

#7393

Purewa Cemetery Trust Board – 4 Parsons Road, Meadowbank
Submission on Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan

February 2014
HG Job Ref.1050-130037-01

RECEIVED
150 JANUARY 2014
COUNCIL
PLANNING

FORM 2

28 FEB 2014

SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN

Sections 123 and 125 Local Government (Auckland Transitional Provisions) Act 2010 and Clause 6 of Schedule 1 Resource Management Act

To Unitary Plan Submission Team, Auckland Council, Freepost Authority 237170,
Private Bag 92300, Auckland 1142

For Auckland Council Office Use Only

Submission No:

Receipt Date:

Submitter Details

Name of submitter:

Purewa Cemetery Trust Board (PCTB)

Name of submitter's agent:

Harrison Grierson

Address for service of submitter:

PCTB
c/o Harrison Grierson
PO Box 5760
Wellesley Street
Auckland 1141

Attn: Clare Covington

Email for service of submitter:

c.covington@harrisingrierson.com

Telephone for service of submitter:

09 917 5000

1. This is a submission on the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP)

2. Trade competition

PCTB could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

3. Omitted

4. Scope of submission

The specific provisions of the PAUP that PCTB's submission relates to are:

Provision(s): *Proposed Public Open Space – Community Zone*
Property address(es): *4 Parsons Road, Meadowbank*
Map(s): *Zoning*

1/22

5. PCTB's submission is

PCTB **oppose** the specific zoning provisions above and wish to have them amended from those notified in the PAUP.

The reasons for PCTB's views are as follows:

PCTB is particularly concerned about the zoning of the southern portion of the site as 'Public Open Space'. This zoning for a privately owned site is incorrect and misleading as it could be considered to indicate ongoing public access is available to the site.

This southern portion of the site is currently used as a driveway leading to the cemetery and also includes a lounge facility associated with the cemetery activity at the site. This driveway portion of the site leading from St Johns Road up to Parsons Road is surplus to PCTB requirements as it is not the only access to the main part of the cemetery site with alternative access to the cemetery available from Fancourt Street. In addition, the development of this land would provide funding necessary for the long term maintenance of the Cemetery.

As such, the PCTB seek an amendment to the zoning of the site to provide for residential development of this portion of the site (refer to **Attachment 1**). Given it is no longer required for cemetery purposes, the most appropriate new zone for this area would be that of the adjacent sites i.e. the Mixed Housing Urban zone.

As there are a large number of trees in this portion of the site, PCTB commissioned an Arborist assessment to determine the health and status of the trees and determine how many would be protected under the current zoning provisions (refer to **Attachment 2** - report from Peers Brown Miller). This assessment informed an indicative plan showing potential building platforms to demonstrate that there would be development options which would still ensure the retention of a large number of trees (refer to **Attachment 3**). A further review of the potential building platforms and their impact on trees has been carried out by Richard Peers (refer to **Attachment 4**) and he concludes that:

"The Building Platform Plan demonstrates that all 88 of the trees deemed desirable to retain can feasibly be retained, subject to a greater level of analysis at the design phases. In addition, many trees that are deemed to be not so significant can feasibly be retained. Overall just 16 trees are actually captured within the indicative building platforms; meaning that a proposal to obtain nine building sites within this particular parcel of land would not significantly diminish the tree cover that the site offers to the local landscape".

This portion of the site has a total area of 11,892m² (comprised in 3 Certificates of Title, NA 23B/603 being 1664m², NA 23B/606 8,908m² and NA 23B/604 1320m², all owned by PCTB). The option for multi-unit developments within the identified building platforms would be readily accommodated with by the application of the Mixed Housing Urban zone to this site area ie. 47 units at 1 unit per 250m² site area or alternatively no density limit given the site size.

The site is located within close proximity to the Meadowbank Local Centre and on an arterial road with regular bus services. The Auckland Plan and PAUP, specifically Part 1, Chapter B, Section 2.1, Objective 3 and Policy 2 of the PAUP seeks to achieve a more intense and compact urban form in areas that are in

#7893

close proximity to town centres and that are close to public transport facilities, community facilities and are adequately serviced.

