

Brick Bay Lodge Referral Application under section 13 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024: Christine and Richard Didsbury (Applicants)

Record of Consultation

Stakeholder Consulted	Record of Key Activity	Responses Received from Stakeholder	How Responses have Informed the Project
Auckland Council	17/3/26 - Peter Hall email to Dean Williams (Manager Auckland Council Premium Unit) outlining the proposal and requesting a meeting with Auckland Council prior to lodging the application as a relevant administering agency under section 11 FTAA. 26/3/26 - Meeting online with Russell Butchers and Perry Ng (Auckland Council Premium Unit allocated to the project)/Peter Hall/Richard Didsbury/Paige Farley (project engineer) to introduce the project. 31/3/26 - Email from Peter Hall to Russell Butchers confirming intention to lodge the referral application and notifying under s11 of 20 working days notification period.	Feedback from Auckland Council at the 26/3/26 meeting was follows: - Continue to engage with Watercare on water and wastewater as outlined by Paige Farley (project engineer). - Once stormwater design is further advanced then engage with Healthy Waters. - Site visit discussed and to confirm a date. - Key topics and AUP overlays noted, included landscape and visual, ONLs, SEAs, HNCs, heritage in respect of the pā, water supply and wastewater. - Consultation with iwi discussed. - Russell and Perry will circulate wider for feedback.	In response to the matters raised at the meeting with Auckland Council: - The applicant will continue to engage with Watercare on water and wastewater. - Once stormwater design is further advanced in the next phase then the project engineers will engage with Healthy Waters. - Site visit is being arranged. - The Substantive Application will include a full assessment of AUP overlays and topics noted.
New Zealand Heritage Pouhere Taonga	17/2/26 - Peter Hall email to Stuart Bracey (Kaiwhakamāhere Heritage Planner Northern Region, NZ Heritage) outlining the proposal and requesting meeting with NZ Heritage prior to lodging the application as a relevant	Minutes from 4/3/26 NZ Heritage meeting attached. Feedback from NZ Heritage recorded in the minutes as follows: HNZPT Archaeology matter The archaeological assessment needs to explain clearly why archaeology is being	In response to the matters recorded by NZ Heritage in the meeting minutes: The archaeological assessment accompanying the Substantive Application will explain clearly why archaeology is being destroyed/modified (if any such action is necessary).

Stakeholder Consulted	Record of Key Activity	Responses Received from Stakeholder	How Responses have Informed the Project
	administering agency under section 11. 2/3/26 - Memo from Clough and Associates provided to NZ Heritage which sets out preliminary findings and recommendations for next steps. 4/3/26- Meeting online with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga: Mary Kienholz (Area Manager Mid Northern), Greg Walter (Senior Archaeologist), Craig Reidy (Pouarahi), Lisa Ahn (Planner), Stuart Bracey (Planner) Consultant Planner: Peter Hall Consultant Archaeologist: Ellen Cameron Property owner: Richard Didsbury 17/3/26- Email from Mary Kienholz (Kaiwhakahaere a-Takiwa Area Manager, Mid-Northern, Heritage New Zealand) attaching final meeting minutes from the 4 March meeting regarding the Brick Bay Lodge proposal. 31/3/26 - Email from Peter Hall to Mary Kienholz confirming intention to lodge the referral application and notifying under s11 of 20 working days notification period.	destroyed/modified. Destroying means really assessing it as to why it cannot be avoided. There have been similar cases in the past. - Very interesting area and lots of archaeology was recorded some time ago - No doubt as we progress down this process, there may things we may want to raise, but now is a good starting point - Peter Hall said there is room to refine concept plan. HNZPT Māori heritage matter - In terms of consultation, it is good to see that Ngāti manuhiri has been involved - All mana whenua on the list should be contacted - Best to get comprehensive consultation done and ensure it is well-documented. Comprehensive consultation is what iwi needs HNZPT Planning matter - Is there a covenant in the area (on top of the recorded site)? Peter Hall said that this will be discussed with Ngāti Manuhiri.	- All mana whenua required under the FTAA have been contacted for a response per the FTAA - There is no covenant on top of the recorded site (the Pā site), however as set out in the Referral Application, protocols have been established with Ngāti Manuhiri for its protection and celebration.
Department of Conservation	17/2/26 - Email from Peter Hall to Amelia Wilkinson, Permissions Advisor Fast Track Applications,	Minutes from the 24/3/26 DOC meeting are attached .	In response to the matters recorded by DOC in the meeting minutes:

