

Assessment of Environmental Effects

Maungawhau Planting restoration works (southern area)



Aerial view of Maungawhau

Dated: January 2017

SUMMARY

Auckland Council proposes restoration planting and weed management at Maungawhau (Mt Eden). This is part of a long-standing policy and programme to restore the ecological values of the lower slopes of the maunga.

Maungawhau is one of the 14 maunga held by the Tamaki Collective and managed by the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority (**Maunga Authority**). The implementation of the works falls within the scope of the delegation to Auckland Council's operational management.

The native planting and weed removal will have a positive effect on bio-diversity. The only potential adverse effect that may occur as a result of the works is the potential to disturb unrecorded archaeological features. Measures to manage the effect of this have been incorporated into the scope of the proposal. The ground disturbance of a historic heritage place with additional archaeological controls and replanting requires resource consent under the Auckland Unitary Plan¹. Overall the application is a discretionary activity.

Consultation has been undertaken with iwi who have recognised mana whenua associations with the maunga. Support for the works has been received from the iwi who responded. An authority to modify has been made to Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (**Heritage NZ**).

This statutory assessment and assessment of environmental effects (**AEE**) has been prepared in accordance with the Fourth Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**) and corresponds with the scale and significance of the effects that the proposed activity may have on the environment. Planning provisions and other matters of relevance under the RMA have been considered and the overall conclusion is that the application satisfies the statutory provisions and consent should be granted.

¹ Operative in part version, dated 15 November 2016

Table 1: List of Appendices

Appendix	Document
1.	Application form
2.	Title information
3.	Rule assessment
4.	Consultation information
5.	Archaeological assessment
6.	HNZPT Authority
7.	Biodiversity review
8.	Planting details

1. THE APPLICANT AND PROPERTY DETAILS

Table 2: Applicant

Applicant's name:	Auckland Council
Address for service:	Tania Richmond Richmond Planning Limited PO Box 91689 Auckland 1142
Name and address for fees:	Rob Mouldey Auckland Council Private Bag 92300 Auckland 1142
	WBS: N.3589.05

Table 3: Property details and summary of plan controls

Site address:	250 Mount Eden Road Mount Eden Auckland 1024
Legal description:	Section 1 SO Plan 454833
Owners and occupiers:	Held under Section 21, Nga Mana Whenua o Tamaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014 by the Tūpuna Taonga o Tāmaki Makaurau Trust
Area:	76 hectares (total site)
Auckland Council Plan: (district plan)	Auckland City Isthmus Section 1999

District plan zoning:	Open Space 1 (area of works)
District plan designations/limitations	Various, but none apply as they no longer have legal effect
Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) Zoning & Precinct	Public Open Space – Conservation (area of works)
Special features, overlays etc: (relevant to this proposal)	Those relevant to the proposal are in bold text: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic Heritage: Historic Heritage Place - ID 1577, category A* with additional archaeological controls • Natural resources: Significant ecological area - SEA_T_6206 Land • Natural Heritage: Outstanding Natural Features - ID 109, Maungawhau (Mt Eden), category "V" • Historic Heritage: Historic Heritage Place - ID 1752 Public Toilets/ Bus Shelter • Natural Heritage: Volcanic Viewshafts and Height Sensitive Areas • Natural resource: Aquifer – Western Springs Volcanic Aquifer • High Land Transport Route noise – western side of the park. • Designation 9417 – Water Supply Purposes Reservoir, Watercare Services Ltd

Location Diagram



Source: AUP maps

2. THE SITE AND CONTEXT

2.1 Overview

- 2.1.1 The maunga of Tamaki include former Maori pa or built fortification. Despite modifications and damage to the archaeology and fabric of the maunga, some features, such as terraces and midden remain intact. Due to a long history of occupation, there is also potential for undiscovered archaeology to be present.
- 2.1.2 The maunga are defining landscape features that are of outstanding significance and views to the maunga are protected by viewshafts.
- 2.1.3 While each iwi will have their own associations and values with particular maunga, and it is for them to detail this, there is little doubt that the maunga are of profound significance to the iwi that claim mana whenua. This is recognised in the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014.

