Fast Track Resource Consent Application – Parkburn – Pre-application peer review (Freshwater ecology)

Project Name:	**Parkburn**
Council Reference:	**RM25.372 / FTAA-2510-1122**
Specialist Area/Asset Owner Name:	**Freshwater ecology**
Name of Specialist:	**Andrew Rossaak**
Date:	**29 June 2026**

Documents reviewed:

- Parkburn, Luggate-Cromwell Road Ecological Impact Assessment. Prepared by Viridis, Dated 1 May 2026.

Description of Missing Information

Based on my review of the following ecological documents, a fully informed review of the ecological effects and management thereof cannot be made due to the following missing information in the material provided:

Values assessments:

1. Streams:
    a. As the works proposed for the stream includes the removal of culverts (to be replaced by a bridge), the current ecological values and magnitude of effect are accepted. However, as the bridge plan is unsighted, if it is to involve any works in the bed (and banks) of the stream (the EcIA report suggests a pier), additional quantifiable values assessments will likely be required.

2. Wetlands
    a. Whilst the wetlands may not meet the definition of a natural inland wetlands under the NES:F, they are nevertheless wetlands under the RMA. Their values assessment lacks detail and objective indices/metrics.

3. Lake
    a. Lake Dunstan is the immediate receiving environment for freshwater flows from the site. It is in the zone of influence from the proposed activity. Objective quantifiable values assessments are required for the lake as the receiving environment.

Effects management

1. Streams:
    a. There is no evidence, detail or streamworks methodology to indicate how the effects will be managed or how the moderate effect will be managed to be net positive. . A streamworks management plan is recommended.

2. Wetlands
    a. The effects on the wetland values need to be quantified. Aspects such as area impacted, location and replacement wetland extent..
    b. The effects management hierarchy must be applied sequentially to these assessed effects.
    c. There is no evidence presented on how the effects are managed.
    d. Detail of the effects management during construction of the coves is required (methodology).

3. Lake:
    a. There is no evidence, detail to indicate how the potential adverse effects on the lake are assessed or addressed.
    b. There is a proposed stormwater feature though the site and commentary and monitoring of the effects of this on the lake is required.

4. General
    a. The application lacks the substantive detail required to support the conclusions or effects management outcomes reported.
    b. The management actions remain unclear.
    c. The monitoring and validation of the effects management is missing.

It is understood the EcIA is a draft copy and there are placeholders within the document where it is clear that additional information is anticipated to be added.

Why is this Information Essential?

1. The application involves habitat and biodiversity loss associated with freshwater features (streams and wetlands). The assessment of the loss of values, both existing and potential is required.