

# Appendix 8: Record of Consultation



## 1.0 Mana whenua meeting record

Hui	Te Ahiwaru – Waiohua	Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua	Te Ākitai Waiohua	Te Kawerau ā Maki	Ngāti Tamaoho	Ngaati Whanaunga	Record(s) of Meeting
Masterplan Hui: 14 July 2022		Y			Y	Y	Y
Site Walkover: 31 August 2022			Y	Y		Y	Y
Hui One: Held over several dates 14, 15 December 2022 & 23 March 2023	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Te Ahiwaru – Waiohua: Presentation of CVA at Makaurau Marae 20/02/2023							
Site Walkover: 9 June 2023		Y	Y				N
Hui Two: Targeted hui to discuss draft provisions	22/08/2023	12/09/2023	13/08/2023	6/09/2023	24/08/2023	N/A	Y

**Barker & Associates**

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Tauranga | Hamilton | Cambridge | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Wānaka | Queenstown

## 2.0 Summary of Mana Whenua Recommendations – Precinct Provision Review

Item	Feedback - Detail	Outcome
<b>Te Ahiwaru - Waiohua</b>		
1.	The 14m maximum height proposed in sub-precinct A is potentially still too high and could be imposing on the Papakāinga. Consider reducing maximum height further in this area.	<p>Boffa Miskell are engaged to prepare visual simulations. Engagement with iwi is intended to continue and be ongoing (on planning and non-statutory matters); including on concept and layout design. Once more detail is determined (i.e., building envelopes) visual simulations can be provided to demonstrate built form.</p> <p>Maximum buildings heights of 14m versus 20m is substantially lower than the maximum height currently permitted in the light industrial zone. The maximum heights in combination with the proposed yard and landscaping standards are considered appropriate.</p>
2.	Extending the 10m landscape buffer for that full extent of sub-precinct A and applying a building setback standard too because area is directly opposite the Papakāinga.	Options for extending buffer along western extent of sub-precinct A have been considered. Precinct Plan 3 has been updated with a new 5m landscape buffer along the south western boundary of sub-precinct A. Standard I1.6.3 Yards and I1.6.4 Landscaping have also been updated to require suitable setbacks for buildings and planting to be implemented at the time of development.
3.	Seek input and influence over the design of the SW outlet beneath the crater rim / stormwater solution if this option proceeds.	Standard I1.6.6 Stormwater Management has been developed with input of mana whenua and implements best practice engineering principles. This provision is supported by mana whenua. As noted above, ongoing engagement with iwi will continue, including on the stormwater management approach for the site.

## Appendix 8: Record of Consultation

Item	Feedback - Detail	Outcome
		Other non-statutory agreements will be developed with Te Ahiwaru Waiohua, and include detail for ongoing engagement on any stormwater outlet design (i.e., MOU or Cultural Management Framework).
4.	Indicative walkway and public access to the Pā site is discouraged and removal is supported. However, Te Ahiwaru access to the Pā remains important and should be provided for	Include detail in other non-statutory agreements (i.e., MOU or Cultural Management Framework) to establish access to the Pā. Including legal mechanisms.
5.	Update Precinct Plan to show a puna in the cultural landscape that is not currently shown.	Precinct Plan 2: Cultural Landscape has been updated to show Puna identified by Te Ahiwaru Waiohua. Refer to blue/purple dot adjacent to Ōruarangi Awa.
6.	Te Ahiwaru’s Ahi Kaa Framework Plan consolidates the values and aspirations of various strategic documents by Te Ahiwaru. Goodman to consider this Framework Plan and reference document in development of the design guidelines	Include detail in other non-statutory agreements (i.e., MOU or Cultural Management Framework) to develop a Cultural Framework that incorporates guiding protocols during to inform and be implemented at the time of development.
7.	Provide copies of technical reports for review	Due to time constraints, circulation of all technical reports has not been possible. These will be circulated following lodgement of the plan change with Council. As noted, and discussed throughout the engagement process, the preparation of the plan change is only the first phase, and Goodman are committed to ongoing and enduring relationships with each iwi.
8.	Written feedback to include the following text in overview: <i>“Mana whenua Te Ahiwaru, Te Aakitai and Te Kawerau a Maki and some Waikato tribal descendants continue to hold residence (ahi kaa) at the Puketaapapa Papakainga along the Ōruarangi Awa.”</i>	It is acknowledged that Te Ahiwaru Waiohua has a particular relationship to Puketaapapa Papakāinga, Makaura Marae and Waitomokia. However, it is not considered necessary in this instance, to differentiate and evaluate the strengths of different mana whenua relationships to Waitomokia as part of this plan change. A collective approach for developing this Plan Change has been undertaken, which is reflected in the engagement approach. This has included collective hui, to ensure insofar as practicable, that a joined up and

# Appendix 8: Record of Consultation

Item	Feedback - Detail	Outcome
		consistent view can be taken with a focus on identifying and protecting the key features/values of importance.
9.	<p>Clarification of cultural framework (13/11/2023):</p> <p><i>“The cultural framework demonstrates cultural levels of significance for Iwi, Hapuu and Whānau and offers an informed decision-making pathway for others including development partners. Using the framework, each can consider cultural processes, practices, protocols, values and traditions in order to guide their relationships for authentic Tiriti partnership delivery.</i></p> <p><i>Examples of what a cultural framework may include are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Business and Cultural Iwi ethos exchange</i></li> <li>• <i>Pro-active iwi participation in Kaitiakitanga</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Ceremonial blessings – Purposed, Planned, programmed and Implemented</i></li> <li>○ <i>Procurement of iwi services – Iwi owned businesses contracted as suppliers/contractors</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Culturally sensitive subject matter management</i></li> <li>• <i>Iwi outcomes framework interwoven</i></li> <li>• <i>Needs and Aspirations Actions and Outcomes Assessment”</i></li> </ul>	Including a Cultural Management Framework as a special information requirement was considered up until finalising the proposed precinct provisions. However, it was considered that too much uncertainty remained as to what this framework was or would include. As such, it is intended to continue engaging with Te Ahiwaru Waiohua (and others), allowing more time to develop a Cultural Framework that incorporates guiding protocols, to inform and be implemented at the time of development.
<b>Ngāti Tamaoho</b>		
10.	<p>Recommended the development of a Cultural Management Plan (CMP). The CMP will be separate from the Plan Change and will sit within the MOU. The CMP will include a list of key items to address, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Cultural opportunities mapping;</li> <li>b. Artwork;</li> </ol>	It is intended to continue engaging with Ngāti Tamaoho (and others), allowing more time to develop a Cultural Framework that incorporates guiding protocols, to inform and be implemented at the time of development.

**Barker & Associates**

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Queenstown | Wānaka

# Appendix 8: Record of Consultation

Item	Feedback - Detail	Outcome
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Expression of interest;</li> <li>d. Archaeology management (noting that this is not approval for Authority process; and</li> <li>e. Rehabilitation of the esplanade reserve.</li> </ul> <p>Te Ahiwaru is the Ahi Kaa for this cultural landscape and the CMP should appropriately be prepared by Te Ahiwaru.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Edith will provide example of a CMP template to Kowhai for completion.</li> </ul>	
11.	<p>Extending the 10m landscape buffer for that full extent of sub-precinct A and applying a building setback too because area is directly opposite the Papakāinga.</p>	<p>Options for extending buffer along western extent of sub-precinct A have been considered. Precinct Plan 3 has been updated with a new 5m landscape buffer along the south western boundary of sub-precinct A. Standard I1.6.3 Yards and I1.6.4 Landscaping have also been updated to require suitable setbacks for buildings and planting to be implemented at the time of development.</p>
12.	<p>Indicative walkway and public access to the Pā site is discouraged and removal is supported. However, access to the Pā by iwi remains important and should be provided for.</p>	<p>Earlier iterations of the precinct provisions and maps included requirements to provide public access to the Pā at the time of development. However, based on the advice of iwi these provisions were removed.</p> <p>Access for iwi is still intended and will be incorporated into non-statutory agreements that are still to be developed.</p>
13.	<p>Policy 6 should be removed and Precinct Plan 3 should be updated to extend the indicative walkway around the crater rim as opposed to terminating at the Pā site.</p>	<p>Deleted policy that relates to access to Pā. Removed indicative walkway, as this already exists. Commitment to provide walkway / access through Waitomokia Plan Change area at the time of development. To be included in the other non-statutory agreements.</p>