Stakeholder Consulted	Record of Key Activity	Responses Received from Stakeholder	How Responses have Informed the Project
	Department of Conservation outlining the proposal and requesting meeting with DOC prior to lodging the application as a relevant administering agency under section 11. 24/3/26- Memo from Mark Delaney project ecologist provided to DOC setting out preliminary findings and recommendations. 24/3/26 - Meeting online with David Greaves (Consultant Planner Fast Track Applications) and Fiona McKenzie (Ranger/Project Lead Community) (DOC)/ Peter Hall/Richard Didsbury/Mark Delaney (project ecologist) 31/3/26 - Email from Peter Hall to David Greaves confirming intention to lodge the referral application and notifying under s11 of 20 working days notification period.	Feedback from DOC as set out in the meeting minutes is as follows: • There are records of threatened (inanga) and At-Risk (longfin eel, giant bully, banded kokopu) species directly adjacent to the site, which may also be present in the wetland. More information would clarify the potential values and impacts. • Whilst there is no Public Conservation Land directly impacted by the Proposal, the development is adjacent to the coastal environment with recorded archaeological sites present, including midden, ovens and nearby recorded pa site. The Applicant will need an adequate heritage assessment and to consider treaty settlement issues. • A Wildlife Approval is required if there is protected wildlife on the site and the project will affect that wildlife. The application for wildlife approval needs to include all the information listed in Schedule 7, Clause 2 (FTTA). • DOC understands that demonstrating 'best practice methods through documents such as management plans can't be deferred to a subsequent Lizard Management Plan. As such, it is recommended that all potential approvals are sought as part of the FTAA process, which is supported by a comprehensive ecological assessment. • To obtain a wildlife approval DOC strongly recommends that the applicant undertakes a baseline survey and, if	• A full survey including of any threatened (inanga) and At-Risk (longfin eel, giant bully, banded kokopu) species will be undertaken as part of the preparation of the Substantive Application. • Full heritage assessment will be undertaken (see also the preliminary assessment undertaken by Clough and Associates and responses received from NZ Heritage above). • A Wildlife Approval will be sought as part of the Substantive Application and include all FTAA information requirements. • All potential approvals will be sought as part of the FTAA process, and which will be supported by a comprehensive ecological assessment. • Depending on season, a baseline survey will be undertaken and a Lizard Management Plan developed. • Further investigation will be undertaken with regard to bat habitat and the potential effects resulting from the removal of habitat. A bat management plan, tree felling protocol will be developed as per the ecology memo. • Further investigations will also be undertaken regarding the

Stakeholder Consulted	Record of Key Activity	Responses Received from Stakeholder	How Responses have Informed the Project
		lizards are found to be present, develop a Lizard Management Plan • Further investigation should be undertaken with regard to bat habitat and the potential effects resulting from the removal of habitat. A bat management plan, tree felling protocol and lighting controls may be necessary. • Further investigations should also be undertaken regarding the ecological values of the identified pond and wetland on the Site and if the Proposal will result in adverse effects on these values. • DOC is aware of the following Treaty partners with interests that may be relevant to the site: - Ngāti Manuhiri - Te Kawerau ā Maki - Ngāti Pāoa - Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki • DOC encourages the applicant to engage directly with the relevant Māori groups as required by section 29 of the Act. • The following Treaty Settlement Acts are found to be relevant to the project area: - Ngāti Manuhiri Claims Settlement Act 2012; - Te Kawerau ā Maki Claims Settlement Act 2015; - Ngāti Pāoa Claims Settlement Act 2025; - Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Claims Settlement Act 2018 • Specific conservation issues of relevance within these acts include the preservation	ecological values of the identified pond and wetland on the Site. • Responses have been sought from the Treaty partners with interests that may be relevant to the site as identified by DOC (including others as set out in the Referral Application and required under s29 FTAA). • The Treaty Settlement Acts identified by DOC are identified also in the Referral Application). • The applicant has considered approvals needed under the Heritage Nea Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 and will apply for these as part of the Substantive Application. • The Ngāti Manuhiri Statutory Acknowledgement is acknowledged and discussed in the Substantive Application as set out in the Referral Application. • The relevant biodiversity and environmental effects will be considered as part of the full and comprehensive AEE included with the Substantive Application and will address the presence and management of lizards, birds, bats and threatened plant species. • The applicant will engage with DOC prior to lodging the Substantive Application, particularly in relation to any wildlife approvals and conditions.

