



395 Fitzgerald Road, Drury

s92 Response

Taha Auto Limited

Attention:	
Bryce Powell	Consultant Planner

19 August 2025

Dear Bryce,

The following letter outlines the applicant's partial response to the s92 queries. A response to the landscape queries is currently being prepared and will be provided to Council a later date.

As part of this s92 response, an updated Assessment of Environmental Effects has been prepared. Several of the AEE appendices have also been updated:

- Appendix B – Site Plans
- Appendix C – Infrastructure Report
- Appendix D – Environmental Management Plan

Additionally, the following AEE appendices have been added post-lodgement:

- Appendix I – Landscape Plan
- Appendix J – Acoustic Assessment
- Appendix K – Air Quality Assessment

All of the updated and new AEE appendices are included within the s92 response folder provided to Council.



A range of matters are directly addressed by the Babingtons' s92 response which is attached to this letter. To avoid duplication, where Babingtons' have addressed a s92 query, I will defer to their response. I also note that the Babingtons' s92 response provides clarifications for additional s92 matters raised after the original s92 letter.

Item	Description	Response
Mana Whenua		
1	Please provide the outcome of any engagement requested by the mana whenua groups that were identified and consulted with, using Council's mana whenua facilitation service on 27 May 2025. A response to this matter will include any comments/ feedback from mana whenua, as well as commentary on whether any suggestions/ recommendations made by mana whenua will be adopted as part of the proposal.	The applicant agreed to pay costs for Ngati Whanaunga (Mike Baker) to undertake an assessment on 29 May. There has been no feedback to date. A site meeting was held with Jeff Lee of Te Akitai on 10 June 2025. No feedback has been provided by Mr Lee following the site meeting. A site meeting was held with Lucile Rutherford of Ngati Tamaoho on 8 July 2025. No feedback has been provided by Ms Rutherford following the site meeting.
Regional Earthworks		
2	The Reason for Consent is stated as, "The proposed earthworks will occur over an area greater than 10,000m² up to 50,000m² where land has a slope less than 10 degrees outside the Sediment Control Protection Area which is a controlled activity under rule E11.4.1(A4)). The area of earthworks is approximately 26,255m²." The earthworks are immediately adjacent to a tributary of the Hingaia Stream, therefore within the Sediment Control Protection Area (SCPA). Any contiguous area of earthworks within the SCPA that exceeds 2,500m² in area requires resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under E11.4.1(A9). Please update the AEE.	The AEE has been amended to incorporate the consent required under E11.4.1(A9).
3	The Babington Infrastructure Report, April 2025, has a brief section relating to earthworks (5. Earthworks). Whilst the supporting Engineering Drawings provide great detail, the earthworks sediment control methodology is rather brief. Please update the section, 5. Earthworks, to describe site	Refer to Babingtons' response.



	specific detail such as how the two sub-catchments will be managed to ensure that both Sediment Retention Ponds (SRP) receive dirty flows from the correct area, whether chemical treatment is proposed for each SRP and clearly define any areas controlled by Silt Fences alone, noting that the combined area controlled by SRPs is ~2,250m ² , whereas the total earthworked area is 26,255m ² .	
	Stormwater / ITA	
4	Please clarify what will be stored within the second warehouse building (e.g. aggregate?) <i>Reason: It is proposed to utilise the site for two warehousing (each will be approximately 2000m² in size). One of which will be used for the dismantling and storage (front building) and the second for storage only.</i>	Refer to Babingtons' response.
5	Please clarify where on site fuel will be transferred from the vehicles that are to be dismantled into small containers, then into staff vehicles, and where on site these activities will occur, and what mitigation measures are proposal to prevent adverse effects from spilling fuel? What management procedures will be followed if for example, staff vehicles have a full tank or use different fuel to what has been syphoned from vehicles that are being dismantled? Where will the fuel be stored on site? At what quantity before the fuel is disposed of?	Refer to Babingtons' response.
6	Oil and coolant are stored within one of two 1m³ containers in a dedicated storage area (within the warehouse). a) Please clarify if parts will be washed within the dismantling building b) Please clarify where the wash water will discharge c) Please clarify how the dismantling warehouse floor will be cleaned d) Not sure if an oil and water separator will be at the site. e) Please confirm total site impervious area = 11,034m². f) Please clarify how the existing stream on site will be protected from adverse effects relating to the proposed use and development on the site.	Refer to Babingtons' response.



Air Quality		
7	Please provide a detailed air discharge assessment prepared by a qualified air quality specialist, identifying all potential sources of air emissions associated with the proposal and quantifying their likely discharge rates where possible.	Please refer to updated AEE and (new) Appendix K – Air Quality Assessment. This responds to queries 7 – 10.
8	Please conduct an assessment of off-site air-quality effects at nearest sensitive receptors, with comparisons to relevant NESAQ, AUP provisions and recognised good-practice guidelines.	
9	Please provide a detailed description of all proposed mitigation measures (both structural and operational) to minimise emissions, and how these measures will be implemented and maintained under the site’s Environmental Management Plan (EMP).	
10	Please revise AEE and EMP documents incorporating the above information and demonstrating how potential air-quality effects will be managed to be no more than minor.	
	<i>Reason: The information requested in 7-10 is required because there has been no detailed air discharge assessment undertaken to demonstrate compliance with the E14 provisions of the AUP(OP). Vehicle dismantling activities can generate airborne contaminants such as volatile organic compounds, particulate matter and odour, and therefore a detailed assessment is required.</i> <i>We also note that in the assessment provided against the Drury South Precinct rules (I410), the AEE states that “.... the proposed use of land will not produce inappropriate noise or air pollution.” However, no detailed air discharge assessment or compliance with AUP E14 provisions is provided.</i>	
Noise		
11	Please advise the proposed operating days and hours.	Proposed operational hours: 8am to 5pm Monday to Saturday.
12	Please clarify if truck movements are included in the estimated 30 vehicle movements per peak hour and if so, please specify the maximum number of trucks per hour and per day.	Within hourly vehicle movements arriving and departing the site there will be: - 1x medium-sized service vehicle - 1x heavy-sized service vehicle
13	Please clarify if other mobile machinery will be operated outside, for example, a fork hoist or wheeled loader for handling vehicles/engines.	An LPG forklift and a front loader will operate on site.
14	Please clarify if the proposal will include any noisy fixed equipment (e.g. compressor) and if so, where equipment will be located.	A compressor will be used occasionally but will be housed to attenuate noise.