**Barker & Associates**

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Queenstown | Wānaka

## Appendix 8: Record of Consultation

Item	Feedback - Detail	Outcome
14.	Any discharge to the Ōruarangi Awa will need a green outfall design solution.	Standard I1.6.6 Stormwater Management has been developed with input of mana whenua and implements best practice engineering principles. This provision is supported by mana whenua. As noted above, ongoing engagement with iwi will continue, including on the stormwater management approach for the site.  Other non-statutory agreements will be developed with Ngāti Tamaoho, and include detail for ongoing engagement on any stormwater outlet design (i.e., MOU or Cultural Management Framework).
15.	Written feedback included minor amendments to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of sub-precinct B;</li> <li>• Objective's 2, 4;</li> <li>• Policy 1: insert clause (f)The mauri of the taiao;</li> <li>• Policy 3: insert Te Mānukanuka o Hoturoa;</li> <li>• Include reference to GDO4 in I1.6.6.</li> </ul>	All amendments have been accepted.
<b>Te Kawerau ā Maki</b>		
16.	Engagement with Ngāti Whanaunga is considered to be unnecessary because Treaty Settlement identities their rohe boundaries/areas of interest and Waitomokia is not within these identified boundaries. Ngāti Whanaunga should not be named within the plan change.	Noted. While Te Kawerau ā Maki's view is acknowledged. Ngāti Whanaunga have provided a CVA that establishes their relationship to Waitomokia.
17.	Supportive of Te Ahiwaru's bottom lines and will support their position with respect to public access.	Noted.
18.	Requests a 'written notice' Standard be included in the provisions to ensure all landowners (current or future) inform relevant mana whenua groups of earthworks / development occurring on the site, including permitted	Accepted. Refer to I1.6.0 Informing Iwi standard.

**Barker & Associates**

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Queenstown | Wānaka

## Appendix 8: Record of Consultation

Item	Feedback - Detail	Outcome
	activities. This will ensure a 'no surprises' policy and ensure future landowners will continue with the same approach as Goodman.	
19.	Amend precinct description: <i>"Waitomokia is the name of the volcanic basin and crater between Ōruarangi Awa, Ascot Road and Montgomerie Road, and which included a volcanic plug or hill near the centre named Moerangi. It is a feature of great cultural significance to the mana whenua of Te Mānukanuka o Hoturoa and is closely associated with the Mataaoho creation story, an important puna source, and millennia of occupation. The precinct includes the southern portion of Waitomokia and excludes Moerangi."</i>	Accepted.
20.	Amend Policy (1) to include <i>"the mauri of the hydrology of Waitomokia"</i> .	Accepted. Refer to I1.3(1)(b).
<b>Te Ākitai Waiohūa</b>		
21.	Requested visual simulations of how development in the plan change area with the proposed controls will be viewed from the Papakāinga, such as: (a) Lower building height (b) Landscape buffer (c) No build area	Boffa Miskell are engaged to prepare visual simulations. Engagement with iwi is intended to continue and be ongoing (on planning and non-statutory matters); including on concept and layout design. Once more detail is determined (i.e., building envelopes) visual simulations can be provided to demonstrate built form.  Retain height limits and 'no build areas'.
22.	Access to the Pā by iwi remains important and should be provided for.	Include detail in other non-statutory agreements (i.e., MOU or Cultural Management Framework) to establish access to the Pā. Including legal mechanisms.
23.	Requested copies of technical reports once finalised to review in conjunction with precinct provisions.	Due to time constraints, circulation of all technical reports has not been possible. These will be circulated following lodgement of the plan change with Council. As noted, and discussed throughout the engagement process,

**Barker & Associates**

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Queenstown | Wānaka

## Appendix 8: Record of Consultation

Item	Feedback - Detail	Outcome
		the preparation of the plan change is only the first phase, and Goodman are committed to ongoing and enduring relationships with each iwi.
24.	Queried the relevance and reasoning for including Te Motu a Hiaroa Charitable Trust in the precinct description and likely to suggest this passage/reference is deleted.	Noted
25.	Chloe Trenouth to be engaged by Te Ākitai to undertake a peer review of the draft provisions given her background involvement and assistance with the Puhinui Precinct.	Engagement completed and feedback received.
26.	Requested copy of the precinct provisions with amendments agreed with other iwi to date for review.	To be circulated following lodgement.
27.	<p>Amendments to overview ‘Mana Whenua Cultural Landscape’:</p> <p><i>“Māngere Heritage Gateway is notable for its continued occupation of Te Ākitai Waiohū since pre-European times due to its proximity and access to the coast. Māngere is inextricably linked to the history, stories, whakapapa and mythology of Te Ākitai Waiohū. Te Ākitai Waiohū have a strong spiritual (taha wairua) association with Māngere/Ihumātao which gives its people a sense of meaning and purpose.</i></p> <p><i>Te Ākitai Waiohū and the Crown formally signed a Deed of Settlement for historical claims on 12 November 2021 and settlement legislation is imminent. Cultural redress includes changing the official name of Mount Gabriel to Waitomokia Crater and the coastal statutory acknowledgement area (OMCR-131-0378) which applies to the Te Manukanuka o Hoturoa.”</i></p>	<p>The changes sought from Te Ākitai Waiohū are acknowledged. However, it is not considered appropriate in this instance, to differentiate and evaluate the strengths of different mana whenua relationships to Waitomokia as part of this plan change. A collective and consolatory approach for developing this Plan Change has been undertaken, which is reflected in the engagement approach. This has included collective hui, to ensure insofar as practicable, that a joined up and consistent view can be taken.</p> <p>Further, all other iwi groups who actively participated in this plan change have provided evidence of their relationship to Waitomokia as the basis of the plan change.</p>
28.	Written feedback: various amendments to recognise Te Ākitai Waiohū as the primary mana whenua within the precinct.	



## Appendix 8: Record of Consultation

Item	Feedback - Detail	Outcome
29.	Amend Policy (1) to recognise Puketaapapatanga papakāinga as a standalone policy.	Accepted: Refer to Refer to I1.3(4)
30.	Amend Policy (2)(d) to require native landscape planting as standalone policy.	Accepted: Refer to Refer to I1.3(5)
31.	Support rule (A9) of Table I0.4.1 Activity table to require restricted discretionary activity resource consent for all new buildings.	Noted
32.	Support standard I1.6.1. Building Height which maintains visual connection with cultural landscape.	Noted
33.	Support standard I1.6.2. No Build Area which maintains visual connection with cultural landscape.	Noted
34.	Various amendments to I1.8.1. Matters of discretion	Accepted amendments sought.
<b>Ngaati Te Ata Waiohua</b>		
35.	<p>Ngaati Te Ata Waiohua’s position has not changed from that expressed in the Cultural Values Assessment (CVA). The key recommendations of the CVA are that:</p> <p><i>Key areas to protect, enhance and kept free of development</i></p> <p>a. <i>Waterways (awa/waiora)</i></p> <p>b. <i>Soils (whenua)</i></p> <p>c. <i>Wetlands (repo)</i></p> <p>d. <i>Remaining geological features (Mataoho/Rūaumoko)</i></p> <p>e. <i>Viewshafts/Sightlines</i></p> <p>f. <i>Lot 2 (Pā footprint) - free of being developed</i></p>	<p>Discussions with Ngaati Te Ata Waiohua are ongoing and will need to continue both as part of this plan change and at the time of undertaking development at the site. An important item discussed with Ngaati Te Ata Waiohua is the potential for a ‘whare manaaki’ to be provided for. The precinct provisions provide for this in the activity table (A3) ‘Community Facilities’, which includes whare manaaki in the AUP definition.</p>

