



395 Fitzgerald Road, Drury

s92 Response #3

Taha Auto Limited

Updates after s92 response was reviewed by Council

25 September 2025

This document is supported by the following:

- Attachment A – Copy of Ngati Te Ata feedback
- Attachment B – Copy of Ngati Tamaoho feedback
- Attachment C – Mana Whenua Recommendations & Applicant Response
- Attachment D – Assessment of Ngati Whanaunga EMP
- Attachment E – Record of Correspondence with Ngati Whanaunga #1
- Attachment F – Record of Correspondence with Ngati Whanaunga #2



Item	Description	Response	Outstanding Aspects
	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.	<i>The outcomes of engagement with Ngati Tamaoho, Ngaati Whanaunga, and Ngati Te Ata Waiohuria need to be provided, with any agreed actions. I acknowledge that Te Aakitai Waiohuria have provided their feedback and that you have agreed with their recommendations.</i> <u>Response:</u> <u>An on-site hui between David Fraser (Ngati Te Ata) and the applicant was held on 5 September 2025. A formal report was subsequently produced containing various recommendations in relation to the proposed earthworks.</u> <u>Feedback from Ngati Tamoho was received via email on 23 September 2025. The email noted that "this site is in a culturally sensitive area to Ngati Tamoho" and a range of recommendations were proposed.</u> <u>I note that Ngati Tamaoho own the site to the south (377 Fitzgerald Rd). They have advised that the house on the site is currently vacant, and that it might potentially be used as their offices in the future. An update to the adjacent persons assessment is not considered necessary as the original assessment was undertaken assuming that the house was occupied and being utilised for residential activities which is a conservative position. A vacant dwelling and/or the use of the building as an office will reduce the</u>



			<u>sensitivity of the site in relation to the proposed activities.</u> <u>We have also followed up with Mike Baker of Ngati Whanaunga on several occasions but have not received any feedback. In light of this, we have provided our own assessment against the Ngati Whanaunga Iwi Management Plan and provided it to Mike for review.</u> <u>Attachment C outlines the Applicant's response to all of the recommendations raised by iwi to date. A consolidated document has been provided to Council for ease, and separate responses have been provided to Ngati Te Ata and Ngati Tamoho.</u>
	Regional Earthworks		All queries satisfied
	Stormwater / ITA		All queries satisfied
	Air Quality		
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.	Please refer to updated AEE and (new) Appendix K – Air Quality Assessment. This responds to queries 7 – 10.	<i>We acknowledge that the EMP has not been updated, however we are happy for this to be updated as a requirement of a resource consent condition. Do you agree with this approach?</i> <u>Response: We agree to a condition of consent requiring an update to the EMP to address air quality matters.</u>
	Noise		All queries satisfied
	Wastewater		All queries satisfied
	Planning		

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.	 <i>The definition of “building” includes “stacks or heaps of materials over 2m in height that are in existence for more than one month.” Accordingly, these “stacks” would be subject to the yard setback rules that apply to the Future Urban zone. How high would two vehicles stacked on top of one another be?</i> <u>Response: Two vehicles stacked on top of one another would exceed the 2m height limit and therefore would be classified as a building.</u> <u>To ensure buildings in the form of stacks do not infringe the yard setback rules, the applicant proposes a condition of consent that requires the stacking of vehicles/parts to be located in accordance yard setback rules.</u>
	Landscape Visual Effects		
34	The AEE and Landscape and Visual Assessment refer to planting on the stream batter and along the yards. However, no landscape / planting plan is provided as part of the lodged information and it is considered an important part of the mitigation package to integrate into the current rural character / amenity, until the land is live zoned. Therefore, please provide the following: a) A landscape plan which clearly indicates the location of buildings, hard landscape areas (including gravel/metal), driveway, parking (e.g., for workers) and storage areas (outside the areas to be kept clear for workers parking, and vehicles manoeuvring	A Landscape Plan (Attachment 2) has been provided. This outlines the location of planting and the species proposed for the various locations. Visualisations have also been provided to assist in demonstrating how the landscaping will be perceived on the site. It is estimated to take 5 years for the planting to establish a good screen as illustrated in the visual simulations.	<i>Not satisfied. No information has been provided on the preparation of soil / ground conditions for all areas of planting. (Happy to go back to the specialist with a suitably worded condition?)</i> <u>Response: Yes, we agree that this can be covered via a condition of consent. Refer to condition of consent proposed in response to item 40.</u>



