

The Minister for the Environment
c/o The Environment Protection Authority
Private Bag 63002
Waterloo Quay Wellington 6140

23 June 2021

Dear Minister Parker,

Drury Central Station Project and Paerata Station Project

We are responding to your invitation for comments on this application before you for referral to the Expert Panel under the COVID-19 Response (Fast Track Consenting) Act 2020.

The applications are made by KiwiRail Holdings Limited, and are located at Drury and Paerata in Auckland as detailed in the applications.

In response to the specific questions in your letter:

- 1. Are there any reasons that you consider it more appropriate for the projects, or part of the projects, to continue to proceed through existing Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) consenting processes rather than the processes in the FTCA?**

In principle, the Fast Track process could be an acceptable consenting path. There are matters that need to be addressed further during the process, in particular the resolution of flooding and stormwater management, stream and wetland works, public open space and connections to active modes and the wider public transport network. There is insufficient technical detail in the current application to allow conclusions on the likely outcomes for such matters and whether these are acceptable.

- 2. Clarify the relevance of Private Plan Change 48 to the Project.**

Private Plan Change 48 (PC48) as notified proposed a station and station precinct located to the north-west of the plan change area. The plan change requestor acknowledges that the station needs to shift further to the north-east to the preferred KiwiRail site. Amendments to PC 48 will be put forward by the requestor in response and are likely to be within scope of submissions. Specifically, a number of zoning and layout issues in PC 48 relate to the location of the rail station including zoning in the vicinity, pedestrian, cycle and bus access to the station as well as possible plazas and public spaces.

At a strategy level, the plan change request assumes high take up of public transport. If the plan change was modified to better address the important transportation role to be provided by the station for the Centre and surrounding higher density development, there is the potential for good transit-oriented design (TOD) outcomes. The early adoption of the station as the main transport mode for centre staff, shoppers and those living within the developments in the areas covered by PC 48 and PCs 49 and 50 is possible, as opposed to private vehicle usage and early road network congestion.

Please refer to the detailed comments from Auckland Transport (Attachment 1 to this letter) regarding the relationship between the current Fast Track application and PC48.

The management of flood flows in PC48 noted that temporary attenuation of flood flows may need to be provided unless culverts, including the one under the KiwiRail tracks, were upsized. To date Auckland Council (Healthy Waters) has not been provided with flood modelling by either KiwiRail or SGA. As a consequence, we are unable to confirm whether attenuation is required or not to manage flood effects from the Project and development in PC48 and 49.

3. Given that there are a range of existing designations located in the Project site, clarify whether the application covers the full scope of notice of requirements, resource consents or changes to existing designations that would be required to authorise the Project.

As stated in the referral application, Watercare's approval under Section 177 of the Resource Management Act 1991 will be required to enable KiwiRail to undertake any work within the area of existing Designation 9566. Please refer to the detailed comments from Watercare (Attachment 2 to this letter) regarding the impacts on their designation.

It is not possible to conclude whether the full scope of notice of requirements, resource consents or changes to existing designations are covered in the application without viewing a more detailed Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) and project plans.

In particular, Auckland Council staff have not inspected the application sites and have not assessed the waterbodies identified in the application report. Careful consideration will need to be given to any streamworks and works within the vicinity of natural wetlands and assessment will be required under the AUP(OP) provisions, the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 and Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Freshwater) Regulations 2020.

4. What reports and assessments would normally be required by the council for a project of this nature in this area?

Without limitation, the following specialist reports and plans would typically be required:

- Overall Assessment of Environmental Effects.
- Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) report to assess activities with respect to the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011. A Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) report may then be required together with a Remedial Action Plan (RAP).
- Integrated Transport Assessment addressing the effects of on the transport network
- Infrastructure report and plans
- Water supply and wastewater scheme to service the site, including capacity calculations (if it is to be serviced – basic bathroom facilities would be expected)
- Outline plan of works plus additional information to support discharge consent and address E36 natural hazard provisions.
- Flood model, especially Drury Centre to identify impact of upstream catchment, if attenuation is needed and sizing.
- A full Stormwater Management Plan should be provided incorporating detail usually provided for a discharge consent application and including management of flood hazards.
- Ecological assessment of any streamworks and works within the vicinity of natural wetlands, including assessment against the relevant AUP(OP) provisions and assessment against the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Freshwater) Regulations 2020 and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020

- Geotechnical assessment report, including ground water measurement data and detail on the diversion of ground water
- Earthworks and sediment control report.
- Archaeological heritage assessment report.
- Arboricultural report
- Subdivision plans identifying public assets to be vested.
- Confirmation of stream width or where required an assessment of the esplanade reserve under s236 of the RMA (or alternative subdivision process).
- Landscape plans sufficiently detailed to properly assess any proposed assets in the streetscape, reserves to be vested, stormwater assets, and accessways, along with boundary treatment adjoining open space.
- Planting plans with a schedule of species to understand the extent of planting and mitigation provided.
- Provide details of any biodiversity offsetting/compensation where land is vested or to be vested in future.
- Landscape plans detailing the location and extent of offset planting, sufficiently detailed to properly assess any proposed assets and maintenance requirements.
- Assessments of construction effects including noise, vibration, dust and traffic. Duration of construction effects would be an important consideration.