**Barker & Associates**

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Queenstown | Wānaka

## Appendix 8: Record of Consultation

Item	Feedback - Detail	Outcome
36.	Public access to the Pa site is not required or supported. However, iwi access to the Pa site is required to be maintained.	Earlier iterations of the precinct provisions and maps included requirements to provide public access to the Pā at the time of development. However, based on the advice of iwi these provisions were removed.  Access for iwi is still intended and will be incorporated into non-statutory agreements that are still to be developed.
37.	A 10m building setback to the Pa site is not considered to be sufficient and a greater setback is considered to be required. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="367 644 1155 708">Suggested a 10m building setback from the 10m landscape buffer has an alternative.</li> </ul>	Standard I1.6.3 Yards was been amended to require a minimum of 5m setback from the 10m landscape buffer required by I1.6.4 Landscaping.
38.	Requested clarification of views from development in sub-precinct A and what views would be maintained, particularly given the proposed landscape buffer around the Pa site.	Boffa Miskell are engaged to prepare visual simulations. Engagement with iwi is intended to continue and be ongoing (on planning and non-statutory matters); including on concept and layout design. Once more detail is determined (i.e., building envelopes) visual simulations can be provided to demonstrate built form.
39.	Special information requirement: suggested adding in a Cultural Management Plan as a subset of the Archaeological Management Plan to provide for cultural monitoring.	This was considered extensively, however, for the purposes of preparing the proposed precinct provisions there remained too much uncertainty over what would be required / included in Cultural Management Plan. To allow enough time to develop this plan, this will be addressed in a non-statutory agreement. The intention is to develop a Cultural Values Framework that incorporates guiding protocols during to inform and be implemented at the time of development.
40.	Requested copies of the technical reports	Due to time constraints, circulation of all technical reports has not been possible. These will be circulated following lodgement of the plan change with Council. As noted, and discussed throughout the engagement process,

# Appendix 8: Record of Consultation

Item	Feedback - Detail	Outcome
		<p>the preparation of the plan change is only the first phase, and Goodman are committed to ongoing and enduring relationships with each iwi.</p> <p>Provided at the time of plan change circulation.</p>
41.	<p>Amend I1.8.2. Assessment criteria to include:  <i>“include new assessment criteria to be added to the Precinct provisions, relating to the extent to which impacts of development on Māori cultural values are avoided, remedied or mitigated; and the extent to which adverse effects on archaeological features identified within the Precinct are avoided or mitigated.”</i></p>	<p>Partially accepted, refer to I1.8.2.(1)(b). New buildings / additions that require resource consent will need to consider:  <i>The extent to which the development avoids or mitigates adverse effects on, or in close proximity to archaeological features identified within the precinct.</i></p>
42.	<p>Understand that further detailed design of stormwater outlet is required and further engagement required at the time.</p>	<p>Standard I1.6.6 Stormwater Management has been developed with input of mana whenua and implements best practice engineering principles. This provision is supported by mana whenua. As noted above, ongoing engagement with iwi will continue, including on the stormwater management approach for the site.</p> <p>Other non-statutory agreements will be developed with Ngāti Tamaoho, and include detail for ongoing engagement on any stormwater outlet design (i.e., MOU or Cultural Management Framework).</p>
43.	<p>Consider providing for ‘whare manaaki’ within the site.</p>	<p>As noted above in item 35, whare manaaki activities are a subset of ‘community facilities’ as defined under the AUP and is provided for in rule (A3) in Table IO.4.1 Activity table.</p> <p>This has been discussed in detail with Ngaati Te Ata Waiohua. As such (A3) allows for a single storey community building to be constructed within the ‘no build area’ of sub-precinct C.</p>

**Barker & Associates**

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Queenstown | Wānaka

## Appendix 8: Record of Consultation

Item	Feedback - Detail	Outcome
44.	Engagement with Ngāti Whanaunga is considered to be unnecessary because Treaty Settlement identifies their rohe boundaries/areas of interest and Waitomokia is not within these identified boundaries. Ngāti Whanaunga should not be named within the plan change.	While Ngaati Te Ata Waiohua’s view is acknowledged. Ngāti Whanaunga have provided a CVA that establishes their relationship to Waitomokia. Additionally, Ngāti Whanaunga area identified on Auckland Council’s database as have registered interest in this location.

# Appendix 8: Record of Consultation

---

## 3.0 Meeting Notes – Mana Whenua

---

Project: Villa Maria Masterplan Hui

Date: 14 July 2022

Time: 3:00-4:30pm

Location: MS Teams

Attendees: As below

Name	Role/Organisation
Paora Puru / Karl Flavell	Ngaati Te Ata Waiohua
Lucie Rutherford / Edith Tuhimata	Ngati Tamaoho
Jeff Lee	Te Akitai Waiohua
Eynon Delamare	Tauti Consulting Limited
John Dakin / Mike Gimblett / Ben Shaw	Goodman
Rachel de Lambert / Mark Lewis	Boffa Miskell
Nick Roberts / Mary Wong	B&A

Item	Detail	Action
1	NR explained the purpose of this hui is an opportunity for Goodman to present the concept masterplan for the land purchased at Villa Maria, discuss the cultural landscape and considerations for the site and to receive any initial feedback. Goodman's intention is to have ongoing hui and to work collaboratively with iwi to guide development of the masterplan.	To note
2	NR confirmed the invitation from Goodman for iwi to prepare CVA and/or CIA for the masterplan area. Iwi that wishes to prepare a CVA/CIA are requested to send fee estimates to B&A prior to commencing work.	Iwi
3	JL requested the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information that has informed the masterplan work in order to inform preparation of any CVA/CIA.</li> <li>Memo explaining Goodman's development aspirations for the site, master planning work to date and the concept of applying a precinct over the site to iwi for informing the CVA/CIA.</li> <li>Provide indicative timeline of next steps in planning process up to lodgement of PC application if we were to advance the precinct concept.</li> </ul>	B&A
4	JD confirmed recent media surrounding Sir George's receivership issues at Villa Maria do not have any implications on the master	To note

	planning work that Goodman are undertaking. Goodman have already purchased the land, and the boundary adjustment subdivision application lodged with Council just needs to be completed as part of the transaction.	
5	RdL presented the concept masterplan work to date and preliminary Cultural Landscape analysis for review and discussion. Iwi requested for a copy of this presentation to be circulated following the hui.	To note
6	Discussion around the cultural landscape for the site and cultural significance of the wider area. Queries raised as to whether archaeological reports have been prepared for the land. MW confirmed archaeological reports have been prepared as part of previous subdivision consents granted at Villa Maria. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PP suggested Goodman arranges for those archaeological reports to be updated. Matthew Campbell at CFG was suggested as an appropriate consultant to do this.</li> </ul>	Goodman
7	Discussion around Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF) overlays and whether there has been any discussion with Council. NR confirmed that there are no ONF's over the masterplan area. There is an ONF over 82 Pavilion Drive but this land is not owned by Goodman – this land has already been vested to Council as an esplanade reserve.	To note
8	Iwi are interested to understand the regulatory processes for the masterplan versus the subdivision boundary adjustment.	B&A
9	JL interested to review geotechnical reports. KF suggested that Goodman engages Bruce Haywood to review geoheritage aspects of the site.	B&A/Goodman
10	Jeff requested to undertake site visit ASAP and to identify next steps in terms of cultural heritage assessments with kaitiaki working alongside that. This site visit can be joint with other iwi and Goodman's consultant team to better understand the cultural landscape and any opportunities or sensitivities. Goodman team to coordinate dates and issue invitation for site visit.	B&A
11	PP advised that Waiohua are the main iwi group that should be involved in this project. Other two iwi groups that should be involved are Te Ahiwaru – Waiohua, Te Kawerau ā Maki and Te Ākitai Waiohua. Other iwi (in attendance) supported this.	To note
12	MG advised that the vines at VM will be removed shortly as they are no longer productive for wine making.	To note

