

Hunua Quarry Proposal – FTAA-2603-1185

Check to ensure proffered management plans implement specific bottom-line conditions

The following table draws on the version of the volunteered condition set as amended and supplied by the applicant on 18 August 2026.

Management Plan	Primary condition(s) relating the Management Plan	Do those condition(s) cross reference to bottom-line condition(s)?	Are those bottom-line conditions clearly expressed?	Commentary and recommended action (if any)	Applicant's Response
Cultural (Values and) Cultural Management Plan	Conditions 33 and 34	No	N/A	These conditions have been added by the Applicant in response to queries raised by the Panel (Minute 4) and other parties. The conditions are 'stand alone' in that they include a clear purpose (Condition 33(b)), address cultural aspects and there are no bottom line conditions to which a cross reference is necessary.	WA agrees – no response required.
Quarry Management Plan	Conditions 35 and 36	No	N/A	The QMP is an 'umbrella' mgmt. plan that, according to Condition 35, 'is to provide an overview of the measures and procedures to be implemented to manage the environmental effects of the Project to ensure compliance with the conditions of these consents'. Rather than include cross references to conditions that prescribe bottom lines for	WA agrees – no response required.

Management Plan	Primary condition(s) relating the Management Plan	Do those condition(s) cross reference to bottom-line condition(s)?	Are those bottom-line conditions clearly expressed?	Commentary and recommended action (if any)	Applicant's Response
				those 'environmental effects', it refers in the main to other mgmt. plans, where those cross references are more appropriate placed.	
Operational Noise Management Plan	Conditions 37 and 38	Yes, but the cross-referencing is incorrect. Condition 37 cross references to 'Conditions 89 – 1'. Conditions 89 to 91 set <u>construction</u> noise limits. The correct cross reference is to 'Condition 94'.	Yes, Condition 94 set clear limits for operational noise.	The Applicant should be advised to correct the cross reference in Condition 37.	WA agrees – the cross reference has been amended in the 2 nd September version of the conditions.
Contaminated Site Management Plan	Conditions 39 and 40	Yes, in Condition 39 to 'Conditions 105 – 111'.	Yes, although Conditions 105 to 111 are procedural rather than bottom line in nature, in that they set out the circumstances in which a CSMP, RAP and WCP are required, as determined by a SQEP.	This approach doesn't seem to be inappropriate.	WA agrees – the cross reference is correct in the 2 nd September version of the conditions.
Erosion and Sediment Control Plan	Conditions 41 and 42	Yes, in Condition 41 to 'Conditions 122 to 127'. However, the cross-referencing is incorrect in that it should be to 'Conditions 121 to 126'.	Yes, Condition 122 sets out quantitative bottom lines with respect to downstream sediment loads, whereas Conditions 121 and 123 to 126 require the use and maintenance of particular ESC measures.	The Applicant should be advised to correct the cross reference in Condition 41.	WA agrees – the cross reference is correct in the 2 nd September version of the conditions.

Management Plan	Primary condition(s) relating the Management Plan	Do those condition(s) cross reference to bottom-line condition(s)?	Are those bottom-line conditions clearly expressed?	Commentary and recommended action (if any)	Applicant's Response
Chemical Treatment Management Plan	Conditions 43 and 44	Yes, in Condition 43 to 'Condition 126'. However, the cross-referencing is incorrect in that it should be to 'Condition 125'.	Not entirely. Condition 43 requires compliance with Condition 126 (meaning 125) while Condition 125 requires chemical treatment in accordance with the CTMP under Condition 44, so the arrangement is somewhat circular without specifying a bottom line.	Condition 43 does however also specify that the objective of the CTMP is to 'enhance sediment retention efficiency in accordance with GD05'. The Applicant could be asked whether the cross reference to 'GD05' is a sufficient indirect expression of a bottom line. The Applicant should be advised to correct the cross reference in Condition 43.	WA agrees – the cross reference is correct in the 2 nd September version of the conditions.
Air Quality Management Plan	Conditions 45 and 46	Yes, in Condition 45 to 'Conditions 164 – 190'. However, the cross-referencing is incorrect in that it should be to 'Conditions 163 to 189'.	Yes, Conditions 163 to 166 specify qualitative bottom lines, Conditions 167 to 179 specify mgmt. measures and Conditions 180 to 189 specify monitoring and reporting actions.	The Applicant should be advised to correct the cross reference in Condition 45.	WA agrees – the cross reference is correct in the 2 nd September version of the conditions.
Water Quality Monitoring and Management Plan	Conditions 47 and 48	No. While Condition 48(d), states that the WQMMP must include the monitoring parameters to be tested, including 'turbidity (NTU), pH, and total suspended solids (mg/L)' there are no explicit cross references to the water quality monitoring conditions (Conditions 129 and 130)	Yes, the bottom line parameters set out in Conditions 129 and 130 (were they to be cross referenced) are clearly expressed.	The Applicant should be asked to amend Conditions 47 and/or 48 to include a specific cross reference to Conditions 129 and 130.	WA agrees – the cross reference has been included in the 2 nd September version of the conditions.

