

Decision on notification of an application for resource consent under the Resource Management Act 1991



Discretionary activity

Application number(s):	BUN60452273 (Council Reference) LUC60452275 (s.9 land use consent) DIS60452274 (s.15 stormwater permit)
Applicant:	Drury Limited Partnership
Site address:	1206 Great South Road, Drury
Legal description:	Pt Lot 1 Deeds Reg 167
Proposal:	

To establish and operate a civil contractor's yard.

Resource consents are required for the following reasons:

Land use consent (s.9) – LUC60452275

Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part)

Reginal land use (operative plan provisions)

Chapter E11 – Land Disturbance (Regional)

- Earthworks greater than 2,500m² (being 7,500m²) where land has a slope exceeding 10 degrees require consent as a **restricted discretionary activity** in accordance with E11.4.1 (A8).

Chapter E12 – Land Disturbance (District)

- Earthworks of a volume greater than 2,500m³ over an area of greater than 2,500m² and consent is therefore required in accordance with E12.4.1 as **restricted discretionary activities** for earthworks greater than 2,500m² E12.4.1 (A6) and 2,500m³ E12.4.1 (A10).
- The proposal involves earthworks not meeting the general standards in 12.6.2, and as such consent is required as a **restricted discretionary activity** under rule C.1.9(2). In this case the following standards are not met:
 - Earthworks will be within a 100-year AEP flood plain with ground levels being raised more than 300mm (Standard E12.6.2(11))
 - Temporary land disturbance will occur within the 1 per cent AEP flood plain (Standard 12.6.2(13)).

Chapter E27 – Transport

- The proposal involves accessory parking and access that does not meet the following parking and access standards and is a **restricted discretionary activity** under rule E27.4.1(A2) as follows:
 - The proposed vehicle crossing does not comply with E27.6.4.3.2 as it will have a width of 16.61m wide, exceeding the maximum of 6m for an access serving 10 or more parking spaces under (T153).
 - The whole area of parking and manoeuvring areas is not designed, formed, drained, or provided with an all-weather surface as required by E27.6.3.2, E27.6.3.3, and E27.6.3.6.
 - The parking and manoeuvring areas are not proposed to be lit as required by E27.6.3.7.
- The construction and use of a vehicle crossing where a Vehicle Access Restriction applies under Standards E27.6.4.1(3) requires consent as a **restricted discretionary activity** under E27.4.1(A5). In this case, the site access is from an arterial road (Great South Road).

Chapter H18 – Future Urban Zone

- The proposed contractors yard activity is not provided for within the Future Urban zone. In accordance with C1.7, consent is required as a **discretionary activity**.

Discharge permit (s.15) – DIS60432707

Auckland Unitary Plan – Operative in Part (AUP OP)

Regional Land Use

Chapter E8 – Stormwater – Discharge and Diversion

- Consent is required as a **discretionary activity** for the diversion and discharge of stormwater runoff under rule E8.4.1 (A10) as the site is classified as rural with more than 1000m² of impervious area and the diversion and discharge of stormwater from the total site impervious areas is not authorised by other stormwater diversion and discharge rules.

Decision

I have read the application, supporting documents, and the report and recommendations on the application for resource consent, and read the comments from Mr Joe Gray. I am satisfied that I have sufficient information to consider the matters required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and make a decision under delegated authority on notification.

Public notification

Under section 95A of the RMA, this application shall be **PUBLICLY NOTIFIED** because:

1. Public Notification is neither mandatory nor precluded under steps 1 and 2.

2. However, under step 3, public notification is required as:
 - a. while the application is for activities that are not subject to a plan rule or regulation in an NES that specifically requires public notification;
 - b. the adverse effects on the environment will be more than minor. This is because:
 - In the context of the site and its surrounding receiving environment, the development and use of the site as a contractor's yard, which is not provided for within the Future Urban Zone (which has a policy approach that seeks to void development that could impact future urban development) has the potential to impact on the character and amenity of the receiving environment.

