

Appendix 8 - Concerns raised by adjacent residential owners and members of the public

I have summarised concerns raised by members of the public concerning the activity proposed/operating at 320A Cumnor Terrace. This includes residents who live at Long Street, Gould Crescent, Bamford Street and Connell Street

The concerns are in relation to visual amenity, noise, vibrations, nuisance, stormwater and flooding, health and safety, consent history, landscaping and CPTED principles,

Visual Amenity

- It is considered that containers are classified as buildings and the containers on the application site are considered to create a greater adverse effect than a standard industrial building.
- The scale of the height and activity is not anticipated and is likely to remain at a similar height regardless of the resource consent process. The permitted standard was considered to protect the views of the neighbouring residential properties and it was anticipated that there would be a collection of industrial buildings and activities in the locality i.e. warehousing or similar use. It would be generally anticipated that industrial buildings would take up to 40% of the site as considerations of design, building orientation, setbacks, separation by vehicle manoeuvring, parking and building access area. The containers can be seen by local residents, commuters and recreationalists utilising the Heathcote River and its margins. It is considered that there is a 64% increase in height exceedance. It may be difficult for Council to monitor/enforce height changes due to the constant change of container stacks.
- Many residents have noted they have bought their respective properties for the following reasons:
 - o Panoramic views of the Port Hills;
 - o Multiple vantage points of Heathcote River which is scenic and peaceful recreation area;
 - o The view points provided a rural feel prior to development of the industrial area.
 - o The popular and well used walkways in the locality;
 - o The morning sun making its way around the ridges and into the valleys, the golden glow at sunset on the slopes, or the cloud swirling around the tops.
 - o The quietness of the street;
 - o Resulting amenity of the above factors.
- The protection of the Port Hills has a legacy of over one hundred years and the introduction of the Summit Road Protection Act in 1963 cemented the future of the Port Hills as an icon for not only Canterbury but New Zealand as well. The upper regions of the Port Hills from the 60-metre line are designated Outstanding Landscapes so the visual amenity aspect of the Port Hills is protected by the District Plan. These views have been blocked by the stacked container heights. There is concern that the character of the historic area will be lost. Some of the photos taken do not show a clear sky of the port hills which make it difficult to determine whether the vistas are affected by the proposal.
- The containers are considered to be an eyesore/hideous for the following reasons:
 - o The rusty appearance of the containers creating visual pollution;
 - o The height acts as a skyscraper in comparison to residential properties
 - o Lack of mature landscaping and also any future landscaping will not reach the heights of containers and will take time to be established;
 - o The visual bulk is greater than a variation of industrial activities that could be established on the site.
 - o Not anticipated by the District Plan
 - o The view angle is steep which will not mitigate the height of the 18m high stacked containers being viewed at public/private residence vantage points.
 - o It is creating a 'concrete jungle in an ecological paradise';
 - o All residences facing the development have at least a window framing fully showing the activity. Some residents refrain from opening curtains or windows in this area.

- The containers are out of keeping with the surrounding landscape even compared to large warehouses elsewhere on the site. This has caused a loss of enjoyment and amenity in homes and outdoor spaces including private and public spaces as the previous view has been lost.
- The sunlight rebounds against the lighter containers which has had an effect on some resident's eye sight.
- It provides the sense of being imprisoned.
- Associated light pollution during the night from the NZ express site can be seen by residential properties and recreationalists utilising the reserve pathways. Vegetation cannot mitigate this effect. This could be mitigated by repositioning or dimming of the lights.
- The stack of tall containers is not a temporary obstruction as noted in the site operators acoustic assessment.
- Overall the view is not pleasant and enjoyable for residents anymore. It is considered to be getting worse.
- The Heathcote River does not provide an adequate buffer between the residential zone and industrial activity.
- Tunnel Road is a gateway to Christchurch therefore it is considered this creates an adverse effect in this regard.
- It is considered reverse sensitivity effect is created
- The renders provided in the application do not accurately present the actual height and impact of the containers as the dotted line of 11.6m dotted line is setback from the fence. The dotted line in the higher position will obstruct more of the port hills. The 1.5m fill on site exaggerates the visual bulk at permitted height levels which will make mitigation more difficult. The 0.6m height intrusion is allowing a 2.9 metre height container being established on the site which is greater intrusion than a permitted height of stacked containers..
- The 11.6m height exceedance occurs within the open space zone which is not anticipated to have buildings within. Therefore the height exceedance in the 11m height overlay is 13.6m.
- The proposal also have the potential to allow buildings to be erected instead of containers with no consideration or input from the public.
- The 2.4m acoustic fence on top of the northern bund also creates a dominant visual effect. This will be seen by residents nearby and commuters including Gould Crescent, Long Street, Tunnel and Ferry Road. In addition, the fence is a likely target of graffiti. This may also thwart attempts to establish landscaping in the area. There is also an additional fence line which has barbed wire which is hideous and makes the industrial area appear to be a prison.
- The obstruction of view is similar to a ruling which occurred in Wellington: <https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/fence-war-wellington-couple-awarded-72500-after-neighbours-blocked-their-multi-million-dollar-harbour-view/CPFTM7KGP4PC2ZWNTCSDAXR7HI/>
- A number of residents would have not purchased the property if they knew the containers activity or similar would be constructed in the area. It is considered that the properties will be difficult to sell in this area.
- The changes proposed by the applicant will not change the obstruction to the views of the Port Hills currently created.

