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) | Elmira Vatani                 |
|   | Principal Development Planner |
|   | s 9(2)(a)                     |

## **Comment form**

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

| Project name                              | Great South home Park   |
|---|---|
| General comment                           | The roading layout is acceptable in principal as it is consistent with the Precinct<br>Plan within the Auckland Unitary Plan, but the scale of the proposed dwellings and<br>proposed provision for retail are not consistent with the anticipated development<br>under the precinct plan. Further information is required to fully understand the<br>effects of this proposal and an Integrated Transport Assessment should be<br>provided to support an application should this project be accepted for the Fast<br>Track consenting process. |
|   | Auckland Transport requests that, should the project be accepted for fast-track consenting, the requirement for an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) is formally stated in the referral order to accompany any resource consent application for the Project lodged with the Environmental Protection Authority. Auckland Transport would also request the referral order specifically identifies Auckland Transport as a party which the Expert Consenting panel must invite comments from.   |
|   | AT is neutral as to whether this project is considered under the COVID 19 FastTrack process. It is understood a superlot subdivision is also lodged with Council.   |
|   | Since the Gatland Road Precinct Plan is operative the proposed development can<br>be assessed under the normal Council's resource consent process. The benefits of<br>assessing this application under the Fast-Track Act are unclear.  |
| Other considerations                      | -   |
| [Insert specific requests for<br>comment] | -   |

### **Summary of Gatland Road Precinct**

The subject site is within the Gatland Road Precinct where 200 dwellings is anticipated as a result of the plan change 58. However, the maximum yield restriction from the precinct is proposed to be removed under the Plan Change 78 (PC78). The plan change 78 is proposed to respond to the government's National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and requirements of the Resource Management Act. Development within this precinct is envisaged to provide both Residential Mixed Housing Urban and Business Neighbourhood Centre. The southwest corner of the subject site is zoned Business Neighbourhood Centre under the PC78 vs the operative Gatland Road Precinct only requires the development to deliver both residential. The development is required to provide a safe and integrated transport network with the emphasis on walking, cycling and public transport. Therefore, the following transport infrastructure are included under the objectives and policies of the precinct plan:

- East- West connection within the subject site to ensure the neighbouring site to the east which is zoned Future Urban Zone will connect to Great South Road,
- Improvement of Great South Road and Gatland Road frontages,
- North-South connection within the subject site to connect to Gatland Road,
- Widening Great South Road to accommodate active mode facilities and strategic network.

### **Transport Matters**

Great South Road is an arterial road with a posted speed limit of 50km/hr. As shown on the Auckland Transport's GIS Road and Street Framework map<sup>1</sup>, Great South Road is currently classified as a Place 1 and Movement 3 typology under the Road and Street Framework, and it will remain the same in the future. It means Great South Road has a high Strategic significance role with higher volume of users and predominantly local function with a small catchment of users. Great South Road is therefore required to be upgraded with a cycle lane, footpath and underground services with streetlights along the subject site's frontage.

The proposal includes 338 dwellings with retail which exceeds the maximum yield of 200 dwellings under the precinct plan and is not consistent with provisions already approved on the basis of an Integrated Transport Assessment for the plan change 58. Therefore, if the project is accepted for the process under the Fast-Track Act, a full Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) should be provided to recognise the additional intensification and ensure sufficient transport infrastructure is available to accommodate the trip generation from the proposed 334 dwellings and retail activities. The main objective of an ITA is to ensure that the potential adverse transport effects of a development proposal are well considered and addressed with particular consideration of accessibility to and from the development as well as safety and efficiency effects. Auckland Transport requests the following matters form part of an ITA:

- Assess the need for public transport provision including looking at infrastructure such as the quality of the bus stop facilities and access to them,
- An assessment of potential adverse effects on the efficient operation of the surrounding transport network and how these effects will be avoided, remedied or mitigated. There should be particular emphasis on Park Estate Road / Great South Road intersection including mitigation measure if required,
- SIDRA modelling and assessment are required to determine why the intersection of Gatland Road/ Great South Road needs to be signalised,
- An assessment is required to determine the type of intersection treatment of Great South Road / Gatland Road,
- Assessment against the objectives and policies of the AUP as they relate to transport,
- An assessment of bicycle parking requirements for the residential lots,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Here is a link to Road and Street Framework Movement and Place viewer: https://mahere.at.govt.nz/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=54dd86040df541d3be87f7afba42b847

A plan is required to demonstrate the proposed signalised intersection can be installed with the consideration of bus priority and cycle lane facilities and the existing bus stops on Great South Road. The applicant is responsible to ensure sufficient land is available for the upgrade of the intersection and future proofing of the corridor.

