response to draft conditions on 29th September. It maintains its position to retain the maintenance period to 12 months given it has 21 properties to maintain and the logistics of obtaining access to private properties over a 2 year period. Also, after 12 months, planting should generally be well established and ongoing requirements become more akin to routine maintenance rather than establishment maintenance. The move to 24 is more onerous than necessary. <i>The Applicant therefore seeks a change to Condition 147 and Advice Note 149A as follows for clarity:</i> 147 The Consent Holder must maintain the planting for 12 months after <u>the</u> planting is implemented, or as long as required thereafter, to ensure a minimum 90% plant survival rate... Advice Note 149A: Maintenance of mitigation planting after 12 months <u>from implementation</u> (unless the minimum survival rate has not been achieved) is the responsibility of the landowner, unless an alternative arrangement is mutually agreed in writing between the Consent Holder and the landowner Response to the Panel's Comment The Applicant states that given the Panel's opinion they accept the proposed 24-month maintenance period in preference to additional or revised conditions addressing on-site rehabilitation. However, in accordance with its response dated 29th September, it seeks to retain the following amendments to Condition 147 and Advice Note 149 as follows for clarity: 147 The Consent Holder must maintain the planting for ~~12~~<u>24</u> months after <u>the planting is implemented</u>, or as long as required thereafter, to	Panel: Agreed with suggested edits as the Applicant has now accepted 24 months Change made
149	The SQEP must revisit the Site at the end of the establishment period to certify that the agreed planting has been successfully implemented. Advice note: 149A: Maintenance of mitigation planting after 12 months (unless the minimum survival rate has not been achieved) is the responsibility of the landowner, unless an alternative arrangement is mutually agreed in writing between the Consent Holder and the landowner.	N/A				

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
			the planting for 24 months <u>following completion of the planting required by Condition 146 after establishment</u>, or as long as required thereafter, to ensure a minimum 90% plant survival rate. Maintenance must include replacement of dead, dying, or diseased plants; and any additional works required to ensure successful establishment. This condition does not apply if damage to the planting is caused by the landowner 149: The SQEP must revisit the Site at the end of the <u>maintenance period required by Condition 147 establishment period</u> to certify that the agreed planting has been successfully implemented.		ensure a minimum 90% plant survival rate. Maintenance must include replacement of dead, dying, or diseased plants; and any additional works required to ensure successful establishment. This condition does not apply if damage to the planting is caused by the landowner <i>Advice Note:</i> 149A: Maintenance of mitigation planting after ~~4224~~ months <u>from implementation</u> (unless the minimum survival rate has not been achieved) is the responsibility of the landowner, unless an alternative arrangement is mutually agreed in writing between the Consent Holder and the landowner.	
Temporary Revegetation of Inactive Disturbed Areas in Stage 0 and Stage 1						
152	Temporary revegetation of inactive disturbed areas in Stage 0 and Stage 1 As part of each annual review of the Landscape and Rehabilitation Strategy Management Plan, the Consent Holder must identify any quarry face or other disturbed area identified within the pink dashed lines on Figure 9 in Schedule A to the consent, that is expected to remain inactive and not be reworked for a period of five years or more.	N/A	<i>G & A Masters (68 Judge Richardson Drive)</i> In Minute 6 [6](d)(ii) the Panel asked whether temporary planting to soften local visual effects during the years between reworking was practicable and would meaningfully reduce effects for neighbouring dwellings and recorded that although the question was raised in relation to 802 Ponga Road it “applies more generally”. The Applicant’s response addressed Stages 0 and 1 only, and Conditions 152 to 157 have inherited that limitation. We do not read the Panel’s question as having been so confined. No additional machinery is needed, because the assessment criteria in Condition 153 are already stage-neutral: 153(e) refers to “the likely period before the area is reworked” and 153(f) to “the visibility of the area from neighbouring dwellings and other identified viewpoints”. Advice Note 157A already allows temporary vegetation to be removed when quarrying requires it. The properties listed in Condition 143 are affected principally by the later stages, which is where a long inactive period is most likely to arise. Drafting only. The defined term in the definitions table, and the term used at Conditions 9(e)(v), 57 and 58, is “Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan”. Condition 152 uses a different word order, which could be read as referring to a different document. If the Panel does not adopt the amendment above, the plan name in Condition 152 should still be corrected <i>The Masters seek to amend Condition 152 as follows:</i> Temporary revegetation of inactive disturbed areas in Stage 0 and Stage 1 As part of each annual review of the Landscape and Rehabilitation Strategy Management Plan (LRSMP), the Consent	Panel: Wait on Applicant’s response If ‘no’ from Applicant DA to provide response	The Applicant disagrees with the changes sought to Condition 152 as the revegetation of inactive disturbed areas will take place in Stage 0 and Stage 1 as in the ‘areas.’ The identification of disturbed areas suitable for temporary revegetation will occur on an annual basis, but planting will be limited to the areas within the pink line identified on Figure 9. However, the Applicant agrees with the change to the name of the Plan in Condition 152.	Panel: The Panel agrees with the Applicant’s response. The Panel’s focus too has been to manage effects where the success of planting and ability to manage it is more likely to be achieved. The Panel considers that to occur through the offsite mitigation proposal. The two work in tandem and we consider that, with the conditions in place the potential adverse effects are appropriately addressed. Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
			Holder must identify any quarry face or other disturbed area, in any Stage identified within the pink dashed lines on Figure 9 in Schedule A to the consent, that is expected to remain inactive and not be reworked for a period of five years or more.			