2.2 Maungawhau

- 2.2.1 Maungawhau is the highest of Auckland's volcanic cones. Maungawhau is a site of historic heritage significance. It is also an outstanding natural feature and contains areas of ecological significance. It is a place of spiritual value to Maori, and the Pa site is recorded by the New Zealand Archaeological Association, file reference R11/17. As detailed in the attached archaeological assessment, there are 359 identified archaeological features associated with the maunga.²
- 2.2.2 The area of works is located on the southern side of the maunga, some 150m below the tihi (summit). This area includes regenerating vegetation and pedestrian tracks. A small part of the area includes steep rock faces of the former Batger Quarry. Due to former quarrying, past farming practices and the steepness of the face, weeds continue to dominate the area in pockets. This includes Bamboo and Chinese Privet and three large Pine trees. While the area contains weed species, it nonetheless provides a habitat for birds and gecko.³ However, it also contains pest species including rats and possums.
- 2.2.3 Directly above the area of works is the vehicle access to the tihi (now partly closed). Below the area of works are residential properties. The area of works is best viewed from Oaklands Road.

3. CONSULTATION

- 3.1.1 The maunga is governed by the Maunga Authority and was transferred as part of the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014. The Tamaki Collective are consulted about the proposed works via Tamaki Collective notices. Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua were the only iwi to respond, and they expressed support for the works. No other iwi provided comments or requested the opportunity to provide a cultural values assessment to inform the appropriateness of the restoration planting. Appendix 3 contains correspondence with iwi.

² CFG Heritage Ltd, 12 December page 3

³ Maungawhau-Mt Eden Management Plan, pages 19 and 20

3.1.2 Heritage NZ have been consulted and an authority has been granted. This is attached as Appendix 6 (reference 2017/534).

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

4.2.1 The proposal is to undertake restoration planting over approximately 3 hectares of land on the southern side of Maungawhau. This is part of an on-going programme of planting and weed clearance at Maungawhau.

4.2.2 This application is almost identical to an application consented last year for works on the western side of the maunga (reference: R/LUC/2016/1196). The proposed work involves:

- On-going removal of remnant weed species, undertaken in stages. This is defined as those on the Auckland Regional Pest Management Strategy 2012.⁴ Removal will be undertaken by hand held tools. No stump grinding will occur. Larger stumps will be treated by painting the stump with herbicide.
- Annual planting of native species over a period of 5 years. This involves between 500 and 1000 plants per year.

4.2.3 Examples of the species to be planted are included in the attached list. These will be sourced from stock on or around Maungawhau, or within the Tāmaki Ecological District. These will be supplied by the Maungawhau Nursery, with occasional supply by a native plant nursery, where necessary. The list of species has been finalised in conjunction with the Council's biodiversity team (refer to Appendix 7) and the project archaeologist. Following some discussion about larger canopy replanting, a final list has been agreed that achieves an appropriate balance between maintaining views to the tihī and protecting archaeology, whilst ensuring biodiversity of plant species.

4.2.4 To minimise damage to regenerating species, risk to unrecorded archaeological evidence and the geological integrity of the feature, ground modification is limited to:

- The removal of weed species. The amount of displaced soil will depend on the roots of the plant. While an exact figure of land modification cannot realistically be provided, a nominal sum of 1000m² and 2m³ of land disturbance for lower canopy plants is suggested, and noting that no stump grinding will occur for larger weeds and the pine trees.
- The hole required to plant a PB ¾ sized plant. Over the period of five years, land disturbance is estimated to involve 1,000m² and 5m³.
- Returning disturbed soil around the plant. No soil will be imported, other than what is in the plant bag.

4.2.5 The three pine trees will require a specific methodology as the large trunks are likely to be removed by helicopter. The largest of the pine trees is over 40m

⁴ This includes those on the following lists:

- Total Control Pest Plants
- Containment Pest Plants
- Surveillance Pest Plants

high (tree number 2 on the photograph). This method of removal will avoid the risk of damage to archaeology. While removal of large trees by helicopter is well established on sites with constraints, the contractor will be required to prepare a specific methodology in consultation with the project archaeologist and parks arborist. At no time is the helicopter required to land near the works area.



Photo: taken from the pedestrian track adjacent 115 Owens Road.

5. RULE ASSESSMENT AND REASONS FOR CONSENT

5.1.1 Appendix 3 is an assessment of the rules that may be triggered by this proposal. Consent is required only in respect of the AUP.

