

# Application for a project to be referred to an expert consenting panel

**(Pursuant to Section 20 of the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020)**

*For office use only:*

Project name: 8 Stevensons Crescent  
Application number: PJ-0000870  
Date received: 23/02/2023

This form must be used by applicants making a request to the responsible Minister(s) for a project to be referred to an expert consenting panel under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020.

All legislative references relate to the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 (the Act), unless stated otherwise.

The information requirements for making an application are described in Section 20(3) of the Act. Your application must be made in this approved form and contain all of the required information. If these requirements are not met, the Minister(s) may decline your application due to insufficient information.

Section 20(2)(b) of the Act specifies that the application needs only to provide a general level of detail, sufficient to inform the Minister's decision on the application, as opposed to the level of detail provided to an expert consenting panel deciding applications for resource consents or notices of requirement for designations.

We recommend you discuss your application and the information requirements with the Ministry for the Environment (the Ministry) before the request is lodged. Please contact the Ministry via email: [fasttrackconsenting@mfe.govt.nz](mailto:fasttrackconsenting@mfe.govt.nz)

The Ministry has also prepared [Fast-track guidance](#) to help applicants prepare applications for projects to be referred.

## Part I: Applicant

### Applicant details

Person or entity making the request: Mansion Rear Limited

Contact person: Gary Gray

Job title: Developer's representative

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Postal address:

Unit F, Block 2, 44/46 Constellation Drive, Rosedale, Auckland

### Address for service (if different from above)

Organisation: Berry Simons Environmental Law

Contact person: Simon Berry

Job title: Partner

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Postal address:

13 Shortland Street, Auckland CBD, Auckland 1010

## Part II: Project location

The application: does not relate to the coastal marine area

If the application relates to the coastal marine area wholly or in part, references to the Minister in this form should be read as the Minister for the Environment and Minister of Conservation.

Site address / location:

A cadastral map and/or aerial imagery to clearly show the project location will help.

8 Stevensons Crescent, Albany, Auckland, 0793, New Zealand

The proposal is located at 8 Stevensons Crescent, Albany, Auckland ("the Site"), at the north-western edge of the existing Albany village, contiguous with the existing urban area. The location plan is attached Appendix R.

Legal description(s):

A current copy of the relevant Record(s) of Title will help.

Part Allotment 27 Parish of Paremoremo and Part Allotment 299 Parish of Pukeatua.  
A current copy of the relevant Record of Title is attached at **Appendix Q**.

Registered legal land owner(s):

Junjie Xu and Xianghai Chen

Detail the nature of the applicant's legal interest (if any) in the land on which the project will occur, including a statement of how that affects the applicant's ability to undertake the work that is required for the project:

Mansion Rear Ltd ("MRL" or "Applicant") is a New Zealand limited liability company that was incorporated in December 2014. Ms. Junge Xu ("Ms. Xu") is the sole director and shareholder of MRL and therefore has a controlling interest in MRL.

The Applicant is not currently a registered owner of the Site, however, it is confirmed that arrangements are in place to transfer the property from the relevant landowners to the Applicant if the resource consent is obtained for the proposal and prior to drawing on the project finance. The timing of the transfer will be worked through as the project finance is finalised.

Per s 18 of the Covid 19 Recovery (Fast-Track Consenting) Act 2020 ("FTCA"), the Applicant has provided a letter of agreement from the relevant landowner at **Appendix I** which confirms that the Applicant has sufficient legal interest in the land to be able to implement the proposal.

## Part III: Project details

### Description

Project name: 8 Stevensons Crescent

Project summary:

Please provide a brief summary (no more than 2-3 lines) of the proposed project.

The 2.5ha site is located at 8 Stevensons Crescent, Albany, Auckland. The proposal is to obtain the resource consents required to authorise the development of up to 138 residential dwellings, as well as a commercial component which may take the form of mixed-use development with retail or office spaces on the ground or lower floors of multi-storey buildings, with residential units above.

Project details:

Please provide details of the proposed project, its purpose, objectives and the activities it involves, noting that Section 20(2)(b) of the Act specifies that the application needs only to provide a general level of detail.

The 2.5ha site is located at 8 Stevensons Crescent, Albany, Auckland. The proposal is to obtain the resource consents required to authorise the development of up to 138 residential dwellings, as well as a commercial component which may take the form of mixed-use development with retail or office spaces on the ground or lower floors of multi-storey buildings, with residential units above.

