

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

Your reference: 2021-B-07669

29 March 2021

Dear Minister Parker,

RE: COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-Track Consenting) Act 2020 – Karaka North Village – Comments sought

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

The application to Ministry for the Environment is made by Karaka North Village Limited and Cappella Group Limited and is located at 348 Linwood Road and 69A Dyke Road, Karaka.

Having reviewed the application material provided, we can advise that Auckland Council has some potentially significant concerns with the proposed development, as follows:

- Watercare Services Limited (WSL) have identified that at present there is insufficient infrastructure to support the application and that the applicant is relying on private infrastructure (both water supply and wastewater treatment) which will be designed and constructed by the developer. The ownership of the systems will be transferred to an entity controlled by the residents' society. WSL advise that the developer will need to meet the requirements for becoming a drinking water supplier under the Health Act, and in the future under the Water Services Regulator. WSL have advised that if the design, construction and maintenance of the private infrastructure is done to a high standard, then there is no impact on Watercare's water and wastewater infrastructure. However, if the infrastructure fails there will be significant impact on Council and Watercare and the potential for significant adverse effects to occur.
- Councils Development Engineer shares WSL concerns that there is potential for adverse environmental effects to occur if the design, construction and maintenance of the private infrastructure is not done to a high standard.
- Councils Parks Department have identified that the 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 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 resource consent and engineering plan approval process, resulting in a financial burden not anticipated.

From a planning perspective, the proposal is not considered to be contrary to the high level policy framework promoted by the Auckland Unitary Plan. However, more detail is required to better understand the potential adverse effects of the proposal and care must be taken that all the necessary consents are applied for e.g. infringements to the underlying zone provisions (even if only as a technical matter). The application shall also demonstrate that it is consistent with the master plan, infrastructure plan and landscape plan approved under resource consent BUN60362652. Finally, in addition to the potential adverse effects identified above, other potential effects include construction effects and traffic effects.

The local board have also raised concerns in relation to increased traffic volumes, the need to improve the intersection of Dyke, Linwood / Blackbridge Roads and impacts further along at Linwood / Walters Road intersection and the Hingaia Bridge. The width of streets, parking, and replication of community facilities already in the area.

Ward Councillor Bill Cashmore has also raised concerns in relation to public transport, access onto and from Linwood Road, traffic congestion on Linwood Road from cumulative growth and the need to upgrade bridge and culverts.

The impact and cost associated with key infrastructure requirements is therefore a significant matter for Council.

In response to the information requirements stated in your undated letter referenced 2021-B-07669:

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?

No, although different Council agencies such as Watercare and Parks have raised some significant concerns. Such concerns can be addressed via provision of sufficient information from the applicant, appropriate engagement with Council agencies and establishment of appropriate consent conditions.

2. What reports and assessments would normally be required by the Council for a project of this nature in this area?
 - Agreement from AT for privately-owned water and wastewater network to be placed within the road reserve.
 - A detailed infrastructure report is required to provide clarity on servicing (operation and maintenance) including detail around the design and capacity of infrastructure, ongoing maintenance and responsibility of the infrastructure.
 - Transport Impact Assessment for the further subdivision and land use required to understand the effects of vehicles and pedestrian movements,
 - A Stormwater Management Plan for the development that would meet the requirements of consent conditions and be authorised under Auckland Councils Healthy Waters Department approved regionwide Stormwater Network Discharge Consent (DIS60069613).
 - Subdivision plans identifying public assets to be vested, and for private open space assets, whether there will be public access easements

provided to allow public access through the private open space to the esplanade reserve.

- Landscape plans sufficiently detailed to properly assess any proposed assets in the streetscape, reserves to be vested, stormwater ponds, and accessways, along with boundary treatment adjoining open space.
- Planting plans with a schedule of species to understand the extent of mitigation provided.
- Assessment of the esplanade reserve under s236 of the RMA
- Consideration of a body corporate or other management structure plan for the ownership and maintenance of private infrastructure and open space.
- Information to demonstrate the esplanade reserve is adequately protected for conservation purposes with the relocation of the fencing to the esplanade reserve boundary.
- Information that demonstrates the development is consistent with the special information including master plan, infrastructure plan and landscape plan approved under resource consent BUN60362652.

3. Do the applicants, or a company/ies owned by the applicants, have any environmental regulatory compliance history in Auckland City?

The application to Ministry for the Environment has been made by Karaka North Village Limited and Cappella Group Limited.