Stakeholder Consulted	Record of Key Activity	Responses Received from Stakeholder	How Responses have Informed the Project
		of freshwater fisheries, the protection of taonga species, and the protection of areas of significance and historic places. DOC notes that publicly available archaeological mapping indicates the presence of multiple mapped historical and archaeological sites within the proposed project boundaries. None of these sites are located on identified public conservation land and therefore the management of these sites is the responsibility of Pouhere Taonga/Heritage New Zealand. However, DOC has a statutory obligation to advocate for the preservation of important historical and cultural sites. The applicant should consider whether approvals are needed under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all necessary approvals. Furthermore, it is noted that Ngāti Manuhiri holds a Statutory Acknowledgement over the Matakana River catchment. This Statutory Acknowledgement provides a formal acknowledgement of the relationship between Ngāti Manuhiri and the Matakana River Catchment. We understand that part of the project area overlaps with this Statutory Acknowledgement. The applicant should be aware of this relationship when developing the project.	

Stakeholder Consulted	Record of Key Activity	Responses Received from Stakeholder	How Responses have Informed the Project
		- Some primary considerations for DOC include: - That the relevant biodiversity and environmental effects are considered as part of the full and comprehensive AEE included with the future application and shall specifically address the presence and management of lizards, birds, bats and threatened plant species as relevant to the proposal site. - Conditions should be developed and presented to manage any effects on the above. While the current information does not provide enough information to be certain, DOC considers that conditions which relate to the management of light effects on bats may be prudent for this proposal. - Should the application be referred, the applicant is encouraged to engage with DOC prior to lodging a substantive application, particularly in relation to any wildlife approvals. DOC may also be able to provide commentary on draft conditions for the management of effects on bats and lizards.	
Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust	October 2025 to present day - Development of the MOU with Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust (Mook Honeck) through various meetings	Feedback on content of the MOU Opportunities discussed on site hui including working together on the project, ongoing	Development of the content of the MOU between Ngāti Manuhiri and the applicant.

Stakeholder Consulted	Record of Key Activity	Responses Received from Stakeholder	How Responses have Informed the Project
	and discussions, and provision of drafts. The first detailed meeting with Ngāti Manuhiri was with Mook Hohneck on March 10th 2025. There have been numerous discussions since then which have expanded to include the CEO Nicola Rata-MacDonald and more recently Jerome Te Paa.	involvement of Ngāti Manuhiri, and celebrating the Pā.	Ngāti Manuhiri input will continue to be sought in accordance with the MOU in respect to cultural values, adoption of tikanga and matauranga Māori and in other areas as the project develops.
Ngāti Paoa Iwi Trust	31/3/26 - Email from Peter Hall outlining the project and requesting responses within the 20-working day time frame provided for in section 11 of the FTAA (by Friday 1 May 2026). Email to: s 9(2)(a)		
Te Ara Rangatu o te Iwi o Ngāti Te Ata Waiohū	31/3/26 - Email from Peter Hall outlining the project and requesting responses within the 20-working day time frame provided for in section 11 of the FTAA (by Friday 1 May 2026). Email to: s 9(2)(a)		
Ngāti Whanaunga Incorporated	31/3/26 - Email from Peter Hall outlining the project and requesting responses within the 20-working day time frame provided for in section 11 of the FTAA (by Friday 1 May 2026). Email to: s 9(2)(a) 31/3/26 -Remote server returned '550 5.4.310 DNS domain ngatiwhanaunga.maori.nz does not exist		