5. Does the applicant have any environmental regulatory compliance history in your city/region?

No major compliance issues identified.

6. Given the Project comprises part of the broader Te Tupu Ngātahi Supporting Growth Programme and mana whenua is one of the project partners, please provide comment (including any input from Independent Māori Statutory Board, if appropriate) on opportunities this Project may offer for mana whenua, or any other matter relating to mana whenua interests that may be of relevance to the referral decision.

We were not able to obtain a response to this question. We request that the applicant continues to engage via the Te Tupu Ngātahi Supporting Growth Programme.

Yours faithfully

Ian Smallburn
General Manager – Resource Consents

Attachments: Asset Owner / Specialist Responses

1. Transport – Auckland Transport
2. Water and Wastewater – Watercare Services Limited
3. Stormwater – Auckland Council Healthy Waters
4. Parks – Auckland Council Parks Planning

Attachments: Elected Member Responses

- 5.1 Local Board
- 5.2 Local Ward Councillor
- 5.3 Planning Committee Chair

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: Tessa Craig, Major Developments Interface Lead, Auckland Transport

Date: Thursday 17th June 2021

Overall Summary:

Auckland Transport (AT) is supportive of the stations being accepted for fast track consenting. The Projects are considered to help to achieve the purpose of the Act particularly by contributing to a well-functioning urban environment (19 (d) (iii)), providing infrastructure in order to improve environmental outcomes (19(d)(iv) and contributing to efforts to mitigate climate change (19(d)(vii) by providing public transport.

KiwiRail is the applicant for the Projects; however, the stations comprise part of the broader Te Tupu Ngātahi Supporting Growth Programme of works, which is a collaboration between Auckland Transport, Waka Kotahi and its project partners (KiwiRail, Auckland Council and Mana whenua). AT is therefore working with KiwiRail to deliver these stations.

It is noted that MfE have asked for clarity from Auckland Council on the relevance of Private Plan Change 48 to the Project. AT make the following comments in relation to this matter:

Private Plan Change 48 (PPC 48) proposes to rezone 95 ha of Future Urban Zone land into Business Use – Metropolitan Centre; Business – Mixed Use; and Open Space - Informal Recreation land use zones. The intention of the Drury Centre Precinct proposed under PPC 48, as notified, is to provide for the development of a new, comprehensively planned and transit-oriented centre at Drury that supports a quality compact urban form. PPC 48 seeks to achieve this by prioritising access to and within the centre by public and active modes and integrating rail, bus, pedestrian and cycle networks to connect key destinations. The precinct also provides for the highest employment-generating activities around the future Drury Central train station. Overall, PPC48 is reliant on a number of transport network improvements being delivered, including the subject Drury Central Station.

PPC 48, as notified, proposes a Sub-Precinct D which includes a train station and associated Park and Ride and transport interchange. However, the location of the proposed Drury Central Station in PPC 48 is different from that proposed in the subject fast track application. The Applicant is aware of such difference and have subsequently submitted a revised set of precinct provisions which included the removal of the Drury Central Station and associated facilities from their Precinct Plan, as well as other amendments to the precinct provisions associated with this change.

In AT's opinion, the difference in station location anticipated between the fast track application and PPC 48 will not affect PPC 48 in achieving its planning intention as connections between the future Drury Central Station and PPC 48 precinct area could still be achieved, which will be subject to ongoing discussion between AT and the Applicant.

Nevertheless, the proposed urbanisation of Drury that would be enabled by the plan change requires bringing forward the provision, including funding and delivery, of transport infrastructure and services of which the Drury Central Train Station will form a significant part. It should be noted that AT have made submissions on PPC 48 setting out the transport upgrades and connections (other than the Drury Central Station) that are required to support the plan changes. AT's position on PPC 48 is that Council should decline the plan change application, unless the concerns raised in its submission are appropriately addressed and resolved.