PCTB considers that the zoning of this portion of the site as Mixed Housing Urban is consistent with the PAUP objectives and policies in relation to concentrating a more compact urban form near town centres for the reasons listed below:

- The site is within 500m of the Meadowbank Local Centre, which is where the PAUP seeks to concentrate Terrace Housing and Apartments. This is stated in the zone objectives and policies of the Terrace Housing and Apartment zone contained in Part 2, Chapter D, Section 1.7 of the PAUP. Residential intensification is therefore encouraged in this location.
- The site is able to be serviced in terms of water, waste water and stormwater;
- The site is serviced by a comprehensive public bus network along St Johns Road;
- The site is within walking distance to the public reserve to the north; and
- There is a choice of primary and secondary schools within the surrounding area.

In this context and the overriding principles of the Auckland Unitary Plan of quality compact urban form and enabling higher residential density in appropriate locations within the RUB as well as the aim of providing affordable housing, the site provides a good opportunity for development.

The proposed rezoning would therefore achieve the purpose of the RMA of promoting the sustainable management of natural and physical resources under s5(1) of the RMA and would make the best use of a finite land resource as required by s7(g) of the RMA.

6. PCTB seek the following decision from Auckland Council

- 6.1 That the zoning of the southern portion of the PCTB's site, located at 4 Parsons Road, Meadowbank be rezoned from Public Open Space to Mixed Housing Urban. | 1

and

- 6.2 Such other additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above and to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.

or

- 6.3 Such other alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.

- 7.** PCTB wish to be heard in support of their submission.

- 8.** If others make a similar submission PCTB will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

3/22

#7393

Purewa Cemetery Trust Board – 4 Parsons Road, Meadowbank
Submission on Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan

February 2014
HG Job Ref.1050-130037-01

Signature

OTGington

Signature of submitter/person authorised to sign on behalf of Purewa
Cemetery Trust Board

Date **28 February 2014**

N:\1050\130037_01\500 Del\PUPSUB001-PCTB-4parsons road-ctc.docx

4/
22



This map/plan is illustrative only and all information should be independently verified on site before taking any action. Copyright Auckland Council. Land Parcel Boundary information from LINZ (Crown Copyright Reserved). Whilst due care has been taken, Auckland Council gives no warranty as to the accuracy and completeness of any information on this map/plan and accepts no liability for any error, omission or use of the information. Height datum: Auckland 1946.

1:5,000 Auckland Council

Plan Created: 28/2/14

Amended Unitary Plan Base Zone

----- Purewa Trust Land Holdings



5/22
Auckland Council
Te Kaitiaki o Tāmaki Makaurau

PEERS BROWN MILLER LTD

Arboricultural & Environmental Consultants

PUREWA CEMETERY- SURVEY OF TREES IN LOT 5 DP 67742 BETWEEN ST JOHNS & PARSONS ROADS - 14/2/14

1.0 Introduction

This tree survey was undertaken on 13 February 2014 by Richard Peers at the request of Clare Covington of Harrison Grierson Consultants Ltd.

The brief was to identify all trees on the site that are subject to the tree protection rules of the Auckland Council District Plan – Operative Isthmus Section (1999) and to provide brief comment on their condition, and merits in terms of whether or not consideration should be given to retaining any particular trees within a proposed development layout for the site.

The information provided in this survey report has the objective of assisting the architects, engineers and landscape architects with their design work in the first instance. It is also data that needs to be gathered for the Resource Consent report that would need to be prepared in any case.

2.0 Plan References

To aid in the assessment of the trees, I was provided with the following plan;

- Purewa Cemetery 4 Parsons Road, Meadowbank – Site Survey and Tree Location Plan, by Harrison Grierson Consultants Ltd

This plan is the survey of the site as it exists. All feature trees on the site are plotted accurately and I have used this plan as the base for this report. The trees are assigned a number on a version of this survey plan by which they should be henceforth referenced.

A copy of this marked-up plan should accompany this report at all times.

3.0 The Trees – Protection Status

The subject property is zoned Open Space 4 in the operative Auckland Council District Plan – Operative Isthmus Section (1999).

Following is the definition of an urban environment in relation to tree protection rules, as confirmed by the following section taken from a Council document outlining the new tree protection rules in place since January 1 2012;

6/22

1. An urban environment is defined under section 76 (4B) of the Resource Management Act 1991 as:

“....an allotment no greater than 4,000 m²—

- (a) that is connected to a reticulated water supply system and a reticulated sewerage system; and
(b) on which is a building used for industrial or commercial purposes, or a dwellinghouse.”