Additional comments from applicant's updated assessment

- The trigonometry exercise by DCM failed to take into account the containers being stacked closer to the viewpoint than what is currently permitted. The original application notes the containers would be approximately 13.6 m high at the current northern extent of the 11 m building height limit area, which results in a much greater difference in angles than stated. This results in a notable difference in the amount of the Port Hills visible from areas greater than the assumed 78 m away from the site.
- The 25 m high visual obstruction shown in purple in the visualisations from near 32 Gould Crescent appears to be within the building height limit and/or landscape and stormwater area, or in the river.

- There is an approximately 50 m wide landscape and stormwater area constructed per the ODP immediately behind the 11 m building height limit area when viewed from many properties on both Gould Crescent and Long Street towards the part of the Port Hills surrounding Mount Cavendish. It is not clear that this has been factored into the assessment of the visual impacts of potential taller buildings outside of the building height limit area.
- The view from many Gould Crescent properties towards the Port Hills, including from around Castle Rock to the east, would not be impacted by any development in the Heavy Industrial Zone as it is outside of the direct line of sight.
- In the latest visualisations, an outline of 18 m high outdoor storage was shown towards the northern end of the building height limit area. This seems wrong if the application is for the height of outdoor storage and/or buildings to be limited to the progressive 11.6 m to 18 m height limit.
- Regarding the legal situation, the District Plan definition of a building begins with the phrase "as the context requires". Based on this, it would seem entirely reasonable for Jeremy Head to have investigated the background to the Plan Change.

Noise

- The noise from the application site has evolved from earthworks and construction noises (starting two years ago) to the constant movement of containers. This is considered to have worsened as the original noise was only considered to be temporary. Noise was not an issue prior to the activity and the environment considered to be a quiet peaceful area.
- The following noises have been adversely affecting residents of the locality:
 - o Constant droning noise.
 - o Beeping of forklifts and other machinery. Then the reverse beep alert in these lift trucks makes a noise between 80-110dB.
 - o Engine revving from large diesel lifters. The noise increases with height which is likely to increase with the proposed activity. Manufacturers of hoist liftruck container handlers confirm that the average noise their products make is 80-100dB.
 - o Clanging and booming created by containers being stacked.
 - o Booming when collisions in containers occurs or fall over. Manoeuvring the containers onto or off the stacks at higher heights results in more collisions and creates an exponential noise nuisance.
 - o The locking mechanism as the hoist hitch and release them.
 - o Containers banging on the ground;
 - o Repair works;
 - o Trucks beeping their horns
 - o Constant engine
 - o Vibrations created by the above
- The noise levels vary from a steady background drone to noises very noticeable and disruptive when containers are being stacked. The noise worsen when there are no containers acting as an acoustic barrier for the residential properties. The acoustic barrier does not provide a suitable mitigation as there is no guarantee of protection when they are moved regularly. The noise is heard from outdoor and indoor areas including through closed double glazed windows and indoor doors have to be shut to assist with minimising the noise. Sometimes it feels like residents are onsite of the application site. The noise is considered continuous, intrusive, spooky, annoying, disturbing, loud and obnoxious. The noise sometimes sound like small explosions and earth tremors. The incessant noise has become a constant presence, making it nearly impossible to find respite or engage in daily activities without disruption. The enjoyment of residents homes have been adversely affected by the container yard. It is impossible to sit outside or do gardening or anything without being exposed to excessive noise.
- Handling of the operation can cause a variance in noise levels.
- It is considered the applicant's noise assessment needs to be peer reviewed due to the enforcement history of the site. It is considered that the noise is exceeding 50db LAeq noise limit.
- Works have been reported to occur 24 hours a day, early hours (prior to 6am) or late in the evenings (sometimes until 10:30pm). This includes weekends and some public holidays. The