In addition, AT have also provided MfE comment on the fast track for Drury Centre. Auckland Transport does not support the Drury Centre Project being accepted for fast track consenting. Drury Centre is already subject to the private plan change process (PPC 48) under the Resource Management Act 1991 with a hearing commencing in July. It is considered more appropriate for the Project to proceed through existing RMA private plan change processes rather than the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020.

Released under the provisions of
the Official Information Act 1982

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: *Tim Barry – Infrastructure Interface – Watercare Services Limited*

Date: 17th June 2021

Overall Summary:

Watercare Services Ltd. (WSL) has conveyed to Kiwi Rail (KR), the Supporting Growth Alliance (SGA), and private developers including plan change 48 in writing, in workshops and verbally the critical importance of the Waikato No.1 Pipeline and Flanagan Road Water and Wastewater Pump Stations.

The overlapping Watercare Services Limited (WSL) designation at the Drury Central Station is for the Waikato No.1 Pipeline. This pipeline is a critical component of Auckland's water resilience, as the single conveyance asset for all the water that is sourced from the Waikato River. The Waikato River water source plays a crucial role in supplying water to Auckland and offsetting the storage water in Auckland's reservoirs. The water through this pipeline is around 40% of the net use in Auckland and the pipeline is being boosted to increase that capacity even more. It is critical for maintaining serviceability to Auckland.

The pipeline design ensures that for most of its length it is accessible to repair crews, using conventional equipment within a tight response time to maintain this necessary level of service. The route has this designation to ensure this access is maintained.

In a handful of circumstances, the Waikato No.1 pipeline crosses other critical obstacles along its route, for example at the track crossing at Drury Central, or SH1. In these cases, Watercare has purposely minimised the effective lengths of those sections and reinforced the steel pipeline within a grouted conduit.

Watercare does not support having a constructed rail platform/s directly above the Waikato No.1 pipeline or restricting vehicular access to either side of the crossing point. Should there be a failure we would not be able to access and repair, and this would be against the design and operational philosophy of the pipeline where we aim for unrestricted access 24/7. In practice this means being able to quickly deploy conventional tracked excavation and lifting equipment to work a solution.

If the Drury Central train station is located at a southern location to Waihoehoe Bridge this could impact this access and effectively diminish the access resilience that has been designed in from the outset. This is not supported by Watercare

Other considerations for Drury Central Station design are:

- Watercare assets are to be located and condition assessed prior to construction
- The station platforms have been moved Nth of the Waikato #1 pipe at WSL's request – this is no longer a design constraint for the Station and The Waikato No.1 Pipeline is not compromised.

- Watercare accepts that increasing the width of the rail crossing will increase the length of pipeline within the rail corridor and KiwiRail or contractors appointed will work with Watercare on a methodology to protect this section of pipe to an equivalent level as the existing section.
- The same statutory protections for any new WSL asset will also be applied.
- KiwiRail or contractors appointed will also work with Watercare to develop a methodology to minimise service impacts on the active pipeline during construction works near to or involving the active pipeline.
- Watercare considered the Drury Central station location is 'set' and no longer negotiable – efforts are now focused on the connections with other stakeholders respecting this design condition.
- The designation that is being applied for includes a small section of WSL land at the WSL northern extremity - this is being considered for a future platform when the rail width is widened– this use has not been opposed by WSL provided WSL is to be consulted on this subject.
- Interest was also expressed for the potential temporary use of WSL land south of the pump stations for construction staging work

The Flanagan Road Pump Stations (water and Wastewater) are also important assets to Watercare and access to these facilities and access to buried services attached are to be maintained.

Specific questions/suggestions on the application

1. Are there any reasons that you consider it more appropriate for the project, or part of the Project, to proceed through existing Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) consenting processes rather than the processes in the FTCA?

Watercare does not have a view on this question.

2. Clarify the relevance of Private Plan Change 48 to the Project.

Kiwi Property has views on the location of the rail station, and the design of the future access on the eastern end of the rail station. Watercare has been working with KiwiRail and Kiwi Property to ensure that the proposals do not adversely affect Watercare assets.

3. Given that there are a range of existing designations located in the Project site, clarify whether the application covers the full scope of notice of requirements, resource consents or changes to existing designations that would be required to authorise the Project.

There are potential overlaps with the Watercare designation and land holdings that will need to be worked through related to then Waikato No.1, the pump stations (water and

wastewater) and land holdings that WSL has at the Drury Central site. Where the plans for the train station can impact existing designations, such as the corridor width increase, Watercare's designation needs to be increased as well. Access to WSL assets including buried assets needs to be also brought into the design function and protected. Areas of land that are surplus to WSL needs and usable for the station need to work with WSL property team.