The proposed signalised intersection of Great South Road / Gatland Road will provide safe access for pedestrian and cyclists to the retails but no pedestrian crossing facilities are provided from the active mode link (east-west) proposed towards north as the majority of residential amenities including school, shops and church are located on the other side of Great South Road to the north-west of the subject site.

The proposed road layout is consistent with the precinct plan, and the east- west road can be extended in the future to connect the neighbouring site which is zoned Future Urban Zone to Great South Road. Internal road should provide a local cycling connection by providing a traffic calming to achieve a 30km/h environment.

The "Amenity Link" which is the east-west connection does not have the central median. This is acceptable from AT's point of view as long as the over land flow path can be managed safely.

The small area of the subject site is proposed to be developed for retail. There is a concern about the scale of the Business activities. The material submitted with this application does not demonstrate the proposed retail scale meets the local convenience needs of the residents within the subject site and surrounding developments, and providing community access to goods and provides opportunity for social interaction as anticipated under the precinct plan.

### **Stormwater Matters**

There is a significant overland flow path (OLFP) entering the site, and it appears this will be directed through the proposed public roads. It will therefore have potential adverse effects on road users including pedestrians. It is required to demonstrate the OLFP can be managed safely in accordance with SWCoP (section 4.3.5.6) and the Road Drainage chapter of the Auckland Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision.

Given scale of the development and the floodplain downstream, a flood risk assessment that clearly demonstrates how adverse effects on public safety and property are to be avoided or mitigated, by way of a suitable Hazard Assessment in line with Section E36.9 of the AUP will need to be submitted alongside a Stormwater Management Plan.

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

| Local authority providing<br>comment      | Auckland Council |
|---|------------------|
| Contact person (if follow-up is required) | Romel Layco      |
|   | Senior Planner   |
|   | s 9(2)(a)        |

## **Comment form**

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

| Project name                            | Great South Homes Park Project  |
|---|---|
| General comment –<br>potential benefits | there will be new residential units/lots that will be added to the housing stock in the area close to public amenities and the proposal is essentially utilising the land resource available  |
| General comment –<br>significant issues | From a planning perspective, the proposal is not contrary to the high-level policy framework prompted by the Auckland Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan. however, Council's Specialist have identified particular concerns about the overall design of the proposal:   |
|   | • In terms of Urban Design, significant changes are required in terms of layout and likely intensity of the proposed development. Further as limited detail exists on the design of the dwellings to be constructed these details need to be provided.  |
|   | • Healthy Waters requires sufficient details around stormwater management area in order to support the proposed development.  |
|   | • Water and Wastewater will be extended to and well beyond the boundaries of the property at the cost of the applicant.   |
|   | • Parks Consent has considered that the proposed recreation reserve meets the open space policy and could be acquired by Council outside the RMA process  |
|   | • The roading layout is acceptable in principle as it is consistent with the Precinct Plan within the Auckland Unitary Plan, but the scale of the proposed number of dwellings and proposed provision for retail are not consistent with the anticipated development under the precinct plan.                                       |
| Is Fast-track appropriate?              | Not at this instance as the proposal could be assessed under Council's normal resource consent process. It is noted that Council is currently processing an application for the subdivision of the site into 11 residential superlots subdivision.  |
| Environmental compliance<br>history     | There are no records on Council file that enforcement action has been taken against Unisport<br>Great South Limited, however, the Council's Monitoring and Compliance Team have dealings<br>with Opal Zhu regarding the lack of site management, street trees planting and maintenance of<br>the sites he has developed previously. |