154	Where temporary hydroseeding and/or revegetation is assessed as reasonably practicable and capable of providing a visual benefit, the Consent Holder shall, during the first suitable planting season, implement the recommended treatment or any approved establishment trial.	The change amends the terminology to reflect that sought by Auckland Council Winstone seeks to amend Condition 154 as follows: Where temporary hydroseeding and/or revegetation is assessed as reasonably practicable and capable of providing a visual benefit, the Consent Holder ~~shall~~ <u>must</u>, during the first suitable planting season, implement the recommended treatment or any approved establishment trial.	N/A	Panel: Agreed mechanical	N/A	Panel: Agreed Change made
Ecological Survey, Salvage and Relocation						
161	Vegetation clearance must be undertaken 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.	N/A	Department of Conservation (DOC) Support No changes requested	N/A	The Applicant acknowledges DOC's support	No Action / Decision required
Ecological Offsetting and Compensation						
163	The Consent Holder must ensure Conservation covenants are imposed on the Records of Title of sites identified in Focus Areas 1 and 2, in accordance with Section 106 of the RMA and section 77 of the Reserves Act 1977 that provide for the ongoing protection of the areas identified in the "Formal Legal Protection" column of Table 2 . Records confirming this has been completed must be submitted to the Council within one calendar year of the vegetation removal.	N/A	Department of Conservation (DOC) Support No changes requested	N/A	The Applicant acknowledges DOC's support	No Action / Decision required
164	The covenant must: (b) protect and maintain indigenous vegetation on-site (c) be drafted by the council's nominated Solicitor at the consent holder's cost; and (d) be registered against the Computer Register(s) (record of title) to the affected land by the consent holder at their cost; and (e) require the consent holder to: (i) be responsible for all legal fees, disbursements and other expenses incurred by the council in connection with the covenant, and procure its solicitor to give an undertaking to the council for payment of the same; and (ii) indemnify the council for costs, fees, disbursements and other expenses incurred by the council	Minor grammatical changes Winstone seeks to amend Condition 164 as follows: The covenant must: (a) protect and maintain indigenous vegetation on-site (b) be drafted by the Council's nominated Solicitor at the Consent Holder's cost; and (c) be registered against the Computer Register(s) (record of title) to the affected land by the Consent Holder at their cost; and (d) require the Consent Holder to: (i) be responsible for all legal fees, disbursements and other expenses incurred by the Council in connection with the covenant, and procure its solicitor to give an undertaking	N/A	Panel: Agreed mechanical		Panel: Agreed Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
	as a direct or indirect result of the council being a party to this covenant. 2. Within one calendar year of vegetation clearance, the Consent Holder must provide to Council evidence that offset works for Focus Area 3, in the "Formal Legal Protection" column of Table 2, have been completed.	to the Council for payment of the same; and (ii) indemnify the Council for costs, fees, disbursements and other expenses incurred by the Council as a direct or indirect result of the council being a party to this covenant. ...				
Stream Offset and Compensation for Stages 7 and 8						
166	No later than the commencement of Stage 6, the Consent Holder must submit to the Council for certification a Stream Offset and Compensation Plan (SOCP) prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist. The objective of the SOCP is to determine the actions, and the locations and extents of those actions in relation to the loss of all stream extents during Stage 7 noting that 191 m of upper reaches of Trib 4 will already have been offset/compensated during Tranche 1, to demonstrate how no net loss of freshwater values will be achieved	A minor amendment for clarity <i>Winstone seek to amend Condition 166 as follows:</i> No later than the commencement of Stage 6, the Consent Holder must submit to the Council for certification a Stream Offset and Compensation Plan (SOCP) prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist. The objective of the SOCP is to determine the actions, and the locations and extents of those actions in relation to the loss of all stream extents during Stage 7 noting that 191 m of upper reaches of Tributary 4 will already have been offset/compensated during Tranche 1, to demonstrate how no net loss of freshwater values will be achieved	N/A	Panel: Agreed mechanical	N/A	Panel: Agreed Change made
Pest Management						
167	Animal pest management must meet the management targets and adhere to the thresholds for initiating additional control and monitoring frequency for each target species as set out in the following table: ...	N/A	Department of Conservation (DOC) Support <i>No changes requested</i>	N/A	The Applicant acknowledges DOC's support	No Action / Decision required
168	Pest plant management must manage plants that are compiled from the Auckland Council Regional Pest Management Plan 2020-2030, or any other subsequent version, and updated accordingly on proposed baseline monitoring required in Condition 0.	N/A	Department of Conservation (DOC) Condition supported, but Incorrect condition reference. <i>Amend to refer to correct condition reference</i> Pest plant management must manage plants that are compiled from the Auckland Council Regional Pest Management Plan 2020-2030, or any other subsequent version, and updated accordingly on proposed baseline monitoring required in Condition 0.	Panel: Agreed mechanical	The Applicant agrees with the changes sought	Panel: Agreed Change made
Part D – Specific Conditions – Air Discharge Permit						
X						
X	N/A	N/A	G & R Giles (191 Judge Richardson Drive) The draft conditions contain a comprehensive suite of monitoring and management requirements. However, given our property's location relative to quarry operations and prevailing weather conditions, we remain concerned about dust effects as quarrying progresses closer to residential areas. <i>We request that the conditions include:</i> Property-specific monitoring or investigation where repeated dust	Panel: Rejected Panel is satisfied that these matters are adequately covered	Overall, the Applicant noted it is difficult to respond to these comments (which reflect the Giles' initial comments on the Project) as they have not made comments on specific conditions. However, the Applicant has addressed some key matters. The Applicant has previously addressed these matters through the comments process and considers no further changes are required to the conditions that address dust/air quality.	Panel: Rejected for reasons set out in decision and that the matters are adequately covered by the conditions, and in consideration of similar comments by the Applicant No change made - Rejected

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision	
			complaints are received. - Defined investigation and response timeframes when trigger levels are exceeded or complaints indicate potential off-site effects. - Clear and timely reporting of monitoring and investigation outcomes to affected landowners. Although the conditions require monitoring and reporting, there remains uncertainty about how localised impacts on individual properties will be assessed and addressed.				
