

**From:** [Kathryn Drew](#)  
**To:** [Michelle Carmine](#)  
**Cc:** [Jeremy Hunt](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Tamahere Country Club - Further Information/Clarification Sought  
**Date:** Monday, 12 February 2024 8:47:44 AM  
**Attachments:** [ATT00001.png](#)

---

Good morning Michelle,

Please find below, for circulation to Stuart Ford, a response from AgFirst to Stuart's question. Please confirm that the response closes out the matter, or alternatively let me know if further clarification/discussion is required.

Many thanks,  
Kathryn



**Kathryn Drew** LAND DEVELOPMENT MANAGER / PRINCIPAL PLANNER  
Level 5, Building E, Union Square, 192 Anglesea Street  
PO Box 9041, Hamilton, 3240  
R +64 07 838 0144 D +64 027 251 0009  
E [kdrew@bbo.co.nz](mailto:kdrew@bbo.co.nz) W [www.bbo.co.nz](http://www.bbo.co.nz)

If you wish to send us a large file, please click the following link: <https://www.sendthisfile.com>

This e-mail is a confidential communication between Bloxam Burnett & Olliver Ltd (BBO) and the intended recipient. If it has been received by you in error, please notify us by return e-mail immediately and delete the original message. Thank you for your co-operation.

---

**From:** Jeremy Hunt <[jeremy.hunt@agfirst.co.nz](mailto:jeremy.hunt@agfirst.co.nz)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:02 AM  
**To:** Kathryn Drew <[kdrew@bbo.co.nz](mailto:kdrew@bbo.co.nz)>  
**Subject:** RE: Tamahere Country Club - Further Information/Clarification Sought

Hi Kathryn,

Apologies for the delayed response. I am just coming up for air after filing some pretty brutal rebuttal evidence yesterday.

My response to the questions raised:

The only question that I would put to AgFirst is in relation to the area at 82 Tamahere Drive where they say: *"Based on observations and available aerial photography, the 82 Tamahere Drive property shows a significant amount of modified soil, which is classified as anthropic soils<sup>3</sup>. These areas are appropriately considered non-productive land. The property is utilised as a site office and contractor laydown and parking area for the TCC retirement village development. The site is highly modified with the majority of it disturbed and either used for relocatable site offices, parking or the storage of equipment for civil infrastructure works. As such, the soils have been compacted and spread with densely packed gravel. These areas are not suitable for cultivation and arable use due to the soil limitations."*

Then later they say,

*"Note that soils that have been drastically disturbed but have been restored to the extent that they will meet the requirements of orders other than Recent Soils or Raw Soils, will not be assigned to Anthropic Soils."*

This italics text has been extracted from the definition of Anthropic soils in the NZ soil classification. Essentially this states that the soils, regardless of restoration, have been irreversibly modified to the extent that they will no longer be classified as the original soils, but now a young soil, such as recent or raw. Soils which are soils that have a distinct lack of topsoil development.

It would assist for clarity if they could state, with their reasoning, why the current state is a permanent one and therefore justifies them classifying it as anthropic soils.

While there would be the opportunity to restore the soils back to a productive use, they have been modified and compacted to a state where this would be identified as a long-term constraint for land-based primary production.

To re-establish this area it would require:

- Deep ripping the areas to overcome the subsurface compaction caused by heavy machinery and office buildings
- Reinstatement of soil profiles through the replacement of the subsoil and topsoil
- Subsoils and topsoils are placed by truck and spread to the required thickness. The subsoil is left roughened prior to topsoil spreading.
- Travel lanes are established on areas being rehabilitated to reduce the potential for soil compaction during placement
- Lucerne or green manure crops are sown to increase organic matter levels in the topsoil and provide additional opportunities for weed control prior to sowing perennial pastures
- Soil ameliorants and fertilisers will be applied as required

For a 1.7 ha property, such as 82 Tamahere Dr, with permitted entitlement for a house, ancillary buildings, ornamental gardens and curtilage, the above would not be considered likely nor within the definition of “reasonably practicable options to overcome the constraint on economic viability. This property is not a farm suitable for primary production, and is certainly not of a size that is economically viable, as detailed in my report.

I note your reference to the current land use as not being consented and presumably not allowed under the WDP therefore I wonder whether it is temporary, and they intend to restore it to its normal state.

This is just a minor technical issue as I am not of the opinion that it would make any difference to the results of the assessment but it was the only area that I could find which I couldn't follow their logic and therefore it didn't make sense.

I hope this helps clarify.

King Regards  
Jeremy



**Jeremy Hunt**  
Agribusiness Consultant  
Director

e: [jeremy.hunt@agfirst.co.nz](mailto:jeremy.hunt@agfirst.co.nz)  
t: +64 7 839 2683  
m: +64 27 203 6182

26D Liverpool Street  
PO Box 9078  
Hamilton 3240, New Zealand  
[www.agfirst.co.nz](http://www.agfirst.co.nz)



This email message and any attachment(s) is intended solely for the addressee(s) named above. The information it contains is confidential and may be legally privileged. Unauthorised use of the message, or the information it contains, may be unlawful. If you have received this message by mistake please call the sender immediately or notify us by return email and erase the original message and attachments. Thank you. AgFirst accepts no responsibility for changes made to this email or to any attachments after transmission from the office.