4. What reports and assessments would normally be required by the council for a project of this nature in this area?

There would need to be confirmation that Watercare agrees with the design and that it does not impact Watercare assets and/or Watercare accepts the proposal.

5. Does the applicant have any environmental regulatory compliance history in your city/region?

Watercare does not have any comments on this question.

6. Given the Project comprises part of the broader Te Tupu Ngātahi Supporting Growth Programme and mana whenua is one of the project partners, please provide comment (including any input from Independent Māori Statutory Board, if appropriate) on opportunities this Project may offer for mana whenua, or any other matter relating to mana whenua interests that may be of relevance to the referral decision.

Watercare does not have any comments on this question.

Paerata Station Site

With reference to the Paerata Train Station site – there are no existing assets from Watercare's perspective that would be impacted by the development. But Watercare has an interest in servicing any new stations and urban developments in the vicinity and cannot comment on this without clearer strategic plans for the area.

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: Paula Vincent, Principal Planning, Healthy Waters
Danny Curtis, Principal Catchment Manager, Healthy Waters

Date: 16 June 2021

Overall Summary:

- Key concern is lack of integration with surrounding development, particularly PC48 and 49 and lack of detail on how effects will be managed and what assessments have been done to support that approach.
- Downstream flood impacts will also be impacted by the redevelopment of Norrie Road as part of the arterial upgrades. This upgrade is currently part of the arterial route designations being progressed by Supporting Growth Alliance. This needs to be factored into the management of flood flows and staging of development of the train station and supporting infrastructure.
- Discharge consents are mentioned in the application letter as being required in part of the documentation but not listed as a consent being sought under the AUP in Table 3.5. Most of the consents being sought relate to land use and construction activities for Stage 1 yet some stormwater infrastructure will need to be built during Stage 1 construction and will immediately create stormwater and flooding effects. Need to clarify location and type of stormwater infrastructure proposed and when a discharge consent will be sought.
- Lack of clarity on what is being proposed to manage flooding and/or provide attenuation at Drury Central station. On the schematic appended to Letter – Responding to Request for further information there is a stormwater management area shown. For both rail stations this is noted in the Full Application document as providing for stormwater quality treatment once the rail station is operational and potentially used for erosion and sediment control during construction. No indicative location of flood attenuation or sizing has been provided and it is unclear if the designation and Project provides for this.
- PC49 also drains towards the upstream catchment of the Project area and should be acknowledged.
- The section below from the full application document appears counter intuitive and at odds with previous discussions. This is important and needs to be clarified.
- At Drury Central Station, the natural hazard effects of Hingaia Stream mainstream flooding have been limited by retaining the existing barrel culvert under the rail line which acts to reduce backflow up into the tributary and deal to the flooding in the tributary by ensuring sufficient detention storage and the use of attenuation for annual recurrence interval (ARI) 10 and ARI 50 floods in an off line stormwater wetland with the ARI 100 flood bundled from the stream floods.

Specific questions/suggestions on the application

1. Are there any reasons that you consider it more appropriate for the project, or part of the Project, to proceed through existing Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) consenting processes rather than the processes in the FTCA?

- Unclear what the benefit is of progressing through the FastTrack process for the designation, especially if funding for specific stages is unclear.

2. Clarify the relevance of Private Plan Change 48 to the Project.

- Part of the project, including the interchange and carpark and stormwater area is within Plan Change 48. The management of flood flows in PC48 noted that temporary attenuation of flood flows may need to be provided unless culverts, including the one under KiwiRail, were upsized. To date Auckland Council Healthy Waters has not been provided with flood modelling by either KiwiRail or SGA. As a consequence we are unable to confirm whether attenuation is required or not to manage flood effects from the Project and development in PC48 and 49.

3) Given that there are a range of existing designations located in the Project site, clarify whether the application covers the full scope of notice of requirements, resource consents or changes to existing designations that would be required to authorise the Project.

- Would need a discharge consent under chapter E8 of the AUP in addition to other consents listed.

4. What reports and assessments would normally be required by the council for a project of this nature in this area?

- Outline plan of works plus additional information to support discharge consent and address E36 natural hazard provisions.
- Need a freshwater ecologist to confirm presence of natural wetland at Paerata station and then detail to support any application for discharge of water into the wetland.
- Need flood model, especially Drury Centre to identify impact of upstream catchment, if attenuation is needed and sizing.
- A full Stormwater Management Plan should be provided incorporating detail usually provided for a discharge consent application and including management of flood hazards.