X	N/A	The Air Discharge permit will replace the existing discharge permit and therefore the latter needs to be surrendered to avoid confusion and/or duplication. The Panel has already approved the AQMP. Winstone seek to add new condition after Condition 170 of Air Discharge Permit DIS60464130. Air permit 34130 must be surrendered on commencement of this consent.	N/A	Panel: Agreed	N/A	Panel: Agreed Change made	
Air Quality Monitoring							
188	The Consent Holder must carry out Total Suspended Particulate (TSP) monitoring at the following locations: (a) At the site of the existing monitor near the Site access road; (b) In the general vicinity of Middleton Road; and (c) On the south westerly boundary. The monitoring equipment must be of US EPA Federal Equivalent Method (FEM), or considered near FEM for PM₁₀ and operated with a TSP inlet and have a sample flow rate of at least five (5) litres per minute. The monitoring equipment must be connected to a telemetry system capable of recording and presenting data in 1 hour average intervals in real time and be capable of sending alerts to site staff via text and/or email.	N/A	Auckland Council There are some minor inconsistencies across the requirements of these Conditions 188 and 189 which Council recommend are aligned. The condition says the limit is 80 µg/m³ at the locations in Conditions 188(b) and 188(c), and then 100 µg/m³ at the location in Condition 188(b). The same location is therefore subject to both 80 and 100 µg/m³. This is internally inconsistent?	Panel: Wait on Applicant's response / fix	If not fix from the Applicant DA to consider and provide response	The Applicant understands that as per 6.7.2 of the Air Quality Assessment: Condition 24 states that 24-hour average TSP concentrations measured at Symonds Hill and Ponga Road dust monitors shall not exceed 80 µg/m³, and 100 µg/m³ at the main gate dust monitor. PDP considers that these trigger levels remain appropriate for the proposed activities, because they have been demonstrated on this site to be appropriate to date. However, to align with current best practice for TSP control PDP recommends these are updated to be a 24-hour rolling average to align with Table 4 of the GPG Dust. The different triggers represent the sensitivity of the receiving environment and distance to sensitive receivers from the dust source.	Panel: The Panel accepts the Applicant's response and the 24-hour rolling average suggested by PDP Change made
189	Without prejudice to limiting the generality of Conditions Error! Reference source not found. – Error! Reference source not found., if the monitoring shows that the TSP in ambient air at or beyond the boundary of the Site, as measured in accordance with Condition 0, exceeds 80 µg/m3 as a 24 hour average at the sites listed in Condition 0(b) and or (c) and 100 µg/m3 as a 24 hour average at the site listed in Condition 0(b), the Consent Holder must initiate an investigation as to the probable cause(s) of the exceedance.	N/A					
Respirable Crystalline Silica Monitoring							
193	The Consent Holder must engage a SQEP to undertake an ambient Respirable Crstalline Silica (RCS) Monitoring programme in the locations identified in the Air Quality Assessment referred to in the table in Condition 1(a).	N/A	Auckland Council Minor re-wording recommendation for clarity. Suggest re-wording for clarity: Be designed to assess compliance <u>with</u> an annual average RCS concentration	Panel: Wait on Applicant's response / fix	If not fix from the Applicant DA to consider and provide response	The Applicant has no concerns with additional wording as it does not alter the intent of the condition and improves legibility.	Panel: Agreed with suggested edits as the Applicant has accepted wording change Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
	As a minimum, the monitoring programme must: ... (c) Be designed to assess compliance of 3 µg/m³ annual average RCS concentration at any nearby dwelling		limit of 3 µg/m³ at any nearby dwelling?			
Air Quality Reporting						
196	The findings of the monitoring must be included in a report submitted to the Council within 20 working days of the completion of the monitoring required under Conditions 0 and Error! Reference s ource not found..	N/A	Auckland Council There is no defined completion of air quality monitoring in Condition 188, rather it requires a continuous monitoring requirement. The requirement of Condition 196 to then supply monitoring reporting “on completion” of monitoring does not align with this previous requirement. Condition 188 establishes continuous monitoring and has no defined “completion”. Requiring a report within 20 working days of completing monitoring under Condition 188 is therefore not workable and duplicates the annual report required by Condition 191. Condition 193 already has its own reporting requirement. <i>Suggestion: delete Condition 196 or revise it to refer specifically to discrete monitoring campaigns.</i> <i>Continuous TSP reporting should remain through exceedance notifications, quarterly reports and the Annual Monitoring Report.</i>	Panel: Wait on Applicant’s response / fix If not fix from the Applicant DA to consider and provide response	The Applicant acknowledges Council's concern and agrees that Condition 196 should be deleted.	Panel: Agreed with suggested edits as the Applicant has accepted Change made – Condition 196 deleted but let intentionally blank for condition number referencing purposes.
