ATTACHMENT 8.1

ECOLOGICAL ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUEST

This attachment sets out the questions and responses to the clause 23 request (request for additional information) from the Council on the original plan change. This addresses the matters related to ecology. It should be read in conjunction with the Ecology Report at Attachment 8.

This attachment sets out the topic, Council's question, the technical expert who prepared the response and the additional information sought by the Council.

All references to appendices refer to the documents contained in Attachment 8.2.

TOPIC: ECOLOGICAL MAP

Specific request Please provide a map identifying the spatial extent and area (m2) of vegetation types, streams and wetlands.

Applicant response provided by Jason Smith – Morphum Environmental Limited

Applicant response

1 A new map has been provided showing the requested updates, please refer to Appendix 1.

2 Note that areas of rank grass previously mapped have not been included as this area has been modified and as of 31/03/2023 and is now largely a construction site and has been denuded of vegetation.

3 Refer Appendix 1.

TOPIC: ECOLOGICAL VALUE

Specific request Please provide fuller descriptions of the diversity (flora and fauna communities) and structure (canopy, subcanopy, ground cover) of identified areas of ecological value and categorise, where appropriate, in accordance with Auckland Council's indigenous ecosystem types (e.g e.g. WF4, WF8, Singers et al. 2017).

Applicant response provided by Jason Smith – Morphum Environmental Limited

Applicant response

1 Owing to the historical modifications of the precinct (see the photo-series provided in Appendix 2) the vegetation remaining on-site is not reflective of any naturally occurring vegetation community.

2 The majority of the vegetation on-site is comprised of individual exotic trees. Singers et al. (2017) provides 2 categories for where exotic vegetation dominates: Exotic Forest (EF) and Exotic Scrub (ES). Given these species would normally comprise a canopy these areas would be best described as EF, which is described as: Forest vegetation with >50% cover of exotic species in the canopy. The isolated mature trees are generally without a sub-canopy with a groundcover of mown grass. This would include the willows (Salix spp.) that had been considered in the 'Exotic riparian vegetation'.

3 Where vegetation has not been maintained for amenity purposes, including the 'Mature mixed canopy', the canopy is comprised of individual specimens of pohutakawa (Metrosideros excelsa) and kahikatea (Dacrycarpus dacrydioides), there are also mature specimen trees likely planted and being maintained as ornamentals including large puriri (Vitex lucens), Norfolk Island pines (Araucaria heterophylla), magnolia and Moreton Bay fig (Ficus macrophylla). The understory is comprised of self-seeded natives, largely karamu (Coprosma robusta), karo (Pittosporum crassifolium), tarata (Pittosporum eugenioides), and less commonly, juvenile nikau (Rhopalostylis sapida), karaka (Corynocarpus laevigatus) and kawakawa (Piper excelsum). Groundcover is majority leaf litter with a garden bed of Agapanthus alongside Mt Albert Road. Owing to the dominance of exotics, the area would be most appropriately captured by the EF: in Singers et al 2017.

4 For the vegetation categorised as 'Native riparian vegetation', the canopy is limited to a mixture of manuka (Leptospermum scoparium) and kanuka (Kunzea ericoides), the understory, where present is comprised of large flax and karamu. Owing to the dominance of manuka, such areas would be best captured by the Singers et al. 2017 category of VS3: Manuka, kanuka scrub.

5 A Current Ecological Value Assessment utilising the EIANZ assessment framework has been set out for each vegetation type in Appendix 3. Note that in disaggregating the values assessment across the different vegetation types gives three different values; overall these average 'Low' ecological value which is consistent with the EcIA and commensurate with the extent of each different vegetation type.

6 Refer Appendix 1, Appendix 2, Appendix 3.

TOPIC: ROCK FOREST

Specific request Further to E2 (above), please provide commentary on the potential presence of rock forest with descriptions of substrate where vegetation cover is mapped in RFI E1 (above).

Applicant response provided by Jason Smith – Morphum Environmental Limited

Applicant response

1 There is no rock forest present within the plan change area. References to rock forest in the riparian margins of Te Auaunga/Oakley Creek are noted from the literature review, there are records of rock forest in the riparian margins of Te Auaunga, notably in Phyllis Street and Harbutt Reserves which are to the south of the plan change area. There are two exposed rock outcrops within the plan change area which are either unvegetated or covered with exotic grasses. Elsewhere exposed rock has been fashioned into a rock wall to the south of the Central Wetland.

