

Auckland Council / Beachlands South Ecology Meeting Minutes

Date: 24 August 2026

Time: 2:30 – 3:45pm

Purpose: Review and discuss Auckland Council specialist ecology comments on the Beachlands South Fast Track application.

1. Attendees

Council	Applicant / Consultant Team
Adonica Giborees	Brett Russell
Antoinette Bootsma	Rob Bassett
Luke Stanley	Ian Passau
Kala Sivaguru	Khai Azizi
Brooke Dales	Mark Delaney
	Susan Jackson
	Peter Quilter
	Vijay Lala
	Nick Roberts

2. Summary

This workshop was the first direct discussion between Auckland Council specialists and the applicant team on the Beachlands South Fast Track application post the site visit held 30 July 2026 (Council attendees were: Luke Stanley, Brook Dales and Adonica Giborees).

Prior to the meeting, Council specialists provided preliminary comments/queries on the application including identification of information gaps.

Discussion focused on marine ecology, water quality including modelling, biodiversity offsets and compensation, wastewater discharge modelling and ecological management plans. Council generally acknowledged the quality of the ecological reporting while seeking further clarification on the Coastal Bird Management Plan (CBMP), residual effects management, mangrove management, mixing zone methodology, 80th percentile assessment approach, freshwater mapping, and offset modelling assumptions.

3. Key Decisions and Agreed Outcomes

Additional written responses will be provided regarding residual effects management, the CBMP and modelling used to assess the water quality methodology. Additional freshwater and ecological mapping will be prepared. Existing ecological assessments remain the basis of the proposal, with supporting references to be provided where requested. Auckland Council has reviewed these meeting minutes and agreed outcomes document prepared by the applicant team.

4. Meeting Notes

4.1 Marine Ecology

Susan Jackson explained that the 2022 assessment (undertaken as part of Plan Change 88) focused primarily on intertidal habitats, construction sediment effects, stormwater and walkway effects, while wastewater was only addressed at a high level due to limited design information. The Fast Track application provides a detailed assessment of wastewater discharge effects on subtidal habitats and fauna. The discharge location was moved away from sensitive habitats into a subtidal environment to reduce effects and reduce the zone of influence.

Discussion then focused on the rationale for biodiversity offsetting in relation to proposed Coastal Bird Management Plan (CBMP), including shellbank enhancement, selective mangrove management, pest control and biodiversity gains. Kala Sivaguru queried whether the CBMP forms part of the consented proposal, the adequacy of information provided in the application documents for assessment of effects related to biodiversity offsetting and the rationale for extensive residual effects management where effects are assessed as low to negligible. Clarification was also sought regarding the proposed mangrove removal as biodiversity offsetting and as part of residual effects management. Susan clarified that most intertidal effects are related to construction sediment discharges (over ~10 year period) and advised that sediment discharges are expected to be reduced by approximately 60% following completion of construction.

Kala also requested information on number and location of stormwater outfalls proposed in the CMA. This should also include scour protection structures if any proposed for the stormwater outfalls.

Post-meeting comments from Council:

In regard to the stormwater outfalls within the CMA, please provide the following information:

- Location, number, and size of the stormwater outfalls within the CMA; and
- Details of any proposed scour protection structures associated with those outfalls.

In respect of reasons for consent in relation to the Coastal Marine Area, based on the lodged application documents we understand that the following additional consent triggers are required:

- F2.19.6, Rule (A55) (Diversion of water) where temporary diversion of water occurs during cofferdam construction.
- F2.19.8 Rule (A114) (Underwater blasting, impact and vibratory piling) for impact and/or vibratory piling associated with the constriction and possible removal of the cofferdam.
- F2.19.10, Rule (A126) (Coastal marine area structures located below the surface of the foreshore and seabed constructed by methods other than trenching) as the wastewater outfall pipe construction pursuant to s12(1) RMA using horizontal directional drilling and would be located below the seabed which has a SEAM2 overlay.

- E36 and PC120 for the section of pipeline that would be located below the seabed from land to the sea that would be within the 100-year coastal erosion and instability (ASCIE) line.