### Purpose and object of the proposal

In its letter (**Appendix H**) the Applicant confirms that the purpose of the proposal is to increase housing supply in the Auckland region, in particular, providing affordable housing with good amenity to meet market demand in the Albany area, which locally provides excellent education and all other amenities required for urban living. The proposal is to target first home buyers, individuals, small-families, and young families. It is anticipated that the proposed housing will have an expected sale price between \$650k and \$1M, a price bracket that is not readily available elsewhere on the North Shore or in Albany. Prior to the Auckland Unitary Plan ("AUP"), 8 Stevensons Crescent had residential zoning, and it is understood that all infrastructure required to develop the Site and provide medium density housing is available to the Site.

In summary, the proposal seeks to construct a total of 138 residential units, comprising 112 terraced houses and 26 apartment units. The apartment units proposed will comprise a variety of 2-bedroom typologies with a 55-65m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area ("GFA") with 8sqm of balconies, and the terrace houses proposed will be a mix of 3- and 4-bedroom typologies on 3 level buildings with 20sqm of outdoor living space. The GFA for the 3-bedroom dwellings will range from 85 – 135m<sup>2</sup>, and the 4-bedroom

dwellings will range from 99 – 140m<sup>2</sup>. It is noted at the current stage that there are at least 5 terrace house typologies proposed, but this might increase at a later stage.

The proposal also includes a commercial component comprising approximately 550m<sup>2</sup> located at the ground floor of the apartment buildings. At this early stage, the Applicant envisages that the commercial component of the development will be focused on local community facilities and job generation, including:

- (a) a cafe;
- (b) a convenience outlet – dairy; and
- (c) work from home type units fronting Stevensons Crescent.

For completeness, the proposed architectural plan prepared by OZAC Architects is included at **Appendix C**.

#### **Pre-application discussions with Auckland Council**

A pre-application meeting was held by Mansion Rear Ltd and its consultants with Auckland Council officers on 17 December 2020 to discuss the developments of the Site through the process of seeking a resource consent rather than a plan change. The initial part of this meeting discussed the fact that the land previously had residential zoning and was re-zoned (“down zoned”) to Future Urban zone (“FUZ”).

The summary of the meeting minutes (which are provided at **Appendix P**) stated that “it is acknowledged that the AUP does not preclude resource consent applications being lodged for urban development on land zoned Future Urban, however the Council’s advice is that a structure plan process for the site and surrounding land zoned Future Urban is undertaken in the first instance, and a private plan change lodged with Plans & Places Department, as opposed to a non-complying resource consent application for one site only. This will ensure that the land zoned Future Urban is developed in a “comprehensive and integrated manner.”

As a result of this feedback from engagement with Auckland Council, we became aware of the importance of developing the Site having regard to the adjoining site at 24 Stevensons Crescent and to include this site in any structure planning. This advice was taken (see Mr. Munros report at **Appendix B**).

Where applicable, describe the staging of the project, including the nature and timing of the staging:

The total project duration is estimated to take 36 months, with civil works expected to take 18 months and vertical construction expected to take 24 months.

In regard to the staging of the project, the Applicant confirms in the letter included at **Appendix H**, that vertical construction will be sequenced in a staged manner through a number of discrete areas. It is anticipated that house construction can begin after approximately 12 months of civil works and once the roading over the part of the project adjacent to Stevensons Crescent is complete. A diagram showing the potential stages of construction is provided at **Appendix J**.

#### **Consents / approvals required**

Relevant local authorities: Auckland Council

Resource consent(s) / designation required:

Land-use consent, Subdivision consent, Discharge permit

Relevant zoning, overlays and other features:

Please provide details of the zoning, overlays and other features identified in the relevant plan(s) that relate to the project location.

| Legal description(s)                                        | Relevant plan                 | Zone              | Overlays    | Other features |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|----------------|
| Pt Allot 27, Pt Allot 299 Pukeatua Psh Blk III Waitemata SD | Auckland Unitary Plan ("AUP") | Future Urban Zone | No overlays | N/A            |

Rule(s) consent is required under and activity status:

Please provide details of all rules consent is required under. Please note that Section 18(3)(a) of the Act details that the project **must not include** an activity that is described as a prohibited activity in the Resource Management Act 1991, regulations made under that Act (including a national environmental standard), or a plan or proposed plan.