There are no known significant breaches of the RMA for any of the above companies. It is noted that Karaka North Village Limited holds resource consents:

- BUN60362652/ LUC60362654 - 69A Dyke Road: No compliance issue history.
- WAT60351248 & WAT60152102 - 348 Linwood Road: No compliance issue history.

Bruce John Wallace- is the sole shareholder for Karaka North Village Limited and therefore the owner. Mr Bruce John Wallace is the sole or primary share holder and therefore owner of other companies including Tonea Holdings (NZ) Limited and Wallace Bros Limited.

Tonea Holdings (NZ) Limited holds resource consents:

- DIS60315692/ LUC60138526 - 269 Porchester Road, Takanini: No compliance issue history.
- LUC60138547- 587 Mill Road, Ardmore: No compliance issues history
- LUC60308737, LUC60315613, LUC60122825, LUC60271096, LUC60271007, LUC60119352 - 30 Walters Road, Takanini: warning issued on 10.03.2020 for construction after permitted hours.

Wallace Bros Limited does not hold any current resource consents with Auckland Council.

Cappella Group Limited does not hold any other current resource consents with Auckland Council.

Yours sincerely,



Ian Smallburn
General Manager – Resource Consents
Auckland Council

Enclosed:

- Comments from key experts, Auckland Transport, Watercare, Healthy Waters, Parks and Local Board

Elected Members – Feedback to the Minister for the Environment on consideration of a referral application

From		Doug Fletcher		
Date that invitation from MfE was received:	Current Working Days	Brief sent	Elected Member response due	
16/03/2021	2	17/03/2021	24/03/2021	
Proposal		Karaka North Village is a proposed large scale, master planned subdivision in Karaka, South Auckland. The development seeks to deliver up to 850 dwellings and a 2 hectare local centre, with a unique village / rural living environment and outlook.		
Site address and Legal Description:		348 Linwood Road, Karaka, Auckland, 2580, New Zealand		
Applicant		Karaka North Village Limited		
Related applications and consents (old Regional Permits, related current consents or applications)		<p>BUN60362652 was approved by a Duty Commissioner and the consent issued on 12.02.2021 for a 14 super lot subdivision and the consideration of a master plan, infrastructure management plan and landscape management plan as required by the Special Information Requirements of the Karaka North Precinct.</p> <p>WAT60351248 Consent was granted on 1 May 2020 for a maximum daily ground water take of up to 740m³ and an annual volume of 270,000m³.</p>		
Link to plans and relevant information		U:\COO\Resource Consents\Premium Unit\Project Management\Karaka North Village Limited - PRR00037020\1. Lodged Documents		

Elected Members responses

From: Andrew Baker (Franklin Local Board)

Date: 22.03.2021

Overall Summary:

- Concern at the cumulative effect of development on the Karaka / Kingseat / Clarks Beach spine in particular the increase in traffic volumes.
- Related to the development is the intersection of Dyke, Linwood / Blackbridge Roads which is already unsafe. There must be intersection improvements and thus agree with the developer's assessment and offer in regard to construction of a roundabout. There also must be safe pedestrian crossing point to get people from the subdivision to and from the community centre, sports park and hall.
- Concerns at the impact further along at Linwood / Walters Road intersection and the Hingaia Bridge. If the Government accepts to fast track through the Covid process then we expect NZTA funding assurances to get those things onto the RLTP.
- The width of the streets must be of sufficient width or with appropriate parking bays to allow appropriate on street parking and or mitigation with on property off sets and parking capacity to allow safe passage of large vehicles including emergency service vehicles, particularly as unlikely there will be reticulated water supply for fire fighting purposes.
- We do not want to see replication of community facilities already in the area (ie Community hall type facilities in the new development).
- Accept the developer's masterplan as presented to the Local Board.

From: Councillor Bill Cashmore (Franklin Ward)

Date: 19.03.2021

Overall Summary:

- There is minimal Public Transport. Might be in the future.
- The accessibility onto and from Linwood road is problematic, even dangerous. There will need to be an engineered solution.
- Linwood road itself is seriously congested at peak and cumulative growth accentuates that. At some point the bridge and culverts will have to be upgraded.
- This will be a car centric development. The nearest employment will be in Drury other than those who can work from home.