Stakeholder Consulted	Record of Key Activity	Responses Received from Stakeholder	How Responses have Informed the Project
	31/3/26 - Peter Hall email to alternative address s 9(2)(a)		
Ngāti Whātua Ōrakei Trust	31/3/26 - Email from Peter Hall outlining the project and requesting responses within the 20-working day time frame provided for in section 11 of the FTAA (by Friday 1 May 2026). Email to: s 9(2)(a) 31/3/26 - automatic email from Toi Tūhono Ngāti Whātua Ōrakei - Whai Māiato to introduce a new process for submitting all requests for engagement, support, and input from our Toi Tūhono team (Ngāti Whātua Ōrakei - Whai Māia). 31/3/26 - Peter Hall completed online request form for engagement setting out same details and section 11 20-w/d timeframes. Receipt confirmed.		
Ngātiwai Trust Board	31/3/26 - Email from Peter Hall outlining the project and requesting responses within the 20-working day time frame provided for in section 11 of the FTAA (by Friday 1 May 2026). Email to: s 9(2)(a)		
Ngā Maunga Whakahii o	31/3/26 - Email from Peter Hall outlining the project and requesting		

Stakeholder Consulted	Record of Key Activity	Responses Received from Stakeholder	How Responses have Informed the Project
Kaipara Development Trust	responses within the 20-working day time frame provided for in section 11 of the FTAA (by Friday 1 May 2026). Email to: s 9(2)(a)		
Ngāti Maru Rūnanga Trust	31/3/26 - Email from Peter Hall outlining the project and requesting responses within the 20-working day time frame provided for in section 11 of the FTAA (by Friday 1 May 2026). Email to: s 9(2)(a)		
Te Kawerau Iwi Settlement Trust	31/3/26 - Email from Peter Hall outlining the project and requesting responses within the 20-working day time frame provided for in section 11 of the FTAA (by Friday 1 May 2026). Email to: s 9(2)(a)		
Ngāi Tai ki Tamaki Tribal Trust	31/3/26 - Email from Peter Hall outlining the project and requesting responses within the 20-working day time frame provided for in section 11 of the FTAA (by Friday 1 May 2026). Email to: s 9(2)(a) 31/3/26 - Remote server returned '550 5.4.310 DNS domain s 9(2)(a) does not exist 31/3/26 - Peter Hall email to alternative address		

Stakeholder Consulted	Record of Key Activity	Responses Received from Stakeholder	How Responses have Informed the Project
	s 9(2)(a)		
Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua	31/3/26 - Email from Peter Hall outlining the project and requesting responses within the 20-working day time frame provided for in section 11 of the FTAA (by Friday 1 May 2026). Email to: s 9(2)(a) 31/3/26 - Your message to s 9(2)(a) couldn't be delivered. When Office 365 tried to send your message, the receiving email server outside Office 365 reported an error. 31/3/26 - Peter Hall email to alternative address s 9(2)(a)		
Taonga o Marutūāhu Trustee Limited/Marutūāhu Rōpū Limited Partnership.	7/4/26 - Email from Peter Hall outlining the project and requesting responses within the 20-working day time frame provided for in section 11 of the FTAA (by Wednesday 6 May 2026). Email to: s 9(2)(a)		

Fast-Track Pre-Lodgement Consultation Summary

Purpose - This document provides a summary of information from DOC following a pre-lodgement consultation request.