| Relevant plan / standard                                                                                                                                  | Relevant rule / regulation       | Reason for consent                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Activity status          | Location of proposed activity                                                                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011 ("NES-CS") | Regulation 10                    | Disturbance of contaminated soil which exceeds the applicable standards (listed in Regulation 7).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Restricted Discretionary | Across the site as identified in a PSI/DSI                                                                 |
| Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Freshwater) Amendment Regulations 2022                                                           | Regulation 45C Urban Development | Vegetation clearance, earthworks or land disturbance within, or within 10m setback from a natural inland wetland.<br><br>Earthworks or land disturbance within a 100m setback from a natural inland wetland.<br><br>The taking, use, damming or diversion of water within, or within a 100m setback from a natural inland wetland.<br><br>The discharge of water into water within, or within a 100m setback, from a natural inland wetland | Restricted Discretionary | Within 10 and 100m of wetlands identified on concept plan<br><br>Wetlands as identified by RMA Ecology Ltd |
| Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Freshwater) Amendment Regulations 2022                                                           | Regulation 39 and 55             | Wetland restoration activities (vegetation removal, earthworks/land disturbance, taking/use/damming/diversion of water and discharge of water) not complying with                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Restricted Discretionary | Within wetlands as identified by RMA Ecology Ltd / location on the concept plan                            |

|                                                                                                 |               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                          |                                                                                      |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                 |               | permitted activity conditions in Regulation 38.                                                                                                                                                                               |                          |                                                                                      |
| Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Freshwater) Amendment Regulations 2022 | Regulation 71 | The placement and use of a culvert in, on, over or under the bed of a river, not complying with the permitted activity conditions in Regulation 70.<br><br>Note: If detailed design of the culverts cannot ensure compliance. | Discretionary            | See location of proposed vehicle crossings on the concept plan                       |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E39 – Subdivision (Rural)                                         | E39.4.1 (A8)  | Subdivision of land within a natural hazard area (1% AEP)                                                                                                                                                                     | Restricted Discretionary | 1% AEP as identified by DHC Consulting Ltd                                           |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E39 – Subdivision (Rural)                                         | E39.4.1 (A9)  | Subdivision not meeting the relevant standards                                                                                                                                                                                | Discretionary            | Across the site                                                                      |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E39 – Subdivision (Rural)                                         | E39.4.3(29)   | Any other subdivision not provided for in Table E39.4.1 or E39.4.3<br><br>Note: no stream is greater than 3m in width, therefore no esplanade reserve is required.                                                            | Non-Complying            | Across the site                                                                      |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E39 – Subdivision (Rural)                                         | E39.4.3 (A28) | Subdivision for open spaces, reserves or road alignment (in Future Urban Zone)                                                                                                                                                | Discretionary            | Across the site                                                                      |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter H18 – Future Urban Zone                                           | H18.4.1(A28)  | Dwellings that do not comply with Standard H18.6.8<br><br>Note: H18.6.8 states there should be no more than one dwelling per site.                                                                                            | Non-Complying            | Across the site                                                                      |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter H18 – Future Urban Zone                                           | H18.4.1(A34)  | Home occupations that do not comply with Standard H18.6.9<br><br>Note: Work-from-home type offices anticipated adjacent to Stevensons Crescent                                                                                | Non-Complying            | Apartment buildings (type E and F) on the concept plan (Stevenson Crescent frontage) |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter H18 – Future Urban Zone                                           | H18.4.1(A38)  | Restaurants and cafes not otherwise provided for.<br><br>Note: If proposed adjacent to Stevensons Crescent.                                                                                                                   | Discretionary            | Apartment buildings (type E and F) on the concept plan (Stevenson Crescent frontage) |