| Reports and assessments<br>normally required  | Infrastructure/Engineering Report, Flooding Report, Geotechnical Report, Contamination Report,<br>Ecology Report, Traffic Report, Urban Design Assessment Report, SMP, Hydrology Mitigation<br>Report, AEE  |
|---|---|
| Iwi and iwi authorities   | The applicant has consulted with the relevant Iwi for which Ngati Tamaoho and Ngati Te Ata have confirmed their interests to the proposed development.  |
| Relationship agreements<br>under the RMA  | ΝΑ  |
| Insert responses to other<br>specific requests in the<br>Minister's letter (if<br>applicable) | Please note that the Council is currently processing a bundled application, BUN60406797, which was received on 8 August 2022 for bulk earthworks and vacant lot subdivision to create 11 residential superlots, one road, one local purpose (recreation) reserve, two local purpose (drainage) reserves and three road to road walkways to vest in Auckland Council. The proposal also includes the cancellation of CN8653861.20 under s221(3) of the RMA and surrendering of easement created under Transfer D525360.15 under s243(a) of the RMA. The applicant for this application is Unisport Great South Limited. The Minister is requesting clarification in terms of the cancellation /surrender of existing easements and consent notice. In terms of CN8653861.20, it could be cancelled if the subdivision consent is granted by the Council as the application includes the overland flowpath diversion to the road corridor which is considered acceptable by the Council. A consent notice condition will be included if the application if granted. With regards to the future application for building consent on the site making reference to Geotechnical Investigation Report dated 23/12/2003, this was imposed in accordance with the previous rural zoning requirement of the site. Since the site has now re-zoned to Residential – Mixed Housing Urban, this aspect of the consent notice could also be cancelled. |
|   | With regards to the surrender of easement, this could also be surrendered as the existing easements 'A', 'B', & 'C" will not be required following the granting of the subdivision consent. The proposal includes the vesting of a stormwater management pond that is accessible via public road and as such these easements are not required.  |
| Other considerations  | I have included the additional comments of the Council's specialists who provided comments previously.  |

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

| Local authority providing<br>comment      | Auckland Council                |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Contact person (if follow-up is required) | Chris Butler                    |
|   | Team Leader Urban Design Review |
|   | s 9(2)(a)                       |

## **Comment form**

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

| Project name      | Great South Homes Park Project  |
|-------------------|---|
| General comment – | The Urban Design Review Team has provided the following comments to the applicant previously:   |
|                   | 1) Site Context:  |
|                   | Neighbourhood centre zone site – who owns that/relationship of JOALs building to this site,<br>has it been tested? Confirmed this is owned by the applicant and we would encourage that<br>this site be incorporated into aa comprehensive development to ensure the outcomes on<br>this site are not undermined or impacted by the residential development |
|                   | Indicative walking / cycling link. We would question the benefit of this on the basis of its location and that it doesn't appear to have any contextual relevance. A superior outcome would likely be to incorporate this into the main spine road section  |
|                   | What's happening on GSR re. footpaths etc. 5m setback for road widening? Will need to show this context. A pedestrian crossing of GSR for access to PT, schools etc is strongly recommended.  |
|                   | Policy 2 of the precinct talks about 'future road connections to the east' – the proposal has a single connection over a boundary length of approximately 400m. I question the effectiveness of this arrangement to service the neighbouring sites as well as providing suitable permeability in breaking down what are very long blocks in some cases.     |
|                   | <ol> <li>Recommend a robust site and context analysis be undertaken to inform some of the key<br/>moves with respect to green spaces, movement, building intensity, topography, existing<br/>trees etc.</li> </ol>  |
|                   | 3) Topography– at least a 10m fall into the middle of the site. How is the subdivision design<br>responding to this? Retaining walls / level changes? Further information on this issue is<br>strongly recommended up front.  |