Asset Owner and Specialist Input Request Details – Feedback to the Minister for the Environment on consideration of a referral application

From		Doug Fletcher		
Date that invitation from MfE was received:	Current Working Days	Brief sent	Asset Owner / Specialist report due	
16/03/2021	2	17/03/2021	24/03/2021	
Proposal		Karaka North Village is a proposed large scale, master planned subdivision in Karaka, South Auckland. The development seeks to deliver up to 850 dwellings and a 2 hectare local centre, with a unique village / rural living environment and outlook.		
Site address and Legal Description:		348 Linwood Road, Karaka, Auckland, 2580, New Zealand		
Applicant		Karaka North Village Limited		
Related applications and consents (old Regional Permits, related current consents or applications)		<p>BUN60362652 was approved by a Duty Commissioner and the consent issued on 12.02.2021 for a 14 super lot subdivision and the consideration of a master plan, infrastructure management plan and landscape management plan as required by the Special Information Requirements of the Karaka North Precinct.</p> <p>WAT60351248 Consent was granted on 1 May 2020 for a maximum daily ground water take of up to 740m³ and an annual volume of 270,000m³.</p>		
Link to plans and relevant information		U:\COO\Resource Consents\Premium Unit\Project Management\Karaka North Village Limited - PRR00037020\1. Lodged Documents		

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: Andrew Wilkinson, Planning Consultant.

Date: 25.03.2021

Overall Summary:

The scope of this planning review was limited to reviewing the consenting requirements, as well as the higher-level policy aspects of the application.

I raise three main consenting notes with you:

- *The proposal will require consent under the Temporary activity consent under E40, as the proposed construction period will be greater than 24 months (as per permitted activity E40.4.1(A20)), and therefore requires consent as a restricted discretionary activity pursuant to E40.4.1(A24).*
- *Based on layout and development, I believe consent would be required under the NES-FM because of the works, and proximity of discharges to wetland areas. Likely Non-complying.*
- *My understanding of the Precinct provisions (generally), is that they override the underlying zone provisions where there is a corresponding rule stated in the Precinct – for instance I417.6.4 height. The approved masterplan builds in the ability to deviate from the underlying zone standards, with the consent notices in place by the original consent granted. However, application still needs to be made to the infringements to the underlying zone provisions (even if only as a technical matter given where the consent notice create a level of expectation – this would be the means by which to conclude no associated effects to those infringements). This is probably the most crucial aspect to note.*

The material indicated a non-complying activity overall, and this would be the worst case scenario (noting nothing identified would appear prohibited), and so any additional changes would not make consenting any more restrictive than already identified.

Broadly speaking, the details appear to reflect what was contemplated through the initial superlot consenting, and setting in place of the consent notices. In this regard, we had previously concluded that the superlot consent was consistent with (and not contrary to) the RPS provision of Chapter B to the Unitary Plan. On initial reading this would appear to continue to be the case.

**COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 –
Red Flag Checklist**

Criteria Question	Criteria Answer – YES or NO
Is the application clearly inconsistent with the Auckland Unitary Plan and/or not aligned with the outcomes in the Auckland Plan 2050?	NO
Is the application out of sequence with the Auckland Plan Development Strategy and Future Urban Land Supply Strategy?	NA
Is there insufficient infrastructure to support the application and/or significant infrastructure spend is required to support the project?	NA
Is there a significant impact on Auckland Council / CCO and/or third-party infrastructure?	NA
Is the application a notice of requirement?	NO
Is there the potential for significant adverse environmental effects to occur?	NA
Overall, is this application red flagged on one or more criteria?	NO
Other comments?	

COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 –

Red Flag Checklist

Prepared by D Russell Development Engineer

Criteria Question	Red Flag	Amber	Green
Is the application clearly inconsistent with the Auckland Unitary Plan and/or not aligned with the outcomes in the Auckland Plan 2050?			n/a
Is the application out of sequence with the Auckland Plan Development Strategy and Future Urban Land Supply Strategy?			n/a
Is there insufficient infrastructure to support the application and/or significant infrastructure spend is required to support the project?		Given that AT and HW are ok then no issues.	
Is there a significant impact on Auckland Council / CCO and/or third-party infrastructure?		Possible issue if developer and AT cannot reach an agreement for private services on road reserve	
Is the application a notice of requirement?			no
Is there the potential for significant adverse environmental effects to occur?	Wastewater discharge from private treatment to the sea.		
Other comments?			