|                                                                               |              |                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter H18 – Future<br>Urban Zone                   | H18.4.1(A2)  | New buildings, building<br>additions and<br>accessory buildings.                                                                                                              | Discretionary / Non-<br>Complying<br><br>Same status and<br>standards as applies to<br>the land use activity<br>the building is<br>designed to<br>accommodate | Across the site                                                                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter H18 – Future<br>Urban Zone                   | C1.7         | Activities not provided<br>for:<br>“Mixed Use” Type<br>Activities i.e.:<br>- Retail; dairy;<br>offices.                                                                       | Discretionary                                                                                                                                                 | Apartment buildings<br>(type E and F) on the<br>concept plan<br>(Stevenson Crescent<br>frontage) |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter H18 – Future<br>Urban Zone                   | C.1.9        | Development standard<br>infringements:<br>- H18.6.2<br>Maximum Building<br>Height;<br>- H18.6.3 Yards;<br>- H18.6.8<br>Dwellings;<br>- 18.6.9 Home<br>Occupations.            | Restricted<br>Discretionary                                                                                                                                   | Across the site                                                                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E3 Lakes,<br>rivers, streams and<br>wetlands | E3.4.1 (A1)  | Any activities in, on,<br>under or over the bed<br>of lakes, rivers,<br>streams and wetlands<br>not otherwise provided<br>for.                                                | Discretionary                                                                                                                                                 | Wetlands and stream<br>as identified by RMA<br>Ecology Ltd                                       |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E3 Lakes,<br>rivers, streams and<br>wetlands | E3.4.1 (A3)  | Conservation planting<br>not complying with the<br>standards.                                                                                                                 | Restricted<br>Discretionary                                                                                                                                   | Wetlands and stream<br>as identified by RMA<br>Ecology Ltd                                       |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E3 Lakes,<br>rivers, streams and<br>wetlands | E3.4.1 (A19) | Diversion of a river or<br>stream to a new course<br>and associated<br>disturbance and<br>sediment discharge,<br>outside of overlays.                                         | Discretionary                                                                                                                                                 | Stream as identified by<br>RMA Ecology Ltd and<br>illustrated as stream on<br>concept plan       |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E3 Lakes,<br>rivers, streams and<br>wetlands | E3.4.1 (A25) | Partial demolition or<br>removal of structures<br>lawfully existing on or<br>before 30 September<br>2013.<br><br>Note: This is the<br>existing culvert<br>through the stream. | Restricted<br>Discretionary                                                                                                                                   | Existing culvert road<br>crossing of stream                                                      |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E3 Lakes,<br>rivers, streams and<br>wetlands | E3.4.1 (A28) | Structures associated<br>with the enhancement<br>and restoration of<br>lakes, rivers, streams<br>or wetlands not                                                              | Restricted<br>Discretionary                                                                                                                                   | Wetlands and stream<br>as identified by RMA<br>Ecology Ltd                                       |

|                                                                                |                    |                                                                                                                                                                               |                          |                                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                |                    | otherwise provided for.                                                                                                                                                       |                          |                                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E3 Lakes, rivers, streams and wetlands           | E3.4.1 (A33)       | Culverts more than 30m in length, outside of overlays.                                                                                                                        | Discretionary            | Road cross of stream illustrated on concept plan |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E7 Taking using, damming and diversions of water | E7.4.1 (A13)       | Diverting surface water not otherwise listed or meeting the standards.                                                                                                        | Discretionary            | Across the site                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E7 Taking using, damming and diversions of water | E7.4.1 (A26)       | Taking and use of ground water not otherwise listed or meeting the standards.                                                                                                 | Discretionary            | Across the site                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E7 Taking using, damming and diversions of water | E7.4.1 (A28)       | Diversion of ground water not otherwise listed or meeting the standards.                                                                                                      | Restricted Discretionary | Across the site                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E8 - Stormwater – Discharge and Diversion        | E9.4.1(A11)        | Diversion and discharge of stormwater runoff from a new stormwater networks.                                                                                                  | Discretionary            | Across the site                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E9 - Stormwater Quality                          | E9.4.1(A8)         | Development of a new, or redevelopment of an existing high contaminant generating car park that does not comply with the relevant permitted or controlled activity standards. | Restricted Discretionary | Across the site                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E11 – Land Disturbance Regional                  | E11.4.1 (A4)       | Earthworks greater than 10,000 and up to 50,000m <sup>2</sup> where land has a slope less than 10 degrees, outside the Sediment Control Protection Area.                      | Controlled               | Across the site                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E11 – Land Disturbance Regional                  | E11.4.1 (A9)       | Earthworks greater than 2,500m <sup>2</sup> within the Sediment Control Protection Area.                                                                                      | Restricted Discretionary | Across the site                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E11 – Land Disturbance Regional                  | C1.9               | Non-compliance with general standards listed in E11.6.2.                                                                                                                      | Restricted Discretionary | Across the site                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E12 – Land Disturbance District                  | E12.4.1 (A6)&(A10) | Earthworks greater than 2,500m <sup>2</sup> and 2,500m <sup>3</sup> in the Future Urban Zone.                                                                                 | Restricted Discretionary | Across the site                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E12 – Land Disturbance District                  | C1.9               | Non-compliance with general standards listed in E12.6.2.                                                                                                                      | Restricted Discretionary | Across the site                                  |