Applicant response

1 The desktop review for avifauna has been updated and expanded to include a wider area, please refer to Table 1 in Appendix 4.

2 The only significant changes to the vegetation community within the precinct since the Boffa Miskell Assessment (2014) is the maturation of the planting associated with the stormwater management device alongside the Trades Building/Farm Road; and the removal of individual large specimen trees or amenity garden vegetation from the northern half of the precinct.

3 The vegetation currently present was planted during the construction of the 'Stormwater Management Device' and includes kowhai (Sophora microphylla), flax (Phormium tenax)

and cabbage trees (Cordyline australis) interspersed amongst a ground cover of oioi (Apodasmia similis). The area also features a range of pest plants that have colonised the area including wattle species (Acacia spp.), dock species (Rumex spp.), inkweed (Phytolacca octandra), black nightshade (Solanum nigrum), broad-leaved fleabane (Erigeron bonariensis), wild carrot (Daucus carota) and exotic grasses (kikuyu, Cenchrus clandestinus) in the terrestrial margin.

4 The vegetation community on the riparian margin of the 'Central Wetland' is comprised of the native riparian vegetation community described above, generally only a single pole deep. Raupo has establish in the near-shore margin.

5 The surface water within the stormwater management devices are covered in a mixture of aquatic weeds such as both willow weed (Persicaria maculosa) and water pepper (Persicaria hydropiper).

6 Whilst the desktop review includes a wider range of native avifauna, the stormwater management devices would not be considered to provide habitat for the majority of these coastal species.

7 The At Risk or Threatened species noted from the desktop review could conceptually include banded rail (At Risk – Declining) and gull species (At Risk or Threatened depending on species).

8 However, the riparian margin is a relatively small area, and isolated from areas of similar habitat by stream reaches that lack overhead cover which banded rail would utilise as movement corridors. Furthermore, given the exposed nature of the small area (being largely surrounded by mown grass and in close proximity to existing urban development) the area is unlikely to provide habitat for banded rail.

9 Gull species have adapted to forage within a wide range of urban environments. The vegetation near the stormwater management devices will comprise a very small portion of similar low-quality nesting/foraging habitat within the home range for any gull species.

10 Refer Appendix 4.

TOPIC: TERRESTRIAL FAUNA: INDIGENOUS BIRDS

Specific request Please provide an updated database review of indigenous bird species to account for potential and intermittent presence of At Risk or Threatened species, particularly aquatic species around the wetland, where vegetation will have matured since the Boffa Miskell assessment. Please also provide commentary on the effects of the proposed plan change on any additionally identified species, with respect to urban intensification, increased building height and reduction in extent of open space.

Applicant response provided by Jason Smith – Morphum Environmental Limited

Applicant response

1 The desktop review for avifauna has been updated and expanded to include a wider area, please refer to Table 1 in Appendix 4.

2 The only significant changes to the vegetation community within the precinct since the Boffa Miskell Assessment (2014) is the maturation of the planting associated with the stormwater management device alongside the Trades Building/Farm Road; and the removal of individual large specimen trees or amenity garden vegetation from the northern half of the precinct.

3 The vegetation currently present was planted during the construction of the 'Stormwater Management Device' and includes kowhai (Sophora microphylla), flax (Phormium tenax) and cabbage trees (Cordyline australis) interspersed amongst a ground cover of oioi (Apodasmia similis). The area also features a range of pest plants that have colonised the area including wattle species (Acacia spp.), dock species (Rumex spp.), inkweed (Phytolacca octandra), black nightshade (Solanum nigrum), broad-leaved fleabane (Erigeron bonariensis), wild carrot (Daucus carota) and exotic grasses (kikuyu, Cenchrus clandestinus) in the terrestrial margin.

4 The vegetation community on the riparian margin of the 'Central Wetland' is comprised of the native riparian vegetation community described above, generally only a single pole deep. Raupo has establish in the near-shore margin.

5 The surface water within the stormwater management devices are covered in a mixture of aquatic weeds such as both willow weed (Persicaria maculosa) and water pepper (Persicaria hydropiper).