Part E – Specific Conditions – Groundwater Permits						
X						
199	Water permits WAT60152106-A, WAT60412731 and WAT60274802-A must be surrendered upon the commencement of this consent.	Winstone cannot operate under Water Permits WAT60464058 and WAT60464047 until such time as a Groundwater Monitoring and Contingency Management Plan has been provided for feedback to the Kaitiaki Forum and the CLG and certified by the Council. In the meantime, Winstone will operate under its recently granted (renewal) water permit. <i>Winstone seek to amend Condition 199 as follows:</i> Water permits WAT60152106-A, WAT60412731 and WAT60274802-A must be surrendered upon ~~the commencement of this consent~~ receipt of certification of the Groundwater Monitoring and Contingency Management Plan required under Condition 50.	N/A	Panel: Agreed as mechanical	N/A	Panel: Agreed Change made
Monitoring						
222	Within two months of regional groundwater levels dropping below RL65m at Downstream site, the Consent Holder must select at least one more additional gauging site above RL35m and below RL45m, within the Waipokopu Stream to ensure at least two stream flow measurements are taken where there is expected to be an existing regional groundwater contribution to baseflow. The selection of the gauging site	N/A	Auckland Council Schedule C requires amendments in response to Conditions 222 and 228 as drafted. This condition appears to have been changed to match the wording of condition 228, and in doing so has lost the meaning and intent of the original condition. It is specific to ground settlement. Groundwater drawdown may or may not	Panel: Question: DM to discuss off-line with Applicant to ensure accurate and Applicant is to respond to Panel	<i>The Applicant has confirmed the following amendment with Council:</i> 222. Within two months of regional groundwater levels dropping below RL65m at Downstream site, the Consent Holder must select at least one more additional gauging site above RL35m and below RL45m, within the Waipokapū Stream to	Also refer to Condition 228 & Schedule C below Panel: Agreed Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision																					
	location(s) must include consultation with Council. The location of the RL40 (new downstream monitoring site) is to be advised as part of the Annual Monitoring Report required by Condition Error! Reference source not found..		cause the onset of ground settlement. This condition needs to relate the groundwater drawdown and the potential for ground settlement and the potential effects on buildings and structures. Typically if triggers are breached then ground settlement pins should be installed. Hence condition clauses of 215 (c,) and (d) of the 22nd June conditions should be retained. While 247 and 248 have been matched they do have different purposes which needs to be reflected in the wording. We have tracked recommended changes to address this – refer Schedule C in conditions document.		ensure at least two stream flow measurements are taken where there is expected to be an existing regional groundwater contribution to baseflow. ~~The selection of the gauging site location(s) must include consultation with Council. The location of the RL40 (new downstream monitoring site) is to be advised as part of the Annual Monitoring Report required by Condition 73(E).~~ <table><tr><th colspan="3">Schedule C: Waipokapū Stream Low</th></tr><tr><th>Gauging</th><th>Easting</th><th>Northing</th></tr><tr><td>Upstream</td><td>1778510</td><td>5894630</td></tr><tr><td>RL40</td><td>1777002</td><td>589465</td></tr><tr><td>Downstream Site</td><td>1776264 88</td><td>5895491.45</td></tr><tr><td>Bridge Site</td><td>1775733</td><td>589491</td></tr><tr><td>RL 40¹</td><td>TBM 1776265</td><td>TBM 589549</td></tr></table>	Schedule C: Waipokapū Stream Low			Gauging	Easting	Northing	Upstream	1778510	5894630	RL40	1777002	589465	Downstream Site	1776264 88	5895491.45	Bridge Site	1775733	589491	RL 40 ¹	TBM 1776265	TBM 589549	
Schedule C: Waipokapū Stream Low																											
Gauging	Easting	Northing																									
Upstream	1778510	5894630																									
RL40	1777002	589465																									
Downstream Site	1776264 88	5895491.45																									
Bridge Site	1775733	589491																									
RL 40 ¹	TBM 1776265	TBM 589549																									
225	That the Consent Holder must ensure that the records collected under Conditions 216 – 223 (inclusive) for the preceding quarter must be submitted to AC by no later than 10 working days after 28 February, 31 May, 31 August and 30 November each year, and as part the Annual Monitoring Report required by Condition 73	The change reflects the terms used for Auckland Council throughout the conditions. Winstone seek to amend Condition 225 as follows: That the Consent Holder must ensure that the records collected under Conditions 216 – 223 (inclusive) for the preceding quarter must be submitted to <u>AC the Council</u> by no later than 10 working days after 28 February, 31 May, 31 August and 30 November each year, and as part the Annual Monitoring Report required by Condition 73	N/A	Panel: Agreed as mechanical	N/A	Panel: Agreed Change made																					
Augmentation Water Quality Monitoring																											
228	In the event that more than 5% drop in the recognised MALF of the gauging stations on Mangapū Stream, Waipokapu Stream and the diverted stream, the Consent Holder must augment flows upstream of the following stations: (a) Waipokapu Stream (Downstream Site), (b) Mangapū Stream (RL 55 Site), (c) Mangapū Stream (Upstream-2 Site), (d) Mangapū Stream (Diversion-1 Site), at a constant rate by at least the maximum difference between the MALF and the average specific discharge flow for each station in a way to compensate for any loss of flow. The required augmentation rates for each station must be presented in the Annual Monitoring Report required by Condition Error! Reference source not found..	N/A	Department of Conservation (DOC) Condition supported but amend the sentence to include “below” rather than “in” as “in” could be interpreted as the MALF figure itself being revised based on the data ascertained, rather than the flow dropping below a certain level. (note Condition 230 as referred to in DOC comments is not right reference to condition) Amend condition as follows: In the event that more than 5% drop <u>below</u> in the recognised MALF of the gauging stations on Mangapū Stream, Waipokapu Stream and the diverted stream, the Consent Holder must augment flows upstream of the following stations: ...	Panel: Agreed Wait on Applicant's response	The Applicant accepts the change of wording to 'below' noting that it does not alter the intent of the condition. The Applicant also notes that Waipokapū should have a macron over the ‘u’.	Also refer to Condition 222 & Schedule C below Panel: Agreed Change made																					