|                                                                  |                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                             |                                                                                                  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E15<br>Vegetation<br>Management | E15.4.1 (A16)    | Vegetation removal<br>within 20m of a rural<br>stream.                                                                                                                                             | Restricted<br>Discretionary | Within 20m of stream<br>illustrated on concept<br>plan                                           |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E15<br>Vegetation<br>Management | E15.4.1 (A18)    | Vegetation removal<br>within 20m of a natural<br>wetland.                                                                                                                                          | Restricted<br>Discretionary | Within 20m of wetland<br>illustrated on concept<br>plan                                          |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E23 Signs                       | E23.4.2(A53)     | Comprehensive<br>development signage<br><br>Note: For mixed use<br>activities adjacent to<br>Stevenson Crescent.                                                                                   | Restricted<br>Discretionary | Apartment buildings<br>(type E and F) on the<br>concept plan<br>(Stevenson Crescent<br>frontage) |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E25 Noise and<br>Vibration      | E25.4.1(A2)      | Construction works<br>that do not comply<br>with the permitted<br>standards for noise<br>and/or vibration.                                                                                         | Restricted<br>Discretionary | Across the site                                                                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E26<br>Infrastructure           | E26.2.3(A55)     | Stormwater<br>detention/retention<br>ponds/wetlands.                                                                                                                                               | Controlled                  | As identified by DHC<br>Consulting Ltd                                                           |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E27 Transport                   | E27.4.1(A2)      | Parking and access<br>which is an accessory<br>activity but does not<br>comply with the<br>standards.                                                                                              | Restricted<br>Discretionary | Across the site                                                                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E27 Transport                   | E27.4.1(A3)      | Any activity or<br>subdivision which<br>exceeds the relevant<br>trip generation<br>standards.                                                                                                      | Restricted<br>Discretionary | Across the site                                                                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E27 Transport                   | E27.4.1(A5)&(A6) | Construction, use and<br>establishment of new<br>activity where the<br>vehicle crossing access<br>restriction applies.                                                                             | Restricted<br>Discretionary | Stevenson Road<br>frontage                                                                       |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E30 –<br>Contaminated Land      | E30.4.1 (A6)     | Discharges of<br>contaminants into air,<br>or into water, or onto<br>or into land not<br>meeting permitted<br>activity Standard<br>E30.6.1.1; E30.6.1.2;<br>E30.6.1.3; E30.6.1.4; or<br>E30.6.1.5. | Controlled                  | Across the site                                                                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E30 –<br>Contaminated Land      | E30.4.1 (A7)     | Discharge of<br>contaminants not<br>meeting the controlled<br>activity standards.                                                                                                                  | Discretionary               | Across the site                                                                                  |
| Auckland Unitary Plan<br>Chapter E36 – Natural<br>Hazards        | E36.4.1 (A25)    | Surface parking areas<br>and above ground<br>parking areas in the 1<br>per cent annual<br>exceedance probability                                                                                   | Controlled                  | 1% AEP as identified by<br>DHC Consulting Ltd                                                    |

|                                                          |               |                                                                                                                                                                              |                          |                                                      |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                          |               | (AEP) floodplain, that do not comply with Standard E36.6.1.7.                                                                                                                |                          |                                                      |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E36 – Natural Hazards      | E36.4.1 (A33) | Construction of other land drainage works, stormwater management devices or flood mitigation works in the 1 per cent annual exceedance probability (AEP) floodplain.         | Restricted Discretionary | 1% AEP as identified by DHC Consulting Ltd           |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E36 – Natural Hazards      | E36.4.1 (A38) | New buildings to accommodate more vulnerable activities in the 1% AEP.                                                                                                       | Restricted Discretionary | 1% AEP as identified by DHC Consulting Ltd           |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E36 – Natural Hazards      | E36.4.1 (A41) | Diverting the entry or exit point, piping or reducing the capacity of any part of an overland flow path.                                                                     | Restricted Discretionary | OLFPs as identified by DHC Consulting Ltd            |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E36 – Natural Hazards      | E36.4.1 (A42) | Any buildings or other structures, including retaining walls located within or over an overland flow path.                                                                   | Restricted Discretionary | OLFPs as identified by DHC Consulting Ltd            |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E36 – Natural Hazards      | E36.4.1(A56)  | All other infrastructure not specifically listed, located in a hazard area.                                                                                                  | Restricted Discretionary | 1% AEP and OLFPs as identified by DHC Consulting Ltd |
| Auckland Unitary Plan Chapter E40 – Temporary Activities | E40.4.1(A24)  | Specific temporary activities that are not provided as a permitted activity in rules (A12) to (A23).<br><br>Note: Applies if the construction period is to exceed 24 months. | Restricted Discretionary | Across the site                                      |