	<i>Reason: The information requested in x-x is required to better understand actual and potential noise effects and to demonstrate compliance with permitted noise levels specified in E25.6.3 and E25.6.15 (existing zoning) and E25.6.5 and E25.6.19 (future zoning).</i>	An Acoustic Assessment has been prepared by SLR Consulting and is included as a new appendix to the updated AEE (Appendix J). This assessment concludes that “the predicted noise rating levels generated by the proposal comply with the relevant AUP daytime noise limits at the surrounding receivers”.
	Wastewater	
15	Please provide bore logs for boreholes drilled within the primary and reserve wastewater disposal areas. Please note that section 5.2.2 of TP58 states: “all site assessments are to include a detailed assessment of soils underlying the proposed land disposal area. A detailed description of soils encountered, depth to groundwater and relevant soil structure and soil textural features shall be recorded and the depth to each horizon and soil description within the soil profile submitted with the site assessment report.”	Refer to Babingtons’ response.
16	The earthworks plan indicates that soil will be removed from the proposed wastewater disposal area. Please confirm whether the topsoil will be replaced.	Refer to Babingtons’ response.
17	Please specify what wastewater treatment system is proposed	Refer to Babingtons’ response.
18	On the Sheet 1 civil engineering plan, please show the minimum separation distances of the primary and reserve wastewater disposal areas from buildings and overland flow paths including swales.	Refer to Babingtons’ response.
	Planning	
19	Please confirm that request to vary consent notice D3702034.02, which as lodged concurrently with the land use application to operate a car dismantling activity, is to cancel the consent notice as it applies to Lot 3 DP 194536 (NA 123C / 912) (i.e., cancel in part), and not cancel the consent notice as it also applies to Lots 2 and 3. <i>Reason: While it is noted that a separate application has been lodged under s221(3), the AEE for the land use consent application notes that this consent notice must first be cancelled to develop the property. This information will inform</i>	The request to vary consent notice D3702034.02 is to only cancel the consent notice as it applies to the subject site. The application is not for the cancellation as it applies to other lots.



	<i>the assessment of effects for both applications that have been lodged.</i>	
20	Please advise implications / relevance of covenanted area “Z” on the Record of Title to the proposed development and activities. <i>Reason: While it is noted that private covenants are not a resource consent matter, the covenant may assist with understanding the adverse effects of the proposal.</i>	We have reviewed the historical and current titles and there is no detailed record of covenant area ‘Z’. It is assumed that the covenant no longer applies to the site.
21	Please confirm that customers of online sales will not visit the site? (i.e., online sales of parts will be couriered / shipped with no in-person pick-ups. Has this been factored into the anticipated rate of vehicle movements that could be generated by the activity?	Generally, customers will not visit the site to pick up goods in person. The online sales will be transported off site.
22	Will parts of vehicles dismantled offsite be delivered to the site for redistribution/sales?	Vehicles will arrive to site intact and then will be manually dismantled on-site.
23	Will vehicles be delivered on trucks? Will they be driven to the site?	Yes – vehicles will be delivered to the site via trucks.
24	If pick-ups are allowed, please annotate on the plans with where customers will park/load. Please confirm if the car parking spaces will be formed/marked on the ground. <i>Reason: Matters 21-24 are required to undertake the nature of the activity and the potential adverse effects on the transportation environment and the amenity of adjacent landowners.</i>	As per response to query #21, there is no need to identify a customer parking and loading area.
25	Please provide an assessment of the matters listed in section 3.13 of the Drury Opaheke Structure Plan 2019 that pertain to the use of land identified for industrial purposes. <i>Reason: Although the Structure Plan is not statutory, I agree that it can guide what may or not be an appropriate use of land prior to it being live zoned for urban purposes. I therefore consider that the effects on the future environment must be considered, and accordingly the proposal requires a more detailed assessment of the proposal against the outcomes that are sought by the Structure Plan for industrial land uses.</i> <i>This assessment may include analysis of the feedback provided during the structure plan process on the intended zoning of the site and the adjacent sites, noting that there will always be some uncertainty as to what the land will be</i>	Refer to updated section 8.4.1 of the AEE.



	<i>zoned. (Particularly, as this has been scheduled to occur at 2035 at the earliest under the FDS).</i>	
26	Will vehicle / parts be stacked on top of one another within the yard? If so, how high will each stack be managed / limited to?	Vehicles / parts will be stacked no more than two vehicles high on site.

Kind regards,

Author

Will Clarke

Planner

Saddleback

Reviewer

Joe Gray

Principal Planner

Saddleback