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
Contingency Conditions / Mitigation of Sudden Loss of Water Supply, Bore Interference or Stream Flow Depletion / Mitigation of Effects on Bores Identified in the Application						
232 232 234 235 236 237	N/A	N/A	Department of Conservation (DOC) Support Conditions 234 to 239 (note Conditions 232 to 237 fall under the “Augmentation Water Quality Monitoring” conditions – Conditions 238 and 239 address “Mitigation of sudden loss of water supply, bore interference or Stream flow depletion” and “Mitigation of effects on bores identified in the application”, respectively) <i>No changes requested</i>	N/A	The Applicant acknowledges DOC’s support	No Action / Decision required
238	N/A	N/A		N/A	The Applicant acknowledges DOC’s support	No Action / Decision required
239	N/A	N/A		N/A	The Applicant acknowledges DOC’s support	No Action / Decision required
Waipokopu (Hays) Creek Dam and Reservoir						
246	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 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: a. not causing the adverse effect or not causing the variation in monitoring information, no further action will be required of the Consent Holder; or b. 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. The Consent Holder shall provide WSL with copies of monitoring reports prepared in relation to Condition 0 at the same time as they are submitted to Auckland Council.	N/A	Watercare Services Limited (Watercare) Watercare notes that draft condition 246 retains the process for responding to potential effects on Hays Creek Dam, reservoir yield or stream flows. Watercare further notes and supports the inclusion of a requirement for relevant monitoring reports to be provided to Watercare. Having reviewed the draft conditions, Watercare does not seek any further amendments to the draft conditions and has no further comments. If any substantive changes to draft condition 246 are proposed following comments from other parties, Watercare requests an opportunity to review and comment on those changes before the conditions are finalised.	N/A	The Applicant acknowledges Watercare’s support	No Action / Decision required
Groundwater Settlement Contingency Condition						
247	In the event that groundwater drawdown is such that in either or both monitoring bores HUN12/8U on Hunua Road or ID421 on Jack Paterson Drive equals or exceeds the trigger value in Schedule A, the Consent Holder must: a. within seven (7) days of identifying the exceedance, notify the Council in writing and by telephone of the exceedance, specifying which bore trigger(s) have been exceeded and	N/A	Auckland Council Schedule C requires amendments in response to Conditions 222 and 248 as drafted. This condition appears to have been changed to match the wording of condition 248, and in doing so has lost the meaning and intent of the original condition. It is specific to ground settlement. Groundwater drawdown may or may not cause the onset of ground settlement. This	Panel: Question: DM to discuss off-line with Applicant to ensure accurate <i>Groundwater Settlement Contingency Condition 247 Auckland Council have amended Schedule C to respond to Conditions 222 and 248 as drafted. The Panel seeks confirmation that the changes reflected in Schedule C are accurate.</i>	The Applicant confirms it response dated 29 th September • That the changes reflected in Schedule C are accurate • A possible minor addition is required specifying that the report under Condition 247(c) be provided within 20 working days of any investigation Further, the Applicant (advised by its Groundwater expert) agrees with the	Panel: Agreed with suggested edits as the Applicant has accepted • Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
	the quantum of the exceedance for each bore; b. within fourteen (14) days of identifying the exceedance, complete an investigation to determine the cause of the exceedance, including: - Whether the exceedance is attributable to dewatering at the Symonds Hill Pit; - Whether localised pumping from nearby bores is contributing; - Whether seasonal or climatic variation is a factor; - Whether regional groundwater trends are influencing water levels; and - Whether monitoring bore or equipment issues exist; c. provide a report to the Council documenting the findings of the investigation; d. If the investigation confirms that the exceedance is caused by dewatering at the Symonds Hill Pit, the Consent Holder must cease any further drawdown at the Symonds Hill Pit and must not recommence drawdown unless it is demonstrated that the trigger levels can be complied with to the written satisfaction of the Council; and e. If the investigation determines that the exceedance is not caused by dewatering at the Symonds Hill Pit, no cessation of sump drawdown is required. Advice Note 247A: 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 due to dewatering effects, then an application will be required for a change to consent conditions to seek a greater assessed envelope of effects.		condition needs to relate the groundwater drawdown and the potential for ground settlement and the potential effects on buildings and structures. Typically if triggers are breached then ground settlement pins should be installed. Hence condition clauses of 215 (c,) and (d) of the 22nd June conditions should be retained. While 247 and 248 have been matched they do have different purposes which needs to be reflected in the wording. <i>We have tracked recommended changes to address this – refer Schedule C in conditions document.</i>	Applicant is to respond to Panel	Council. Revised Condition 247 is appropriate and well-drafted. The deletion of the "trigger levels can be complied with" has improved the condition by focusing it on the actual risk: ground settlement west of the Drury Fault. The Applicant seeks a possible minor addition specifying that the report under 247(c) be provided within 20 working days of the investigation.	