Points of note from Development Engineer

- While the matter will probably be addressed by Healthy Waters I have not located the drainage reserves or access to them on the plans provided.
- Wastewater system as a private system will need to be copied to Stormwater and wastewater team to review. There are no details here to allow any constructive input
- There is nothing provided to show that they can meet the swimming water standard, or how the water is being disposed of to be confident that wastewater disposal will not be to the harbour
- There is nothing to confirm or otherwise that AT is agreeable to having private water and wastewater services in the public road reserve, and how these assets are to be maintained. This was a real issue during the last application. While AT may not raise it at this point it will be an important factor in getting this application over the line.
- There are a few details about the roundabout on Dyke Rd Linwood Rd intersection but nothing to confirm that it will fit on the land available. Depending on how the ministry formats the conditions the basic design needs to be submitted with the application to show it fits, Otherwise potentially need a road to vest lot to achieve the precinct rules standard



D J Russell

Senior Development Engineer

Asset Owner and Specialist Input Request Details – Feedback to the Minister for the Environment on consideration of a referral application

From		Doug Fletcher		
Date that invitation from MfE was received:	Current Working Days	Brief sent	Asset Owner / Specialist report due	
16/03/2021	2	17/03/2021	24/03/2021	
Proposal		Karaka North Village is a proposed large scale, master planned subdivision in Karaka, South Auckland. The development seeks to deliver up to 850 dwellings and a 2 hectare local centre, with a unique village / rural living environment and outlook.		
Site address and Legal Description:		348 Linwood Road, Karaka, Auckland, 2580, New Zealand		
Applicant		Karaka North Village Limited		
Related applications and consents (old Regional Permits, related current consents or applications)		<p>BUN60362652 was approved by a Duty Commissioner and the consent issued on 12.02.2021 for a 14 super lot subdivision and the consideration of a master plan, infrastructure management plan and landscape management plan as required by the Special Information Requirements of the Karaka North Precinct.</p> <p>WAT60351248 Consent was granted on 1 May 2020 for a maximum daily ground water take of up to 740m³ and an annual volume of 270,000m³.</p>		
Link to plans and relevant information		U:\COO\Resource Consents\Premium Unit\Project Management\Karaka North Village Limited - PRR00037020\1. Lodged Documents		

From: David Snowdon, Team Leader – Specialist Subdivision, Resource Consenting, Auckland Council

Date: 23rd March 2021

Overall Summary:

The referral accurately identifies the consented 'superlot' subdivision consent. The completion of that subdivision requires, amongst other items, consent notices preventing further site development until future infrastructure installation occurs. Those consent notices will need to be addressed as a component of the referral.

The referral accurately identifies the AUP provisions requiring consideration under the subdivision resource consent, concluding that the consent is to be considered as a non-complying activity.

The referral seeks "*a staged subdivision consent across the entire site*" and a plan identifying 5 stages (only) has been provided. From that plan, it is unclear whether the "Local Centre" is a separate stage or linked to Stage 1 or 3. It is also noted that the "Utility Lots" are included within Stage 4.

No indication of the sequencing of the stages is in evidence, so it is surmised that the sequence would be from 1 to 5 in that order. If this is not the case, there will likely be a resultant impact on the linking of infrastructural elements, particularly the 3 waters and roading however this is for others to consider.

It is unclear if Stage 4 'Utility Lots' will be necessary in preceding Stages.

It appears that s230 RMA has not been considered in this referral.



David Snowdon

Asset Owner and Specialist Input Request Details – Feedback to the Minister for the Environment on consideration of a referral application

From		Doug Fletcher		
Date that invitation from MfE was received:	Current Working Days	Brief sent	Asset Owner / Specialist report due	
16/03/2021	2	17/03/2021	24/03/2021	
Proposal		Karaka North Village is a proposed large scale, master planned subdivision in Karaka, South Auckland. The development seeks to deliver up to 850 dwellings and a 2-hectare local centre, with a unique village / rural living environment and outlook.		
Site address and Legal Description:		348 Linwood Road, Karaka, Auckland, 2580, New Zealand		
Applicant		Karaka North Village Limited		
Related applications and consents (old Regional Permits, related current consents or applications)		<p>BUN60362652 was approved by a Duty Commissioner and the consent issued on 12.02.2021 for a 14 super lot subdivision and the consideration of a master plan, infrastructure management plan and landscape management plan as required by the Special Information Requirements of the Karaka North Precinct.</p> <p>WAT60351248 Consent was granted on 1 May 2020 for a maximum daily ground water take of up to 740m³ and an annual volume of 270,000m³.</p>		
Link to plans and relevant information		<p>U:\COO\Resource Consents\Premium Unit\Project Management\Karaka North Village Limited - PRR00037020\1. Lodged Documents</p> <p>out of scope</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>		

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: *Elmira Vatani, Senior Development Planner*

Date: 23/03/2021

Overall Summary:

The subject site is affected by Karaka North Precinct where the first subdivision resource consent application is required to prepare special information, including a Master Plan, Landscape Management Plan, and Infrastructure Plan (Karaka North Precinct standard I417.9.1-3). This information has been provided under the consent BUN60362652. As a result of the consent notice on the approved 14 superlots, and also the standard I417.9.(1,2,3)(3) of Karaka North Precinct of the AUP the subsequence land use and subdivision application must be consistent with the approved special information under BUN60362652.