Project: Villa Maria Masterplan Hui  
 Date: 31 August 2022  
 Time: 1 – 3:30pm  
 Location: On site  
 Apologies: Kowhai Olsen – Te Ahiwaru Waiohua, Lucie Rutherford – Ngati  
 Attendees: Tamaoho See table below

Name	Role/Organisation
Edward Ashby	Te Kawerau Iwi
Michael Baker	Ngaati Whanaunga
Jeff Lee	Te Aakitai Waiohua
Mike Gimblett Ben Shaw Phil Crampsie	Goodman
Rachel de Lambert William Hatton	Boffa Miskell
Nick Roberts Mary Wong	Barker & Associates

Item	Detail	Action
1	NR explained the purpose of this hui is for the Goodman project team to walk the site with iwi and to receive feedback on the developing masterplan to guide future development. Iwi are invited to prepare CVA and/or CIA to inform the masterplan.	To note
2	NR explained provided an overview of the planning process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Private plan change to apply a Cultural Landscape Precinct Plan over the site;</li> <li>- Bespoke precinct provisions will be developed to complement the Cultural Landscape Plan;</li> <li>- No structure planning will be required as part of the private plan change because the land is zoned Business – Light Industry so is already lived zoned (i.e. not a greenfield development); and</li> <li>- Goodman will be the requestor for this plan change.</li> </ul>	To note
3	RdL presented the concept masterplan work to date and preliminary Cultural Landscape analysis for review and discussion.	To note



4	The esplanade reserve adjacent to Oruarangi Creek and the pa site have both already been vested to the Council as an esplanade reserve and a historical reserve. Both reserve lots are therefore not owned or controlled by Goodman and do not form part of the masterplan area.	To note
5	<p>EA encouraged the Goodman team to explore the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Long-term screening to the pa site from the nearest Goodman development land to give breathing space to the pa. Opportunity to visually reconnect the pa to the creek and village.</li> <li>- Preservation of the band of vegetation along the esplanade reserve and provide screening to future buildings near the pa. But phased replacement of existing exotic Eucalyptus &amp; Japanese Cedar trees with native species including Kanuka, Rewarewa, Pohutukawa.</li> </ul> <p>Goodman responded that there is no intention to remove vegetation along the esplanade reserve. Goodman has an obligation to implement a weed control programme for this vegetation.</p>	<p>Goodman /BM</p> <p>To note</p>
6	Notwithstanding that the pa site is contained within the vested historical reserve lot, EA advised that the whole site is considered to be wahi tapu and sensitive response is considered to be required.	To note
7	EA explained water sensitivity to Waitomokia / streams is a key consideration and this would need to be carefully managed.	To note
8	The Goodman land directly adjoining the pa site and adjacent reserve land, is considered to be more sensitive given its elevation and views out to the Manukau Harbour and Puketutu Island / Te Motu a Hiaroa.	Goodman /BM
9	EA encouraged exploration of design controls to manage effects on mana whenua values including signage, colours and height. MG advised this can be explored and similar controls have been successfully implemented at Goodman's Highbrook development.	Goodman /BM
10	MG/BS advised that Goodman intend to carry out preliminary preloading to prepare the land for future development due to geotechnical conditions which requires this. Feedback from iwi is requested as to whether presents any cultural issues.	To note / Iwi
11	EA encouraged exploration of groundwater recharge for future development to replicate the original hydrology of the site and to reflect the name/history of the area in the hydrological design (i.e. reference to historical wetland on site).	Goodman
12	EA encouraged exploration of precast concrete wall patterning on walls of buildings to reference the cultural history of the site. The	Goodman

	design can change in transition with different parts of the site to reference the cultural history for that particular part of the site.	
13	EA suggested the SW management area could be planted to reflect the original wetland ecology of the site.	Boffa Miskell
14	The location and connectivity of pedestrian access through the site was questioned, it was explained that access would be associated with the crater rim feature to be preserved.	To note
15	EA noted that the cut through the crater accessing the Indevin site provided an opportunity for interpretation of the geomorphology (noting this is outside the Goodman site. Bruce Hayward may also pick up on this in his Geoheritage reporting.	To note
16	Goodman inquired if it would be appropriate to reference the project name as the “Waitomokia Precinct”. EA supports this project name and JL had no comment at this stage but identified that iwi would need to offer the use of this or any other culturally appropriate name.	To note
17	A planning summary of the Light Industrial zone development standards was requested to better understand the height, scale and nature of development that is enabled by the current zoning.	B&A (attached)
18	Goodman advised the following consultants have been engaged to provide advice and input on the developing masterplan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matt Campbell – CFG, Archaeology</li> <li>- Bruce Hayward – Geoheritage</li> </ul> Reports will be shared and circulated for review once available.	To note / Goodman

## Business – Light Industry Zone, Auckland Unitary Plan Planning Summary

The following activity table provides a specific list of activities provided for in the Light Industry zone and their relative activity status. The activity status specifies what type of resource consent is required for that particular activity.

*Table 1: Land Use and Development*

**Table H17.4.1 Activity table**

Activity		Activity status
<b>Use</b>		
(A1)	Activities not provided for	NC
<b>Accommodation</b>		
(A2)	Workers accommodation - one per site	P
(A3)	Dwellings	NC
(A4)	Integrated residential development	NC
<b>Commerce</b>		
(A5)	Commercial services	D
(A6)	Dairies up to 100m <sup>2</sup> gross floor area	P
(A7)	Drive-through restaurant	P
(A8)	Entertainment facilities	D
(A9)	Food and beverage up to 120m <sup>2</sup> gross floor area per site	P
(A10)	Garden centres other than in H17.4.1(A11)	P
(A11)	Garden centres within 100m of a Business – Heavy Industry Zone	RD
(A12)	Motor vehicle sales other than in H17.4.1(A13)	P
(A13)	Motor vehicle sales within 100m of a Business – Heavy Industry Zone	RD
(A14)	Marine retail other than in H17.4.1(A15)	P
(A15)	Marine retail within 100m of a Business – Heavy Industry Zone	RD
(A16)	Offices up to 100m <sup>2</sup> gross floor area per site	RD
(A17)	Offices that are accessory to the primary activity on the site and: (a) the office gross floor area does not exceed 30 per cent of all buildings on the site; or (b) the office gross floor area does not exceed 100m <sup>2</sup>	P
(A18)	Offices that are accessory to the primary activity on the site and the office gross floor area exceeds 30 per cent of all buildings on the site	RD

(A19)	Offices not otherwise provided for	NC
(A20)	Retail accessory to an industrial activity on the site, where the goods sold are manufactured on site and the retail gross floor area does not exceed 10 per cent of all buildings on the site	P
(A21)	Retail not otherwise provided for	NC
(A22)	Service stations	P
(A23)	Show homes	P
(A24)	Trade suppliers	P
<b>Community</b>		
(A25)	Care centres	D
(A26)	Community facilities up to 450m <sup>2</sup> per site	D
(A27)	Community facilities exceeding 450m <sup>2</sup> per site	NC
(A28)	Emergency services	P
(A29)	Hospitals	D
(A30)	Recreation facilities	D
(A31)	Tertiary education facilities that are accessory to an industrial activity on the site	P
(A32)	Tertiary education facilities not otherwise provided for	D
<b>Industry</b>		
(A33)	Industrial activities	P
(A34)	Wholesaler	P
(A35)	Storage and lock-up facilities	P
<b>Rural</b>		
(A36)	Animal breeding or boarding	P
(A37)	Horticulture	P
<b>Development</b>		
(A38)	New buildings	P
(A39)	Additions and alterations to buildings	P
(A40)	Demolition of buildings	P

**Table 2: Development Standards**

Building Height	Maximum 20m
Height in relation to boundary	6m + 35° along the boundary where it adjoins an Open Space Zone boundary (490R Oruarangi Road)  No HIRB control applies between Light Industry zone sites.
Maximum impervious area in the riparian yard	The maximum impervious area within a riparian yard must not exceed 10 per cent of the riparian yard area.
Yards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Front: 2m setback is required from the road boundary (but not for internal roads or service lanes).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The front yard (excluding access points) must be planted with a mixture of trees, shrubs or ground cover plants (including grass) within and along the full extent of the yard.</li> <li>● Side and Rear: minimum 5m where it adjoins and Open Space Zone (490R Oruarangi Road)</li> <li>● Riparian yard: minimum 10m riparian yard setback applies from the edge of all permanent and intermittent streams.</li> <li>● Coastal Protection yard: Minimum 25m</li> </ul>
Storage and screening	Any outdoor storage or rubbish collection areas that directly face and are visible from an open space zone must be screened from those areas by landscaping, a solid wall or fence at least 1.8m high.