5. Does the applicant have any environmental regulatory compliance history in your city/region?

- NA

6. Given the Project comprises part of the broader Te Tupu Ngātahi Supporting Growth Programme and mana whenua is one of the project partners, please provide comment (including any input from Independent Māori Statutory Board, if appropriate) on opportunities this Project may offer for mana whenua, or any other matter relating to mana whenua interests that may be of relevance to the referral decision.

- NA

Parks Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: Hester Gerber, Parks Planning Team Leader

Date: 16.06.2021

Overall Summary:

Background information:

The Drury Central station site is within the Plan Change area for PPC48, for which Parks, Sport and Recreation have provided s42a reporting.

Key Issues from a Parks Planning Perspective

A key issue with the project going through the COVID-19 Recovery Act 2020 fast track consenting process is the potential for Auckland Council to inherit parks and open space assets where they have not had the opportunity to assess and comment on prior to receiving them. There is a risk that the vested assets Council may inherit are not to the same standard or consistent with those assets which go through the normal plan change, resource consent and engineering plan approval process, resulting in a financial burden not anticipated.

Parks Planning information, reports, and assessment requirements:

- a) subdivision plans identifying public assets to be vested.
- b) confirmation of stream width or where required an assessment of the esplanade reserve under s236 of the RMA.
- c) landscape plans sufficiently detailed to properly assess any proposed assets in the streetscape, reserves to be vested, stormwater assets, and accessways, along with boundary treatment adjoining open space.
- d) planting plans with a schedule of species to understand the extent of planting and mitigation provided.
- e) provide details of any biodiversity offsetting/compensation where land is vested or to be vested in future.
- f) landscape plans detailing the location and extent of offset planting, sufficiently detailed to properly assess any proposed assets and maintenance requirements.

This would provide Council with the means to determine factors such as:

- Whether streams within the site meet the requirements under s230 of the RMA so an assessment can be made whether esplanade reserve is triggered in accordance with the Act and Rule E39.4.1(A5) of the AUP.
- Whether stream reclamation works will impact the greenways network.
- Whether streetscape planting is appropriate. Council has significant experience in this area as an asset owner and promotes the Auckland Council Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy, species which provide attractive streetscapes including species which are also suitable from a maintenance perspective and are practical in their chosen location e.g. will not hinder the sight lines of drivers or reduce usability of footpaths over time.
- Whether any aspects of the design would require the approval of the Local Board or Governing Body to accept any proposed assets as delegated decision makers.
- Whether access ways to parks and reserves are suitable from a crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) perspective. This includes assessing building orientation and fencing on properties adjoining parks and park accessways to ensure appropriate passive surveillance over these areas is provided.
- Accessway widths and gradients are also important for the safe movement of walkers and cyclists.
- Whether the interfaces between the development and any proposed open space are appropriate.

- Hard assets such as stormwater outfalls or retaining walls are designed and located where they do not reduce the amenity of the parks and reserves or impact future greenways.
- Whether any infrastructure or structures associated with the development will impact on the purpose and usability of open spaces proposed.
- Whether Parks and Community Facilities have the budget to maintain proposed open space assets.
- That, any biodiversity offsetting/compensation works required are not placing any burden on Council in terms of its ongoing maintenance on behalf of the developer and as provided under s239(1) will avoid encumbrances being placed on future land to be vested.
- Whether option A or B for each site provide greater access, interface and links to open space.

Acquisition of land

Should public open space be proposed to be vested, the Land Advisory team would undertake an assessment of the acquisition of such land. A decision on whether to acquire any proposed reserve would be made by the relevant Local Board and Council's Governing Body. Furthermore, Healthy Waters would normally decide whether to accept drainage reserves as assets, including stormwater ponds. It is pointed out that there is no requirement that Auckland Council is to accept any reserves proposed through a development proposal.

Biodiversity offsetting/compensation

Should biodiversity offsetting/compensation be required as part of the works proposed, parks would request these not to be on reserves to be vested in Council. It is considered that the ongoing maintenance of this should be for the developer and not to be transferred. Here covenants will need to be avoided which would require encumbrances being imposed on vested land and adjacent lot owners (3rd Parties) to maintain these works on public land. Please note that there is no requirement for Auckland Council to accept these works as an asset.

Overall position of Parks Planning

Overall, it is considered that measures will need to be put in place under the COVID-19 Recovery Act 2020 fast track consenting process to ensure Council is able to provide sufficient input to decisions around the management of or acceptance of vested assets. This is to ensure public open spaces are safe and appropriately managed and any assets Council receives are to the normal standard and consistent with those that have gone through a normal resource consent process.