6 Whilst the desktop review includes a wider range of native avifauna, the stormwater management devices would not be considered to provide habitat for the majority of these coastal species.

7 The At Risk or Threatened species noted from the desktop review could conceptually include banded rail (At Risk – Declining) and gull species (At Risk or Threatened depending on species).

8 However, the riparian margin is a relatively small area, and isolated from areas of similar habitat by stream reaches that lack overhead cover which banded rail would utilise as movement corridors. Furthermore, given the exposed nature of the small area (being largely surrounded by mown grass and in close proximity to existing urban development) the area is unlikely to provide habitat for banded rail.

9 Gull species have adapted to forage within a wide range of urban environments. The vegetation near the stormwater management devices will comprise a very small portion of similar low-quality nesting/foraging habitat within the home range for any gull species.

10 Refer Appendix 4.

TOPIC: TERRESTRIAL FAUNA: BATS

Specific request Please justify why the likelihood of bat roosting habitat is considered 'negligible' if potential roost habitat along Te Auaunga is considered to hold potential and given that native bats have very large home ranges. Further, if potential bat habitat is acknowledged as possible within the precinct, please comment on the potential effects of the plan change, including urban intensification (including increased light levels, building height) and reduction in open space on access by bats to potential foraging, flight and roost habitat (e.g. mature tree groves), noting that bats use open spaces and wetlands and other water bodies.

Applicant response provided by Jason Smith – Morphum Environmental Limited

Applicant response

1 Bat habitat within the precinct has been considered as negligible on the basis that the vegetation within the precinct has been managed over a significant period of time for amenity purposes and as such lacks the hollows and cavities that would provide bat roosts. This is exemplified by the photographs provided in Appendix 5 that demonstrate how lower or fallen limbs have been anthropogenically removed to prevent the occurrence of hollows.

2 The potential for bats to utilise such trees is further reduced by the isolated nature of the individual trees within the precinct, and the existing urban development.

3 Should Auckland Council take an alternative view, it is noted that the plan change seeks to vary existing precinct provisions (as set out in section 3 of the EcIA) which already provide for significant development within the precinct, and therefore which would not substantially alter the current planning provisions that would impact on bat values given these existing provisions and the current urbanisation of the catchment which includes the north-western motorway, Great North Road and the associated fly-overs.

4 There is a greater extent of higher quality bat roosting and foraging habitat outside of the plan change area, within the riparian margin of Te Auaunga, where vegetation has not been actively maintained. The exotic canopy trees (including copses of pines, oaks and gum spp. would have the loose bark and hollows for bat roosts).

5 Refer Appendix 5.

TOPIC: WETLANDS

Specific request Please provide evidence to illustrate that both of these wetlands individually are classified as "a deliberately constructed wetland", and therefore are excluded from the definition of "natural inland wetland" as defined in the NPS-FM.

Update Map in Appendix 1 of the Ecological Report accordingly.

Applicant response provided by Jason Smith – Morphum Environmental Limited

Applicant response

1 The 'Stormwater Management Device' is deliberately constructed. As evident from the photo-series provided in Appendix 2, there is no natural watercourse in this location preceding the construction of the stormwater management device in (2015 – 2017).

2 The earliest aerial imagery available for the area of the 'Central Wetland' (1940) is after any natural vegetation has been cleared and the catchment transformed for agricultural purposes. The historic aerial imagery is interpreted to show that a drain has been created in this area, evidenced by the straight, linear and well-defined watercourse. The area lacks any darker colouration in the immediately area surrounding the watercourse that would indicate a wetland.

3 The artificial nature of the 'wetland' aspect is elaborated on in the memorandum from Auckland Council prepared for Unitec's resource consent application for damming of water and use of an existing dam on the bed of a tributary of Oakley Creek for stormwater treatment in 2015 and attached as Appendix 6. This memorandum considers that the Central Wetland was formed deliberately as a dam for constructing and demonstrating stormwater ponds.

4 Note that this is not considered to be a natural wetland as defined in the NPS:FM; however, given the previous occurrence of a waterway in this location it could still be considered a modified element of a natural watercourse (stream) for the purposes of the Auckland Unitary Plan and Resource Management Act.