	onto the site as shown in the traffic report) and planting. b) A detailed planting plan that identifies the location of specific species proposed to be implemented across the site and a plant palette for the proposed planting associated with bund, stream, pond or mitigation planting. The plant schedule should include the proposed species, grade/height at time of planting, spacing, quantity and growth habit/speed in five years from planting. c) Noting the extent of earthworks across the site, please provide the preparation of the soil/ground for all areas of planting. Confirm how long it is anticipated to take for the planting to establish to a scale to provide the screening outlined within the Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment.		
35	Please confirm that there is sufficient space for the proposed planting by providing detailed sections of planting beds/bunds and swales. The sections should annotate key dimensions, gradients and arrangement of plants.	Detailed landscape sections have been provided (Attachment 3). They demonstrate that there is sufficient space for the proposed planting.	<i>Satisfied, though some concerns raised by the specialist that you may wish to address ahead of a decision being made on notification. Specialist notes that at the base of the retaining walls only 900mm-1000mm provided for planting and this may create some maintenance issues. Thoughts?</i> <u>Response:</u> <u>We propose that where there are large retaining walls, the 2m high wire mesh fence goes on top of the retaining wall with the planting in front (in general, the wire mesh fencing will be on the site boundaries).</u>



			<u>Maintenance can then be achieved in the following ways where the fencing is at the top of the retaining wall:</u> - <u>Landscaping along the eastern side boundary can be maintained from the adjacent site.</u> - <u>Landscaping along the northern front boundary can be maintained from Fitzgerald Road.</u> - <u>Landscaping along the western side boundary can be maintained by the adjacent driveways.</u>
40	Please confirm if any fencing (e.g., boundary, safety from fall, entry gate, security) is proposed as part of the application. If yes please identify the location of fencing/gates on a plan, and provide the type and details (e.g., height, appearance, permeability), supported with precedent images.	Boundary fencing will be a black wire mesh fence up to 2m high. There will be an entry gate (mesh type to match the fencing). Refer to query 46 response for description of retaining walls and safety fencing.	<i>Satisfied, though some concerns raised by the specialist that you may wish to address ahead of a decision being made on notification. Specialist advises:</i> <i>“The written response notes a 2m high black wire mesh fence, and entry gate to match the fencing are proposed.</i> <i>Please provide a fencing/gate plan indicating the location of the fences, noting spaces for retaining walls, driveways, bunds, swales and planting.</i> <i>It would be helpful if the planting sections were updated to show the proposed 2m high fence, and the pool fencing noted for safety – to understand where more than one fence may be proposed, and whether the location continues to allow for suitable space for planting to establish and be maintained.”</i> <u>Response:</u>



			<u>We believe a condition of consent for a detailed landscaping plan is suitable to address the location of fencing and other aspects. It seems the material concern is the feasibility of maintaining the landscaping (which is addressed above).</u> <u>We suggest the following wording for the condition:</u> <u>A landscape planting and management plan (with supporting specifications) must be prepared and submitted to Council for certification prior to construction commencing.</u> <u>The landscape planting and management plan must contain:(amend as required)</u> - <u>Reference to the written description/concept plan</u> - <u>A plan of the planted area detailing the proposed plant species, plant sourcing, plant sizes at time of planting, plant locations, density of planting, and timing of planting.</u> - <u>Details on the deep soil areas and canopy trees</u> - <u>A programme of establishment and post establishment protection and maintenance (fertilising, weed removal/spraying, replacement of dead/poorly performing plants, watering</u>
--	--	--	--



			<u>to maintain soil moisture, length of maintenance programme.</u> - <u>the location, materiality, height and design of fencing and retaining walls;</u> - <u>the details of drainage, soil preparation, tree pits, staking, irrigation; and</u> - <u>the construction details of all hard landscape elements (paving, fencing, gates, lighting etc).</u> <u>These plans must be supported by specifications that describe in a written form the more specific technical landscape matters such as quality of materials.</u>
43	Please provide cross sections through the site illustrating the relationship between the proposed buildings, external storage area, existing and / or proposed planting and neighbours. This should indicate any proposed planting at the height of time of implementation and then at 5 years. See Figure below for indicative locations.	Please refer to landscape sections and visualisations provided alongside this letter.	<i>Satisfied, though the specialist notes:</i> <i>"I note the following, and note that visualisations should be viewed alongside the accurate site plans to fully understand the proposal:</i> • <i>Visualisations do not show any retaining walls – this would apply for Viewpoint 2 (without planting version)</i> <u>Response: There are fill retaining walls up to 1.8m proposed within this perspective. Given the significant cost of creating additional visualisations, the landscape cross sections are considered appropriate for demonstrating how the retaining walls will appear on the site.</u> • <i>No fencing or gates are shown.</i>



Response: 2m high wire mesh fencing is proposed for all boundaries as described above. A detailed landscape plan accommodating all of the elements can be provided as a condition (as per response to query #40).

- *No planting versions (while not proposed) shows a large gravel area that could have 2-high stacked cars on it.*

Response: Noted, no further updates to the visualisations are proposed. The buildings were the focus of the visualisations given they are substantial additions to the site and will be in a specific location. The stacked vehicles will vary in location and intensity on the site depending on the operational requirements of the site so it would be difficult to present a 'typical' scenario.