If a tree is located on a site which does not meet any one of these criteria then that site is not defined as an “urban environment”. The tree will therefore still be subject to the relevant general tree rule from 1 January 2012; this being the rule that relates to the existing zoning of the site.

The subject site is 8908m² in area; so, in light of the above definition, is not an urban environment. Trees on the site are therefore subject to the relevant general tree protection rules that applied prior to 1 January. In this particular zoning, both native and exotic trees are protected at thresholds of either 6m in height or if they have girth measurements, as measured at 1.4m from ground level, of 600mm.

It can be noted that there are no Notable or covenanted trees on the site.

4.0 Schedule of Trees

With the exception of one tree, only trees that enjoy protective status under the abovementioned Rules are included in the schedule below. Their dimensions are not given, as it is considered that that information is not materially relevant to the purposes of this assessment. It should therefore be taken as read that they have been identified as having height and/or girth measurements that are beyond the thresholds set out in the previous section.

Tree No	Name (Common)	Condition Health/Structure	Recommendations
1	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Good state of health and sound of structure	Retain
2	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Good state of health and sound of structure	Retain
3	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Good state of health and sound of structure	Retain
4	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Weak, suppressed specimen	Retain?
5	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Spindly, suppressed specimen	Retain?
6	Pohutukawa hybrid – with Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Good state of health and sound of structure	Retain

7	Pohutukawa hybrid – with Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Good state of health and sound of structure	Retain
8	Pohutukawa hybrid – with Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Good state of health and sound of structure	Retain
9	Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Weak, suppressed specimen. Has been reduced	Retain?
10	Pohutukawa hybrid – with Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Suppressed specimen	Retain?
11	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Good state of health and sound of structure	Retain
12	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Good state of health and sound of structure	Retain
13	Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Weak specimen. Has been reduced	Retain?
14	Kermadec island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Weak specimen. Has been reduced	Retain?
15	Pohutukawa hybrid – with Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Good state of health and sound of structure	Retain
16	Swamp cypress	Good health and structure	Retain
17	Swamp cypress	Good health and structure	Retain
18	Totara	Good health. Semi-mature. Upright form	Retain
19	Silky oak	Good health. High crown. Sound structure	Retain?
20	Japanese cedar	Good health. Typical form	Retain?
21	Black poplar – <i>Populus nigra</i>	Large tree with high broad crown. Sparse foliar cover	Remove
22	Monkey apple		Remove. Not protected
23	Pin oak	Good health. Slightly suppressed crown. Good structure	Retain

24	Pin oak	Good health and structure. Merged with 23 – more suppressed of form	Retain?
25	Golden macrocarpa	Large broad-crowned specimen. Has cypress canker. Suppressed one side by tree since removed	Remove
26	Totara	Good strong tree	Retain
27	Kowhai – <i>Sophora microphylla</i>	Spindly suppressed specimen	Remove OK
28	Puriri	Very good large specimen in all respects	Retain
29	Pohutukawa hybrid – with Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Good state of health and sound of structure	Retain
30	Pohutukawa hybrid – with Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Weak of health. Spindly suppressed form	Retain?
31	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Large specimen. Good health and structure	Retain
32	Karaka	Semi-mature. Good health and structure	Retain
33	Puriri	Very good large specimen in all respects	Retain
34	Puriri	Good specimen. Some dieback in places.	Retain
35	Swamp cypress	Good health and structure	Retain
36	Japanese cedar	Semi-mature. Good health. Close to 35 – slight lean	Remove OK
37	Swamp cypress	Strong tree. Good health and structure	Retain
38	Japanese cedar	Same as 36, but larger	Remove OK
39	Titoki	Young minor tree. Good health.	Retain
40	Swamp cypress	Good health and structure	Retain
41	Japanese cedar	Same as 36 and 38, but weaker	Remove OK
42	Swamp cypress	Good health and structure. Wind-burnt one side due to sudden exposure by removal of adjacent tree	Retain