- 4) Appear to be a number of existing trees on site what efforts have been made to retain some of the more significant trees? Would strongly encourage a review of these and retention of key trees to contribute to site and context amenity
- 5) Existing pond/wetland. Interface to wetland has building on two frontages with a third unknown. Are we genuinely wanting to incorporate this as an amenity feature or not? SOLA design principles talk about activating and connecting the SW reserve as a public space while high level moves (SOLA) refer to future access opportunities which are difficult to visualize. This is a poor outcome where it is likely this feature would be surrounded on three sides by road. This outcome would not be supported. For open space the applicant should be aiming for road frontage on at least three sides.
- 6) How does the pump station fit in with that context how are we setting up this place to function how does the neighbouring site to the east respond to these edge conditions? Looks like another poor outcome.
- 7) Size of some blocks and car parking areas are of concern struggling to see benefits of RA's or body corps covering such a large expanse – including cost of open space provision based on the quality of the imagery illustrated by SOLA, but also the guardianship and ownership of such spaces, the sense of place, arrival and human / pedestrian scale environs. Dotting newly planted trees through these areas is not going to achieve desired outcomes. Reconsider block sizes, the extent and design of parking areas and hard/soft landscape response.
- 8) Response to existing development along northern boundary? The level of intensity will present an effective wall to this boundary which will be a very stark transition. The precinct description *envisages approximately 200 new dwellings* (we have 340) *comprising a mixture of attached and detached typologies*. I don't think there is a single detached dwelling in this entire proposal and when reviewing your plans I'm struggling to understand how the very separate and unique edge conditions (on all boundaries) have been considered and responded to in both the subdivision design and built form approach.
- At this stage I have not considered the typologies and their suitability for a given road section/location, levels of glazing along street frontages, variety of design and appearance etc.
- 10) In terms of the two road cross sections. What we are shown in the OZAC plans appears to be very different to what we are seeing in the SOLA Plans with a heavily treed boulevard running east-west through the centre of the site. The 16m wide road section which on the SOLA drawings shows indented parking bays, this does not appear possible / likely based on the OZAC plans we are seeing.
- 11) Based on the number of issues outlined and the scope for improvement, I am recommending this for referral to the Urban Design Panel.

Further to the above comments, the new scheme is marginally better and does cover off some of these aspects however the latest design is yet to be reviewed in detail. Further amendment is required, and it is also noted that the new landscape drawing set does not appear to include any street tree planting or planting/fencing responses for individual lots.

| Other considerations | Click or tap here to insert any other responses you consider relevant for the Minister to be aware |
|----------------------|--|
|                      | of.  |

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

| Local authority providing<br>comment      | Auckland Council          |
|---|---------------------------|
| Contact person (if follow-up is required) | Lea van Heerden (Lombard) |
|   | Senior Parks Planner      |
|   | s 9(2)(a)                 |

### **Comment form**

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

| Project name         | Great South Homes Park Project   |
|----------------------|--|
| General comment –    | Parks consent has provided their comments previously to the applicant.<br>During the pre-application number we worked closely with the applicant to secure the provision of that neighbourhood park.<br>The park meets the open space provision policy and is a requirement under the NPSUD to secure adequate open space for future communities in a way council can acquire it. Council will acquire the parks outside of the RMA.<br>The applicant has provided sufficient information from a parks planning perspective and I require no additional information. |
| Other considerations | Click or tap here to insert any other responses you consider relevant for the Minister to be aware of.   |

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

| Local authority providing<br>comment      | Auckland Council             |
|---|------------------------------|
| Contact person (if follow-up is required) | Danny Curtis                 |
|   | Principal Catchment Planning |
|   | s 9(2)(a)                    |

## **Comment form**

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

| Project name         | Great South Homes Park Project  |
|----------------------|---|
| General comment –    | Healthy Waters have provided a provisional approval of Stormwater Management Plan under<br>Auckland Council Regional Stormwater Network Discharge Consent (DIS60069613) – Reference<br>NDC 2020-034 dated 18 December 2022. The applicant has provided a copy this letter in their<br>Fast Tract application.   |
|                      | The SMP that the above letter is referring to is the plan change SMP, is not consider appropriate to support a resource consent application because:  |
|                      | <ul> <li>It provides stormwater management options only, no direction on what is to be<br/>provided.</li> </ul>   |
|                      | <ul> <li>The SMP states a number of work tasks that need to be completed at RC stage, that haven't been completed, which include;         <ul> <li>Downstream assessment of flows and their impacts on private drainage infrastructure and lot access</li> <li>Flow hydrograph analysis to support the pass-flows forward approach the SMP requires</li> </ul> </li> <li>There is insufficient detail provided around the wetland to clearly understand what its function is to be, how it will be vested to Council, how any upgrade would be integrated whilst maintaining its current treatment function, or design calculations to support the figures provided in the report.</li> </ul> |
|                      | Documentation submitted as part of the current consent application is not suitable to support<br>the Resource Consent application as it does not provide sufficient detail around the stormwater<br>management to be provided, and instead relies on the plan change SMP  |
| Other considerations | Click or tap here to insert any other responses you consider relevant for the Minister to be aware of.  |

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) | Elmira Vatani                 |
|   | Principal Development Planner |
|   | s 9(2)(a)                     |