In support of the application, a Landscape and Visual Assessment and Landscape Plan has been prepared by LA4, along with an Urban Design Memorandum by Weir Associates. The Landscape and Visual Assessment, which is based on the original proposal, concludes that the activity could be integrated into the site and surrounding landscape without adversely affecting landscape character, aesthetic values, or visual amenity. The Urban Design Memorandum considers the role of Great South Road as an edge and concludes that, from an urban design perspective, the proposal would not irrevocably or unduly change character, and that it is neither possible nor appropriate to seek to protect rural character on the opposite side of Great South Road in this location.

These assessments, along with the wider application material, have been peer reviewed by Council's Consultant Landscape architect, Mr Peter Kensington. In contrast to the applicant's conclusions, Mr Kensington identifies that the site currently exhibits rural character and amenity values consistent with the wider rural environment to the west of Great South Road and extending beyond the Rural Urban Boundary (RUB) to the south. He notes that the site contains existing attributes that contribute positively to rural character and amenity, and that these attributes are not present to the same extent on land to the east of Great South Road, which is more urban in appearance. Mr Kensington considers that the proposed contractor's yard would introduce an urbanised character to the site, more closely aligned (albeit at a different scale and intensity) with activities occurring on the eastern side of Great South Road. He also concludes that proposed planting would not be effective in mitigating adverse effects within a meaningful timeframe, and that Great South Road functions as a defining infrastructural element that "holds the line" between rural and urban character. Overall, Mr Kensington concludes that the proposal would result in a moderate level of adverse effects on rural character and amenity as experienced by the public and neighbouring residents.

The site sits within an area bounded generally by Great South Road to the east, Runciman Road to the west, and the Rural Urban Boundary (RUB) to the south. Within this area, land use is predominantly rural or rural-residential in nature, reflecting a working rural environment. It is acknowledged that to the north of the site, at 1186 Great South Road, consent is held for a caravan storage activity, and that this site exhibits a more urban character (noting that a separate abatement notice applies to the site and an application for resource consent relating to transport and storage yard activities is currently being considered for this site). Notwithstanding the consented

and current activities on that site, and the more urban character they exhibit, that site is considered distinguishable from the surrounding properties, which otherwise retain a rural character and amenity.

To the east of Great South Road, between the road and the Southern Motorway, the land has established an urban character and contains consented commercial storage and lock-up activities at 1159, 1187A, and 1207 Great South Road respectively. Importantly, these activities are subject to landscaping requirements along Great South Road to mitigate effects on to the west, and no signage has been approved in association with those activities, reinforcing the sensitivity of this interface.

In this context, I agree with Mr Kensington that the site is located at the interface of rural and urban environments, and that its existing character is more closely aligned with the surrounding rural environment than with the urbanised land to the east of Great South Road. I also agree with Mr Kensington that the proposed development and establishment of a contractor's yard would urbanise the site. It is therefore considered that the proposal, which would occur in advance of any plan change to give effect to an urban zoning, would introduce an urbanised form and intensity of activity that is inconsistent with the current rural environment. In this context, the proposed change in character and amenity would not be limited to the site itself but has the potential to have a significant impact on the character and amenity of surrounding Future Urban Zoned land and the wider rural receiving environment.

It is noted that the applicant has proposed mitigation through the implementation of a comprehensive landscape plan that provides visual screening of the site. There is however uncertainty as to the timeframe for this planting to become an effective visual screen. Given the immediate change in character that would occur upon commencement of the activity, and the limited five-year duration of the proposal, I agree with Mr Kensington that it is unlikely that the planting would establish sufficiently within that timeframe to provide an effective visual screen that would sufficiently mitigate the adverse character or amenity effects arising.