It is noted under the consent BUN60362652 the potable water supply will be via two private on-site bores and will not vest with Watercare. A concern was therefore raised by AT over it being reticulated through vested roads by a private entity (i.e. a residents society or a company set up by the developers) or if the entity owning the infrastructure is a proven operator in the field. Hence, the applicants asked Veolia to operate and maintain the network.

With regards to the wastewater, the applicant's ultimate wastewater proposal is to connect to a Watercare network via Kingseat, in which case the entire network would be public and vested in Watercare. Relevant consents were sought and granted to treat and discharge 481m³ (3x ADWF) of wastewater and the early stage of the development will discharge to a local plant. Consultation with AT's Property & Planning and Chief Engineer & Asset Management teams was undertaken to ensure this arrangement (i.e. privately-owned water and wastewater network within the road reserve) would be acceptable to AT. It is understood that the conditional agreement is obtained.

Linwood Road is an arterial road with a high speed (80km/hr) environment of rural character. As shown on the AT's GIS Risk map, Linwood Road is identified as a medium to high-risk road. It means the personal risk (crash rate) is medium to high. It is therefore proposed to upgrade the infrastructure on Linwood road, Dyke Road and Blackbridge Road. It is also noted that even the standard I417.6.9 Access of Karaka North Precinct requires lots' access direct from Linwood and Dyke Road to mitigate the safety effects the access along Linwood Road and Dyke Road is limited as approved under Master Plan.

Overall, this site does not feature any strategic networks relates to service by a frequent public transport connection. Currently, Karaka Village only has a service (#395) which has two trips in the morning to Papakura and two in the afternoon. This development will be largely dependent on on private vehicle until such time as the rail line to Pukekohe is electrified and the new southern stations being Drury Central and Paerata station are constructed (which are due for opening in February 2025).

The following information is required:

- Transport Impact Assessment from the further subdivision and land use required to understand the effects of vehicles and pedestrian movements,
- The SMP provided under the approved superlot subdivision is a draft and an update version are required to reflect any changes,
- A detailed infrastructure report is required to provide clarity on servicing (operation and maintenance),
- It is required to demonstrate the subsequent subdivision is consistent with the approved special information including master plan, infrastructure plan and landscape plan.

COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 –

Red Flag Checklist

Criteria Question	Criteria Answer – YES or NO
Is the application clearly inconsistent with the Auckland Unitary Plan and/or not aligned with the outcomes in the Auckland Plan 2050?	NO
Is the application out of sequence with the Auckland Plan Development Strategy and Future Urban Land Supply Strategy?	NO <i>The proposed development is within the Live Zoned Areas as shown on the Development Strategy- Sequencing and Timing of Growth map.</i>
Is there insufficient infrastructure to support the application and/or significant infrastructure spend is required to support the project?	NO <i>Infrastructure management plan has been approved under BUN60362652. Any development needs to comply with this special information. As part of the proposal it is proposed to upgrade the infrastructure along Linwood Road, Dyke Road and Blackbridge Road.</i>
Is there a significant impact on Auckland Council / CCO and/or third-party infrastructure?	NO
Is the application a notice of requirement?	NO
Is there the potential for significant adverse environmental effects to occur?	NO
Overall, is this application red flagged on one or more criteria?	NO
Other comments?	-

Asset Owner and Specialist Input Request Details – Feedback to the Minister for the Environment on consideration of a referral application

From		Doug Fletcher		
Date that invitation from MfE was received:	Current Working Days	Brief sent	Asset Owner / Specialist report due	
16/03/2021	2	17/03/2021	24/03/2021	
Proposal		Karaka North Village is a proposed large scale, master planned subdivision in Karaka, South Auckland. The development seeks to deliver up to 850 dwellings and a 2-hectare local centre, with a unique village / rural living environment and outlook.		
Site address and Legal Description:		348 Linwood Road, Karaka, Auckland, 2580, New Zealand		
Applicant		Karaka North Village Limited		
Related applications and consents (old Regional Permits, related current consents or applications)		<p>BUN60362652 was approved by a Duty Commissioner and the consent issued on 12.02.2021 for a 14 super lot subdivision and the consideration of a master plan, infrastructure management plan and landscape management plan as required by the Special Information Requirements of the Karaka North Precinct.</p> <p>WAT60351248 Consent was granted on 1 May 2020 for a maximum daily ground water take of up to 740m³ and an annual volume of 270,000m³.</p>		
Link to plans and relevant information		<p>U:\COO\Resource Consents\Premium Unit\Project Management\Karaka North Village Limited - PRR00037020\1. Lodged Documents</p> <p>out of scope</p>		