Project Details

Project name:	Christine and Richard Didsbury
Engagement type:	Pre-lodgement engagement Referral Application
Applicant/agent:	Peter Hall, Peter Hall Planning Limited
Proposal overview:	The Applicant is proposing to construct and operate luxury visitor accommodation comprising approximately 45 accommodation suites and associated lodge amenities on the property at Snells Beach, which is adjacent to the Brick Bay Wines & Sculpture Trail
Location:	15 Arabella Lane/52 Kauri Drive, Snells Beach
Date pre-lodgement request received:	23 February 2026 (deposit paid 6 March 2026, preliminary meeting 24 March 2026)
Summary of pre-lodgement Consultation	
Fast track project lead DOC:	David Greaves – Consultant Fast-track Consents Advisor
DOC specialist input required:	Fast-track Project Lead – David Greaves
DOC Permissions/ Approvals Identified by applicant in pre-lodgement request as potentially required:	Authority under Wildlife Act 1953 – potential approval needed for lizard salvage and relocation.
DOC Commentary on Fast Track approvals and permissions identified: Note DOC's role in relation to specific	Wildlife Act 1953 Permissions The information provided to date sets out that: - The Applicant has undertaken field surveys and reviewed ecological databases. - It is noted that there are a number of bird species in the wider vicinity and as such, the investigations will determine if the site provides habitat for identified species and therefore if further approvals are required for the development.



	• Further investigations are required regarding the status of a pond/wetland on the site and if approvals are required for works adjacent to it. • Further investigations are required to determine if bats are present and as such, if approvals are required in that regard. Based on the information provided DOC advises that: • There are records of threatened (inanga) and At-Risk (longfin eel, giant bully, banded kokopu) species directly adjacent to the site, which may also be present in the wetland. More information would clarify the potential values and impacts. • Whilst there is no Public Conservation Land directly impacted by the Proposal, the development is adjacent to the coastal environment with recorded archaeological sites present, including midden, ovens and nearby recorded pa site. The Applicant will need an adequate heritage assessment and to consider treaty settlement issues. • A Wildlife Approval is required if there is protected wildlife on the site and the project will affect that wildlife. The application for wildlife approval needs to include all the information listed in Schedule 7, Clause 2 (FTTA). • DOC understands that demonstrating 'best practice methods through documents such as management plans can't be deferred to a subsequent Lizard Management Plan. As such, it is recommended that all potential approvals are sought as part of the FTAA process, which is supported by a comprehensive ecological assessment. • To obtain a wildlife approval DOC strongly recommends that the applicant undertakes a baseline survey and, if lizards are found to be present, develop a Lizard Management Plan which documents: • The location of any species present and their number and location. It is noted that lizards are extremely difficult to detect unless best practice methods are used. • Actual and potential effect on any lizard species found to be present. • Details of avoidance and mitigation methods. • Methods to salvage and relocate lizards, including identifying and preparing release sites. Methods should be guided by species threat status (noting there are constraints on relocating lizards and specific consideration should be given to providing appropriate relocation sites). • Duration – DOC would anticipate a wildlife approval, if necessary, will be required for activities for the duration of the construction phase.
--	---

	• Further investigation should be undertaken with regard to bat habitat and the potential effects resulting from the removal of habitat. A bat management plan, tree felling protocol and lighting controls may be necessary. • Further investigations should also be undertaken regarding the ecological values of the identified pond and wetland on the Site and if the Proposal will result in adverse effects on these values.
Treaty partners:	DOC is aware of the following Treaty partners with interests that may be relevant to the site: • Ngāti Manuhiri • Te Kawerau ā Maki • Ngāti Pāoa • Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki DOC encourages the applicant to engage directly with the relevant Māori groups as required by section 29 of the Act.
Treaty Settlement implications/considerations:	<u>Treaty Settlement implications/considerations</u> The following Treaty Settlement Acts are found to be relevant to the project area: • Ngāti Manuhiri Claims Settlement Act 2012; • Te Kawerau ā Maki Claims Settlement Act 2015; • Ngāti Pāoa Claims Settlement Act 2025; • Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Claims Settlement Act 2018 Specific conservation issues of relevance within these acts include the preservation of freshwater fisheries, the protection of taonga species, and the protection of areas of significance and historic places. DOC notes that publicly available archaeological mapping indicates the presence of multiple mapped historical and archaeological sites within the proposed project boundaries. None of these sites are located on identified public conservation land and therefore the management of these sites is the responsibility of Pouhere Taonga/Heritage New Zealand. However, DOC has a statutory obligation to advocate for the preservation of important historical and cultural sites. The applicant should consider whether approvals are needed under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all necessary approvals. Furthermore, it is noted that Ngāti Manuhiri holds a Statutory Acknowledgement over the Matakana River catchment. This Statutory Acknowledgement provides a formal acknowledgement of the relationship between Ngāti Manuhiri and the Matakana River Catchment. We understand that part of the project area overlaps with this Statutory Acknowledgement. The applicant should be aware of this relationship when developing the project.

