

Brooke Dales

From: Fennel Mason <fennel.mason@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Sent: 23 July, 2020 3:33 PM
To: Tania Richmond
Cc: Brooke Dales
Subject: Tupuna Maunga Authority: Puketapapa review summary

Hi Tania,

Apologies for the delay in sending this summary over to you.

As discussed, Brooke had drafted his planning report associated with the exotic tree removal proposal for the works at Puketapapa (Mt Roskill), which was subsequently reviewed. This review raised some items, which have been summarised below:

Visual / amenity effects

1. *The Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVA) contains some speculative assumptions as to how visual change would be perceived by the public and neighbouring property owners.*
2. *There is an apparent logical disconnect in accepting that visual effects are undeniably subjective, and that there will be a high or very high degree of visual change, and then concluding that the effect of such change will be very low adverse (less than minor) to positive.*
3. *This conclusion did not appear to be based on any information as to whether affected people have a subjective preference for a vegetated or open visual character on the maunga (and if so, how strong that preference is).*
4. *We could not see how the conclusions that “from limited locations the adverse effects may be perceived as very low adverse” could be reached with any degree of reliability. It is equally possible that such effects will be perceived in a minor or more than minor adverse manner. This is particularly so for property owners / occupiers who are in closer proximity to the maunga who may highly value the existing vegetated outlook and, for instance, the privacy it affords.*
5. *The LVA did not provide viewpoints for near neighbours to Puketāpapa–Pukewīwī / Mt Roskill, such that there was arguably insufficient information to enable an adequate assessment of effects on these viewers.*
6. *We queried whether the LVA had adequately articulated how the proposed revegetation would mitigate the anticipated loss of amenity / visual effects. Given the high level of change at issue, we would expect to see more analysis of this potential effect. The following did not appear to have been adequately addressed in the LVA:*
 - a) *The proposed revegetation will be of lesser stature than the mature trees to be removed;*
 - b) *That the revegetation areas are not co-extensive with the proposed removals; and*
 - c) *The time lag between tree removal and the establishment of native vegetation.*
7. *All this leads to a concern with the reliability of the conclusion reached in the LVA that adverse effects would be, at worst, “less than minor”.*

Noise effects

8. *The assessment of noise effects was problematic in two respects:*

- a) *It effectively applied the construction noise standard to the Application when the operational noise limits under the AUP apply; and*
- b) *It applied a permitted baseline for construction noise where no credible onsite permitted activity was identified to warrant the application of such a baseline.*

Ecological effects

- 9. *The peer review of the Te Ngahere ecological assessment by Council's Consultant Ecologist/Environmental Scientist, Andrew Rossaak, found that two effects of the proposal remained a concern, namely:*
 - a) *the time lag for revegetation planting; and*
 - b) *the overall loss of large trees habitat and associated biodiversity.*
- 10. *It was unclear from Mr Rossaak's peer review what his conclusion was as to the resultant level of effect (with the application of these conditions) to properly inform a notification assessment.*

AUP objectives and policies

- 11. *The Application has inadequately assessed the proposal in terms of objectives and policies in Chapter E16, which state:*

E16.2. Objectives

- (1) **Trees in open space zones that contribute to cultural, amenity, landscape and ecological values are protected.***
- (2) There is an increase in the quality and extent of tree cover in open space zones, particularly within areas identified for intensified living.*

E16.3. Policies

- (1) Encourage ongoing maintenance of trees to enhance open space zones, while recognising existing constraints and functional requirements of the site.*
- (2) Manage trees within open space zones to **protect their cultural, amenity, landscape and ecological values**, while acknowledging that multiple uses occur in open space areas.*
- (3) Encourage the use of indigenous trees and vegetation for planting within open space zones, where appropriate, to recognise and reflect cultural, amenity, landscape and ecological values.*

[emphasis added]

- 12. *While acknowledging that the trees proposed to be removed are exotic, these provisions are engaged at least in respect of:*
 - a) *The ecological values that the larger trees provide in terms of habitat; and*
 - b) *The amenity values provided by the trees, including in particular the Phoenix Palms which are noted for such value in the LVA and peer review.*

Public notification / Special circumstances / Limited notification

- 13. *The degree to which these issues are addressed will impact upon whether the application warrants public notification (including because of special circumstances) or limited notification. Please refer to our previous Advice for more detail.*

It is recommend the TMA review these comments and look to address the matters raised. We are happy to discuss further or meet if needed to run through any of this.

Whilst these comments relate specifically to the Puketapapa application, there are matters which would equally be relevant to other applications.

I hope this helps,

Ngā Mihi

Fennel Mason
Principal Project Lead
Premium

Resource Consents

Ph 021 851 195

Te Kaunihera o Tāmaki Makaurau

35 Graham Street, Auckland

Visit our website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

I am generally based in the office on Monday's and Thursday's and working from home the other days.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.