7am start time appears to be false as residents have been awoken prior to this time daily. A discussion with a security guard confirmed that some forklift workers like to work at 6:30am some mornings. Some noise occurs at irregular hours. The acoustic report appears to be incorrect in terms of operating hours.

- Noise can be unbearable at times and has disrupted resident's sleep on a number of occasions. Some residents have reported to have moved away from the area as a result.
- It is considered the container's location creates maximum impact to neighbouring residents. The noise echoes across the river. The containers also echoes traffic from the motorway and Ferry Road which is more noticeable prior to the establishment of the activity. There are no buildings or structures to mitigate the noise effecting residential properties directly.
- It is considered the noise decreases purposefully when CCC staff arrive for monitoring at the site. Once this has been completed, the noise increases. The noise seems to get worse after each complaint. Due to the wait lines on Council's Hotline, some residents have not placed additional complaints. Some residents have been told to get over the noise as it is what to expect with heavy machinery and the operations of the site can work from 6am to 8pm. Council staff have been invited to resident's properties to experience what residents are experiencing on a daily basis. A Official Information Act request was received which identified the noise complaints were not actioned or there was a delay in noise control. It seems that the corporation operating the activity onsite appear to have instructed their employees to make as much noise as possible. This similar to a malicious act.
- In terms of mitigation, some residents consider there is no mitigation is present. Another resident has suggested to reduce the activity to a permitted standard which will assist with minimising the noise effects.
- Low level containers have been blown over by the wind in April 2023. It creates a booming noise multiple times as well as vibrations. It sounded like a 'bomb'.
- The site operators acoustic assessment notes that that a fence and an acoustic barrier (stacked containers) are needed to allow noise to be compliant. For one planning rule to be breached to allow another to be met, is a strong indication the operation is not consistent with the anticipated activity in the area.

Stormwater & Flooding

- There are concerns that the filling of the site will create flooding effects on Gould Crescent.
- It is not considered the stormwater system in place for the application site will be sufficient due to the site being located on a previous swamp. The Portlink development's stormwater system was based on the findings of the Barnett McMurray Report in 2008. A resident has raised the following concerns:
"The climate change models used are also from that time, and contrary to what is stated in the report, the empirical evidence points out that the models have rather under-predicted flooding than over-predicted flooding. Moreover, the hydrological and hydraulic models used in the report are from 1996 and the actual data used is from 2003 and 2005. How is this report relevant?"
- The impact of the proposed south-west bund should be discussed in a public forum as it could have an impact on flooding in the river and moves away from what was envisaged in the Outline Development Plan.
- There are concerns that flooding may be created by the falling of stacked containers into the river. This is likely to increase further due to climate change and the increased run off from the development and will affect residential neighbouring properties. The rainfall used to sink into the land to some extent, but now runs off into the river which is a huge concern, and especially to those further down the river that used to be flooded before the container port was developed. Council have obligations and a responsibility to mitigate risks of future flooding, not exacerbate flooding.
- A resident was refused by Council to seal part of their driveway due to flooding effects (the rainwater catchment allowance may be too large for the size of the section. It is questioned how the proposed activity were able to seal the site and stack containers if flooding is a risk in this area.

Vibrations

- When the movement of containers occurs, vibrations have been felt by multiple residential properties. It has been reported that the movements feel like houses are shaking and is similar to earthquakes
- It has been observed that in two instances, shipping containers have been dropped by the lifting equipment from height, shaking the ground and accelerating deterioration of nearby properties through the constant vibration.