Management Plan	Primary condition(s) relating the Management Plan	Do those condition(s) cross reference to bottom-line condition(s)?	Are those bottom-line conditions clearly expressed?	Commentary and recommended action (if any)	Applicant's Response
		wherein these parameters are specified.			
Groundwater Monitoring and Contingency Plan	Conditions 49 to 53	Yes, in Condition 49 to 'Conditions 193 to 241', whereas Condition 50 refers to 'details of the step-wise groundwater level drawdown process in accordance with Conditions 198 to 199' and 'the envelope of effects defined in condition 200 to 206'. However, the cross references are incorrect in that they should refer to 'Conditions 192 to 242', '197 to 198' and '200 to 205', respectively.	Yes, bottom line abstraction limits are set out in Conditions 193 to 196 and Conditions 198 to 205 set out procedures following the setting out of bottom line parameters for drawdown in Condition 197.	The Applicant should be advised to correct the cross reference in Conditions 49 and 50.	WA agrees – the cross reference has been amended in the 2 nd September version of the conditions.
Trigger Action Response Plan	Conditions 54 and 55	Yes, in Condition 54 to 'Condition 103'. The cross reference is incorrect – it should be to 'Condition 113'.	Yes, Condition 113 sets out bottom line geotechnical limits.	The Applicant should be advised to correct the cross reference in Condition 54.	WA agrees – the cross reference has been amended in the 2 nd September version of the conditions.
Landscape Rehabilitation Strategy and Management Plan	Conditions 56 and 57	Yes, in Condition 56 to 'Conditions 133 – 139'. The cross reference is incorrect – it should be to 'Conditions 137 to 139'.	Yes, Condition 139 sets out bottom line maintenance obligations and a 90% shrub and tree coverage target. However, this doesn't square with the metrics imposed by Condition 57, which impose an 80% canopy closure target and 90%	The Applicant should be asked to comment on and resolve the apparent misalignment between Conditions 57 and 139. The Applicant should be advised to correct the cross reference in Condition 56.	WA agrees – the cross reference has been amended in the 2 nd September version of the conditions

Management Plan	Primary condition(s) relating the Management Plan	Do those condition(s) cross reference to bottom-line condition(s)?	Are those bottom-line conditions clearly expressed?	Commentary and recommended action (if any)	Applicant's Response
			plant survival rate. Should not these parameters align?		
Ecological Management Plan	Conditions 58 and 59	Yes, Condition 58 refers to 'no net loss' and cross references 'Conditions 145 – 152'. The cross reference is incorrect – it should be to 'Conditions 153 to 156'. That being said, bottom line maintenance obligations and an 80% canopy closure target and 90% plant survival rate are specified in Condition 59(i).	Yes, the bottom line prescriptions in Condition 59(i) are clear.	The Applicant should be advised to correct the cross reference in Condition 58.	WA agrees – the cross reference has been amended in the 2 nd September version of the conditions.
Aquatic Fauna Salvage and Relocation Plan	Conditions 60 and 61	Yes, in Condition 60 to 'Condition 150'. The cross reference is incorrect – it should be to 'Condition 149'. That being said, parameters limiting the location of salvage are set out in Condition 61(b).	Yes, the bottom line prescriptions in Condition 61(b) are clear.	The Applicant should be advised to correct the cross reference in Condition 60.	WA agrees – the cross reference has been amended in the 2 nd September version of the conditions.
Lizard Management Plan	Conditions 62 and 63	Yes, in Condition 62 to 'Condition 151'. The cross reference is incorrect – it should be to 'Condition 150'.	No, neither Conditions 62, 63 nor 150 set out bottom lines with respect to lizard relocation (which it may not be feasible to do) but	The Panel may conclude this is sufficient as the condition set as it stands reflects DoC's input.	WA agrees – the cross reference has been amended in the 2 nd September version of the conditions.

Management Plan	Primary condition(s) relating the Management Plan	Do those condition(s) cross reference to bottom-line condition(s)?	Are those bottom-line conditions clearly expressed?	Commentary and recommended action (if any)	Applicant's Response
			Condition 63 does specify the procedures that the LMP must contain.	The Applicant should be advised to correct the cross reference in Condition 62.	
Pest Management Plan	Conditions 64 to 66	No. While Conditions 65(b) and (d), state that the objective of the PMP is to control target animal and plant pests 'at or below abundance targets' and 'desired targets' there are no explicit cross references to the specific suspension targets set out in Conditions 159 to 161.	Yes, the suspension targets set out in Conditions 159 to 161 (were they to be cross referenced) are clearly expressed.	The Applicant should be asked to amend Conditions 65(b) and (d) to include a specific cross reference to Conditions 159 to 161.	WA agrees – the cross reference has been included in the 2 nd September version of the conditions.
Stream Realignment Management Plan	Condition 67 to 69	Yes, in Condition 67 to 'Conditions 115 – 116 and 134 – 137'. These cross references are incorrect – they should refer to 'Conditions 116 to 119 and 133 to 136'. Further, Condition 67(a) sets out 'indicative thresholds' for habitat quality, deposited fine sediments and an MCI band.	Yes, Conditions 116 to 118 are procedural in nature whereas Condition 119 establishes bottom lines for flood levels. Conditions 133 to 135 require compliance with the SRMP in accordance with specified timeframes and Condition 136 established a maintenance requirement based on achieving a 90% canopy cover.	The Applicant should be advised to correct the cross reference in Condition 67.	WA agrees – the cross reference has been amended in the 2 nd September version of the conditions.