5.1.2 Resource consent is required under the AUP for the following reasons:

- D17.4.1 (A9) Modifications to, or restoration of, buildings, structures, fabric or features of a scheduled historic heritage place, are a restricted discretionary activity except where provided for as a permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary activity in another rule⁵. This applies to removal of weed plants and planting of native plants.
- D17.4.1 (A23) Conservation planting⁶ is a discretionary activity.

⁵ The entire site is included in the Historic Heritage Overlay extent of place ID 1577, Mount Eden /Maungawhau Volcanic cone pa site terrace/s, pit/s and midden. A*, and includes additional rules for archaeological sites or features and is identified as a place of Maori interest or significance. Of relevance is that D17.1. Background Category states that A* is an interim category until a comprehensive re-evaluation of these places is undertaken and their category status is addressed through a plan change process. Maungawhau is identified as Category A* in Schedule 14.1. This means that Council has yet to identify the primary features within the HH extent of place. In the absence of this information consent is sought for the tree removal work (on the basis that the trees are part of the fabric or features). However, Council may consider that this is not required.

⁶ The works fall within this definition, as set out in Chapter J1.

- D17.4.1 (A26) Removal of trees greater than 3m in height or greater than 300mm in girth is a discretionary activity in the historic heritage where the scheduling includes additional archaeological rules. This includes weed species.
- E12.4.3 (A40) Earthworks greater than 2m³ and up to 10m³ is a restricted discretionary activity within an Outstanding Natural Feature Category V1 (large volcanic landform).
- E16.4.1 (A10) Tree removal of any tree greater than 4m in height or greater than 400mm in girth in the Open Space Zone is a restricted discretionary activity. Note: this only applies to removal of weed species such as privet and bamboo.

6. NOTIFICATION ASSESSMENT

6.1 Statutory requirements

- 6.1.1 Section 95A gives a council discretion to decide whether to publicly notify an application or not. However, an application must be publicly notified if:
- (a) the activity will have, or is likely to have, adverse effects on the environment that are more than minor;
 - (b) the applicant requests public notification of the application; or
 - (c) a rule or national environment standard requires public notification.
- 6.1.2 Section 95A(3) provides that an application must not be publicly notified if a rule or national environmental standard precludes public notification and the applicant has not requested public notification.
- 6.1.3 In this case, there are no national standards that direct a decision on notification and the applicant is not requesting notification.
- 6.1.4 Despite the above, a council also has discretion to publicly notify an application if it decides there are special circumstances in relation to the application.
- 6.1.5 Section 95B provides that if an application is not publicly notified a council must decide if there are any affected persons (or affected order holders) in relation to the activity. Limited notification of the application must be given to affected persons unless a rule or national environmental standard precludes limited notification.
- 6.1.6 In determining whether to publicly notify an application, section 95D requires a council to decide whether an activity will have, or is likely to have, adverse effects on the environment that are more than minor. In making this decision, there are effects that must be disregarded.

6.2 Effects that must be disregarded

- 6.2.1 Adjacent sites are considered those to be those residential properties directly adjoining the reserve where the works occur. This includes those from Batgner Road to Owens Road. Any effects on these properties for the purpose of section 95D are therefore disregarded.
- 6.2.2 There are no national standards that require notification and trade competition is not relevant to this proposal. Given the various controls applying there is effectively no permitted baseline.
- 6.2.3 The existing environment, against which the effects should be assessed, is described in section 2 of this AEE, and in particular: it contains weed species and there are no recorded archaeological features in the area of works.

6.3 Adverse Effects on the Environment (section 95A and 95D)

Built heritage effects

- 6.3.1 The area of the proposed works does not contain any built historic features. Given the distance, topography and vegetation from the scheduled built heritage, the works do not affect any built heritage.

Archaeological effects

- 6.3.2 CFG⁷ advise that the works are outside areas of recorded archaeology and these recorded areas will not be affected by any of the proposed works.⁸ As Maungawhau is a location of Maori settlement, there is the potential for unrecorded archaeological evidence and this could be disturbed during the ground works. Due to the limited nature of the excavation, this is considered unlikely, but nonetheless a protocol and methodology has been developed. Subject to adherence to this, effects on archaeology will be avoided.