# Hui 1 Notes

Project: Waitomokia Plan Change

Date: 14 December 2022

Time: 12pm – 1pm

Location: Online

Attendees: Karl Flavell (KF), Sarah Haydock (SH), Mike Gimblett (MG), Rachel de Lambert (RdL), William Hatton (WH), Nick Roberts (NR), Mary Wong (MW), Makarena Dalton (MD), Dan Reddy (DR).

Item	Detail	Action
1	<p><b>Additional Opportunity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For mana whenua to have physical presence, ‘Whare Manaaki’. Working through an example with Fletchers. This allows mana whenua/ iwi to have place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Karl to provide more detail of how this might work.</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Stormwater:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is this a SW pond or wetland?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DR: The SW device (basin) is a ‘dry wetland’ that will be vegetated.</li> <li>DR: This will be primarily wet. The attenuation period is approx. 24 hours.</li> <li>The first stage is slightly wetter and will be a planted swale.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Who will own the SW device? As Healthy Waters is not preferred for mana whenua.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsure at this stage. Still working this through.</li> <li>An operations and maintenance plan will be prepared and details of this can be considered further.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The four bay approaches described in the presentation is not considered to be SW Treatment Train Approach. The approach needs to incorporate rain gardens / vegetated swales for treatment prior to discharge into SW basin device, as well as incorporating final.</li> <li><b>Roof water collection:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS: Yes, roof water collection will be included. Need to work through level of reuse based on future use. But this is common practice is prior development examples i.e., use for building wash, irrigation and grey water where possible.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Aquifer / Recharge:</b> The proposal does increase impervious surfaces and this needs to be commented on with respect to groundwater recharge.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS to share ENGEO findings when available.</li> <li>Investigate more opportunities to incorporate treatment options as discussed to achieve the treatment train approach.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ BS: ENGEO have undertaken preliminary investigations. Details to be shared.</li> <li>● Have there been any conversations with Healthy Waters regarding SW approach and wetland at Montgomery Road?</li> <li>○ NR: We're not familiar with this particular example, however, this would be an opportunity to collaborate.</li> </ul>	
3	<p><b>Non-statutory agreements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Not supportive of MOU however considers other relationship agreements to be useful. Support this approach generally.</li> <li>● Agree that focus should be on plan change first, with relationship agreement to be discussed further.</li> <li>● Good example with Drury South.</li> </ul>	
4	<p><b>Plan Change / Features / Values:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Heartland Site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Potential location for Whare Manaaki.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Harbour View Site (Lot 2): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mana whenua seek no development on this area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Access: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No real issues with public access.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Precinct Plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Need to incorporate Aquifer layer in Precinct Plan 3</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Access to be discussed further to ensure sensitive values / wāhi tapu are respected.</li> </ul>
6	<p><b>Next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● All confirmed the next steps are 'ok' with timeline for further engagement in Mid/Late Feb 'ok'.</li> <li>● Overall, approach is on the right path, but the course can always change.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● B&amp;A to prepare notes and circulate pre-station material and matrix table.</li> </ul>

# Hui 1 Notes

**Project:** Waitomokia Plan Change

**Date:** 14 December 2022

**Time:** 9am – 10.30

**Location:** Highbrook and online

**Attendees:** **In person:** Edith Tuhimata (ET), Stuart Renata (SR), Phil Crampsie (PC), Ben Shaw (BS), Sarah Haydock (SH), Rachel de Lambert (RdL), William Hatton (WH), Nick Roberts (NR), Mary Wong (MW), and Makarena Dalton (MD)

**Virtual:** Lucie Rutherford (LR), Ben Lenard (BL), Mickael Baker (MB), Kowhai Olsen (KO), Mike Gimblett (MG), and Dan Reddy (DR).

Item	Detail	Action
1	Karakia: William Hatton Intro and overview: Nick R Introductions (all)	N/A
2	<p><b>Stormwater:</b> DR presented stormwater design and approach. Key issues/questions raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is this a SW pond or wetland?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ DR: The SW device (basin) is a ‘dry wetland’ that will be vegetated.</li> <li>○ DR: This will be primarily dry. The attenuation period is approx. 24 hours.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The four bay approaches described in the presentation are not considered to be SW Treatment Train Approach. The approach needs to incorporate rain gardens / vegetated swales for treatment prior to discharge into SW basin device, as well as incorporating final.</li> <li>• <b>Roof water collection:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ BS: Yes, roof water collection will be included. Need to work through level of reuse based on future use. But this is common practice in prior development examples i.e., use for building wash, irrigation and grey water where possible.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SW approach needs to incorporate treatment for runoff from road surfaces. This needs to occur prior to discharge to SW basin device. SW Outfall needs to be upgraded to ‘green outlet’ with polishing method with green rip rap mesh and planting. This will be 3 points of treatment and achieve the treatment train approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS to share ENGEO findings when available.</li> <li>• Investigate more opportunities to incorporate treatment options as discussed to achieve the treatment train approach.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aquifer / Recharge: The proposal does increase impervious surfaces and this needs to be commented on with respect to groundwater recharge. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ BS: ENGEO have undertaken preliminary investigations. Details to be shared.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Have there been any conversations with Healthy Waters regarding SW approach and wetland at Montgomery Road? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NR: We're not familiar with this particular example, however, this would be an opportunity to collaborate.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
3	<p><b>Non-statutory agreements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can consider augier conditions to be incorporated into resource consent conditions.</li> <li>• Mixed response from ER and KO regarding relationship agreement. Mana whenua need to discuss this separately from Goodman and consultants and how something like this may work.</li> <li>• This needs to be done in accordance with tikanga Māori, in particular 'Hohou (houhou) te rongo'. Raised by KO and ER.</li> </ul>	
4	<p><b>Plan Change / Features / Values:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Harbour View:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reiterate that Mana whenua seek no development on this area.</li> <li>○ Reaffirm: no development of Tuff Ring.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Values:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Additional values 'Tikanga Māori'.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Access:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This needs to be discussed further. May not want public access.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Support retention of kohatu 'volcanic rocks' on site.</li> <li>• Support height controls.</li> <li>• Puhinui Precinct Plan in AUP not considered an exemplar. Needs further refinement and opportunity for mana whenua to contribute to development of plan change.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to be discussed further to ensure sensitive values / wāhi tapu are respected.</li> </ul>
6	<p><b>Additional opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education opportunities for tamariki / kids i.e., laboratory.</li> <li>• Moana (ocean) needs to have the clear integrated management with freshwater.</li> </ul>	
6	<p><b>Next steps:</b></p> <p>All confirmed the next steps are 'ok' with timeline for further engagement in Mid/Late Feb 'ok'.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B&amp;A to prepare notes and circulate prestation material and matrix table.</li> </ul>

# Hui 1 Notes

Project: Waitomokia Plan Change

Date: **23 March 2023**

Time: 12pm – 1.30pm

Location: Goodman Head Office and Online

Attendees: Jeff Lee (JL), Ed Ashby (EA), Sarah Haydock (SH), Mike Gimblett (MG), Ben Shaw (BS), Rachel de Lambert (RdeL), Neville Smyth (NS), Dan Reddy (DR), Nick Roberts (NR), and Makarena Dalton (MD).

