

Hauraki District Council

Project Martha

Property valuation Appendix X – Further Information request clarification

Further to the telephone discussion between Malcolm Lane (for OGNZL) and Mark Buttimore and Dave Burton (for HDC) regarding the Council's further information request to OGNZL dated 22 June 2018, we provide the following clarifications regarding the further information in respect of the Property Valuation Report (Appendix X of the Project Martha application)

Item 1

This relates to the location of complaints received regarding vibrations from mine related activities. The HDC considers that this information would be useful and the provision of the complaint data (location and number) from the start of the Correnso project in the form of a heat map was discussed (considered an appropriate format). This may include some complaints related to open pit operations and subsequent SUPA Underground Mine activities (adjacent to the Correnso operation). This information will be useful in confirming if complaints are mostly close to the working areas and whether these are widespread or concentrated on certain properties. This is Item 2B.

Item 2

As discussed, the HDC is not pursuing the de-seasonalising of the sale price data (Item 2A) but we still consider that there would be value in showing the average sale prices in a nominal current dollar value to better illustrate what the report authors are saying (Waihi Average Sale Prices for Single Unit Homes, p11 and Average Sale Prices for Vacant Residential Sites (chart 2 in Appendix B). This data is for Waihi only and could be provided in tabular form or, better, presented in graphical format.

Item 3

As requested. A more definitive position is requested on the use of AEP and Top Up provisions, which are presented as conditions underpinning the conclusions in paragraph 8.6.

Item 4

Having undertaken 2B, it should be straightforward to estimate the dollar values associated with the graph on page 36 (Item 4), and to compare in real terms the estimated fluctuation in property prices with fluctuations that have occurred previously. The dollar value will have to be based on a simple extrapolation of prices over the life of Project Martha and then adjusted (i.e. create a counterfactual). This need not be done on the graph but should be covered in the commentary. It would make the assessment more meaningful and accessible, even acknowledging that it is not definitive

Item 5

As requested. At para 8.6 it is stated that the conclusions of the report are conditional on (amongst several matters), that property will be able to maintain existing insurance cover. Will there be changes in insurance for affected properties and if so is it significant or not? If so, how might increased premiums add to the effect considered on page 36?

The above clarifications are provided following the referenced telephone discussion and are to be considered part of the 22 June further information request.