43	Swamp cypress	Very good strong specimen	Retain
44	Kohekohe	Small tree. Heavy lean. Decay in stem wood – esp. at site of included stem union.	Remove
45	Pohutukawa hybrid – with Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Weak, suppressed, spindly tree with dieback. Leans heavily into 44	Remove
46	Karaka	Good health. Trunk wound from failure. Steel stake embedded. Leans from 47. 3m from MH	Remove OK
47	Puriri	Semi-mature. Drawn up form. Decay in stem wood. Close to boundary. 2m from MH	Remove OK
48	Pohutukawa	Large tree. Good health. Extends far over neighbour's yard	Retain
49	Karo	Heavy lean towards road	Remove
50	Karo	Heavy lean towards road	Remove
51	Pohutukawa	Same comments as for 48 above	Retain
52	Pohutukawa	Same comments as for 48 & 51 above. More splayed stems	Retain
53	Claret ash	Large tree. Good health. Sound structure	Retain
54	Karaka	Good health. Some decay in trunk. Under canopy of 53	Retain
55	Wharangi	Good health. Minor tree. Under canopy of 53	Retain
56	Golden ash	Small specimen with weak habit – typical of cultivar. Much borer and some dieback. At entrance	Remove OK
57	Fraxinus sp.	Tree at entrance. Weak appearance. Sun burnt sparse foliage	Retain?
58	Sheoke	High Crown. Good structure	Remove OK
59	Himalayan cedar	Semi-mature specimen. Slightly suppressed form. Sparse but in good health.	Retain?

60	Willow myrtle	Typical form. One dead stem with Ganoderma bracket	Remove OK
61	Akiraho	Good example of native species rarely seen at this size	Retain
62	Fraxinus sp.	Tall strong healthy specimen. Twin-stemmed but union sound	Retain
63	Puriri	Weak specimen. Under canopies of adjacent trees. Decay in stem wood.	Retain?
64	Bottlebrush	Spindly	Remove
65	Pohutukawa	Strong large healthy elite tree	Retain
66	Karaka	Semi-mature. Good health. Under canopies of adjacent trees	Retain
67	Pohutukawa	Large healthy tree – merged with 65	Retain
68	Puriri	Large tree. Full crown. Some stem wood decay and dead wood, but sound	Retain
69	Pin oak	Large tree. Good health. Inclusion between stems. <1.5m MH	Retain?
70	Box elder	Small suppressed weak tree with dieback	Remove
71	Liquidambar	Semi-mature. Phloem necrosis in stem wood. Full crown. Tightly packed limb unions	Remove OK
72	Titoki	Young tree. Good health. Steel stake in trunk. Under canopy of 71	Remove OK
73	Liquidambar	Semi-mature. Phloem necrosis in stem wood. Drawn up form	Remove OK
74	Liquidambar	Semi-mature. Phloem necrosis in stem wood. Two stems from base with included union. Canopy a bit sparse with some tip dieback	Remove OK

75	Pin oak	Very tall with broad crown spread. Reasonably good health and sound structure	Retain
76	Puriri	Weakening tree. With much epicormic growth. Under canopies	Retain?
77	Pin oak	Same comments as for 75	Retain
78	Queensland Box	Tall strong healthy tree with good structure	Retain
79	Mexican pine	Suppressed form. Leans towards road	Remove OK
80	Puriri	Weakening specimen. Suppressed under canopies of adjacent trees. Decay in stem wood and cavity at base	Retain?
81	Firewheel tree	Good health. Drawn up form. Tight but sound structure	Retain
82	Pohutukawa	Tall strong tree. Has had two stem failures, but appears sound	Retain
83	Swamp cypress	Sound healthy strong tree	Retain
84	Chinese poplar	Very large specimen. Good health. Sound structure but heavy limbs	Remove OK
85	Japanese cedar	Suppressed under 84. Not good form	Remove
86	Firewheel tree	Good health and structure. Under canopies – drawn up form	Retain?
87	Bottlebrush	Suppressed under 83. Weak and spindly	Remove
88	Pohutukawa	Medium size. Good health	Retain?
89	Pohutukawa	Medium size. Good health	Retain?
90	Firewheel tree	In open. Good health. Included unions – one opening	Remove OK
91	<i>Camellia japonica</i>	In open. Unbalanced form	Remove OK
92	Cabbage tree	A cluster. Main stem completely hollow	Remove OK
93	Bottlebrush	Spindly specimen	Remove OK