Item	Detail	Action
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slide 3 – NR notes that Te Ahiwaru is also being engaged to prepare a CVA and advised we attended Makaurau Marae on 22/03.</li> <li>Slide 4 – JL identified spelling error of ‘Hoturoa’ in the presentation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MD to correct Slide prior to circulation.</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Harbour View Site:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EA it is important to retain the character and openness on the Harbour View Site.</li> </ul>	Noted
3	<p><b>Ōruarangi and waterbodies:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JL requested Te Akitai Waiohua statutory acknowledgements to be referred to in CVA matrix. Important to acknowledge the work Te Akitai Waiohua has put in to get this.</li> <li>Circulate ENGEO Hydrology report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MD to update CVA Matrix</li> <li>MD to circulate Hydrology report</li> </ul>
4	<p><b>Interpretation and Cultural Narratives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EA suggested a transparent sign etched with what the scoria cones of Waitomokia looked like historically be installed that can be viewed along the public walkway. Could be located on the tuft ring high point.</li> <li>RdeL supported EA, acknowledging that this has been mentioned previously.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. To be considered in MOU.</li> </ul>
5	<p><b>Wāhi Tapu, Wāhi Taonga and Wāhi Tupuna</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JL requested internment protocols for managing any unearthed archaeological artifacts.</li> <li>JL queried how the earthworks were to be managed to avoid destruction of artifacts. Need certainty over how this is done</li> <li>EA reiterated putting aside space to inter.</li> <li>EA noted the main thing was that iwi were leading this and not Heritage NZ. Cultural monitoring to take place while earthworks in progress.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be considered in PC provisions (rules and assessment criteria) and MOU</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EA suggested that buildings were built in a style that reflected what was sitting underneath them.</li> <li>JL/EA importance of retaining kohatu on site.</li> </ul>	
6	<p><b>Place names:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JL confirmed support of naming the precinct Waitomokia and noted that different iwi have different priorities and to ensure we manage that carefully.</li> </ul>	Noted
7	<p><b>Next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All confirmed the next steps are 'ok' with timeline for further engagement in April 'ok'.</li> <li>EA noted he would be happy to join Goodman and meet with Council to support the plan change and JL agreed.</li> <li>EA overall supportive of approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B&amp;A to prepare notes and circulate presentation material, matrix table and Hydrology Report.</li> </ul>

Project: Waitomokia Plan Change – Te Ahiwaru Hui  
 Date: 22 August 2023  
 Time: 2-4pm  
 Location: Te Ahiwaru Tari, Main Room, 24 Ruaiti Road

Attendees:

Name	Role/Organisation
Nick Roberts	B&A
Mary Wong	B&A
Kowhai Olsen	Te Ahiwaru
Sophia Olo-Whaanga	Te Ahiwaru
Pania Newton	Te Ahiwaru
Ben Shaw	Goodman

Item	Detail	Action
1	<p>NR discussed the project background and recap of the work completed to date and previous hui. This was followed by a summary of the Plan Change and key features/points of discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outline of the precinct plans i.e. showing the precinct boundary including Indevin site.</li> <li>- The no-build zones including the notion of building a shelter or some other structure to form a place of reflection for Whanau at the high point in sub-precinct A.</li> <li>- The proposed building height restrictions for the different sub-precincts.</li> <li>- The crater rim no-build zone</li> <li>- The 10m landscape buffer and setback in sub-precinct A to provide a buffer to the Pā and screening to the Papakāinga opposite the Oruarangi Awa.</li> <li>- Stormwater management including:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Potential for a secondary SW outlet beneath the crater rim to avoid excessive fill heights.</li> <li>o The SW design involves the full treatment train:                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inert roofing</li> <li>▪ Enviropods</li> <li>▪ SW360 Sand filters</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Swale/raingardens for carparks and road side (where practical)</li> <li>▪ Final polishing via the SW wetland/pond</li> </ul>	
2	<p>Te Ahirwaru feedback/comments on Plan Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pleased to see the proposed lowering of building height in sub-precinct A. However, the 14m building height proposed is potentially still too high and could be imposing on the Papakāinga.</li> <li>- Queried if a building setback is proposed along the narrow section of sub-precinct A and why the 10m landscape buffer did not extend for the full length along this boundary. This area is directly opposite the Papakāinga so is requested to be screened and setback from buildings too.</li> <li>- BS clarified this area is the narrowest part and the only route in to this part of the site so is likely to be accessway / start of the yard, rather than buildings. However, the bulk and location is still to be finalised.</li> <li>- If the option for the SW outlet beneath the crater rim proceeds, Te Ahiwaru seek input and influence over the design of the outlet and the stormwater solution.</li> <li>- The indicative walkway on Precinct Plan for access to the Pā is not considered to be essential because public access to the Pā site is discouraged and removal of this is supported. However, Te Ahiwaru access to the Pā remains important and should be provided for.</li> <li>- Copies of technical reports informing the plan change are requested for review.</li> <li>- There is a puna in the Waitomokia cultural landscape that is currently not reflected on Precinct Plan 2 and this is suggested to be shown on the precinct plan too.</li> </ul>	B&A and Goodman to investigate solutions
3	<p>Te Ahiwaru other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is there any opportunity for Goodman to assist/support/lobby for Te Ahiwaru’s development plans with council – particularly for SW/WW which is currently under capacity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o NR advised this is something that could be explored in the MOU.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Goodman

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How does Goodman intend “to honour Te Tiriti” (o Waitangi)? Suggestion of return of land to Te Ahiwaru.</li> <li>- Query raised as to whether are any ONF overlays proposed over Waitomokia and if Council intended to do this. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o NR/MW advised that this matter was discussed recently with Council and the advice was there was no intention to do so.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Goodman
4	Reminder and discussion of the proposed MOU as a tool to be used to adopt Māori architectural concepts but also could be used to flesh out other detailed design features such as the SW outlet. The MOU would enforce the design guidelines being developed for buildings in the precinct.	Goodman
5	<p>Next steps following hui today:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Te Ahiwaru to review plan change in more detail and provide B&amp;A/Goodman with their feedback any proposed changes.</li> <li>- Goodman will continue with advancing plan change and targeting lodgement in the next 4-6 weeks.</li> <li>- Intention is for Goodman to arrange another pre-lodgement meeting with Council and would welcome Te Ahiwaru to attend this meeting expressing support for the plan change.</li> </ul>	B&A/Goodman
6	<p>SO shared an overview of Te Ahiwaru’s Ahi Kaa Framework Plan which consolidates the values and aspirations of various strategic documents by Te Ahiwaru. This Framework Plan identifies priorities for Te Ahiwaru and outlines potential options for implementation.</p> <p>Recommended that Goodman considers this Framework Plan and could be a useful document for Goodman to refer to in development of the design guidelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Framework Plan is 90% completed and a copy can be shared with Goodman once finalised.</li> </ul>	Te Ahiwaru

**Project:** Waitomokia Plan Change – Ngati Tamaoho

**Date:** 25 August 2023

**Time:** 2-3:30pm

**Location:** Ngati Tamaoho Office, 128 Hingaia Road

**Attendees:**

Name	Role/Organisation
Nick Roberts	B&A
Mary Wong	B&A
Makarena Dalton	B&A
Lucie Rutherford	Ngati Tamaoho
Edith Tuhimata	Ngati Tamaoho
Phil Crampsie	Goodman