Schedules						
N/A	Schedule C	N/A	Auckland Council Schedule C requires amendments in response to Conditions 222 and 248 as drafted. This condition appears to have been changed to match the wording of condition 248, and in doing so has lost the meaning and intent of the original condition. It is specific to ground settlement. Groundwater drawdown may or may not cause the onset of ground settlement. This condition needs to relate the groundwater drawdown and the potential for ground settlement and the potential effects on buildings and structures. Typically if triggers are breached then ground settlement pins should be installed. Hence condition clauses	Panel: Question: DM to discuss off-line with Applicant to ensure accurate and Applicant is to respond to Panel	<i>The Applicant has confirmed the following amendment with Council:</i> 222. Within two months of regional groundwater levels dropping below RL65m at Downstream site, the Consent Holder must select at least one more additional gauging site above RL35m and below RL45m, within the Waipokapū Stream to ensure at least two stream flow measurements are taken where there is expected to be an existing regional groundwater contribution to baseflow. ~~The selection of the gauging site location(s) must include consultation with Council.~~	Also refer to Conditions 222 & 228 above Panel: Agreed Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision																		
			of 215 (c,) and (d) of the 22nd June conditions should be retained. While 247 and 248 have been matched they do have different purposes which needs to be reflected in the wording. <i>We have tracked recommended changes to address this – refer Schedule C in conditions document.</i>		The location of the RL40 (new downstream monitoring site) is to be advised as part of the Annual Monitoring Report required by Condition 73[E). <table><tr><th colspan="3">Schedule C: Waipokapū Stream Low</th></tr><tr><th>Gauging</th><th>Easting</th><th>Northing</th></tr><tr><td>Upstream</td><td>1778510</td><td>5894630</td></tr><tr><td>RL40 Downstream Site</td><td>1777002 177626 4 88</td><td>589465 5895491.45</td></tr><tr><td>Bridge Site</td><td>1775733</td><td>589491</td></tr><tr><td>RL 40¹</td><td>TBM 1776265</td><td>TBM 589549</td></tr></table>	Schedule C: Waipokapū Stream Low			Gauging	Easting	Northing	Upstream	1778510	5894630	RL40 Downstream Site	1777002 177626 4 88	589465 5895491.45	Bridge Site	1775733	589491	RL 40 ¹	TBM 1776265	TBM 589549	
Schedule C: Waipokapū Stream Low																								
Gauging	Easting	Northing																						
Upstream	1778510	5894630																						
RL40 Downstream Site	1777002 177626 4 88	589465 5895491.45																						
Bridge Site	1775733	589491																						
RL 40 ¹	TBM 1776265	TBM 589549																						
Appendix D – Wildlife Approval Conditions																								
Authorised Activity																								
1	All works relating to lizard fauna, including capture, handling, marking and relocation must occur in accordance with the Lizard Management Plan dated 11 September 2026 and submitted with the application.	N/A	Department of Conservation (DOC) The Department is satisfied with the condition as drafted but has two final comments on the LMP: - Section 6.4.3.1 omits Pacific geckos from the release site. DOC suggests amending the LMP to say, Forest geckos and pacific geckos (if present) will be released into arboreal AR's in the same.... - Appendix 1 is missing from the LMP. As Appendix 1 is a cross-reference table identifying where wildlife approval information requirements are addressed in the document and is not material to lizard management, DOC has no concerns with its omission	Panel: DM to discuss off-line with Applicant to ensure accurate and respond to Panel If amended LMP then to provide up-to-date version	The LMP has been amended to refer to Pacific geckos, and Appendix 1 has been provided	Panel: Accept / LMP approved by Panel - LMP: Version 5, Final – Dated 05/10/2026 - Amended LMP provided to address Section 6.4.3.1 omission raised by DOC - Appendix 1 has been provided as a separate document to the LMP - Consequential changes to the condition to reference to the latest version made in the Wildlife Approval and Resource Consent conditions																		
4	This wildlife approval is valid for 10 years from 1 October 2027.	The current Wildlife Act permit ends in October 2026. The intent was for this WA to replace it as it addresses lizard salvage and relocations from anywhere within the Hunua Quarry. As such, it is proposed to name Graham Ussher in Condition 10 to recognise existing contractual arrangements. A minor amendment has also been made to the Lizard Management Plan to reflect amended October 2026 start date. Condition 4 is sought to be amended as follows: This wildlife approval is valid for 10 years from 1 October 2027.	N/A	Panel: Agreed Panel: Question: In its drafting changes to the conditions for the Wildlife permit in Schedule 1 of its comments on the draft conditions the applicant seeks a start date of 1 October 2026. In Schedule 2 of its comments, it seeks that the permit commences the date the permit is granted. Which start date does the Applicant prefer?	The Applicant confirms that it prefers that the wildlife approval be valid for 10 years from the commencement date of these approvals, as the current Wildlife Act permit expires shortly. The intent was for this WA to replace the existing WA as it addresses lizard salvage and relocations from anywhere within the Hunua Quarry.	Panel: Agreed Change made to refer to the Approval being valid for 10 years from the date of commencement of the Approval																		
Lizard Capture & Handling																								
10	Lizards must only be handled by Katherine Muchna or Matt Turner or by others under the direct supervision of a SQEP.	Graham Ussher is a suitably qualified and experienced herpetologist and Principal Ecologist with RMA Ecology Ltd. He holds a PhD in Environmental Management, an MSc in Conservation Ecology, and a BSc from the University of Auckland. His specialist	N/A	Panel: Agreed	N/A	Panel: Agreed Change made																		

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
		expertise includes native lizard survey, salvage, handling and relocation, preparation and implementation of lizard-management measures, threatened-species management, ecological monitoring, and DOC wildlife permitting. He has been directly involved with ecological management at Hunua Quarry since 2007 and has detailed knowledge of the site's elegant gecko population, the 2011 Lizard Relocation Plan, and the subsequent salvage and translocation programme, under which 152 elegant geckos were relocated between 2011 and 2025. He has also provided specialist advice on the DOC Wildlife Act Authority governing the relocation of Hunua geckos to Tiritiri Matangi <i>Condition 10 is sought to be amended as follows:</i> Lizards must only be handled by Katherine Muchna or Matt Turner or <u>Graham Ussher</u> or by others under the direct supervision of a SQEP.				