5 The plan change does not propose any amendments to the provisions of E3 (streamworks) in the AUP nor any activities that would detract from the value, or opportunity to restore these waterbodies.

6 Refer Appendix 2, Appendix 6.

TOPIC: WETLAND MAP

Specific request Map and describe the natural wetland referred to in the ecological report at the confluence with Te Auaunga.

Please update Map in Appendix 1 of the Ecological Report accordingly.

Applicant response provided by Jason Smith – Morphum Environmental Limited

Applicant response

1 Through the Mason Clinic, the Wairaka Stream remains heavily incised and lined by rock and would be considered to reflect a stream environment.

2 As the Wairaka Stream exits the Mason Clinic site, within the riparian vegetation as the stream reaches the lower relief of Te Auaunga, it would appear that the stream frequently floods. There is an isolated stand of Purei (Carex secta) on the true left bank and where groundcover exists it is dominated by alligator weed.

3 Based on the previous site investigations (as this area is off-limits to the public for public safety), this area could pass the rapid test for wetland vegetation depending on the sample location.

4 Refer to Figure 2 in Appendix 7 for an indicative site photograph, which was taken from the point marked Photo point 2 in the map provided as Appendix 1.

5 This is outside of the plan change area, and the plan change does not propose any amendments to the provisions of the AUP nor any activities that would detract from the value, or opportunity to restore this area.

6 Refer Appendix 1, Appendix 7.

TOPIC: WETLAND ADJACENT TO THE COASTAL MARINE AREA

Specific request Please provide a description of the habitat immediately above the Coastal Marine Area (CMA), with an assessment against the criteria of a natural inland wetland (as set out in the NPS-FM).

Applicant response provided by Jason Smith – Morphum Environmental Limited

Applicant response

1 The CMA, in this area is defined in the AUP as the seaward side of Great North Road (ID: 159; NZTM Point X: 1751960.23, NZTM Point Y: 5917779.09).

2 The riparian area immediately above Great North Road is not consistent with the definition of a natural inland wetland in the NPS:FM (as of April 2023) as it would not meet the first criterion. The area is not a wetland (as defined in the Act). In this location Te Auaunga is well defined by the heavily incised stream bed/banks, with the stream approximately 2 m below the floodplain comprised of a similar vegetation community as of the rest of the riparian margin of Te Auaunga (a mixture of exotics in the tree canopy, and a native understory; ground cover is comprised heavy of leaf litter, alluvial deposits that are likely to have been deposited after recent heavy rainfall, ground cover vegetation where present was the exotic pest plant Hedera helix (Ivy) and Tradescantia.

3 The area is not a wetland. It is also noted that this area is outside of the plan change extent.

4 Refer Figure 3, Appendix 8.

TOPIC: STREAMS

Specific request	Please provide a map of the section of Wairaka Stream that has been/is proposed for daylighting. Update Map in Appendix 1 of the Ecological Report accordingly.
Applicant response provided by	Jason Smith – Morphum Environmental Limited

Applicant response

1 This was shown in the map provided as Appendix 1 of the original EcIA. Please refer to Appendix 1 map of EcIA.

2 Note that, as shown in Figure 4 in Appendix 9, a section of the daylighting has already occurred.

3 An updated stream length of potential daylighting opportunity is shown in Appendix 1. Approximately 2/3rds of daylighting remain.

4 Refer Appendix 1, Appendix 9.

TOPIC: NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENTS

Specific request	Please provide an assessment of the Plan Change Request against the NZCPS, including an assessment of effects on the Significant Ecological Area – Marine, immediately adjacent to the site.
Reasons for request	Section 75 of the RMA states that a district plan must give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS). As the Plan Change area is located within the coastal environment, the provisions of the NZCPS are relevant matters for consideration for a Plan Change Request.
Applicant response provided by	John Duthie of Tattico
Applicant response	

Background

1. This clause 23 request asks for an assessment of this plan change against the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management (*NPS:FW*).

2. This response should be read in the context of the information set out in the Morphum response to clause 23 requests E1-E9.

3. This response relies on the ecological assessment, including the identification of streams and wetlands. Tattico have taken this ecological analysis and assessed that in the context of the NPS:FW, including an analysis against whether the National Environmental Standards on Freshwater Management (*NES:FW*) apply.