## **Comment form**

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

| Project name                              | Great South home Park   |
|---|---|
| General comment                           | The roading layout is acceptable in principal as it is consistent with the Precinct<br>Plan within the Auckland Unitary Plan, but the scale of the proposed dwellings and<br>proposed provision for retail are not consistent with the anticipated development<br>under the precinct plan. Further information is required to fully understand the<br>effects of this proposal and an Integrated Transport Assessment should be<br>provided to support an application should this project be accepted for the Fast<br>Track consenting process. |
|   | Auckland Transport requests that, should the project be accepted for fast-track consenting, the requirement for an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) is formally stated in the referral order to accompany any resource consent application for the Project lodged with the Environmental Protection Authority. Auckland Transport would also request the referral order specifically identifies Auckland Transport as a party which the Expert Consenting panel must invite comments from.   |
|   | AT is neutral as to whether this project is considered under the COVID 19 FastTrack process. It is understood a superlot subdivision is also lodged with Council.   |
|   | Since the Gatland Road Precinct Plan is operative the proposed development can<br>be assessed under the normal Council's resource consent process. The benefits of<br>assessing this application under the Fast-Track Act are unclear.  |
| Other considerations                      | -   |
| [Insert specific requests for<br>comment] | -   |

### **Summary of Gatland Road Precinct**

The subject site is within the Gatland Road Precinct where 200 dwellings is anticipated as a result of the plan change 58. However, the maximum yield restriction from the precinct is proposed to be removed under the Plan Change 78 (PC78). The plan change 78 is proposed to respond to the government's National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and requirements of the Resource Management Act. Development within this precinct is envisaged to provide both Residential Mixed Housing Urban and Business Neighbourhood Centre. The southwest corner of the subject site is zoned Business Neighbourhood Centre under the PC78 vs the operative Gatland Road Precinct only requires the development to deliver both residential. The development is required to provide a safe and integrated transport network with the emphasis on walking, cycling and public transport. Therefore, the following transport infrastructure are included under the objectives and policies of the precinct plan:

- East- West connection within the subject site to ensure the neighbouring site to the east which is zoned Future Urban Zone will connect to Great South Road,
- Improvement of Great South Road and Gatland Road frontages,
- North-South connection within the subject site to connect to Gatland Road,
- Widening Great South Road to accommodate active mode facilities and strategic network.

### **Transport Matters**

Great South Road is an arterial road with a posted speed limit of 50km/hr. As shown on the Auckland Transport's GIS Road and Street Framework map<sup>1</sup>, Great South Road is currently classified as a Place 1 and Movement 3 typology under the Road and Street Framework, and it will remain the same in the future. It means Great South Road has a high Strategic significance role with higher volume of users and predominantly local function with a small catchment of users. Great South Road is therefore required to be upgraded with a cycle lane, footpath and underground services with streetlights along the subject site's frontage.

The proposal includes 338 dwellings with retail which exceeds the maximum yield of 200 dwellings under the precinct plan and is not consistent with provisions already approved on the basis of an Integrated Transport Assessment for the plan change 58. Therefore, if the project is accepted for the process under the Fast-Track Act, a full Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) should be provided to recognise the additional intensification and ensure sufficient transport infrastructure is available to accommodate the trip generation from the proposed 334 dwellings and retail activities. The main objective of an ITA is to ensure that the potential adverse transport effects of a development proposal are well considered and addressed with particular consideration of accessibility to and from the development as well as safety and efficiency effects. Auckland Transport requests the following matters form part of an ITA:

- Assess the need for public transport provision including looking at infrastructure such as the quality of the bus stop facilities and access to them,
- An assessment of potential adverse effects on the efficient operation of the surrounding transport network and how these effects will be avoided, remedied or mitigated. There should be particular emphasis on Park Estate Road / Great South Road intersection including mitigation measure if required,
- SIDRA modelling and assessment are required to determine why the intersection of Gatland Road/ Great South Road needs to be signalised,
- An assessment is required to determine the type of intersection treatment of Great South Road / Gatland Road,
- Assessment against the objectives and policies of the AUP as they relate to transport,
- An assessment of bicycle parking requirements for the residential lots,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Here is a link to Road and Street Framework Movement and Place viewer: https://mahere.at.govt.nz/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=54dd86040df541d3be87f7afba42b847

A plan is required to demonstrate the proposed signalised intersection can be installed with the consideration of bus priority and cycle lane facilities and the existing bus stops on Great South Road. The applicant is responsible to ensure sufficient land is available for the upgrade of the intersection and future proofing of the corridor.