Resource consent applications already made, or notices of requirement already lodged, on the same or a similar project:

Please provide details of the applications and notices, and any decisions made on them. Schedule 6 clause 28(3) of the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 details that a person who has lodged an application for a resource consent or a notice of requirement under the Resource Management Act 1991, in relation to a listed project or a referred project, must withdraw that application or notice of requirement before lodging a consent application or notice of requirement with an expert consenting panel under this Act for the same, or substantially the same, activity.

MRLs' letter (**Appendix H**) confirms MRL hasn't made any previous resource consent applications. The previous owners of the Site applied for resource consent to subdivide the property on 15 August 2016. Auckland Council noted this application was never closed/completed. The relevant scheme plans, and application documents are included at **Appendices N** and **O**.

Following the Applicant's review of Auckland Council's property file for the Site and discussions with Auckland Council planning desk, Auckland Council have confirmed

that there have been no resource consent applications at the Site since the 2016 application.

Resource consent(s) / Designation required for the project by someone other than the applicant, including details on whether these have been obtained:

No resource consents or designations are required from someone other than the Applicant.

Other legal authorisations (other than contractual) required to begin the project (eg, authorities under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 or concessions under the Conservation Act 1987), including details on whether these have been obtained:

No other authorisations will be required to commence the project.

### **Construction readiness**

If the resource consent(s) are granted, and/or notice of requirement is confirmed, detail when you anticipate construction activities will begin, and be completed:

Please provide a high-level timeline outlining key milestones, e.g. detailed design, procurement, funding, site works commencement and completion.

A high-level timeline of construction/works for the proposal is provided in the Applicant's letter at **Appendix H**, and is set out below:

1. Month 1 to 2 – Site establishment and set up of sediment control measures.
2. Months 3 to 18 - Horizontal development - Civil works - bulk earthworks, retaining walls as required, roading, drainage.
3. Months 9 to 19 – Installation of underground services up to building sites.
4. Month 13 to 36 – Staged vertical construction of buildings.
5. Months 20 to 36 - House Completion for settlement.

For completeness, a Gantt chart which shows the timeline of construction is included at **Appendix K**.

The Applicant has confirmed that full funding for the complete subdivision and development of the project can be obtained via its broker, Golden Water Fund GP Limited ("GWF"), which has recently secured funding for the Applicant's 16 lot subdivision and development of standalone houses in Ranui, Auckland.

Project funding for the development will be provided by a Senior Loan facility from non-bank lenders.

In support of the Applicant's funding, a letter of intent from GWF in relation to the funding of the development is attached as **Appendix M**. A second letter of intent that has also been received from Labassa Capital, a specialised real estate debt and equity investor, is also attached at **Appendix L**.

Assuming that the consent was granted in August 2023, the Applicant anticipates that Site establishment could begin in late September 2023, sediment control and preliminary site works could be established in October 2023, and bulk earthworks could then begin in November 2023 in line with the recognised Auckland summer earthworks season. As set out above, it is anticipated that construction will be completed between 19-36 months of commencement.

## **Part IV: Consultation**

### **Government ministries and departments**

Detail all consultation undertaken with relevant government ministries and departments:

On 17 June 2022, Ms. Xu and her consultants met with officials from the Ministry for the Environment to discuss the proposal and the feasibility of making an application to authorise the development via the FTCA fast track procedure. It was discussed that the fast track procedure was a feasible option, and that the next steps would include framing up a structure plan with a clear project description, along with preliminary technical assessments of effects for the fast track referral process.

### Local authorities

Detail all consultation undertaken with relevant local authorities:

The Applicant has attended one pre-application meeting with Auckland Council. This meeting was held by Ms. Xu and her consultants on 17 December 2020. The advice of Auckland Council's planners following this meeting are noted earlier and are attached at **Appendix P**.