4. The Morphum report identifies that:

a. The only stream/river within the precinct is the Wairaka Stream which runs from the southern central portion of the precinct at the Puna, first flowing north and then west to join into Te Auaunga/Oakley Creek.

b. There are no other streams or natural wetlands within the precinct.

5. There is an artificial wetland in the southern portion of the precinct. This was created in circa 1960s by Unitec as part of an environmental research study into stormwater management techniques.

6. There is also an artificial wetland on the western side of the Unitec campus within the Crown owned land. This was intended to treat stormwater run-off from the new Unitec Trades building. However, Council changed its preferred method for treating stormwater, generally preferring other methods within the treatment train process. This included using non-contaminating roofing and cladding materials on the Unitec Trades building. Identification of this artificial stormwater pond on Precinct plan 1 is accordingly proposed to be removed as part of this plan change.

7. This plan change does not seek to modify any of the Auckland-wide provisions or overlay provisions. All the standard controls on streams, wetlands, water quality and significant ecological areas, to the extent that they are relevant, continue to apply within the precinct.

8. In addition to these Auckland-wide rules, the precinct provisions maintain the existing open space classifications over the Puna and Wairaka Stream, as shown within Precinct plan 1. This is unchanged by the plan change.

9. As referenced above, the only stream within the precinct is the Wairaka Stream. The plan change does not propose any amendment to any provisions in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (*AUP*) relevant to the protection of Wairaka Stream. Furthermore, the backbone consent, which the Marutūāhu and Waiohua-Tāmaki Rōpū have obtained, gave approval to the daylighting of the portion of Wairaka Stream immediately west of the Spine Road, where it ran within a box culvert through both the Crown and Te Whatu Ora – Health New Zealand owned land parcels. These works have been completed on the Crown land, with the stream now partially daylighted and the significant landscape revegetation in place.

10. The artificial stormwater wetland in the east comprises two ponds, a small pond in the south which drains into the larger wetland in the more central part of the precinct. The central wetland is an artificial wetland. Notwithstanding that it is artificial, it is retained under this plan change and identified within an area of "open space" on Precinct plan 1.

NPS:FW

11. The NPS:FW sets a range of policies designed to protect rivers, streams and natural wetlands. It sets a hierarchy of objectives with *the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems* listed as the first priority. Wairaka Stream is retained and protected through the various AUP provisions (including the precinct). This primary objective is therefore satisfied.

12. The NPS:FW relevant policies are set out below:

Policy 1: Freshwater is managed in a way that gives effect to Te Mana o te Wai.

Policy 2: Tangata whenua are actively involved in freshwater management (including decision-making processes), and Māori freshwater values are identified and provided for.

Policy 3: Freshwater is managed in an integrated way that considers the effects of the use and development of land on a whole-of-catchment basis, including the effects on receiving environments.

Policy 4: Freshwater is managed as part of New Zealand's integrated response to climate change.

Policy 5: Freshwater is managed (including through a National Objectives Framework) to ensure that the health and well-being of degraded water bodies and freshwater ecosystems is improved, and the health and well-being of all other water bodies and freshwater ecosystems is maintained and (if communities choose) improved.

Policy 6: There is no further loss of extent of natural inland wetlands, their values are protected, and their restoration is promoted.

Policy 7: The loss of river extent and values is avoided to the extent practicable.

Policy 8: The significant values of outstanding water bodies are protected.

Policy 9: The habitats of indigenous freshwater species are protected.

13. The plan change will give effect to these policies. In particular:

    a. The Puna and Wairaka Stream are protected through the AUP wide provisions and the open space identification on Precinct plan 1.

    b. Objective 10, as proposed to be amended through the plan change, states:

        An integrated urban environment is created, which:

        …

        (b) Recognises, protects and enhances the environmental attributes of the precinct in its planning and development;

    c. Virtually all built development (with very limited exceptions) and all subdivisions will trigger resource consent to enable appropriate Council assessment of development.

    d. The Rōpū have been involved in the development of the plan change and in the identification of the open space areas protection of the Wairaka Stream and Puna.

    e. The Wairaka Stream is considered in the context of the Stormwater Management Plan adopted by Council for the whole precinct.

    f. There is no loss of natural streams through this plan change. In fact, the daylighting of part of the stream has enhanced its ecology in terms of the planting of native vegetations along the stream margins and creating a more natural stream bed and banks.