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: Mark Iszard, Growth and Development Manager, Healthy Waters

Date: 18/03/2021

Overall Summary:

Auckland Councils Healthy Waters Department holds a regionwide Stormwater Network Discharge Consent (DIS DIS60069613) Details of this consent and conditions can be found on the Auckland Design Manual website:

<http://www.aucklanddesignmanual.co.nz/regulations/technical-guidance/ndc>

Healthy Waters has been working closely and collaboratively with the Capella Group to develop a suitable Stormwater Management Plan for the development that would be meet the requirements of our consent conditions and be authorised under the above approved stormwater discharge consent.

The proposal being put in front of the EPA under the fast track process is similar to that we have been reviewing and we believe a suitable stormwater solution can be successfully implemented and adopted under our regional stormwater discharge consent.

Providing authorisation or approval for a developer to come under this discharge consent is not something the EPA can manage or provide approvals for since it is a consent already issued to Council. On other fast track proposals, it is being proposed that this authorisation is managed via an offline agreement with the applicant and Healthy Waters for approval of the SMP, separately from and concurrent to the overall consent application.

If a private discharge consent is being proposed (as an alternative to being approved under the regional consent), then Healthy Waters may be in a position that we cannot vest some or any of the proposed stormwater infrastructure and it would need to remain in private ownership.

COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 –

Red Flag Checklist

Criteria Question	Criteria Answer – YES or NO
Is the application clearly inconsistent with the Auckland Unitary Plan and/or not aligned with the outcomes in the Auckland Plan 2050?	NO
Is the application out of sequence with the Auckland Plan Development Strategy and Future Urban Land Supply Strategy?	NA
Is there insufficient infrastructure to support the application and/or significant infrastructure spend is required to support the project?	NO
Is there a significant impact on Auckland Council / CCO and/or third-party infrastructure?	NO
Is the application a notice of requirement?	NA
Is there the potential for significant adverse environmental effects to occur?	NO
Overall, is this application red flagged on one or more criteria?	NO
Other comments?	

Asset Owner and Specialist Input Request Details – Feedback to the Minister for the Environment on consideration of a referral application

From		Doug Fletcher		
Date that invitation from MfE was received:	Current Working Days	Brief sent	Asset Owner / Specialist report due	
16/03/2021	4	17/03/2021	24/03/2021	
Proposal		Karaka North Village is a proposed large scale, master planned subdivision in Karaka, South Auckland. The development seeks to deliver up to 850 dwellings and a 2-hectare local centre, with a unique village / rural living environment and outlook.		
Site address and Legal Description:		348 Linwood Road, Karaka, Auckland, 2580, New Zealand		
Applicant		Karaka North Village Limited		
Related applications and consents (old Regional Permits, related current consents or applications)		<p>BUN60362652 was approved by a Duty Commissioner and the consent issued on 12.02.2021 for a 14 super lot subdivision and the consideration of a master plan, infrastructure management plan and landscape management plan as required by the Special Information Requirements of the Karaka North Precinct.</p> <p>WAT60351248 Consent was granted on 1 May 2020 for a maximum daily ground water take of up to 740m³ and an annual volume of 270,000m³.</p>		
Link to plans and relevant information		<p>U:\COO\Resource Consents\Premium Unit\Project Management\Karaka North Village Limited - PRR00037020\1. Lodged Documents</p> <p>out of scope</p>		

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: Ashleigh Richards, Parks Planner, Auckland Council

Date: 23.03.2021

Overall Summary:

Background information:

Zone: Residential Mixed Housing Suburban, Residential Single House, Local Centre, Rural - Mixed Rural, Rural - Rural Coastal
Precinct: Karaka North Precinct - sub precinct A
Controls: Macroinvertebrate Community Index - Rural
Designations: Airspace Restriction Designations - ID 1102, Protection of aeronautical functions - obstacle limitation surfaces, Auckland International Airport Ltd

Positives of application

From the draft subdivision layout plans provided by the applicant it can be determined that:

- The proposal appears to follow the same or similar layout as the approved plans under BUN60362652 (Master Plan) in terms of open space.