The proposed signalised intersection of Great South Road / Gatland Road will provide safe access for pedestrian and cyclists to the retails but no pedestrian crossing facilities are provided from the active mode link (east-west) proposed towards north as the majority of residential amenities including school, shops and church are located on the other side of Great South Road to the north-west of the subject site.

The proposed road layout is consistent with the precinct plan, and the east- west road can be extended in the future to connect the neighbouring site which is zoned Future Urban Zone to Great South Road. Internal road should provide a local cycling connection by providing a traffic calming to achieve a 30km/h environment.

The "Amenity Link" which is the east-west connection does not have the central median. This is acceptable from AT's point of view as long as the over land flow path can be managed safely.

The small area of the subject site is proposed to be developed for retail. There is a concern about the scale of the Business activities. The material submitted with this application does not demonstrate the proposed retail scale meets the local convenience needs of the residents within the subject site and surrounding developments, and providing community access to goods and provides opportunity for social interaction as anticipated under the precinct plan.

### **Stormwater Matters**

There is a significant overland flow path (OLFP) entering the site, and it appears this will be directed through the proposed public roads. It will therefore have potential adverse effects on road users including pedestrians. It is required to demonstrate the OLFP can be managed safely in accordance with SWCoP (section 4.3.5.6) and the Road Drainage chapter of the Auckland Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision.

Given scale of the development and the floodplain downstream, a flood risk assessment that clearly demonstrates how adverse effects on public safety and property are to be avoided or mitigated, by way of a suitable Hazard Assessment in line with Section E36.9 of the AUP will need to be submitted alongside a Stormwater Management Plan.

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

| Local authority providing<br>comment      | Auckland Council             |
|---|------------------------------|
| Contact person (if follow-up is required) | Sanjeev Morar                |
|   | Development Manager - Veolia |
|   | s 9(2)(a)                    |

## **Comment form**

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

| Project name      | Great South Homes Park Project   |
|-------------------|--|
| General comment – | Veolia is able to accommodate the proposed development subject to the conditions within the Plan<br>Change submission (enclosed), including upgrade of the existing water network, upgrade of the<br>existing Slippery Creek Wastewater Pump Station and upgrade of the existing wastewater gravity<br>network. These upgrades extend well beyond the boundaries of the property and would be at the<br>cost of the Developer. |
|                   | These are as follows:  |
|                   | (a) Existing water infrastructure is modelled to determine if sufficient<br>capacity exists. Should there be insufficient capacity, it is the<br>responsibility of the Applicant to, at its cost, design and construct<br>required network infrastructure upgrades.  |
|                   | (b) Wastewater disposal from the Plan Change Area is required to be<br>connected to the public wastewater network, discharging to the<br>Slippery Creek Wastewater Pump Station, Motorway Wastewater<br>Pump Station and across State Highway 1 to the Hingaia Wastewater<br>Pump Station.   |
|                   | <ul> <li>(C) The Applicant will, at its cost, design and construct:</li> <li>i. any wastewater infrastructure required to enable the connection of the Plan Change Area to the public wastewater disposal and collection system</li> <li>ii. any water infrastructure required to enable the connection of</li> </ul>  |
|                   | <ul> <li>(d) The Applicant obtains approval from Veolia for the connection points to the local network to service the Plan Change Area.</li> </ul>   |

| Other considerations | Click or tap here to insert any other responses you consider relevant for the Minister to be aware of. |
|----------------------|--|



Auckland Council

Level 24, 135 Albert Street

Private Bag 92300

Auckland 1142

Attn.: Planning Technician

### unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

TO: Auckland Council

- SUBMISSION ON: Plan Change 58 (Private) 470 and 476 Great South Road and 2 and 8 Gatland Road, Papakura
- FROM: Veolia Water Services (ANZ) Pty Ltd

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE: sanjeev.morar@veolia.com

DATE: 1 March 2021

Veolia could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1. Background

On July 1, 1997 a 30-year franchise agreement commenced with the Papakura District Council to outsource operations of the water and wastewater networks in Papakura, Drury and Takanini to a Veolia, wholly owned subsidiary called United Water.