Conclusion

Should the EPA decide to allow the development to go through the Covid-19 Fast Tack process, it is recommended that the proposal address all information requirements from a Parks perspective supplemented by a suitable assessment for the matters of concern. The applicant should also be made aware of any political decisions that are required for proposed vested assets (land acquisition, easements etc.) which may impact on the delivery of the project.

Prepared by:



Ashleigh Richards

Senior Parks Planner - Parks, Sports and Recreation

Parks Agency Lead:



Hester Gerber

Parks Planning Team Leader - Parks, Sports and Recreation

Drury Central and Paerata Stations Fast Track Referral Request Council and Local Board Comments

From: Andrew Baker (Franklin Local Board) <[REDACTED] s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 16 June 2021 1:04 PM
To: Bernie Warmington <[REDACTED] s 9(2)(a)>
Cc: Councillor Bill Cashmore <[REDACTED] s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Kiwirail Drury Central and Paerata Stations - Comments sought by Friday 18/6/21 - COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-Track Consenting) Act 2020

Hi Bernie

Thanks for request.

In regard to the application, the LB has no reasons to oppose the fast tracking application and our previously submitted feedback to the SG team stands.

We are comfortable with the Drury West station timing being pushed out as there is still some debate required in regard to location and thus we prefer we have those discussions so we get the best result.

For Paerata and Drury Central the provision of sufficient park and ride capacity that reflects the importance these stations will have for the surrounding rural areas and settlements where commuters reside in increasing numbers and have no public transport currently or planned. Lessons from high demand park and ride facilities in places like Albany must be heeded and up front investment for these stations must be committed to. Both stations should include within the design areas for drop off from private vehicles (kiss and ride).

In regard to development around the Drury Central station, there is obviously a timing issue with this development likely to be well ahead of that of the current adjacent owner (Kiwi Property) hence there must be some arrangement for parking as well as appropriate vehicle and cycle / walking access to the station so that it does not become an isolated and difficult to access "island" until private development occurs.

Consideration as to possible negative impact on the existing Drury village and parking in area like Tui Street needs to be considered as does the intersection of Flanagan Rd and Waihoehoe Road. Both intersections with Waihoehoe are poorly constructed in terms of sight lines from side roads.

Both stations should have significant effective cycle storage facilities as both service relatively flat and cycle friendly areas within several kilometres.

As both stations will be starting point for mostly long journeys, capacity for likes of a coffee / food vendor should be factored into the design as well as public toilets.

Regards

Andy

Andy Baker
Chair
Franklin Local Board
Mobile: [REDACTED] s 9(2)(a)

Email: [redacted] s 9(2)(a)
Auckland Council, 82 Manukau Road, Pukekohe 2120
Visit our website: aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

From: Councillor Bill Cashmore <[redacted] s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Wednesday, 16 June 2021 2:10 PM
To: Bernie Warmington <[redacted] s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: RE: Kiwirail Drury Central and Paerata Stations - Comments sought by Friday 18/6/21 - COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-Track Consenting) Act 2020

Hi Bernie. I concur with FLB's submission.

Bill Cashmore
Deputy Mayor | Franklin Ward Councillor
[redacted] s 9(2)(a)
135 Albert Street, Auckland Council

From: Councillor Chris Darby <[redacted] s 9(2)(a)>
Sent: Monday, 14 June 2021 3:40 PM
To: Bernie Warmington <[redacted] s 9(2)(a)>
Subject: Re: Kiwirail Drury Central and Paerata Stations - Comments sought by Friday 18/6/21 - COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-Track Consenting) Act 2020

Kia ora Bernie

I'm generally supportive of this going forward.

cD

Chris Darby
Auckland Councillor | North Shore ward
Chair | Planning Committee

p. [redacted] s 9(2)(a)
e. [redacted] s 9(2)(a)
w. www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Taylor Farrell
Advisor to Councillor Darby

e. [redacted] s 9(2)(a)
p. [redacted] s 9(2)(a)

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Comments on applications for referral under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020

This form is for persons requested by the Minister for the Environment to provide comments on an application to refer a project to an expert consenting panel under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020.