Outstanding natural feature (geological feature)

- 6.3.3 Effects on outstanding natural features (ONF) can occur through:
- Changes in landform
 - Removal of soil
 - Importing of foreign soil or materials
 - Planting of species that are not endemic to the locality
 - Construction of buildings that impact on the views to and from the feature
- 6.3.4 In this case, the works do not change the landform. No removal of soil from the maunga is proposed and any imported material is limited to the soil in the plant bag and this is locally sourced from the Tāmaki Ecological District. Plant species are limited to those eco-sourced from the Auckland region. Removal of pockets of weed species will improve the visual appearance of the landscape, but there is otherwise no impact on sightlines/views to or from Maungawhau.

⁷ CFG, diagram, page 4

⁸ CFG, page 5

Mana Whenua

- 6.3.5 As outlined earlier, those tribal authorities who have associations with the maunga were contacted to provide feedback on the proposal and how it may impact on their values. No iwi wished to provide a values assessment, but given that the maunga are part of the Tamaki Collective deed of settlement, their importance is acknowledged.⁹ Of the iwi who responded, support has been received for the proposed activity.

Ecological/Trees

- 6.3.6 The attached planting plan identifies the focus of the works is the gradual removal of exotic weed species from the maunga and replanting with native species eco-sourced from within the Tāmaki Ecological District. Over time, this will improve biodiversity, protect regional values and reduce the need for pesticides, by reducing the incidence of pests within the region.¹⁰ This will have a positive rather than adverse effect on the significant ecological area (SEA).

Sediment, erosion and water quality

- 6.3.7 Given the limited nature of the earthworks, no adverse effects on sediment, erosion and water quality are anticipated.

Summary of Effects

- 6.3.8 It can be concluded from the above that the potential adverse effects generated by the activity on the environment are limited to disturbance of unrecorded archaeology and these effects can be mitigated by adherence to a method of works and protocol.

6.4 Special Circumstances (section 95A(4))

- 6.4.1 There are no special circumstances that warrant the public notification of this application.

6.5 Affected Persons (section 95B and 95E)

- 6.5.1 If the application is not publicly notified, a council must decide if there are any affected persons and give limited notification to those persons. A person is affected if the effects of the activity on that person are minor or more than minor (but not less than minor). In making this decision a council must also have regard to any statutory acknowledgement under schedule 11. However, a council must not consider that a person is affected if they have given their written approval or it is unreasonable in the circumstances to seek that person's approval.
- 6.5.2 Based on the assessment in section 6.3 and the conclusion that there are no minimal adverse effects on the environment, no persons are adversely affected by the activity. In coming to this conclusion, particular consideration has been given to:

⁹ Clause 65 Crown Acknowledgment, Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014

¹⁰ Auckland Regional Pest Management Strategy, page 2

- the management plan and operational plan identifying the proposal works; and
- attempts to contact iwi with associations to the maunga the iwi that responded provided support for the works.

6.6 Notification conclusion

6.6.1 Based on the above analysis, this application may be processed without public or limited notification because:

- The adverse effects of the activity on the environment will be less than minor.
- There are no special circumstances to warrant notification.
- No persons are adversely affected.

7. CONSIDERATION OF THE APPLICATION

7.1 Statutory Matters

7.1.1 Subject to Part 2 of the RMA, when considering an application for resource consent and any submissions received the council must, in accordance with section 104(1) of the RMA have regard to; any actual and potential effects on the environment of allowing the activity; any relevant provisions of a national policy statement, a New Zealand coastal policy statement; and a regional policy statement or proposed regional policy statement; a plan or proposed plan; and any other matter a council considers relevant and reasonably necessary to determine the application.

7.2 Actual and Potential Effects on the Environment (section 104(1)(a))

7.2.1 An assessment of adverse effects has been set out at section 6 above where it was concluded that there are minimal adverse effects of the activity on the environment.

7.2.2 As part of the section 104(1)(a) analysis, a council is required to have regard to any positive effects on the environment as a result of the activity. This proposal has a positive effect on the environment as it promotes biodiversity through weed removal and removal of pest habitats (e.g. rats and possums), and replanting of native species.

7.3 Planning documents – section 104(1)(b)(vi)

7.3.1 There are appeals to objectives and policies in the Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF)¹¹ and Significant Ecological Area (SEA) chapter, but no rules trigger reasons for consent under the district plan. Equivalent provisions under the district plan applies to this site e.g. scheduled geological feature and significant ecological area. A review of corresponding objectives and policies

¹¹ CIV-2016-404-002299: Federated Farmers of New Zealand and CIV-2016-404-002343: Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated

for the equivalent provisions confirms the outcomes sought are similar. The focus of the following assessment is therefore on the AUP.