19	The DOC Operations Manager for Auckland must be contacted immediately [insert contact details] for further advice if lizard species other than those listed in Condition 2 above are located within the clearance area or within the release site.	<i>The contact details for DOC Operations Manager for Auckland have been included for completeness.</i> The DOC Operations Manager for Auckland must be contacted immediately [~~insert contact details~~ <u>auckland@doc.govt.nz</u>] for further advice if lizard species other than those listed in Condition 2 above are located within the clearance area or within the release site.	Department of Conservation (DOC) <i>Email address for Auckland Operations team added</i> The DOC Operations Manager for Auckland [~~insert contact details~~ <u>aucklandpermissions@doc.govt.nz</u>] must be contacted immediately for further advice if lizard species other than those listed in Condition 2 above are located within the clearance area or within the release site.	Panel: Agreed to DOC's email - mechanical	Matter already addressed by Applicant, but confirm that the correct email address is as provided by DOC	Panel: Agreed with DOC and final Applicant comments • Mechanical change made
Death of Wildlife Associated with Salvage Activities						
20	If any lizards should incidentally die during the approved activities of catch, transfer or liberation, the Approval Holder must: (a) inform the Auckland DOC Operations Manager [insert contact details] within 48 hours, chill the body if it can be delivered within 72 hours, or freeze the body if delivery will take longer than 72 hours; and	<i>The contact details for DOC Operations Manager for Auckland have been included for completeness.</i> If any lizards should incidentally die during the approved activities of catch, transfer or liberation, the Approval Holder must: (a) inform the Auckland DOC Operations Manager [~~insert contact details~~ <u>auckland@doc.govt.nz</u>] within 48 hours, chill the body if it can be delivered within 72 hours, or freeze the body if delivery will take longer than 72 hours; and	Department of Conservation (DOC) <i>Email address for Auckland Operations team added</i> If any lizards should incidentally die during the approved activities of catch, transfer or liberation, the Approval Holder must: (a) inform the Auckland DOC Operations Manager [~~insert contact details~~ <u>aucklandpermissions@doc.govt.nz</u>] within 48 hours, chill the body if it can be delivered within 72 hours, or freeze the body if delivery will take longer than 72 hours; and	Panel: Agreed to DOC's email - mechanical	Matter already addressed by Applicant, but confirm that the correct email address is as provided by DOC	Panel: Agreed with DOC and final Applicant comments • Mechanical change made
Reporting						
22	A report summarising the salvage and relocation results must be prepared and submitted to DOC [Auckland Office, insert contact details] and permissionshamilton@doc.govt.nz within 30 working days from the completion date of the salvage.	A report summarising the salvage and relocation results must be prepared and submitted to DOC [~~insert contact details~~ <u>auckland@doc.govt.nz</u>] and permissionshamilton@doc.govt.nz within 30 working days from the completion date of the salvage.	Department of Conservation (DOC) <i>Email address for Auckland Operations team added</i> A report summarising the salvage and relocation results must be prepared and submitted to DOC [~~insert contact details~~ <u>aucklandpermissions@doc.govt.nz</u>] and permissionshamilton@doc.govt.nz within 30 working days from the completion date of the salvage.	Panel: Agreed to DOC's email - mechanical	Matter already addressed by Applicant, but confirm that the correct email address is as provided by DOC	Panel: Agreed with DOC and final Applicant comments • Mechanical change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
X						
N/A	X	At Paragraph 591 of the draft decision, the Panel has supported Winstone making a voluntary financial donation to the Supporters of Tiritiri Matangi. While this donation does not seem to have materially informed the Panel's decision to grant the WAA, Winstone considers it appropriate to offer an Augier condition to provide certainty that the donation will be made. <i>Winstone seeks to include a new section and condition or Advice Note:</i> <u>Donation</u> The Authority Holder shall donate a maximum of \$15,000 to the Supporters of Tiritiri Matangi Incorporated, calculated on the basis of \$200 per successfully relocated lizard, up to a maximum of 75 lizards. Only live lizards salvaged from the approved Hunua Quarry project footprint and released on Tiritiri Matangi shall count towards the donation. Recaptured animals, or animals otherwise counted more than once, shall be excluded and the number of qualifying lizards shall be confirmed through the salvage and relocation reporting under the Lizard Management Plan and reporting required by Condition 22.	N/A	Panel: Accept as condition(s) and alter 'shall' to 'must' Martin to update wording for decision re Augier condition by Applicant and Panel accepted		Panel: Accept as condition(s) with the alteration of the wording 'shall' to 'must' • Change made
Appendix F – Archaeological Authority Conditions						
Heading						
N/A	APPENDIX F – ARCHAEOLOGICAL AUTHROITY	The change is required to correct a spelling error. <i>A change is sought to the heading as follows:</i> APPENDIX F – ARCHAEOLOGICAL AUTH<u>OR</u>QITY	N/A	Panel: Agreed to - mechanical	N/A	Panel: Agreed • Mechanical change made
Tikanga						
4	Archaeological work must be undertaken in conformity with any tikanga Māori protocols agreed between the Authority Holder and Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti te Ata, Te Ākitai Waiohūa and Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki (relevant iwi). In addition: a. The Authority must be exercised subject to any health and safety requirements. b. If any possible taonga or Māori artefacts are encountered, relevant iwi must be informed to enable appropriate tikanga to be undertaken, so long as all statutory requirements under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 and the Protected Objects Act 1975 are met. c. If any archaeological site is encountered and works modifying or destroying the archaeological site are undertaken, relevant iwi must be provided with a copy of any reports	At Paragraph 601 of the draft decision, the Panel has requested that the Applicant confirm the proposed redrafting of Condition 4(a) to confirm it captures the intent of the condition and confirm the reference in Condition 4(c). <i>Winstone confirms both matters above.</i>	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) At [601] of the decision the Panel records that it has imposed the conditions that have been agreed by HNZPT and the Applicant, with one exception being condition 4(a). The Panel states that this condition “did not make sense” and in order to amend this, the Panel has proposed redrafting as follows: <i>Archaeological work must be undertaken in conformity with any tikanga Māori protocols agreed between the Authority Holder and Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti te Ata, Te Ākitai Waiohūa and Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki (relevant iwi).</i> <i>In addition:</i> a. <u>The Authority must be exercised subject to any health and safety requirements.</u> The Panel has also asked the Applicant to	Panel: Await Applicant's response Any issues remaining DA to address	This condition was amended by the Panel For completeness, the Applicant has no concerns with the amendment sought as it still requires consideration of health and safety requirements	Panel: Accept changes to the condition as proposed by HNZPT and agreed to by the Applicant • Change made