Nuisance

- The existing erosion and sediment control for the application site is inadequate. Dust has been reported to spread past the site and there is serious potential that excess sediment will enter the Heathcote River by the existing stockpiles. Residents have noted increasing dust effects from places of residents. It is estimated that dust received in 24 hours is as much as what was received in a week and residents refrain from hanging out their clothes in outdoor areas.
- Queries have been raised in relation to how the fumigation of logs will be prevented from entering the waterway following a rain event or from reaching neighbouring residential areas.
- There are concerns over air quality due to the following aspects:
 - o Dust
 - o Fumigation of logs from wood processing activity
 - o Diesel fumes from container operation
- Some residents are reporting sinus-relating sickness, allergies increasing over the last few months and ambient air testing has been requested to be undertaken.
- Increase traffic has occurred from the container activity which is likely to have increase pollution in the locality.

Fairness

- Some residents feel this activity would not occur in other suburbs such as Merivale, Fendalton or Halswell. Residents feel like it is socio-economic discrimination against a lower decile community. It is noted that one person was able to shut down a bar in City Centre and 10 noise complaints in Halswell for a skate ramp can be get resolved however this larger scale affect cannot despite noise regulations being breached.
- If Lyttleton Port Company (LPC) on Curries Road in Woolston and Mainland Port in Rolleston are not situated close to residential properties, why should containers be located within proximity of Woolston?

Previous consents and history of the applicant site

- It is considered that Plan Change 28 anticipated the following aspects:
 - o The 30m setback was never meant to be intruded as 50m-100m waterway setbacks were initially proposed. The setback was to be planted mostly in natives
 - o The change of rural land to industrial uses was anticipated.
 - o The visual impact was foreseen by the community during Plan Change 28, which resulted in "an 11 metre height limit for that part of the site within 130 metres of the river opposite the residential area. That limit will assist in retaining views across the site to the Port Hills.
 - o Post-2011 earthquake there were discussions and documentation between the residents and the Council about the use of the land and the development of a crushing plant had been raised as a possibility. In the end, it was not proceeded with and it was understood that residents would be involved in any future developments planned for that land.
 - o It is noted the adjacent community was against the previous private plan change.
 - o The area would be used for warehousing or similar industrial uses.

- Members of public have performed due diligence prior to purchasing residential properties in the area with anticipation of the above aspects. It was impossible to predict the proposed/existing occupancy of the site. Some resident's were unaware of the industrial zoning.
- It is considered the resource consents RMA92023697 and RMA/2019/1823 had greater effects and the applications should have been notified. The s127 variation makes reference to partial completion of works in relation to the subdivision RMA/2017/947 however it is unclear what works it refers to. It is unclear why vibrations were not included in this variation of consent. It is considered the existing earthwork consents should be cancelled due to the level of non-compliance with these conditions and unconsented activity on the site. This includes operating on public holidays and after hours and noise levels.
- There was uncertainty what would be built during the earthworks process. No consultation was provided at this time and residents had to endure a prolonged period of releveling and earthworks of the site. It was however expected that the earthworks would only be short term.
- In March 2022, rumours were present that resident's views would be obstructed from a container yard and at this time the local councillor was unaware. In July 2022, the container activity was starting on being established.
- Members of the public have been disappointed with the enforcement process as the unconsented activity did not take long to establish itself, but the enforcement action has been slow. Although complaints are confidential, it is felt the effects gets worse after every complaint is laid. The testing is located outside of resident's property which is likely to be made available to the landowner and their tenants. Works have been heard outside of homes making comments such as "we are being watched, we better stop working or another complaint will be put in". When Armoguard or CCC have been within the vicinity, the works either have not started work prior to 7am, or if it is during operational hours they will move to a different part of the site and return once they have left. Another issue is Armoguard have been seen near 2-16 Long Street which is not anywhere near where the complaints are being made from.
- The proposal is considered not to be in accordance with the District Plan due to the following reasoning:
 - o The scale is larger than anticipated.
 - o The setback and visual requirements are of a lesser quality.
 - o The changes sought are comparable to a plan change.
 - o Council do not need to notify residents of planned changes to their environment.
 - o All issues previously resolved in the plan change are now being raised again by Woolston residents.
 - o It is a deliberate intrusion by 15m or more into the landscape and drainage area.
- The activity is too close to residential activities. The negative impacts of industrial areas next to residential areas are well know and documented. All other developed countries establish new industrial activities away from residential areas as much as possible and existing industrial areas are converted to business hubs or residents. It was inappropriate Council established a new industrial zoning in location knowing it would have a negative impact on the well being of residents.
- The majority of the application is retrospective nature and raise the issue of good faith of the applicant from the public. This includes the sealed surfacing, fencing, bunding and building height exceedances. There has been deliberate actions by the applicant who now accepts that there has been fault and is seeking consent, this needs to be examined in a public forum. The resource consent provides little reassurance with residents as the developer has been continually allowed to exceed the height limits prior to assessment. This is considered to be significant failure in planning and very secretive.
- Some members of the public consider Council have duplicitous, devious and deceitful in terms of their approach. The Council were aware of the previous concerns of the residents in terms of the future use of the land. The Council is not concerned for the well-being of their residents' environment and are not in accordance with the environment plans they produce. Council has failed in it's duty of care to rate payers. Council can do something to resolve this matter.