It is noted that the meeting minutes are Auckland Council's own record of the minutes.

### Other persons/parties

Detail all other persons or parties you consider are likely to be affected by the project:

In accordance with s 20(3)(h) of the FTCA, the following persons/agencies are likely affected:

- Relevant iwi authorities

**Relevant iwi authorities** – Consultation with iwi has been initiated, with details sent to mana whenua identified by Auckland Council for this location. A copy of the cultural consultation letter and associated email dated 16 February 2023, along with an expression of interest from Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust, are provided in **Appendix S**. On site visits and detailed consultation will be taking place with iwi authorities expressing an interest in the project.

Detail all consultation undertaken with the above persons or parties:

As detailed above, a cultural consultation letter has been sent out to the relevant iwi authorities. Details of this consultation and associated communications are included in the following section ("Part V: Iwi authorities and Treaty settlements").

## Part V: Iwi authorities and Treaty settlements

For help with identifying relevant iwi authorities, you may wish to refer to [Te Kāhui Māngai – Directory of Iwi and Māori Organisations](#).

### Iwi authorities and Treaty settlement entities

Detail all consultation undertaken with Iwi authorities whose area of interest includes the area in which the project will occur:

| Iwi authority      | Consultation undertaken                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki | 16 February 2023 – Consultation with iwi has been initiated, with a letter sent to mana whenua identified by Auckland Council for this location. The consultation letter details the application, seeks feedback, and will identify whether further engagement is sought. A response is presently awaited. |

|                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ngāti Manuhiri            | <p>16 February 2023 – Consultation with iwi has been initiated, with a letter sent to mana whenua identified by Auckland Council for this location. The consultation letter details the application, seeks feedback, and will identify whether further engagement is sought.</p> <p>20 February 2023 – Courtney Shaw on behalf of Manuhiri Kaitiaki Charitable Trust responded to advise they would like to express an interest in providing a cultural response on this project. A copy of this email is at Appendix S, page 4.</p> |
| Ngāti Maru                | <p>16 February 2023 – Consultation with iwi has been initiated, with a letter sent to mana whenua identified by Auckland Council for this location. The consultation letter details the application, seeks feedback, and will identify whether further engagement is sought. A response is presently awaited.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Ngāti Pāoa                | <p>Ngāti Paoa Iwi Trust &amp; Ngāti Pāoa Trust Board</p> <p>16 February 2023 – Consultation with iwi has been initiated, with a letter sent to mana whenua identified by Auckland Council for this location. The consultation letter details the application, seeks feedback, and will identify whether further engagement is sought. A response is presently awaited.</p>                                                                                                                                                           |
| Ngāti Te Ata              | <p>16 February 2023 – Consultation with iwi has been initiated, with a letter sent to mana whenua identified by Auckland Council for this location. The consultation letter details the application, seeks feedback, and will identify whether further engagement is sought. A response is presently awaited.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Ngāti Whanaunga           | <p>16 February 2023 – Consultation with iwi has been initiated, with a letter sent to mana whenua identified by Auckland Council for this location. The consultation letter details the application, seeks feedback, and will identify whether further engagement is sought. A response is presently awaited.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara    | <p>16 February 2023 – Consultation with iwi has been initiated, with a letter sent to mana whenua identified by Auckland Council for this location. The consultation letter details the application, seeks feedback, and will identify whether further engagement is sought. A response is presently awaited.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei       | <p>16 February 2023 – Consultation with iwi has been initiated, with a letter sent to mana whenua identified by Auckland Council for this location. The consultation letter details the application, seeks feedback, and will identify whether further engagement is sought. A response is presently awaited.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Te Ākitai Waiohau         | <p>16 February 2023 – Consultation with iwi has been initiated, with a letter sent to mana whenua identified by Auckland Council for this location. The consultation letter details the application, seeks feedback, and will identify whether further engagement is sought. A response is presently awaited.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Te Kawerau ā Maki         | <p>17 February 2023 – Consultation with iwi has been initiated, with a letter sent to mana whenua identified by Auckland Council for this location. The consultation letter details the application, seeks feedback, and will identify whether further engagement is sought. A response is presently awaited.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua | <p>17 February 2023 – Consultation with iwi has been initiated, with a letter sent to mana whenua identified by Auckland Council for this location. The consultation letter details the application, seeks feedback, and will identify whether further engagement is sought. A response is presently awaited.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

Detail all consultation undertaken with Treaty settlement entities whose area of interest includes the area in which the project will occur:

| Treaty settlement entity | Consultation undertaken |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| N/A                      | N/A                     |

## Treaty settlements

Treaty settlements that apply to the geographical location of the project, and a summary of the relevant principles and provisions in those settlements, including any statutory acknowledgement areas:

Section 18(3)(b) of the Act details that the project **must not include** an activity that will occur on land returned under a Treaty settlement where that activity has not been agreed to in writing by the relevant land owner.

