

**Before the Environment Court
At Auckland**

In the matter of the Local Government (Auckland Transitional Provisions Act 2010 (**LGATPA**) and the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

And

In the matter of appeals under section 156(1) of the LGATPA

Between **Weli Yang, Zhi Lu & Jing Ni**

(ENV-2016-AKL-000196)

Okura Holdings Limited

(ENV-2016-AKL-000211)

Appellants

And **Auckland Council**

Respondent

And **Weiti Development Limited Partnership**

Section 274 Party

(continued on next page)

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF PAT BASKETT ON BEHALF OF THE
LONG BAY - OKURA GREAT PARK SOCIETY INCORPORATED**

28 JULY 2017

**And Long Bay-Okura Great Park Protection Society
Section 274 Party**

**And Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society
Incorporated
Section 274 Party**

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 My evidence is on the wider community recreational use of the area that would be impacted by moving the Rural Urban Boundary to the Okura Estuary and the then proposed urban development of that area.

2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 My name is Pat Baskett.

3 LONG BAY OKURA MARINE RESERVE

- 3.1 The significance of this reserve surpasses its value as a recreational destination for the city. These wider benefits have been adequately addressed by the scientific community and are well known. In dealing with the detrimental effects on the marine reserve of urbanisation on land to the south of the Okura estuary I take into account the following:

- The uniqueness of this estuary, its status as a marine reserve and its location close to a growing urban area.
- Its value as a recreational destination to kayakers, canoeists and small boat owners.
- Its value for those interested in marine biology.
- Its value for those interested in birdlife to observe shore birds, some endangered, in the natural habitat and feeding grounds the mudflats provide.
- The extraordinary tranquillity afforded by the view along the estuary to the outer harbour.
- The undermining of the above advantages that will ensue from the various stages of development of the land on its south side – ie the degradation of the estuarine waters from the long-term pollution of run-off from impermeable surfaces.
- The absurdity to me of exposing an invaluable marine asset to the visual (and physical) long term pollution of suburbanisation's houses and cars.

- 3.2 In summary, in my opinion the existing countryside living zone which allows 26 houses must be maintained to better preserve the area's recreational values. This zoning will also better maintain the rural ambience and secure the integrity of the marine reserve.

3.3 Protection of the area has been mandated by the community for the last 30 years. Its loss would be a tragedy for the city.

Pat Baskett
28 July 2017