94	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Spindly drawn up suppressed form	Retain?
95	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Tall specimen	Retain
96	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Tall specimen suppressed by 96.	Retain
97	Chinese poplar	Tall specimen. Good foliar growth. History of branch snaps	Remove
98	Weeping Lillypilly	Very good health. Nice tree	Retain
99	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Suppressed by 98	Retain
100	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Suppressed by 98	Retain
101	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Suppressed by 100	Retain
102	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Good balanced tree	Retain
103	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Tall. Suppressed form	Retain
104	Pohutukawa hybrid – with Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Tall. Slightly suppressed	Retain
105	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Spindly form	Retain
106	Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Open habit	Retain
107	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Tall. Good balance	Retain
108	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Tall	Retain
109	Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Suppressed by 110	Retain?
110	Kermadec Island Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Elite strong tree	Retain
111	Pohutukawa	Avenue tree. Suppressed by 110	Retain?
112	Pohutukawa	Splayed structure. Good health. Against boundary. Karo growing in centre	Retain?
113	Pohutukawa	Splayed structure. Reasonable health. Against boundary	Retain?
114	Camellia sasanqua	Good health. Pushed out by 111	Retain?
115	Camellia sasanqua	Good health. More upright form	Retain?

116	Weeping Lillypilly	Young tree. Drawn up form	Remove OK
117	Pohutukawa	Splayed structure. Good health. Against boundary.	Retain?
118	Flowering cherry	Weak declining health	Remove OK
119	Weeping Lillypilly	Drawn up leaning form. Base girdled by root. Potentially unstable. Weak health	Remove
120	Pin oak	Tall elite tree. Good health and structure.	Retain
121	Pohutukawa	Tall. Drawn up form. Good health	Retain
122	Japanese cedar	Spindly single-stemmed specimen	Remove OK
123	Weeping Lillypilly	Semi-mature. Good health. Leans towards road	Remove OK
124	Pohutukawa	Tall. Splayed stem formation. Extends over neighbour's yard	Retain

5.0 Notes on Schedule

The information provided in the tree schedule can be summarised as follows;

1. Tree 22 is the only tree of the 124 listed in the schedule that is not protected. It is included because it is plotted by survey and stands as a feature tree amongst the other trees. It is listed with pink text in the schedule.
2. There are several minor and self-sown trees hard against boundary lines either side of the site that can be defined as being protected. Some of these are among those trees marked with a small green tree symbol on the survey plan. These trees have not been included in this schedule due to their insignificance. However, they can be quantified and identified at a later stage if required.
3. There are some protected trees present in the garden, and to the east, of the Lounge building on Parsons Road that were not surveyed. It is assumed that the Lounge and its immediate environs would be exempt from this assessment.
4. There is a distinct avenue of Pohutukawa trees for a considerable length of the northeast portion of the roadway. They are identified in the third column as being an 'Avenue tree'. These trees have been identified as being a mix of New Zealand Pohutukawa specimens, Kermadec Island Pohutukawa specimens and hybridised specimens of both. As is commonly the case with trees that comprise an avenue, some become more elite than others.

In this case, certain trees display either suppressed form or weak condition – or a combination of both. The recommendation 'retain?' given to these trees indicates this particular characteristic but conveys the idea that they are, nonetheless, integral to the contiguousness and character of the avenue as a landscape feature.

5. Several trees that are not part of the avenue have also been awarded a 'retain?' recommendation. This indicates that those particular trees are not major trees; but are trees which do have some degree of merit. For example, some stand under the canopies of superior trees that are more definitely recommended for retention, and they therefore may not necessarily need to be removed to facilitate the establishment of a building platform in any case.
6. All 'retain?' trees are colour-coded blue in the schedule for ease of reference. There are 28 such trees.
7. Those trees that have a 'retain' recommendation are colour-coded green. There are 60 such trees.
8. In the 'Recommendations' column I have indicated an ambivalence towards trees that are considered to be of lesser quality than those recommended 'retain or 'retain?'. I have stated either 'remove' or 'remove ok', and the difference therefore warrants explanation here. Those with 'remove' would be recommended for removal, in my opinion, as a matter of good tree management even if this exercise were not being undertaken. Those with 'remove ok' are trees that are not so poor as to warrant being removed imminently, but which a decision to seek consent for their removal as part of any development proposal could be made easily and with confidence.

'Remove' trees are colour-coded pink. There are 13 such trees.

'Remove OK' trees are colour-coded orange. There are 23 such trees.

