

# Sunfield Fast-track

Auckland Council Specialist Memo

**Annexure 22:**

**Air Quality**

**Marie Meredith**

**4 August 2025**

# Air Quality Memo

**Prepared by:** Marie Meredith, Specialist, Contamination, Air & Noise Team, Auckland Council

**Date:** 4 August 2025

1. This memorandum addresses the air quality aspects of the Sunfield proposal, with a focus on the matters noted in paragraph 6 below.

## **Qualifications and Relevant Experience**

2. I hold the qualifications of Bachelor of Environmental Science, Master of Science in Environmental Science, and have ten years in environmental science including three in air quality and contaminated land.
3. I am a full member of the Australasian Land and Groundwater Association. I have prepared technical assessments for resource consent applications, notices of requirement for designation and fast-track applications.

## **Code of Conduct**

4. I confirm that I have read the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 – Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (**Code**), and have complied with it in the preparation of this memorandum. I also agree to follow the Code when participating in any subsequent processes, such as expert conferencing, directed by the Panel. I confirm that the opinions I have expressed are within my area of expertise and are my own, except where I have stated that I am relying on the work or evidence of others, which I have specified.

## Documents Reviewed

5. I have reviewed the following documents in preparing this memorandum with respect to the requirements of Chapter E14 Air Quality of the AUP(OP):
  - *Sunfield Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 Substantive application Planning Report* (AEE) prepared by Tattico, dated 31/03/2025
  - *Attachment 2: Sunfield Conditions of Consent* (proposed conditions), dated 31-Mar-2025

## **Specialist Assessment**

6. Expert input was sought in relation to the Applicant's reference to "Air Discharges – Turbulence" on page 165 of the AEE and whether I consider proposed Condition 96 to be appropriate.

7. According to the AEE, light industrial activities are intended to be provided for within the “Employment Precinct”. Whether or not this area will be Business – Light Industry would be a consideration in terms of potential future land use activities associated with air discharges.

8. Though there are no matters of control or standards specifically relating to discharges to air effects on turbulence, Policy E14.3(10) of the AUP(OP) states:

*“Require large scale combustion sources that discharge contaminants to air to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on aircraft safety”.*

9. The application contains no indication that large scale combustion sources are proposed for the area. However, I recommend that the applicant be asked to confirm whether the proposal complies with Policy E14.3(10) above and provides evidence to support this.

10. The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) has some information on airspace hazards here: <https://www.aviation.govt.nz/airspace-and-aerodromes/airspace/airspace-hazards/>. While this is not my area of expertise, air quality considerations correlate with CAA rules.

#### **Comment on Proposed Conditions**

11. Proposed Condition 96 states that anything built/growing/discharging at a velocity of 4.3 m/s should not penetrate the airport designation area. The CAA (refer link above) specifically references any “*structure that is to be built, or altered, proposed to discharge efflux greater than 4.3m/second that is: 60 m (200 ft) or higher, or within an aerodrome/heliport obstacle protection area*” as an airspace hazard.

12. There seems to be a distinction between the 60 m structure and anything being built or altered within the airport designation area. The fact that proposed Condition 96 does not mention this 60 m height restriction may benefit from further review / consideration, but again it is neither our area of expertise (we would defer to CAA) nor is it covered by any matters of control in Chapter E14 of the AUP(OP).

13. I recommend that the applicant be asked to confirm whether the reference to the 60 m height restriction is required in the proposed Condition 96 and provide further explanation of why or why not.