14. In addition, while identification of the smaller artificial wetland within the precinct is proposed to be removed, the largest artificial wetland is retained.

NES:FW

15. The NES:FW primarily relate to development consents and the resource consent process. They are not directly relevant to the plan change.

16. Having said that, the development within the precinct undertaken to date clearly demonstrates the workings of the NES:FW in that the Marutūāhu and Waiohua-Tāmaki Rōpū resource consent sought approval for daylighting of the Wairaka Stream, and also for a water-sensitive design for the new Outfall #6, which provided for above-ground conveyance of stormwater within a large planted swale. These works have been completed and put in place to a high standard.

Summary

17. As set out above, demonstrably this plan change is consistent and, to the extent required, retains mechanisms to protect the Wairaka Stream in accordance with the objectives of the NPS:FW. This is set out in both the objectives and policies in the precinct provisions and the relevant open space identification provisions of Precinct plan 1.

TOPIC: NATIONAL COASTAL POLICY STATEMENT

Specific request	New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement Assessment *E(F)1 Please provide a response to E10 of the original Clause 23request, in respect of the NZCPS***.**
Reasons for request	This request was for an assessment against the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement because of the proximity to the coastal marine area and SEA Marine.
Applicant response provided by	John Duthie of Tattico

Applicant response

This application undertakes an assessment against the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS).

The Te Auaunga Precinct is not on or adjoining the coast, but is in reasonable proximity and within the Oakley Creek catchment which drains into the Waitematā Harbour and, in particular, the Motumānawa/Pollen Island marine reserve.

This response sets out the objectives of the NZCPS, and then comments on the relevant aspects of this plan change request in terms of the six relevant NZCPS objectives.

Objective 1

To safeguard the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the coastal environment and sustain its ecosystems, including marine and intertidal areas, estuaries, dunes and land, by:

- maintaining or enhancing natural biological and physical processes in the coastal environment and recognising their dynamic, complex and interdependent nature;
- protecting representative or significant natural ecosystems and sites of biological importance and maintaining the diversity of New Zealand's indigenous coastal flora and fauna; and
- maintaining coastal water quality, and enhancing it where it has deteriorated from what would otherwise be its natural condition, with significant adverse effects on ecology and habitat, because of discharges associated with human activity.

Assessment:

- The use and activities that occur within the precinct are physically separated from the marine environment by Great North Road and the motorway interchange. The potential impact is primarily through water quality issues as the Te Auaunga Precinct is within the Oakley Creek catchment.
- The Motumānawa/Pollen Island marine reserve is identified as an important and significant natural ecosystem protected under the Marine Reserves Act 1971. The Te Auaunga Precinct is physically removed from that land / marine area. The potential impact is again through water quality issues.

- Stormwater is managed through a treatment train process. This is addressed elsewhere in the plan change application and in the technical report by MPS.
- The precinct is subject to the full suite of AUP(OP) Auckland Wide provisions relating to Water quality, discharges, stormwater and land disturbance. The plan change does not seek to avoid or modify any of these key environmental controls. Future developments will need to meet the water quality standards applying under the Unitary Plan provisions, or apply for specific consents.
- Wastewater connections will be to the public wastewater network and will be coordinated with Watercare.
- The AUP(OP) erosion and sediment control standards will apply to any development to ensure control of sediment and erosion.
- Protection yards are applied along the Oakley Creek to protect the native bush and native vegetation which in turn will assist in protecting the marine environment.
- The enhancement of water quality needs to be part of an overall Council response to the larger catchment. Significant investment is already in place or underway with infrastructure upgrades like the Central Interceptor, and in stormwater management, measures and with enhanced erosion and sediment controls; these are intended to cumulatively make a difference over time in the enhancement of water quality within the harbour.

Objective 2

To preserve the natural character of the coastal environment and protect natural features and landscape values through:

- recognising the characteristics and qualities that contribute to natural character, natural features and landscape values and their location and distribution;
- identifying those areas where various forms of subdivision, use, and development would be inappropriate and protecting them from such activities; and
- encouraging restoration of the coastal environment.