	There are multiple treaty settlements under negotiation which are relevant to the project, this includes: Ngāti Whatua remaining claims, Ngāti Maru (Hauraki), Ngāti Tamaterā and Ngāti Whanaunga. Additional information in these under-negotiation settlements can be found at the Te Tari Whakatau/Office of Treaty Settlements website. Should any of these settlements be passed, additional settlement considerations will be relevant.
Potential Resource Management Act (RMA) considerations and effects: <i>Note: DOC's role in relation to 53(2)(m)(i) FTAA</i>	As pre-lodgement consultation was preliminary in nature, very high-level RMA commentary has been provided. Some primary considerations for DOC include: • That the relevant biodiversity and environmental effects are considered as part of the full and comprehensive AEE included with the future application and shall specifically address the presence and management of lizards, birds, bats and threatened plant species as relevant to the proposal site. • Conditions should be developed and presented to manage any effects on the above. While the current information does not provide enough information to be certain, DOC considers that conditions which relate to the management of light effects on bats may be prudent for this proposal.
DOC Statutory Planning Document considerations in relation to site (e.g. CGP/CMS/CMP):	The following Statutory Planning documents are relevant to the proposal: • Conservation General Policy 2005; • Auckland Conservation Management Strategy 2014. The application is not inconsistent with the relevant statutory planning provisions. However, consideration needs to be given to: • the relevant provisions in the Hauraki Marine Park Act 2000 relating to the catchments of the Hauraki Gulf ; • protecting and restoring relevant indigenous ecosystems; • ensuring the persistence and preservation of threatened species; • protecting freshwater fish habitat and fish passage; • protecting, restoring and interpreting historic and cultural heritage sites.
Any specific information requests to applicant(s)/agent for pre-app engagement at this point:	Should the application be referred, the applicant is encouraged to engage with DOC prior to lodging a substantive application, particularly in relation to any wildlife approvals. DOC may also be able to provide commentary on draft conditions for the management of effects on bats and lizards.
Any further information/considerations:	No additional considerations have been identified at this stage.
Additional Notes:	While DOC will assist applicants as much as we can when they engage in pre-lodgement consultation, it is the applicants' responsibility to comply with the FTAA and to ensure they have applied for all permissions they need. Guidance for applying for a wildlife approval under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 can be viewed here: Guidance for applying for a wildlife approval.

	DOC encourages the applicant to share draft application documents so that feedback can be provided on how it views alignment with information requirements of Schedule 7 of the FTAA, noting DOC is unable to request further information once a completeness check is commenced by the EPA. Note that a panel will invite the statutory bodies listed in clause 4 of Schedule 7 to comment on the application (NZCA, conservation boards, Fish and Game Council, and Game Animal Council). We encourage applicants to engage with these bodies in advance of filing a substantive application. While DOC will assist applicants as much as we can when they engage in pre-lodgement consultation, it is the applicants' responsibility to comply with the FTAA and to ensure they have applied for all permissions they need. It is recommended that the information provided in any substantive application prepared under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 be separated out by the various approvals sought (if multiple approvals required) and all information requirements are addressed for each approval sought. Lizards Preliminary environmental reports indicate that skinks have been recorded near the site. Prior to the preparation of the substantive application for a wildlife approval, the applicant should ensure that site surveys are undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced person to determine the presence, or not, of lizards on the site and specifically address the same in the substantive application documents. A suitable release location should be identified for any lizards proposed to be salvaged and released. Bats It is recommended that the applicant ensure that site surveys are undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced person to determine the presence, or not, of bats on the site and specifically address the same in the substantive application documents. Information and protocols for working with bats can be found here: Resources for bat workers: Bats/pekapeka. This information is provided to assist in the development of an effective Bat Management Plan.
--	--