Landscaping/CPTED

- It considered by some that the esplanade reserve would not benefit the community and may be more of maintenance cost to Council;
- Members of the community have noted there is a history of arson along the river margins. It is recommended that future landscaping is resilient to fire as much as possible;
- It is recommended that no cabbage trees are planted within the river margins as they have heavy leaf fall which will create blockages in the river. The site used to have species such as Kahikatea and it is therefore recommended that larger trees are re-established in the area;
- The high earth bunds have been constructed within 30m setback from the Heathcote River and in some points as close as seven metres. There are concerns the stockpiles are starting to encroach the track, making it inaccessible for people to use, as well as crowding the area creating land use effects. It is considered the intrusion must be reversed immediately.
- The Kennaway Group (part of the Ōpāwaho Heathcote River Network Group) volunteers to maintain the existing track over the last four years. As an interested party, this group needs to have an opportunity to comment.

Health and safety

- There are concerns with containers falling onto the adjacent reserve if not stacked appropriately. This could occur by the return events blowing the containers over or a sizable earthquake occurs. This track is highly utilised by walkers and bikers. As there has been recent toppling of stacked empty containers on the site recently (April 2023), it is considered the 16m or higher containers presents a very real danger in high winds. There are also similar concerns in terms of logging stacks. It is understood that worksafe have been involved with these incidents. Issues are going to remain regardless if the container stacks are 11m (4 containers vary between 9.4m to 11.6) or upwards of 17m (6 containers). If the containers were to fall over, and evacuations were required, it would be a challenge for some residents who have physical disabilities. It's a potential disaster waiting to happen.
- There are concerns that there is increased heavy vehicle movement on the residential streets. There is a health and safety risk for people getting in and out of cars with increased heavy vehicle movements.
- The light pollution makes it difficult to see around the river tracks which increases the risk of tripping in these areas.

Well being

- The current operation has had an adverse effect on the nearby resident's well being and mental health for the following reasons:
 - o The ability to relax when the operations (including the 24 hour activity) are occurring. Some residents have experienced feeling being trapped and exhausted in their own homes. The combined bumps and clanging have made residents feel uneasy and on a high sense of alert and this is constantly occurring. The residents are concerned they will never have peace again what was experienced prior to this activity. Residents are unable to enjoy their residential properties anymore with families.
 - o Lack of sleep due to noise associated with the activity. This includes during the day for younger family members. One resident has had to take sleeping pills in order to fall asleep however will still be awoken to the noise in the early hours. In addition this resident has to use earplugs and noise cancelling headphones which have caused a chronic ear infection. Some residents have been deprived of sleep for over a year now.
 - o Severe anxiety has been felt by multiple resident (similar to anxiety experienced in the earthquakes).
 - o Residents who perform working from home occupations or study find it hard to operate in the area due to vibrations and noise. Some residents have to close all doors and windows (internally and externally) in order to focus on study/work. One resident has had to rent an office elsewhere which is putting a strain financially.

- One resident is considering prosecution for the state of their health and lost of any views they previously had as they consider they are owed compensation for the harm the activity has caused them.
- Increased level of hay fever symptoms, migraines, elevated blood pressure and increased allergies has occurred in residents by the activity.
- Overall reduced quality of life has been experienced by residents.
- Family pets have also have been adversely affected by the activity.