- *Some plants and trees from existing photos have not been removed from the visualisation version (e.g., Viewpoint 2 trees and plants behind/on top of warehouse)."*

Response: Noted. Although, in our view they don't materially affect the intention of the visual sims – to show the proposed warehouse development from the public realm.

45	Please provide perspectives / visual montages from the adjacent properties towards the proposal, the images should demonstrate accurately the proposal (buildings, landform changes, structures, fencing, planting, lighting etc) at eye level. See figure below for locations 	In our view, the work associated with providing the additional montages from the adjacent properties to the south and west is not warranted given the other landscape related information provided to this point. The landscape plan, landscape cross sections and general information provided in writing is sufficient to understand the proposal and its potential impacts on adjacent persons.	<i>Satisfied, though some concerns raised by the specialist that you may wish to address ahead of a decision being made on notification, as follows:</i> <i>“No additional perspective views from neighbours’ properties were provided. I note that while planting is proposed along boundaries, this will take time to establish to visually screen/filter the proposed commercial/industrial use on site. I will address the potential adverse effects on neighbours (short and long term) within my final memo review.”</i> <u>Response: Additional perspective views from neighbouring sites were not prepared given the significant cost of creating additional visualisations in the context of the assessment on these persons (that any adverse effects will be less than minor). In particular, I note the following for each adjacent site where perspectives were requested:</u> <u>360 Fitzgerald Road (opposite):</u> <u>The visualisations provided in the previous s92 response show the proposal from Fitzgerald Road and are considered appropriate for this site.</u> <u>341 Fitzgerald Road (north-west):</u> <u>This site is separated from the subject site by the accessway for 359 and 377 Fitzgerald Road. This site has an existing shelterbelt along its eastern boundary provides screening when looking towards the subject site and it is proposed to introduce screen planting on the western side boundary of the site. Vegetation on the site will reach 3m+ in height at maturity as shown</u>
-----------	---	---	--



		<u>by the landscape cross-sections in s92 response #2. The level of screening via vegetation will provide mitigation for any adverse visual effects, to the point where they will be less than minor.</u> <u>377 Fitzgerald Road (south):</u> <u>This site is owned by Ngati Tamaoho, who have advised the applicant that this site is currently un-occupied and therefore there are no persons who could be adversely affected regarding visual effects. Nevertheless, if the site was occupied, there is a good level of existing vegetative screening between the sites and the proposed planting parallel to the stream will provide further screening and therefore mitigate adverse visual effects to a less than minor level (refer to section 5 of landscape cross-sections in s92 response #2).</u> <u>359 Fitzgerald Road (south-west) and Section 10 SO543175 (south):</u> <u>The requested perspectives for these sites are 190m and 290m respectively from the closest part of the southern-most warehouse proposed for the site. In addition to the large separation distances, the proposed development will be screened from view from these perspectives by the proposed planting on the southern boundary, existing vegetation and the greenhouses and dwelling at 377 Fitzgerald Road (in the case of the latter site). Given the above, adverse visual effects will be less than minor.</u>
--	--	--



	Further Matters / Queries		
1	In addition to the above, we suspect that resource consent may be required to infringe the following: - E27.6.2.5(T92) – bicycle parking spaces. (1 needed).		<u>Response:</u> <u>As per the lodged Transportation Assessment: “one cycle parking stand/rack can be readily provided within or adjacent to the proposed warehouse buildings”. Therefore, the development is compliant.</u>
2	Further request sent via separate email: The Babington <i>Infrastructure Report, Rev 2, 07.08.25</i>, provides the following detail re the use of Silt Fences (SFs). <i>“Silt fences will be established along down gradient site boundaries to manage dirty water during construction of the SRPs, and once dirty water diversion bunds have been established to direct runoff to an SRP, the silt fences will remain in place to manage the small areas where runoff cannot be directed to an SRP. Catchment areas managed by silt fences alone, have been detailed on the ESCP”</i>. This is a significant area of earthworks (2,747m²) to be undertaken immediately adjacent to the sensitive stream environment. Please justify the use of SFs given the efficiency of SFs is ~50% as opposed to ~80% for chemically treated DEBs. It may be that there an option to Cut & Cover” with the SFs as backup, or divert all flows to a DEB?		<u>Response: We are happy to use a cut and cover methodology with the SFs as back up</u> <u>We would prefer that this be conditioned to be shown on the drawing and present at the preconstruction meeting.</u>

3	Query #21 of the original s92 request: 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.	The applicant wishes to add further information to their original response on this matter. It is proposed to include the following condition: <i><u>"All sales must be made via remote means. The site must be secured at all times."</u></i> We trust that this condition will ensure that the anticipated vehicle movements generated by the activity will align with the actual future movements.
---	---	--	---

Kind regards,

Author



Will Clarke

Planner

Saddleback

Reviewer



Joe Gray

Principal Planner

Saddleback