Item	Detail	Action
1	<p>NR discussed the project background and recap of the work completed to date and previous hui. This was followed by a summary of the Plan Change and key features/points of discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outline of the precinct plans i.e. showing the precinct boundary including Indevin site</li> <li>- The no-build zones including the notion of building a shelter or some other structure to form a place of reflection for Whanau at the high point in sub-precinct A</li> <li>- The proposed building height restrictions for the different sub-precincts.</li> <li>- The crater rim no-build zone</li> <li>- The 10m landscape buffer and setback in sub-precinct A to provide a buffer to the Pā and screening to the Papakāinga opposite the Oruarangi Awa.</li> <li>- Stormwater management including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potential for a secondary SW outlet beneath the crater rim to avoid excessive fill heights.</li> <li>- The SW design involves the full treatment train:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inert roofing,</li> <li>▪ Enviropods,</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SW360 Sand filters,</li> <li>▪ Swale/raingardens for carparks and road side (where practical)</li> </ul> <p>- Final polishing via the SW wetland/pond</p>	
2	<p>Ngati Tamaoho feedback/comments on Plan Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Existing provisions in the AUP do not properly acknowledge mana whenua values and particularly in Light Industry zones but that does mean they do not exist.</li> <li>- In reference to the no build zone in sub-precinct A, it is not just the high points identified that should be protected but there are outer slopes that should be protected too.</li> <li>- Due to the cultural significance and undeveloped nature of the land, the likelihood of uncovering unrecorded sites during future development is likely to be high. Ngati Tamaoho advised they will not support or agree to authorities to modify or destroy archaeological sites.</li> <li>- Recommended the development of a Cultural Management Plan (CMP). The CMP will be separate from the Plan Change and will sit within the MOU. The CMP will include a list of key items to address, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Cultural opportunities mapping;</li> <li>o Artwork;</li> <li>o Expression of interest;</li> <li>o Archaeology management (noting that this is not approval for Authority process; and</li> <li>o Rehabilitation of the esplanade reserve.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Advised that Te Ahiwaru is the Ahi Kaa for this cultural landscape and the CMP should appropriately be prepared by Te Ahiwaru. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Edith will provide example of a CMP template to Kowhai for completion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Queried why the 10m landscape buffer did not extend for the full length along this boundary. This area is directly opposite the Papakāinga so be screened and setback from buildings too.</li> <li>- The indicative walkway on Precinct Plan for access to the Pā is not considered to be essential because public access</li> </ul>	<p>B&amp;A - special information requirement to be updated to require Archaeological Management Plan at the time of RC.</p> <p>Edith to discuss with Kowhai</p> <p>B&amp;A/Goodman</p> <p>B&amp;A</p>



	<p>to the Pā site is discouraged and removal of this is supported. However, access to the Pā remains important and should be provided for. Policy 6 should be removed and Precinct Plan 3 should be updated to extend the indicative walkway around the crater rim as opposed to terminating at the Pā site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The MOU must continue to provide Te Ahiwaru with access to the Pā site.</li> </ul> <p>- Advised that any discharge to the Oruarangi Awa will need a green outfall design solution.</p>	Goodman
3	<p>Next steps following hui today:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ngati Tamaoho to review plan change in more detail and provide B&amp;A/Goodman with their feedback any proposed changes.</li> <li>- B&amp;A to provide updated version of precinct provisions based on discussions and circulate to Ngati Tamaoho for review.</li> <li>- Goodman will continue with advancing plan change and targeting lodgement in the next 4-6 weeks.</li> <li>- Intention is for Goodman to arrange another pre-lodgement meeting with Council and would welcome Ngati Tamaoho to attend this meeting expressing support for the plan change.</li> </ul>	B&A/Goodman
4	<p>Next hui to be reconvened in 3 weeks (week of 11<sup>th</sup> Sept) to review updated provisions and list of items for CMP.</p>	B&A to arrange

Project: Waitomokia Plan Change Hui – Te Akitai Waiohua

Date: 31 August 2023

Time: 12-1pm

Location: B&A Offices, Shortland Street

Attendees:

Name	Role/Organisation
Nick Roberts	B&A
Mary Wong	B&A
Jeff Lee	Te Akitai Waiohua
Ben Shaw	Goodman

Item	Detail	Action
1	<p>NR discussed the project background and recap of the work completed to date and previous hui. This was followed by a summary of the Plan Change and key features/points of discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Outline of the precinct plans i.e. showing the precinct boundary including Indevin site.</li><li>- The no-build zones including the notion of building a shelter or some other structure to form a place of reflection for Whanau at the high point in sub-precinct A.</li><li>- The proposed building height restrictions for the different sub-precincts.</li><li>- The crater rim no-build zone</li><li>- The 10m landscape buffer and setback in sub-precinct A to provide a buffer to the Pā and screening to the Papakāinga opposite the Oruarangi Awa.</li><li>- Stormwater management including:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Potential for a secondary SW outlet beneath the crater rim to avoid excessive fill heights.</li><li>o The SW design involves the full treatment train approach:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Inert roofing,</li><li>▪ Enviropods,</li><li>▪ SW360 Sand filters,</li><li>▪ Swale/raingardens for carparks and road side (where practical)</li></ul></li></ul></li></ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Final polishing via the SW wetland/pond</li> </ul>	
2	<p>Te Akitai Waiohua feedback/comments on the Plan Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requested doing visual simulations of how development in the plan change area with proposed controls will be viewed from the Papakāinga, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lower building height</li> <li>o Landscape buffer</li> <li>o No build area</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Requested clarification on access to Pā site and if public access will be removed altogether if the standard in the precinct provisions is removed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o NR clarified public access will not be removed but will not be facilitated or encouraged by the plan change.</li> <li>o The MOU will specify and ensure access to the Pā site by iwi.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- MOU should specify meaningful engagement with iwi and commitment that development of buildings in precinct will be by Goodman, as opposed to other occupants/customers, to provide continuity of engagement with iwi.</li> <li>- Requested copies of technical reports once finalised to review in conjunction with precinct provisions.</li> <li>- Likely to recommend that Chloe Trenouth is engaged by Te Akitai to undertake a peer review of the draft provisions given her background involvement and assistance with the Puhunui Precinct.</li> <li>- Signalled that there may be suggestions to change the language in the precinct description that better acknowledges Te Akitai's values. Provisions will be provided to Te Akitai management for review and to provide feedback.</li> <li>- Queried the relevance and reasoning for including Te Motu a Hiaroa Charitable Trust in the precinct description and likely to suggest this passage/reference is deleted.</li> <li>- Requested copy of the precinct provisions with amendments agreed with other iwi to date.</li> </ul>	<p>BM/Goodman</p> <p>B&amp;A</p> <p>Te Akitai</p> <p>B&amp;A</p>

3	<p>Next steps following hui today:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Te Akitai Waiohua to review plan change in more detail and provide B&amp;A/Goodman with their feedback any proposed changes.</li> <li>- Goodman will continue with advancing plan change and targeting lodgement in the next 4-6 weeks.</li> <li>- Intention is for Goodman to arrange another pre-lodgement meeting with Council and would welcome Te Akitai Waiohua to attend this meeting expressing support for the plan change.</li> </ul>	B&A/Goodman
4	<p>Post-meeting notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- JL advised the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Te Akitai Waiohua has a coastal statutory acknowledgement area along with the iwi listed. It may not be included because it hasn't passed into legislation, however it is in the signed Deed of Settlement.</li> <li>o Te Akitai Waiohua also have a statutory acknowledgement over Otutataua Stonefields Reserve area (although that is not directly relevant).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Project: Waitomokia Plan Change Hui – Ngati Te Ata

Date: 12 September 2023

Time: 11:30am

Location: MS Teams

Attendees:

Name	Role/Organisation
Nick Roberts	B&A
Mary Wong	B&A
Karl Flavell	Ngati Te Ata
Ben Shaw	Goodman