Key Issues from a Parks Planning Perspective

The 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 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 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, and for private open space assets, whether there will be public access easements provided to allow public access through the private open space to the esplanade reserve.
- b) landscape plans sufficiently detailed to properly assess any proposed assets in the streetscape, reserves to be vested, stormwater ponds, and accessways, along with boundary treatment adjoining open space.
- c) planting plans with a schedule of species to understand the extent of mitigation provided.
- d) assessment of the esplanade reserve under s236 of the RMA
- e) consideration of a body corporate or other management structure plan for the maintenance of private open space.
- f) Further information to demonstrate the esplanade reserve is adequately protected for conservation purposes with the relocation of the fencing to the esplanade reserve boundary.

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

- Whether open space, stormwater and streetscape assets are to be public or privately owned.
- Whether the width of the stream adjoining the site meets the requirements under s230 of the RMA so an assessment can be made whether the top up of esplanade reserve is triggered in accordance with s236 of the RMA and Rule E38.4.1(A8) of the AUP.
- Whether streetscape planting is appropriate. Council has significant experience in this area as an asset owner and promotes species which provide attractive streetscapes but 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 the existing esplanade reserve 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, reserves or impact future greenways.
- Whether Parks and Community Facilities have the budget to maintain assets.
- Consideration of whether the private assets will be appropriately managed by the private entity
- How the development meets (or otherwise) the objectives and policies of the Karaka North 1 Precinct including - I417.2.(1), (2), (4) and (5), I417.3.(4) and (6).
- Identification of clearly demarcated public access links through the private open space from the roads and proposed carparking areas to the esplanade reserve in the form of public access easements or areas protected from the areas that are grazed.

Acquisition of land

In addition to the above Healthy Waters would normally decide whether to accept the drainage reserves as assets, including the stormwater ponds. The Community and Social Policy team would also do an assessment of the acquisition of the proposed recreational reserve. A decision on whether to acquire the proposed small recreation reserve as land in lieu of reserve under the Local Government Act 2002 would be made by the relevant Local Board and Council's governing body.

Here the proposed recreation reserves appear to be classified as a pocket park according to Auckland Council's Open Space Provision Policy. The policy states that pocket parks can be voluntarily provided at no capital cost to Council and only on agreement by Council. Alternatively, pocket parks can be retained in private ownership. As per the advice given in the original master plan application (BUN60362652), the Council would not be interested in seeking to purchase the proposed recreational open space within the development block.

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 acquisition of land and the acceptance of vested assets. This is to ensure Auckland Council receives vested park, reserve and streetscape assets that 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 (off-setting mitigation on asset owner land or proposed land for vesting, land acquisition, easements, reserve embellishments etc.) which may impact on the delivery of the project.

Maylene Barrett
Acting Parks Planning Team Leader
Date 23.3.2021



COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 –

Red Flag Checklist

Criteria Question	Criteria Answer – YES or NO
Is the application clearly inconsistent with the Auckland Unitary Plan and/or not aligned with the outcomes in the Auckland Plan 2050?	NO
Is the application out of sequence with the Auckland Plan Development Strategy and Future Urban Land Supply Strategy?	NO
Is there insufficient infrastructure to support the application and/or significant infrastructure spend is required to support the project?	NO
Is there a significant impact on Auckland Council / CCO and/or third-party infrastructure?	NO
Is the application a notice of requirement?	NO
Is there the potential for significant adverse environmental effects to occur?	NO
Overall, is this application red flagged on one or more criteria?	NO
Other comments?	While the application does not receive a red flag for parks, sport and recreation matters as per the above checklist, it should be noted that the lack of clarity around assets being vested to Council is a concern that Parks, Sport and Recreation believe worthy of a red flag. These concerns are outlined in the memo.