Assessment:

- Te Auaunga Precinct is removed from the coastal environment. As such development of the Precinct enabled by the plan change will have minimal impact on the character of the coast.
- Essentially the environment is separated by the Waterview State Highway 16/22 motorway interchange and Great North Road.
- The precinct is embedded within a major metropolitan area. It is already an urban environment.
- The precinct has long been identified as a key location to give effect to the Council's urban consolidation policies. The scale and level of development to be enabled by the plan change is appropriate and will have no direct impact on the coastal environment.
- Because the precinct does not adjoin the coastal environment, there is no direct opportunity to enhance the landscape feature of the coastal environment.

Objective 3

To take account of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, recognise the role of tangata whenua as kaitiaki and provide for tangata whenua involvement in management of the coastal environment by:

- recognising the ongoing and enduring relationship of tangata whenua over their lands, rohe and resources;
- promoting meaningful relationships and interactions between tangata whenua and persons exercising functions and powers under the Act;
- incorporating mātauranga Māori into sustainable management practices; and
- recognising and protecting characteristics of the coastal environment that are of special value to tangata whenua.

Assessment:

- The ongoing development of this precinct directly involves Marutūāhu, Waiohua-Tāmaki Rōpū and Ngāti Whātua as supporters of this plan change and with an ongoing role including as future owners within the precinct.
- This plan change request, and the Crown initiatives on this land, recognise the ongoing relationship with tangata whenua over the land. This will see iwi groups have eventual ownership and development opportunity of significant portions of the precinct.

Objective 4

To maintain and enhance the public open space qualities and recreation opportunities of the coastal environment by:

- recognising that the coastal marine area is an extensive area of public space for the public to use and enjoy;
- maintaining and enhancing public walking access to and along the coastal marine area without charge, and where there are exceptional reasons that mean this is not practicable providing alternative linking access close to the coastal marine area; and
- recognising the potential for coastal processes, including those likely to be affected by climate change, to restrict access to the coastal environment and the need to ensure that public access is maintained even when the coastal marine area advances inland.

Assessment:

- The walkway and cycleway network within the precinct connects to the north-western cycleway and walkway network and the Te Auaunga walkway. This gives good public access and recreational opportunity, connecting the stream walkway to the coastal walkway.
- There are no parts of the Precinct that adjoin the coast and therefore the plan change can not directly contribute to public open space and recreational opportunities on the coast.

Objective 5

To ensure that coastal hazard risks taking account of climate change, are managed by:

- locating new development away from areas prone to such risks;
- considering responses, including managed retreat, for existing development in this situation; and
- protecting or restoring natural defences to coastal hazards.

Assessment:

- The precinct is not subject to coastal inundation or any other natural hazard processes associated with hazard risk and climate change in the coastal environment.
- The normal AUP(OP) controls on natural hazards and risk apply to this precinct, and no changes are sought to the Auckland-wide provisions.

Objective 6

To enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing and their health and safety, through subdivision, use, and development, recognising that:

- the protection of the values of the coastal environment does not preclude use and development in appropriate places and forms, and within appropriate limits;
- some uses and developments which depend upon the use of natural and physical resources in the coastal environment are important to the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities;
- functionally some uses and developments can only be located on the coast or in the coastal marine area;
- the coastal environment contains renewable energy resources of significant value;
- the protection of habitats of living marine resources contributes to the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities;
- the potential to protect, use, and develop natural and physical resources in the coastal marine area should not be compromised by activities on land;
- the proportion of the coastal marine area under any formal protection is small and therefore management under the Act is an important means by which the natural resources of the coastal marine area can be protected; and
- historic heritage in the coastal environment is extensive but not fully known, and vulnerable to loss or damage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.

Assessment:

- This land has been subject to live urban zoning for high density residential development and associated mixed use and tertiary education uses for over a decade.
- This activity does not rely on any use of natural and physical resources of the coastal environment.
- No functions are directly located on coastal land.
- There is no impact on coastal habitat.
- There is no impact on the extent of the Motumānawa/Pollen Island marine reserve.
- There is no subdivision adjoining the coast.

Objective 7

To ensure that management of the coastal environment recognises and provides for New Zealand's international obligations regarding the coastal environment, including the coastal marine area.

Assessment:

- Not applicable.