Organisation providing comment	Auckland Transport
Contact person (if follow-up is required)	Tessa Craig
	s 9(2)(a)
	s 9(2)(a)

Comment form

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

Project name	Drury Central and Paerata Stations
General comment	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the referral of Drury Central and Paerata Stations for consideration under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 (FTCA). Auckland Transport supports the stations being accepted for fast track consenting. The Projects are considered to help to achieve the purpose of the Act particularly by contributing to a well-functioning urban environment (19 (d) (iii)), providing infrastructure in order to improve environmental outcomes (19(d)(iv) and contributing to efforts to mitigate climate change (19(d)(vii) by providing public transport and supporting mode shift away from private vehicles.</p>
Other considerations	<p>Click or tap here to provide any information you consider relevant to the Minister's decision on whether to refer the project to an expert consenting panel.</p>
[Insert specific requests for comment]	<p>The following specific questions have been asked by MfE, and the responses are provided below.</p> <p>1. Clarify Auckland Transport's position regarding works and upgrades proposed in this application on Auckland's transport network.</p> <p>Auckland Transport (AT) has been consulted on the Works and supports the application being accepted for fast track consenting. KiwiRail is the applicant for the Projects; however, the stations comprise part of the broader Te Tupu Ngātahi Supporting Growth Programme of works, which is a collaboration between Auckland Transport, Waka Kotahi and its project partners (KiwiRail, Auckland Council and Mana whenua).</p> <p>Te Tupu Ngātahi Supporting Growth Alliance has identified the preferred transport network needed to enable the growth envisaged for this area in the Drury-Opaheke Structure Plan, adopted by Auckland Council in August 2019. The stations are a key component of this, along with supporting/complementary infrastructure.</p> <p>2. What are the outcomes of discussions undertaken with the applicant regarding the likely approvals required to carry out works and upgrades on Auckland Transport's road network?</p> <p>KiwiRail are aware of requirements for approvals to work on or within the road corridor, and will follow any Auckland Transport approval processes.</p> <p>3. Clarify whether any land/property agreement with the applicant be required pursuant to the Public Works Act 1981 or others. If yes, what is the likely timing of reaching to an agreement and getting Auckland Transport's approval, if required?</p>

	AT is supporting KiwiRail to obtain designation and consents through the Te Tupu Ngātahi Supporting Growth Programme. There are no issues envisaged with granting of approvals or reaching agreement in relation to existing AT assets or designations.
--	---

Note: All comments, including your name and contact details, will be made available to the public and the applicant either in response to an Official Information Act request or as part of the Ministry's proactive release of information. Please advise if you object to the release of any information contained in your comments, including your name and contact details. You have the right to request access to or to correct any personal information you supply to the Ministry.

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Comments on applications for referral under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020

This form is for persons requested by the Minister for the Environment to provide comments on an application to refer a project to an expert consenting panel under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020.

Organisation providing comment	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)
Contact person (if follow-up is required)	Sonya McCall
	s 9(2)(a)
	s 9(2)(a)

Comment form

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

Project name	Drury Central & Paerata Stations
General comment	Waka Kotahi is working closely with KiwiRail on both proposed stations. Waka Kotahi is comfortable with the proposal subject to detailed design and safety audits
Other considerations	N/A
[Insert specific requests for comment]	<p>Specific questions asked of Waka Kotahi in the Minister's letter dated 09 June 2021 are addressed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify Waka Kotahi's position regarding overlapping designations at the intersection of the proposed Paerata Station accessway and State Highway 22. <i>Waka Kotahi have been involved in workshops and discussions specifically with regard to this aspect of the proposal. Waka Kotahi support the approach proposed by KiwiRail.</i> What are the outcomes of discussions undertaken with the applicant regarding the likely approvals required under section 177 of the Resource Management Act 1991? In particular, please clarify the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the likely timing of reaching to an agreement and getting Waka Kotahi's approval? <i>S177 approval would come at the detailed design phase. Waka Kotahi will continue to work with KiwiRail to ensure a timely response.</i> What is Waka Kotahi's understanding of who has responsibility for the transferred designations and assets within these designations in the post construction/delivery phase? <i>Waka Kotahi understands that no formal discussions have taken place to date in this regard, although we have signalled that these conversations still need to be had. Given our involvement in this work to date we are comfortable that this issue can be resolved with Kiwirail prior to construction commencing.</i> Clarify whether any land/property agreement with the applicant be required pursuant to the Public Works Act 1981. If yes, what is the likely timing of reaching to an agreement? <i>Waka Kotahi-owned land is not required for the proposed works.</i>

--	--

Note: All comments, including your name and contact details, will be made available to the public and the applicant either in response to an Official Information Act request or as part of the Ministry's proactive release of information. Please advise if you object to the release of any information contained in your comments, including your name and contact details. You have the right to request access to or to correct any personal information you supply to the Ministry.

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Comments on applications for referral under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020

This form is for persons requested by the Minister for the Environment to provide comments on an application to refer a project to an expert consenting panel under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020.