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
	completed under Conditions 8 and 11 and be given an opportunity to discuss it with the section 45 Approved Person if required		confirm this captures the intent of the condition and also confirm the reference in condition 4(c) <i>[For completeness, HNZPT has checked the cross-referencing in 4(c) and confirms it is correct]</i>. Although HNZPT has not been asked to specifically comment as to this condition, we provide the following comment pursuant to section 70 of the FTA Act. The intent of condition 4 is to ensure that the Authority is exercised in accordance with tikanga agreed between the relevant iwi parties and the Applicant. The condition then identifies three specific scenarios where tikanga must be respected – in relation to access to sites, encountering possible taonga or Māori artefacts, and the provision of information and reports prepared regarding any site modification. These are included in specific detail based on HNZPT's experience working with iwi to ensure that appropriate tikanga are observed in critical and important times. In our experience, where these scenarios have not been specified then conformity with tikanga has not always been respected. Condition 4(a) as recommended by HNZPT provides the ability of access to iwi parties in relation to any archaeological sites in order to exercise that tikanga right. This, however, is not an unfettered right of access, and the condition therefore notes that any access is subject to health and safety requirements – for example access would not likely be permitted whilst heavy machinery is operating. The amended condition proposed by the Panel, does not capture the provision of access to iwi, rather it concentrates on the health and safety aspect only. <i>HNZPT respectfully disagrees with the Panel's amended condition 4(a). In order to address the concern of the Panel with the condition, we have considered how to word this in a clearer way, whilst continuing to achieve the intent of the condition, and propose the following:</i> Archaeological work must be undertaken in conformity with any tikanga Māori protocols agreed between the Authority Holder and Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti te Ata, Te Ākitai Waiohū and Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki (relevant iwi). In addition: a. The Authority <u>Holder</u> must <u>enable access for relevant iwi to any archaeological site encountered in order to undertake tikanga (subject to any health and safety requirements)</u> ~~be exercised subject to any health and safety requirements.~~ ...			

Cond Ref	Condition Per Draft Decision	Reason & Changes Sought by Winstone (Applicant)	Reason & Changes Sought by Other Parties	Panel Initial Response / Decision	Winstone (Applicant) Response & Changes to Comments	Panel Response / Decision
Appendix H – Complex Freshwater Fisheries Activity Approval Conditions						
Aquatic Fauna Salvage and Relocation Plan						
1	The objective of the Aquatic Fauna Salvage and Relocation Plan (AFSRP) is to detail the measures and procedures to avoid or minimise potential adverse effects on native aquatic fauna (fish and kōura) by way of relocating native aquatic fauna prior to any works being undertaken within watercourses at the Site. The AFSRP must include: (a) a description of the aquatic fauna values to be addressed by the AFSRP; (b) plans identifying the locations where salvage of fish and kōura will be undertaken and in Tributary 3 restrict salvage to culvert installation sites only at Stage 2; and culvert installation sites and upstream reaches of Tributary 4 during Stage 2; (c) procedures for pre-stream works site visits prior to any works commencing within any streams, with each site visit addressing at a minimum: i. the extent of works proposed; ii. the timing and methods proposed for stream works; iii. the methods proposed for fish salvage; iv. monitoring methods; v. locations for relocation sites; vi. information necessary to inform the Relocation Event Salvage Plan; (d) a description of the process for developing and content of Relocation Event Salvage Plans; (e) a description of methods to be used for fish salvage activities; (f) timeframes for the implementation of the AFSRP; (g) procedures to ensure compliance with all other permits and approvals required for fish salvage activities; (h) a description of how salvage and relocation actions will be monitored and reported, including timeframes, and measures of success; and (i) a process for review of the AFSRP to adapt to any changes in the receiving environment.	N/A	Department of Conservation (DOC) It is standard practice for complex freshwater fisheries approvals to include conditions containing timing restrictions or exclusions for in-stream works during fish spawning and migration periods. Including this information in the management plan provides assurance to DOC as the administering agency of this approval that works will be undertaken in accordance with recognised good practice and minimises effects on freshwater fish populations. <i>DOC suggests inclusion of additional specification for the Aquatic Fauna Salvage and Relocation Plan “Measures to avoid or minimise time instream works during key fish spawning and migration periods”.</i> The objective of the Aquatic Fauna Salvage and Relocation Plan (AFSRP) is to detail the measures and procedures to avoid or minimise potential adverse effects on native aquatic fauna (fish and kōura) by way of relocating native aquatic fauna prior to any works being undertaken within watercourses at the Site. The AFSRP must include: (a) a description of the aquatic fauna values to be addressed by the AFSRP; (b) <u>Measures to avoid or minimise time instream works during key fish spawning and migration periods;</u> (c) plans identifying the locations where salvage of fish and kōura will be undertaken and in Tributary 3 restrict salvage to culvert installation sites only at Stage 2; and culvert installation sites and upstream reaches of Tributary 4 during Stage 2; ...	Panel: Agreed Wait for Applicant’s response	The proposed additional measure is accepted by the Applicant as it aligns with requirements in the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations 1983 and best practice to minimise the time spent in streams during spawning seasons	Panel: Additional measure accepted by Panel, and has support of Applicant • Change made