Item	Detail	Action
1	<p>NR discussed the project background and recap of the work completed to date and previous hui. This was followed by a summary of the Plan Change and key features/points of discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Outline of the precinct plans i.e. showing the precinct boundary including Indevin site.</li><li>- The no-build zones including the notion of building a shelter or some other structure to form a place of reflection for Whanau at the high point in sub-precinct A.</li><li>- The proposed building height restrictions for the different sub-precincts.</li><li>- The crater rim no-build zone</li><li>- The 10m landscape buffer and setback in sub-precinct A to provide a buffer to the Pā and screening to the Papakāinga opposite the Oruarangi Awa.</li><li>- Stormwater management including:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Potential for a secondary SW outlet beneath the crater rim to avoid excessive fill heights.</li><li>o The SW design involves the full treatment train approach:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Inert roofing,</li><li>▪ Enviropods,</li><li>▪ SW360 Sand filters,</li><li>▪ Swale/raingardens for carparks and road side (where practical)</li></ul></li></ul></li></ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Final polishing via the SW wetland/pond</li> </ul>	
2	<p>Ngati Te Ata feedback/comments on the Plan Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Queried if Council had any intention to apply any ONF overlay over the plan change area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o NR advised that we have spoken and checked with council about this and the advice received was council had no knowledge or plan to do this.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Queried if property ownership changed in the future how can iwi be assured that these provisions and framework will be maintained. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o NR advised that because this is a plan change – the provisions will be maintained in the AUP and will remain in effect irrespective of any changes to property ownership in the future.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Agreed that public access to the Pa site was not required or supported. However, iwi access to the Pa site is required to be maintained.</li> <li>- KF does not support development on the high point areas in sub-precinct A to not obstruct the key views, shown on Precinct Plan 1. Sought assurance that development in these areas will not occur.</li> <li>- Requested clarification of views from development in sub-precinct A and what views would be maintained, particularly given the proposed landscape buffer around the Pa site.</li> <li>- Queried if the ‘no build areas’ will definitely not be developed on in the future. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o NR clarified that the provisions do not permit development but will enable the development of public amenities (i.e. seating, shelter building etc) for iwi.</li> <li>o On-going management of this area will be via the MOU with Goodman.</li> <li>o Access to the ‘no build area’ can be achieved via the public esplanade reserve accessed from Oruarangi Road.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Queried the potential extent of modifications to the crater rim <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o NR and BS clarified that the provisions do not permit development or earthworks on the crater rim. However, the provisions do enable minor modifications for landscaping and maintenance of walking tracks to avoid future consents for these minor maintenance works.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 10m building setback to the Pa site is not considered to be sufficient and a greater setback is considered to be required.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o KF suggested a 10m setback from the 10m landscape buffer as an alternative.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Stormwater management             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o BS advised rainwater harvesting now forms part of Goodman’s greenstar initiatives.</li> <li>o BS advised the roof area provides potential for solar panels too and forms part of greenstar initiatives. KF supports this initiative and including as part of MOU.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Assessment criteria applying to the development of new buildings is supported.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o BS clarified that the development of buildings in the precinct would be by Goodman and not by the individual customers in the future. This provides iwi with continuity of point of contact with Goodman.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Special information requirement: suggested adding in a Cultural Management Plan as a subset of the Archaeological Management Plan to provide for cultural monitoring.</li> <li>- Requested copies of the technical reports</li> </ul>	
3	<p>Next steps following hui today:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Goodman to finalise technical reports and precinct provisions for lodgement of plan change.</li> <li>- Ngati Te Ata to review plan change in more detail and provide B&amp;A/Goodman with their feedback any proposed changes.</li> <li>- Goodman will continue with advancing plan change and targeting lodgement in the next 4-6 weeks.</li> <li>- Intention is for Goodman to arrange another pre-lodgement meeting with Council and would welcome Ngati Te Ata to attend this meeting expressing support for the plan change.</li> <li>- KF advised he would be amenable to attending the council meeting with other iwi in attendance too but would attend in a neutral position.</li> </ul>	B&A/Goodman

# Appendix 8: Record of Consultation

---

## 4.0 Meeting Notes – Auckland Council

---



Project: Waitomokia Plan Change

Date: 7 July 2023

Time: 10:30-11:30am

Location: MS Teas

Attendees:

Name	Role/Organisation
Celia Davison	Auckland Council
Marc Dendale	Auckland Council
Nicholas Lau	Auckland Council
Nick Roberts / Mary Wong	B&A
Mike Gimblett / Phil Crampsie / Ben Shaw	Goodman

Item	Detail	Action
1	<p>Nicholas Lau feedback</p> <p>Mangere-Otahuhu area plan is publicly available</p> <p>Cultural landscape principles have been developed as part this area plan and would be complementary to Waitomokia PC</p> <p>Maori heritage team likely to be involved with PC</p> <p>Soft lodgement opportunity for council officers to provide feedback before formal lodgement? Clarity on timeframes is requested to manage workloads.</p> <p>Commended effort of Goodman to work with iwi and to recognise/respect cultural values. PC and approach to managing cultural values of the land is supported.</p>	
2	<p>Marc Dendale</p> <p>Discussions with surrounding landowners have extended to Indevin but not the Wedding family.</p> <p>Marc will be main point of contact for Goodman</p>	
3	<p>Local Board engagement</p> <p>Ideally to be undertaken in conjunction with council and with iwi groups.</p> <p>Nicholas Lau noted that the local board would likely be supportive of this approach to managing mana whenua values</p>	
4	<p>Sites of significance –</p>	

<p>Oruarangi Awa – Te Ahiwaru has requested for this to be recognised as a site and place of significance to iwi.</p> <p>Nicholas to check and confirm with Maori heritage team for the site and any other nominations from iwi</p>	
---	--

Project: Waitomokia - Meeting 2  
 Date: **30 November 2023** 3pm – 4pm  
 Time: MS Teams  
 Location:

Name	Role/Organisation
Sheri-Ann Atuahiva	Auckland Council – Team Leader Maori Heritage
Alex Jorgensen	Auckland Council – Maori Heritage Team
Nicholas Lau	Auckland Council – Plans and Places Team
Karl Flavell / Paora Puru	Ngati Te Ata Waiohua
Ed Ashby	Te Kawerau a Maki
Mike Gimblett, Ben Shaw, Phil Crampsie and Sarah Haydock	Goodman

Item	Detail	Action
1	Goodman is industrial developer and investor with long term ownership and management of assets.	
2	NR provided overview of PC and took attendees through a presentation.	
3	Karl Flavell feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recommended there should a kaitiaki space in the precinct to have a presence within the precinct. There needs to be korero with iwi about what this space and presence looks like.</li> <li>- Reiterated that there should be no development in the Harbourview Block</li> <li>- Execution, implementation and upholding of the mana will be key to the success of the PC.</li> </ul>	
4	Ed Ashby feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Waitomokia is a site of significance and noted that ideally there would be no development in the Harbourview Block.</li> <li>- Acknowledged that Goodman have taken the right approach to engage with hui from the beginning of the process and to apply constraints on the land for future development given there are none under the AUP.</li> <li>- Protecting integrity of the crater rim and this significant geological feature</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Protection of the mauri of the Awa – supports the flood storage wetland proposed in the precinct.</li> <li>- Design controls for new buildings in the precinct</li> <li>- Acknowledges the statutory process and framework is imperfect but considers the more nuanced approach of the Waitomokia Precinct to be appropriate.</li> </ul>	
5	<p>Auckland Council Sheri-Ann feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Commends the work done to date for the project and to protect/acknowledge mana whenua values over the land.</li> <li>- Suggests that Sheri-Ann/Alex formulates email to iwi regarding nominations. There have been four nominations from iwi to schedule Waitomokia – iwi to confirm scheduling vs. precinct approach in the PC. Council will be guided by what iwi advise them on their preference for scheduling or not.</li> <li>- Ed previously nominated the site in 2014 but acknowledges some time has pass. Considers that a PC to protect the land is appropriate and should be progressed as the opportunity arises given that there no protection over the land currently.</li> </ul>	
6	<p>Paora Puru feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Waitomokia is considered to be wahi tapu to iwi of the Manukau Harbour because of the unbroken connection.</li> <li>- Iwi need to maintain cultural and customary connection to the land and a kaitiaki space in the precinct will provide this presence on site.</li> <li>- Lacking in consideration of cultural values and impact of development on those values.</li> </ul>	
7	<p>Auckland Council Nic Lau feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Commends the work done to date by Goodman and mana whenua</li> <li>- Kaupapa area plans – sufficient time needs to be provided to iwi to provide feedback.</li> </ul>	
8	<p>Lodgement –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Issues of agreement and issues where there is no consensus</li> <li>- Record of engagement with iwi and hui.</li> </ul>	