Around the globe, Veolia helps cities and industries to manage, optimize and make the most of their resources. The company provides an array of solutions related to water, energy and materials Veolia's 174,000 employees are tasked with contributing directly to the sustainability performance of customers in the public and private sectors, allowing them to pursue development while protecting the environment.

 $\cdot$  100 million people supplied with drinking water

- · 63 million people connected to wastewater systems
- · 4,245 drinking water production plants managed
- · 3,303 wastewater treatment plants managed[s1]

In 2011, United Water was rebranded to Veolia, its parent company's name. This brand change brought the New Zealand operations in line with Veolia's global business.

Under the existing franchise agreement, Veolia is responsible for all aspects of the water and wastewater business including:

- · Meter reading, billing and collection of revenue
- · Customer services
- · Operations and maintenance of the water supply and wastewater collection systems
- Planning, design and construction of new infrastructure

Papakura District Council was disestablished in 2010 with the creation of the Auckland Council as a unitary authority.

Auckland Council owns Watercare - a council organisation. All the water in the Papakura district is supplied by Watercare and all wastewater is treated at Watercare's Mangere Plant.

Watercare Services Ltd <u>owns</u> the water and wastewater infrastructure which <u>is operated</u> by Veolia.

### 2. SUBMISSION

#### 2.1. General

This is a submission on a change proposed by Greg and Nicky Hayhow to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) that was publicly notified on 11 December 2020 ("**Proposal**").

The Applicant proposes to rezone 6.1 hectares of Future Urban land at 470 and 476 Great South Road and 2 and 8 Gatland Road, Papakura to a Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban with a block of Business Neighbourhood Centre Zone ("**Plan Change Area**").

Veolia neither supports nor opposes the Proposal. The purpose of this submission is to address the technical feasibility of the proposed water and wastewater servicing arrangement to ensure that the effects on the existing and planned water and wastewater network are appropriately considered and managed in accordance with Resource Management Act 1991 ("**RMA**").

In making its submission, Veolia has considered the relevant provisions of the Auckland Plan 2050, Te Tahua Taungahuru Te Mahere Taungahuru 2018 – 2028/The 10-year Budget Long-term Plan 2018 – 2028, the Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy 2015 and 2017, the Water Supply and Wastewater Network Bylaw 2015 and the Water and Wastewater Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision. It has also considered the relevant RMA documents including the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 which (among other matters) requires local authorities to ensure that at any one time there is sufficient housing and business development capacity which:

- (a) in the short term, is feasible, zoned and serviced with development infrastructure (including water and wastewater);
- (b) in the medium term, is feasible, zoned and either:
  - (i) serviced with development infrastructure, or
  - (ii) the funding for the development infrastructure required to service that development capacity must be identified in a Long Term Plan required under the Local Government Act 2002; and
- (c) in the long term, is feasible, identified in relevant plans and strategies, and the development infrastructure required to service it is identified in the relevant Infrastructure Strategy required under the Local Government Act 2002.<sup>1</sup>

### 2.2. Specific parts of the Proposal

The specific parts of the Proposal that this submission relates to are: the proposed water and wastewater servicing arrangement and the effects of the Proposal on the existing and planned water and wastewater network.

Veolia has reviewed the Proposal but it is not in a position to confirm whether, in Veolia's opinion, the proposed servicing arrangement is appropriate. Specifically:

- (a) Water Supply Network modelling to be undertaken to determine suitability of existing infrastructure to provide for proposed demand
- (b) Wastewater Network (gravity) Availability of capacity to be determined pending discharge location
- (c) Wastewater Pump Station and Rising Main Upgrades to be assessed for the existing Slippery Creek WWPS, Motorway WWPS and Motorway rising main.

### 2.2.1. Water supply

### 2.2.1.1. Water supply infrastructure

The two properties, 470 and 476 Great South Road, Papakura are positioned with a public 150mm public watermain along their western boundaries. The other two properties, 2 and 8 Gatland Road, Papakura are positioned with a 40mm public watermain along their southern boundaries.

National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016, policy PA1.

### 2.2.1.2. Water supply servicing for the Plan Change Area

In order to adequately assess the effects of the Proposal on the existing and planned water infrastructure network, the following further information regarding the proposed water supply servicing is required:

- (a) network modelling of the existing network with the additional demand proposed
- (b) an assessment of the water infrastructure upgrades that might be required to service the development

The Applicant will be required to construct and fund any local network to service the Plan Change Area

For clarity, all of the water supply network relevant to the plan change is considered local network, and is therefore required to be funded by the developer.