Subject to receiving further information on biodiversity offsetting proposals, there may be additional consent triggers.

Please also refer to the comments and questions in the memo dated 14 August 2026..

4.2 Water Quality

Peter Quilter outlined the wastewater receiving environment model, including assessment of total nitrogen, total phosphorus, dissolved oxygen and suspended solids. Conservative assumptions were applied including worst-case tidal conditions, no diffuser benefit, discharge volumes exceeding consented volumes, and use of 80th percentile discharge quality assumptions.

The discussion focused on the modelled 100 metre mixing zone and approximately 850-times dilution at the edge of that zone. Susan advised that the 100 metre distance reflects model resolution (with the modelling undertaken at 10m grids) rather than actual effect extent and that the actual mixing zone is likely to be much smaller.

Council questioned the use of the 80th percentile approach rather than consent limits or discharge quality standards proposed. Peter advised that this method aligns with the statistical basis of receiving environment guideline values as shown in ANZECC Water Quality Guidelines. Both parties agreed that additional written explanation of the mixing zone methodology and percentile approach would assist Council review.

Post-meeting comments from Council: Please also refer to the comments and questions in the memo dated 14 August 2026..

Council advise that the comments/queries circulated prior to the meeting remain relevant, but agrees that provision of information to address the queries would assist the Council review.

4.3 Freshwater and Terrestrial Ecology

Mark Delaney presented the freshwater and terrestrial ecological assessment, noting that existing ecological values are generally low to moderate due to historical modification, invasive vegetation and limited indigenous habitat.

Approximately 2ha of EPAN vegetation removal is proposed, offset by 2.6ha of additional planting. The overall EPAN area for this application will be approximately 75ha. Freshwater compensation includes restoration of a 2.9ha coastal fringe wetland to address 2,906m² of wetland loss and 646 m of stream loss. This freshwater compensation forms part of a broader restoration programme. Luke Stanley advised that the biodiversity and flora management plans were generally clear and well prepared.

Antoinette Bootsma and Luke Stanley addressed culvert locations, fish passage requirements, freshwater reclamation areas, EPAN boundary management, walkway locations and offset modelling assumptions. Mark confirmed that culverts occur within ephemeral reaches or are located directly adjoining ephemeral reaches where fish passage is not required, and that future riparian planting values were incorporated into offset

calculations. Council requested additional mapping and references to report sections supporting offset assumptions.

5. Open Technical Matters

1. Confirmation of how the CBMP , shellbank enhancement and mangrove removal forms part of the consented proposal and residual effects framework.
2. Additional explanation of wastewater mixing zone methodology and model assumptions.
3. Clarification of the rationale for the 80th percentile discharge assessment approach.
4. Confirmation that stormwater outfalls are located at the property boundary and/or in the CMA and reflected in consent conditions, including addressing the consent triggers identified above.
5. Verification that walkways and cycleways do not encroach into riparian planting areas.
6. Provision of additional mapping linking culverts, freshwater reclamation areas, rain gardens and stormwater wetlands.
7. Identification of report references supporting future planting assumptions used within offset calculations.

6. Action Register

No.	Action	Owner	Due Date	Status
1.	One-on-one follow-up session on water quality and mixing zone questions.	Peter Quilter / Kala Sivaguru	Not stated	Open
2.	Provide written response on residual effects management, CBMP, shellbank enhancement, mangrove removal role and 80th percentile rationale.	Susan Jackson / Peter Quilter	Not stated	Open
3.	Produce mapping linking freshwater features, culverts, rain gardens, stormwater wetlands and reclamation areas.	Mark Delaney	Not stated	Open
4.	Provide references to report sections addressing planting assumptions in offset modelling.	Mark Delaney	Not stated	Open
5.	Verify that new walkways and cycleways do not encroach into riparian planting areas.	Mark Delaney	Not stated	Open
6.	Confirm stormwater outfall locations relative to aquatic habitat (specifically the wetted edge of streams and wetlands) and ensure consent conditions are consistent with the proposed design.	Applicant Team	Not stated	Open