Ecology

- In terms of ecology, it is considered that the activity has created the following effects:
 - Destroyed ecological habitats on the site and the Heathcote River margins. The current resource consent application seeks to reverse much of the decision-making of the private plan change in terms of creating a good riparian margin and ecological habitat for the Heathcote River.
 - The application is reducing the amount of green space to establish a dense riparian margin.
 - The stopbank (bunds) and fence line create a significant breach of the waterway setback rules highlights the industrial disrespect for the river which has occurred over many years (for example the waterway was once used as a sewer and outlet for industrial waste).
 - The creation of the “southwest bund” introduces an element into the design of the development that impinges significantly on the width, amenity and ecological usefulness of the Landscape and Drainage Area in this section of the Landscape Area. There are concerns that landscaping and trees will not be able to grow on the bunds currently in place.
 - The portlink development a mockery of the Opawaho Lower Heathcote River Guidance, which the Council has supported.
 - A lot of bird habitat has now disappeared on the site and within the riparian margins.
- The entire Ōpāwaho Heathcote River is a Site of Ecological Significance. The estuary is not far away from the site and has a world heritage status which needs to be protected.
- It is unusual that Lizards are delaying the process for landscaping.
- The importance of buffer or transitions zones near rivers, estuarine rivers, riparian areas and open spaces is critical to minimising the affects on the surrounding environs. These are very sound and accepted practices for having Green Space especially in this critical urban river environment and a nearby '*Site of Ecological Significance*'. It is considered the waterway needs space to regenerate and protect its ecosystem. The trees that grow in the margins should shade the river to keep it cool, thus increasing the oxygen content of the water and encouraging macrobiotic life. The grasses and reeds that might grow in these margins would provide habitat for insects that in turn provide food for birds and fish. Whitebait spawn in these margins.
- The Kennaway Work Group has been working with Christchurch City Council staff and CCC Community Rangers, community groups and volunteers since 2017 restoring and revegetating the Ōpāwaho / Heathcote River Reserve area from Cumnor Terrace to the Tunnel Road riparian zone a length of 1400 metres. Firstly, boxthorn, gorse and broom were removed and 5,000 plants have since been planted. This includes about 800 salt marsh ribbonwoods [*plagiantus divaricates*], variuos lowland /dryland *coprosma spp.*, toitoi, flaxes, sedge grasses, tussocks and other suitable plants. The Kennaway Work Group has a 'vision' to enhance the riparian zone along the Ōpāwaho / Heathcote River, providing a habitat for 'At risk' skinks and the fauna and allowing public access to enjoy the natural environment as much as possible.
- Ōpāwaho Lower Heathcote Guidance Plan 2022 should be considered. This plan is a living and enduring framework to support and enhance the long-term sustainability of ecology and biodiversity in the area, reversing the damage or restoring the ecosystem after decades of degradation from a wide range of sources. This guidance plan aims to be cohesive, bringing together the various efforts of the community and organisations with an interest in the health and use of the lower Ōpāwaho Heathcote River. The large number of community groups and stakeholders that participated in putting the Guidance Plan together demonstrates that many people passionately feel connected with the local river as a 'taonga' and the principles of Kaitiakitanga (Guardianship, concerned with environmental sustainability and beneficial use).

- Ideally, the setback from the river reserve should be 50 metres as an open low growing 2 to 4 metre high plants with various low growing coprosma spp., sedges, grasses, tussocks as that best suits the current residential skink population and amenity values of the area.

Property Values

- Most residents has raised concern with the container activity devaluing the residential properties. Many residents wish to leave the areas however due to the house price dropping significantly, residents cannot afford to move to a suitable location. It is considered people would be reluctant to purchase a house nearby to a container activity. This part of Woolston is no longer attractive.
- The increase price of living and rates has been noted as an issue while the residents are dealing with the effects of the industrial operation.
- It is considered rates should be dropped due to the lost of capital in the house.
- The LIM should have alerted the residents that an industrial zone was opposite the properties.

Recommendations from members of the public

- The application should be declined and abatement notices are served to reinstate green zone set back, 11m height restriction and require construction of acoustic fencing and adequate planting to shield the operation and restore some peace to the community.
- The council should engage in a constructive dialogue with the operators of the shipping container yard to find alternative solutions that could alleviate the negative effects on the surrounding residential area. These solutions could include relocating the facility to an industrial zone away from residential areas.
- The containers should be reduced to six to seven metres high as there is mature vegetation around this height and it does not interfere with the views of the Port Hills.
- The Ōpāwaho Heathcote River Network would like to be consulted via public notification on the proposal.