Asset Owner and Specialist Input Request Details – Feedback to the Minister for the Environment on consideration of a referral application

From		Doug Fletcher		
Date that invitation from MfE was received:	Current Working Days	Brief sent	Asset Owner / Specialist report due	
16/03/2021	2	17/03/2021	24/03/2021	
Proposal		Karaka North Village is a proposed large scale, master planned subdivision in Karaka, South Auckland. The development seeks to deliver up to 850 dwellings and a 2-hectare local centre, with a unique village / rural living environment and outlook.		
Site address and Legal Description:		348 Linwood Road, Karaka, Auckland, 2580, New Zealand		
Applicant		Karaka North Village Limited		
Related applications and consents (old Regional Permits, related current consents or applications)		<p>BUN60362652 was approved by a Duty Commissioner and the consent issued on 12.02.2021 for a 14 super lot subdivision and the consideration of a master plan, infrastructure management plan and landscape management plan as required by the Special Information Requirements of the Karaka North Precinct.</p> <p>WAT60351248 Consent was granted on 1 May 2020 for a maximum daily ground water take of up to 740m³ and an annual volume of 270,000m³.</p>		
Link to plans and relevant information		<p>U:\COO\Resource Consents\Premium Unit\Project Management\Karaka North Village Limited - PRR00037020\1. Lodged Documents</p> <p>out of scope</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>		

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: Tarso Girio, Development Engineer, Watercare

Date: 24 March 2021

Overall Summary:

The proposal for a mixed-use development located at 348 Linwood Road and 69A Dyke Road, Karaka, Auckland, includes:

- Subdivision and land development to create up to 598 residential lots, 17 super lots for future comprehensive residential development, a local commercial centre super lot, four utility lots, and approximately six recreation/drainage reserve/rural amenity farm lots
- Further subdivision and land development of three of the 17 super lots to create an additional 52 residential lots
- Construction of up to 9,000m² Gross Floor Area (GFA) of commercial buildings within the local commercial centre, and construction of a community venue building of up to 350m² GFA within a rural amenity farm lot, and
- Future development of up to 850 residential units to be constructed by other parties.

No water and wastewater flow or water supply demand data were provided as part of this application.

There is no public water or wastewater network infrastructure available to service this site.

The Infrastructure Management Plan (IMP) for BUN6362652 proposes reliance on private water supply and wastewater infrastructure.

These private on-site water and wastewater systems must be owned, operated and maintained by the developer.

Water Supply:

The developer is proposing an on-site potable water supply from bore water. The water supply network reticulation and Water Treatment Plant will be designed, constructed and maintained by the developer and will remain private. The ownership of the system can be transferred to an entity controlled by the residents' society at their discretion. The developer will need to meet the requirements for becoming a drinking water supplier under the Health Act, and in the future under the Water Services Regulator.

The appointment or decision on which contractor will be responsible for the maintenance of the on-site water supply systems falls outside Watercare's jurisdiction. Watercare has advised the developer that it will not assume operational responsibility for this supply and network.

Wastewater:

The Karaka North Precinct anticipates a centralised on-site wastewater treatment plant for each sub precinct unless a connection is available and approved to a public wastewater reticulation system. Watercare has indicated that a possible connection is available to the South West

Wastewater Scheme via Kingseat. However, the South West Scheme has been delayed due to Auckland Council budget constraints, and Watercare cannot confirm the timing of this scheme. Watercare has discussed funding and delivery of the connection from Karaka North to Kingseat and on to Clarks Beach, but these discussions have not progressed until the timeframe for the South West Scheme is confirmed.

The IMP provides a high-level discussion on an on-site wastewater treatment option. The developer is proposing an on-site wastewater treatment and disposal system. The wastewater infrastructure and Wastewater Treatment Plant will be designed, constructed and maintained by the developer and will remain private. The ownership of the system can be transferred to an entity controlled by the residents' society at their discretion.

The appointment or decision on which contractor will be responsible for the maintenance of the on-site wastewater systems falls outside Watercare's jurisdiction. Watercare has advised that it will not assume operational responsibility for the plant or reticulation network.

The developer will also need wastewater discharge consent for the wastewater treatment plant and may need discharge consent for the network.

COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 –

Red Flag Checklist

Criteria Question	Criteria Answer – YES or NO
Is the application clearly inconsistent with the Auckland Unitary Plan and/or not aligned with the outcomes in the Auckland Plan 2050?	NO
Is the application out of sequence with the Auckland Plan Development Strategy and Future Urban Land Supply Strategy?	NA
Is there insufficient infrastructure to support the application and/or significant infrastructure spend is required to support the project?	YES
Is there a significant impact on Auckland Council / CCO and/or third-party infrastructure?	YES
Is the application a notice of requirement?	NA
Is there the potential for significant adverse environmental effects to occur?	YES
Overall, is this application red flagged on one or more criteria?	YES
Other comments?	The applicant is relying on private infrastructure. This requires consents and to be managed privately. If this is done to a high standard, then there is no impact on CCO water and wastewater infrastructure. However, if it fails there will be significant impact on Council and its CCOs.