6.0 Photograph Gallery



Fig 1 – view of avenue of Pohutukawa – looking from northeast end



Fig 2 – Trees 19-21



Fig 3 – Tree 22 centre, 23 & 24 to right, and 25 to left



Fig 4 – Tree 34 to right, 33 centre, 35 to left



Fig 5 – Tree 43 in centre, 44 behind



Fig 6 – trees to west of St Johns Rd entrance

18/
22



Fig 7 – Group of Liquidambar – Trees 71, 73 & 74



Fig 8 – Tree 90 to left, 88 & 89 centre, 84 (poplar) behind

19/
22



Fig 9 – Trees 36-39 right to left

7.0 Conclusion

This report has the objective of being a preliminary assessment that gives information and recommendations pertaining to just protected trees within the site. It serves to provide information that will assist with the development of a concept design for the proposed use of the site. It is not intended to be part of any future Resource Consent application documentation.

Please feel free to contact the undersigned if any further discussion is required.

Richard Peers
Director



ASSOCIATION OF CONSULTING ENGINEERS NEW ZEALAND

ISO 9001 QUALITY ASSURED

THIS DRAWING AND DESIGN REMAINS THE PROPERTY OF, AND MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED OR ALTERED, WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF HARRISON GRIERSON CONSULTANTS LIMITED. NO LIABILITY SHALL BE ACCEPTED FOR UNAUTHORIZED USE OF THIS DRAWING.

#7393

Auckland Office
Dilworth House 71 Great South Road
Newmarket Auckland 1051
P 464 9 917 5000
www.harrisongrierson.com

REF	REVISIONS	BY	DATE
A	CLIENT ISSUE	DAS	25.02.14

PROJECT: PUREWA CEMETERY
4 PARSONS ROAD
MEADOWBANK

TITLE: POSSIBLE BUILDING PLATFORM LOCATIONS

ORIGINATOR:	DATE:	SIGNED:	PLOT BY:
DAS	02.14		JHT

DRAWN:	DATE:	SIGNED:	PLOT DATE:
JHT	02.14		25.02.14

CHECKED:	DATE:	SIGNED:	SURVEY BY:
DAS	02.14		ANP

APPROVED:	DATE:	SIGNED:	SURVEY DATE:
DAS	02.14		16.01.14

ISSUE STATUS: CLIENT ISSUE

PROJECT No:	SCALES:	
1050-130037-01	1:400-A1 1:800-A3	A1

DRAWING No: 130037-900

File: NEWMARKET N:\1050\130037_A\CAD\130037-900.DWG

PEERS BROWN MILLER LTD

Arboricultural & Environmental Consultants

PUREWA CEMETERY- ARBORICULTURAL COMMENT ON PROPOSED BUILDING PLATFORMS IN LOT 5 DP 67742 - 26/2/14

The comments contained in this memo relate to the following plan produced by Harrison Grierson Consultants Ltd;

- Possible Building Platform Locations – Drawing No 130037-900

Nine indicative building platforms (15m x 15m) are shown on the above plan. The locations have been chosen with particular regard taken of the outcome of the tree survey prepared earlier by myself. 124 trees were surveyed, and these were identified four ways, as follows;

- Retain – green – 60 trees
- Retain? – blue – 28 trees
- Remove OK – orange – 23 trees
- Remove – pink – 13 trees

The rationale behind each of those recommendations is contained in the tree survey report of 14-2-14.

Accordingly, the indicative building platforms have been drawn in locations where not one tree that was identified as 'Retain' or 'Retain?' has been captured within a platform footprint – as drawn. However, some do stand in close proximity to certain drawn platforms; although it is acknowledged that actual house footprints would have different shape factors that would offer scope for there to be a greater degree of clearance from those trees. Indeed, there are roomy areas of ground beside some of the platforms that do not have 'retain/retain?' trees. These areas could be utilised for building envelopes – thereby increasing clearances from such trees.

The Building Platform Plan demonstrates that all 88 of the trees deemed desirable to retain can feasibly be retained, subject to a greater level of analysis at the design phases. In addition, many trees that are deemed to be not so significant can feasibly be retained. Overall, just 16 trees are actually captured within the indicative building platforms; meaning that a proposal to obtain nine building sites within this particular parcel of land would not significantly diminish the tree cover that the site offers to the local landscape.



Richard Peers
Director

PEERS BROWN MILLER LTD

PO Box 10166 Dominion Rd Auckland 1446

Ph 09 631 7610 Fax 09 631 7611

www.peersbrownmiller.co.nz

22/22