Auckland Unitary Plan objectives and policies

Public Open Space - Conservation zone

- 7.3.2 The conservation zone seeks to protect and enhance the natural, ecological, landscape and heritage values while still providing for public use and enjoyment.¹² For the reasons already expressed, the works are consistent with the two objectives for this zone.
- 7.3.3 Policies include enabling appropriate activities that conserve, protect and enhance the values detailed above. Ensuring minimal disturbance to landforms and vegetation from new structures is also encouraged.¹³ For the reasons detailed earlier, the proposal is consistent with these policies.

Historic heritage

- 7.3.4 Objectives and policies for historic heritage are contained in D17. The approach is to protect, maintain, restore and conserve scheduled historic places.¹⁴ The works avoid the total or substantial to the known historic heritage values of recorded archaeology and mana whenua associations with former pa site.¹⁵ The planting supports restoration as it will remove weed species that detract from the heritage values of the place.¹⁶

Outstanding natural feature

- 7.3.5 For the reasons detailed in section 6, the planting and lower canopy weed removal does not affect the ONF, including its physical and visual amenity. The works encourage the enhancement of the ONF and its visual significance in the landscape, and the mana whenua values associated with native planting and ecological restoration.¹⁷

Earthworks

- 7.3.6 While the framework for earthworks within natural resource areas acknowledges that earthworks are a pre-requisite for the development of urban land, focus is on the management of adverse effects for both large and small distribution areas with values such as archaeological specifically noted. Objective 1 seeks that earthworks are undertaken in a manner that protects people and the environment. This will be achieved.

Vegetation

- 7.3.7 As directed in E15.1 specific objectives and policies for vegetation management in SEA's are contained in Chapter D9. Having regard to these provisions, the works are considered to be consistent with chapter D9 as they will protect areas of significant indigenous biodiversity value¹⁸ through the

¹² H7.4.2

¹³ H7.4.3

¹⁴ D17.4.2

¹⁵ D17.4.3(14)

¹⁶ D17.4.3(10)

¹⁷ D10.4.3(7)

¹⁸ Policy D9.2(1)

removal of pest species. Policy 7 provides for the role of Mana Whenua as kaitiaki in managing biodiversity, particularly in Treaty Settlement areas, and for cultural practices and cultural harvesting in SEA where the mauri of the resource is sustained. The works reflect these policies.

7.3.8 Overall, it is concluded that the works are consistent with the objectives and policies of the AUP.

Auckland Unitary Plan restricted discretionary assessment criteria

7.3.9 For those activities that are restricted discretionary, there are specific criteria to be considered and these are addressed below.

Scheduled historic heritage place

7.3.10 Criteria for modifications to the fabric or features of a scheduled historic heritage place is set out at D17.8.1(1). Having regard to those matters that are relevant, the works are appropriate for the following reasons:

- The methodology for the works will mitigate the effects on the known heritage values, identified in Schedule 14 as historic, knowledge and aesthetic.
- There are no associated site works beyond the weed removal and replanting.
- The works do not alter the inter-relationship between buildings and features.
- The effects on views from the SHHP will be positive as weed species will be removed.
- Overall, the significance of the maunga will be improved.
- The conservation plan identifies heritage values including archaeological, Maori heritage, geological, European heritage, built heritage, landscape and ecological values. None of these values will be compromised by the proposal.

Outstanding natural feature

7.3.11 Criteria for earthworks on an ONF are historic heritage place is outlined at D10.8.2. Having regard to those matters that are relevant, the works are appropriate for the following reasons:

- The minor ground disturbance and replanting has no adverse effect on the geological value of the volcanic cone.
- The modification is necessary for the restoration planting.
- The proposed works will protect the feature from future damage from inappropriate exotic plants and pests.
- Replanting with native species has a positive effect on Mana Whenua values. As the works are promoted by the Maunga Authority, they provide for matauranga and tikanga values.

7.4 Weighting of the District Plan and AUP

7.4.1 For those provisions that are subject to appeal, weight must be given to the operative document alongside the AUP version. As it relates to this application, the objectives and policies seek similar outcomes. In this regard, there is no conflict that requires a weighting exercise to be undertaken.