Accordingly, having considered the applicant's specialist assessments alongside the peer review undertaken on behalf of Council, it is concluded that the proposed contractor's yard would result in a noticeable change to the character and amenity of the site and receiving environment. In light of the site's location at a clear rural-urban interface, the existing character and amenity values of the surrounding environment, and potential for this change to impact on the character and amenity beyond the site and wider Future Urban Land, it is considered that the proposal has the potential to generate more than minor adverse effects on rural character and amenity on the environment.

- Council's Senior Development Engineer Mr David Russell has reviewed the proposal and consulted with Auckland Transport. Mr Russell has raised no concerns from an engineering perspective and noted that:
 - There are no geotechnical issues with the proposal. However, a report is required to detail what has occurred on site under this consent and inform future land use assessments.

- The stormwater pond has been designed to attenuate the flow to pre-development levels and meet the treatment requirements for runoff.
- Whilst the estimated traffic is considered low, given the nature and scale of the proposal AT have raised no concerns.
- AT accept the proposed vehicle crossing which provides for a 19.45m long vehicle accessing the site. A visibility splay and sightline required are recommended by AT and supported by Mr Russell.
- No concerns are raised with respect to the management of flood hazards on the site.

Further to this assessment, it is noted that:

- Given the nature and scale of the activity and provision for on-site manoeuvring, any adverse effects associated with providing for unmarked parking and/or loading and not lighting the parking area are considered to be less than minor and contained within the subject site.

Mr Russell has recommended that standard conditions be imposed, with respect to ensuring the detention basin is constructed in accordance with GD01, provision of Geotechnical Completion Reporting, management of construction traffic, and the construction of the vehicle crossings (including provision of visibility splays). Overall, having considered the assessments of Mr Russell, and on behalf of the application, it is considered that any adverse development engineering effects can be managed so that they are less than minor.

For completeness it is noted that whilst the condition recommended by AT may conflict with the proposed landscaping along Great South Road, should consent be granted, and assuming the proposed screening landscaping is accepted as mitigation of the visual effects and required, it is considered reasonable (noting also the accepted setback for the activity) that the applicant would be able to provide a finalised landscaping plan that demonstrates that the landscaping design works with the visibility sight line.

- Council's Stormwater Specialist Mr Meyer has reviewed the application material (as amended by the further information responses) with respect to the effects associated with the discharges of stormwater on the site. It is noted that Mr Meyer's assessment relates to the proposal as originally presented, rather than the amended proposal, however this notwithstanding, given the reduction in scale of the proposal (including the duration), and the proposed use of the same stormwater management, for the purpose of this notification assessment it is considered that this assessment can be relied upon.

Mr Meyer concludes that the proposed stormwater management of swales and dry detention basin are appropriate for the proposed activity and provide appropriate management of any effects on stormwater quantity and quality so that any effects on the downstream environment are suitably managed. Mr Meyer has advised that standard stormwater conditions (which reflect the implementation of the stormwater

system, and ongoing operation and maintenance of the proposed stormwater devices) will be appropriate to ensure that the discharge is appropriately managed.

Having considered the assessment of Mr Meyer, the relevant matters of the AUP (OP), and the application material, it is considered that any effects on the environment associated with the management of stormwater on site can be effectively and appropriately managed so that any adverse effects are less than minor.

- Given the nature of the proposed contractors yard activity, the activity is not considered to be sensitive to effects from surrounding rural activities (including dust and noise), and as such, the proposal is not anticipated to have any adverse effects with respect to reverse sensitivity.
- With respect to cultural effects, the applicant has outlined that they engaged with mana whenua, including Te Aakitai Waiohua, Ngāti Tamaoho, and Ngāti Te Ata. As outlined above, Te Aakitai Waiohua have responded and confirmed that they do not oppose the proposal subject to conditions. No request for further engagement has been received by the council from Ngati Tamaho (who hold a Statutory Acknowledgement for the area), or Ngāti Te Ata. With these considerations in mind, the proposal is not considered to have any adverse cultural effects on the environment.

3. Consideration of step 4 is not required given the finding of step 3.



Dr Lee Beattie

Duty Commissioner

14 February 2026