Organisation providing comment	Watercare Services Limited
Contact person (if follow-up is required)	Tim Barry
	Infrastructure Interface
	s 9(2)(a)

Comment form

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

Project name	Drury Central and Paerata Stations
General comment	The nature of Watercare's key infrastructure in the Drury Central Train Station as described in our responses below are critical and the Station design cannot interfere with Watercare infrastructure or limit access.
Other considerations	Click or tap here to provide any information you consider relevant to the Minister's decision on whether to refer the project to an expert consenting panel.
[Insert specific requests for comment]	<p>We respond to the specific questions set out in the letter to Watercare dated 9 June 2021 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clarify Watercare's position regarding overlapping designations with Drury Central Station's indicative footprint. <p>The overlapping Watercare Services Limited (WSL) designation at the Drury Central Stations indicative footprint relates to the designation over WSL Land. The proposed station designation area intersects the northern tip of WSL Designation 9566. Subject to the confirmation that the proposed designation is outside the existing site access to the Flanagan Road pump stations and is over land that will not be utilised by WSL, WSL has, in principle, no objections to entering into an agreement of the transfer and use of this un-utilised land for Drury Central Train Station purposes in the future.</p> <p>The newly constructed Drury South wastewater pipe is also partially within the indicative Drury Central Train Station designation and will need to be operated and maintained. Watercare will need to have unfettered access to this infrastructure.</p> <p>The Waikato No.1 Pipeline may be within the indicative station designation. This pipeline is critical to water resilience, as the single pipeline for water sourced from the Waikato River.</p>

This importance highlighted by the 2020/21 drought, accounting for around 40% of the Auckland supply and being further boosted to increase that capacity.

The pipeline design ensures accessibility for repair crews, using conventional equipment within a tight response time. The route is protected to ensure this access is maintained.

In a handful of circumstances, the pipeline crosses other critical obstacles, for example, at the track crossing at Drury Central, or SH1. In these cases, Watercare has purposely minimised the effective lengths of those sections and reinforced the steel pipeline within a grouted conduit.

2. What are the outcomes of discussions undertaken with the applicant regarding the likely approvals required under section 177 of the Resource Management Act 1991? Please clarify the following information:

WSL has conveyed to Kiwi Rail (KR), the Supporting Growth Alliance (SGA), and private developers in the area in writing, in workshops, and verbally the critical importance of the Waikato No.1 Pipeline and Flanagan Road Pump Stations.

Watercare does not support having a constructed rail platform/s directly above our pipeline or restricting vehicular access to either side of the crossing point.

Should there be a failure, WSL requires unrestricted access 24/7?

If the Drury Central Train Station platform is located at a southern extremity, this could impact the access resilience to the pipeline. This is not supported by Watercare.

Other considerations for Drury Central Station design:

- The station platforms have been moved North of the Waikato No.1 pipe at WSL's request.
- Watercare accepts that increasing the width of the rail crossing will increase the length of pipeline within the rail corridor and KiwiRail or contractors appointed will work with Watercare on a methodology to protect this section of pipe to an equivalent level as the existing section.
- The same statutory protections for any new WSL asset should be applied for this crossing.
- KiwiRail or contractors appointed should work with Watercare to develop a methodology to minimise service impacts on the active pipeline during construction works near to or involving the active pipeline.
- Watercare considers the Drury Central station location as 'set' and is no longer negotiable – efforts are now focused on the connections with other stakeholders respecting this design condition.

-
- Interest was also expressed for the potential temporary use of WSL land south of the pump stations for construction staging work.

- What is the likely timing of reaching to an agreement and getting Watercare's approval?

Provided the existing conditions agreed are adhered to, approvals can be expected within normal timeframes.

- What is Watercare's understanding of who has responsibility for the transferred designation and assets within the designation in the post construction/delivery phase?

Watercare's expectations are that the statutory protections are returned and expanded (under the extended rail width) to be the equivalent to the protections enjoyed today.

3. Clarify whether any land/property agreement with the applicant be required pursuant to the Public Works Act 1981 or others. If yes, what is the likely timing of reaching to an agreement?

If mutually agreed land agreements are required with WSL, the process will follow a land valuation, compensation, and transfer process. An indicative timing on such an agreement could be 6 weeks. If WSL deems land to be required for future water infrastructure or access, WSL will retain that ownership.

Note: All comments, including your name and contact details, will be made available to the public and the applicant either in response to an Official Information Act request or as part of the Ministry's proactive release of information. Please advise if you object to the release of any information contained in your comments, including your name and contact details. You have the right to request access to or to correct any personal information you supply to the Ministry.

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982