7.5 Other Matters - section 104(1)(c)

7.5.1 The site is classified under the Reserves Act 1977 and gazetted for historic reserve purposes. The Maungawhau-Mt Eden Management Plan 2007, promotes, through objective B2.4, *the restoration of selected ecological habitat through the use of native species representative of scoria cone forest, where it is compatible with the archaeological, geological, Maori heritage values of the site.* The planting is consistent with this objective.

7.5.2 Regard has been given to Council's Indigenous Biodiversity Strategy July 2012. Objective 1 relating to conserving Auckland's diverse range of biodiversity is most relevant to this proposal and none of the species to be removed are rare or endangered.

7.5.3 The Tūpuna Maunga Integrated Management Plan 2016 applies to Maunga governed by the Maunga Authority. These works are consistent with the relevant provisions including the Takotoranga Whenua / Landscape Value:

Active restoration and enhancement of the natural features of the Maunga by:

- *Increase the biodiversity, structural diversity and native habitat values of the Tūpuna Maunga and their hinterland by enhancing plant health, soil health, native food resources and habitat connectivity through the development and implementation of an Ecological Restoration Strategy.*
- *Ensure planting and other landscape features are compatible with the protection of the natural and cultural features of the maunga.*

Preserve the visual and physical authenticity and integrity of the Maunga as landmarks of Tāmaki by:

- *Respect the visual connection and sense of place people derive from the Tūpuna Maunga by maintaining significant views to the maunga from across Tāmaki Makaurau.¹⁹*

7.5.4 The works are consistent with the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority Draft Operational Plan 2016/17, which prioritises and allocates operational expenditure at Maungawhau for animal and pest control and vegetation management, including removal of harmful exotic species.

7.6 Part 2 of the RMA

7.6.1 The purpose of the RMA is stated in section 5 as *....to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.* This requires managing the use of natural and physical resources in a way that enables people and communities to provide for their social, cultural and economic well-being while sustaining those resources for future generations, protecting the life supporting capacity of ecosystems, and avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment.

¹⁹ Section 8.7, Page 67

- 7.6.2 Weed removal and native planting promotes mauri and encourages bio-diversity. In doing so it supports the life supporting capacity of air, water, soil or ecosystems.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1.1 Auckland Council is seeking resource consent for restoration planting at Maungawhau. This maunga is one of the maunga vested back to ownership of the Nga Mana Whenua o Tamaki Collective and the works fall with the scope of maintenance works that are under the delegation of the Auckland Council's management. There are minimal adverse effects on the environment as a result of the works at Maungawhau. Positive effects on biodiversity will result from weed clearance and native planting. The works are consistent with the objectives and policies of the relevant planning documents and in particular, the AUP. The application satisfies the relevant statutory tests and as such, the application should be granted consent.

9. OFFERED CONDITIONS OF CONSENT

- 9.1.1 The applicant invites the consent authority to impose standard conditions imposed on all applications. In addition, the following specific conditions are offered:

Specific conditions

1. The consent holder shall employ an archaeologist (project archaeologist) to be on site for the pre-start meeting and in the event of encountering archaeological evidence.
2. The consent holder is to ensure that all contractors, volunteers and work site supervisory staff who are carrying out works authorised by this consent are advised of the conditions of consent. The conditions are to be available at all times on the work site when the works are occurring.
3. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the draft Ngā Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau - tree pruning or removal protocols attached to the assessment by CFG Heritage Ltd.
4. An annual ADP briefing of contractors and/or volunteers shall take prior to weed clearance and planting. This briefing shall discuss the following:
 - a) what constitutes historic heritage materials; the legal requirements of unexpected historic heritage discoveries;
 - b) the appropriate procedures to follow if historic heritage materials are uncovered whilst the project archaeologist is not on site, to safeguard materials; and
 - c) the contact information of the relevant agencies (including the project historic heritage expert, the Team Leader: Monitoring, the Auckland Council Heritage Unit and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga) and mana whenua.

5. Prior to the removal of the pine trees, a specific removal methodology shall be submitted to and approved by the Team Leader Monitoring – Central. The methodology shall be prepared in consultation with the project archaeologist and parks arborist. The methodology shall take into account the following:
 - a) The potential to encounter archaeological evidence and measures to avoid the risk of large limbs falling;
 - b) Measures to protect existing native vegetation; and
 - c) Notice to residents adjoining the works area of the proposed work, including dates and times where removal is proposed.

Author



Tania Richmond BPlan, MNZPI
Richmond Planning Limited
Dated: January 2017