### 2.2.2. Wastewater

#### 2.2.2.1. Wastewater infrastructure

Currently, the Slippery Creek and Motorway wastewater pump stations are at capacity. There is some capacity available in the upstream gravity networks, however, capacity will vary location dependent.

### 2.2.2.2. Wastewater servicing for the Plan Change Area

A total of six wastewater servicing options has been proposed. Although not in its entirety, a feasible option, Option 3, proposes that the Plan Change Area be serviced via a proposed then existing gravity wastewater network, through to the existing Slippery Creek Wastewater Pump Station, to the Motorway Wastewater Pump Station, where wastewater is pumped via a rising main across State Highway 1, into the Bulk Hingaia Wastewater Pump Station.

Although there may be limited capacity available in the gravity wastewater network, upstream of the wastewater pump stations, there is insufficient capacity available at both the Slippery Creek and Motorway stations. Capacity within the rising main from each station also requires assessment.

The Applicant will be required to construct and fund the local network upgrade to service the Plan Change Area.

This would require, at the cost of the Applicant, the design and construction of:

- (a) suitable gravity network discharge location. Should capacity be insufficient where the Applicant wishes to discharge, upgrades will be required
- (b) upgrade of the existing Slippery Creek and Motorway wastewater pump stations, including (but not limited to) storage and pump capacity
- (c) assessment of suitability of both the Slippery Creek and Motorway wastewater pump station rising mains - capacity and head losses to be determined pending proposed pump station upgrades

All upgrades are to be reviewed and agreed with Veolia.

### 3. DECISION SOUGHT

Veolia seeks a decision that ensures that the water and wastewater capacity and servicing requirements of the Proposal will be adequately met, such that the water and wastewater related effects are appropriately managed.

To enable that decision to be made, Veolia requests that:

- (a) Existing water infrastructure is modelled to determine if sufficient capacity exists. Should there be insufficient capacity, it is the responsibility of the Applicant to, at its cost, design and construct required network infrastructure upgrades.
- (b) Wastewater disposal from the Plan Change Area is required to be connected to the public wastewater network, discharging to the Slippery Creek Wastewater Pump Station, Motorway Wastewater Pump Station and across State Highway 1 to the Hingaia Wastewater Pump Station.
- (c) The Applicant will, at its cost, design and construct:

   any wastewater infrastructure required to enable the connection of the Plan Change Area to the public wastewater disposal and collection system
   any water infrastructure required to enable the connection of the Plan Change Area to the public retail water network
- (d) The Applicant obtains approval from Veolia for the connection points to the local network to service the Plan Change Area.

### 4. HEARING

Veolia wishes to be heard in support of its submission.

Sanjeev Morar Developments Manager

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) | Amir Karimi - <mark>s 9(2)(a)</mark> |
|   |                                      |
|   |                                      |

## **Comment form**

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

| Project name    | Great South Homes Park   |
|-----------------|--|
| General comment | No infrastructure report, engineering plans, capacity assessment, flow data an connection points were provided as part of this application.  |
|                 | Based on very limited data provided, Watercare has completed a very high-level assessment for the proposed development. The proposed development is for approximately 338 residential units and 400sqm of small commercial/retapremises at 470 and 476 Great South Road and 2 and 8 Gatland Road, Papakura.  |
|                 | This area falls within the area serviced by Veolia water.  |
|                 | In this area, Watercare is responsible for the operation and planning of the water   |
|                 | supply and wastewater transmission networks. Veolia is responsible for operatin  |
|                 | and maintaining the local water and wastewater network in their area of service.   |
|                 | Wastewater:  |
|                 | Based on the location, it is assumed the developer would be intending to discharg<br>to the Hingaia pumping station. The Hingaia pumping station is currently unde<br>capacity, with proposed upgrade solutions still several years out. We do not hav<br>any ability to accept additional flows from this development at Hingaia pumpin<br>station ahead of the current programme of works. The developer will need to<br>confirm their connection point and the timing of their flows coming online. |
|                 | Water supply:  |
|                 | The application is lacking sufficient detail on the proposed connection point to full<br>assess the impact on the transmission network. However, the water transmissio<br>system seems to have sufficient capacity to supply the extra demand by th<br>proposed development.   |