Meeting Minute: Pre-application Meetings and Associated Work

Date: 4 March 2026	
Start Time: 3:00am	End Time: 3:30pm
Matter: Brick Bay Lodge Proposal	
Attendees: Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga: Mary Kienholz (Area Manager Mid Northern), Greg Walter (Senior Archaeologist), Craig Reidy (Pouarahi), Lisa Ahn (Planner), Stuart Bracey (Planner) Consultant Planner: Peter Hall Consultant Archaeologist: Ellen Cameron Property owner: Richard Didsbury	
Description of Activity: To develop a lodge at Brick Bay in Snells Beach/Matakana	
Location of Activity: 17 Arabella Lane, Snells Beach	
Consideration/Notes regarding documents provided prior to meeting: • Pre-application notes and site location via email	
Discussion <u>Proposal</u> • Project is to construct a luxury lodge in Brick Bay, property owned by Christine and Richard Didsbury. The property is already well served with wider Matakana, along with tourism opportunities. There is a shortfall of high-end lodge in the Auckland region and so this project is to remedy that as well as to attract international tourists. • The site is near the coastal area and involves archaeological sites. • Masterplan development to date will continue. There are range of technical experts involved (undertaking technical assessments and refining masterplans). <u>Process</u> • This stage is only referral application under the Fast-Track Act and seeking early feedback. • Following that will be the substantive application stage with full scope of information and approval sought. • What has been identified in the preliminary stage is that an archaeological authority is recommended given the rich history of the site. Main work is modification but it is subject to further archaeological survey and assessment. <u>Richard Didsbury</u> • Established long term relationship with Ngāti Manuhiri and have visited the site together several times.	

- Would like to celebrate New Zealand history with the hotel guests as they want to understand the history of the land, and so as part of this exercise is to develop a comprehensive plan and be able to share that with the guests.
- Current relationship and works involved were have weekly function with guests, visited the Pā with Ngāti Manuhiri, and talked about how the land was inhabited, moana, and their lives.
- The guardianship of the Pā (under private ownership), want Ngāti Manuhiri to be the guardians of the Pā. which could include archaeological investigations, and they would have access to the Pā and other parts of the areas, as well as events.
- Other things include story boards, plaques, etc. This is for the storytelling of the land; history in conjunction with Ngāti Manuhiri.

Clough and Associates

- Sites were identified in the 1970s
- Intensive survey is required. Survey will cover all types of archaeological sites.
- The Pā site (R09/169) will be avoided completely and is a priority. Will be looking to ensure that it is not physically affected by the works.
- Middens, environmental information, can add to the story and interpretation in the future if any sites cannot be avoided. Although avoidance is the first priority.
- In the preliminary stage, found out that further archaeology has been discovered
- To provide full extent of the Pā (R09/169) for avoidance through non-invasive methods.
- Brick Bay itself has archaeology associated with 19th century brick making and there may be archaeological evidence of this in part of the development properties.

HNZPT Archaeology matter

- The archaeological assessment needs to explain clearly why archaeology is being destroyed/modified. Destroying means really assessing it as to why it cannot be avoided. There have been similar cases in the past.
- Very interesting area and lots of archaeology was recorded some time ago
- No doubt as we progress down this process, there may things we may want to raise, but now is a good starting point
- Peter Hall said there is room to refine concept plan.

HNZPT Māori heritage matter

- In terms of consultation, it is good to see that Ngāti manuhiri has been involved
- All mana whenua on the list should be contacted
- Best to get comprehensive consultation done and ensure it is well-documented. Comprehensive consultation is what iwi needs

HNZPT Planning matter

- Is there a covenant in the area (on top of the recorded site)? Peter Hall said that this will be discussed with Ngāti Manuhiri.

Action Steps: Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga to provide the meeting minutes.