The Site is not treaty settlement land and is not located within any iwi statutory acknowledgement area. See **Appendix U** for the Treaty Settlements and Statutory Acknowledgments overlay for the Site, on Auckland Council GIS viewer Geomaps.

## Part VI: Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011

### Customary marine title areas

Customary marine title areas under the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 that apply to the location of the project:

Section 18(3)(c) of the Act details that the project **must not include** an activity that will occur in a customary marine title area where that activity has not been agreed to in writing by the holder of the relevant customary marine title order.

The proposal is not located in the Coastal Marine Area, so this is not applicable.

### Protected customary rights areas

Protected customary rights areas under the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 that apply to the location of the project:

Section 18(3)(d) of the Act details that the project **must not include** an activity that will occur in a protected customary rights area and have a more than minor adverse effect on the exercise of the protected customary right, where that activity has not been agreed to in writing by the holder of the relevant protected customary rights recognition order.

The proposal is not located in the Coastal Marine Area, so this is not applicable.

## Part VII: Adverse effects

Description of the anticipated and known adverse effects of the project on the environment, including greenhouse gas emissions:

In considering whether a project will help to achieve the purpose of the Act, the Minister may have regard to, under Section 19(e) of the Act, whether there is potential for the project to have significant adverse environmental effects. Please provide details on both the nature and scale of the anticipated and known adverse effects, noting that Section 20(2)(b) of the Act specifies that the application need only provide a general level of detail.

### Potential adverse effects

In terms of sustainable use, the proposed use responds with a significantly greater positive environmental outcome than if the Site remains as currently utilised. The site at 8 Stevensons Crescent is currently occupied by one dwelling and was previously used for grazing, which has now ceased. The proposed change in use is to provide for 138 residential units, with some of those dwellings intended to be targeted as affordable dwellings, while also offering a commercial component,

including retail activities and work from home type units. Overall, the proposal has a substantial net positive environmental effect.

The potential adverse effects are those typically associated with large-scale residential development, those relating to:

- Increased local traffic on the road network.
- Perceived amenity effects from the increased use on surrounding residential neighbours.
- Temporary works during the construction and development of the Site, including noise, vibration, traffic, odour etc.
- Infrastructure effects relating to wastewater and water supply, demand and capacities, and stormwater discharges (including effects on the overland flow path shown on Auckland Council's GIS).

Any potential adverse effects can be readily addressed as follows:

- Accessibility to public transport, the available on-site parking, and the capacity of the existing roading network to absorb additional traffic.
- A high standard of urban design providing a higher intensity of residential use at a scale contemporary to the surrounding area.
- Use of standard engineering methods for earthworks and construction of infrastructure (roads and services).
- Upgrading of local infrastructure services as needed (which is typical of a development of this size) and managing potential overland water flows through design decisions.
- Undertaking preliminary and detailed site investigations relating to geotechnical and civil engineering matters.

#### Traffic

A preliminary assessment of the traffic effects of the proposed development for the Site has been undertaken by Keith Bell of TEAM Traffic and is attached at Appendix F. As an overview, Mr. Bell's assessment is that the additional movement generated from the development will be easily accommodated by proposed internal roading configurations and the existing configuration of the Stevensons Crescent / Dairy Flat Highway intersection and the wider road network. With transport, connectivity and amenity in the area is only expected to improve as Auckland Transport moves towards upgrading the existing footpath networks and Dairy Flat Highway between Stevenson Crescent and Albany Village.

#### **Civil Engineering and Servicing**

A preliminary assessment of the public stormwater, wastewater and water supply servicing for the Site has been undertaken by Nigel Fernando of DHC Consulting and is attached at **Appendix D**. Mr. Fernando confirms that part of the Site can be serviced by the existing public stormwater network, but it is recommended that further investigations be carried out to confirm if the existing network requires any upgrades. Furthermore, Mr. Fernando confirms that:

- The Site can be serviced by the existing public wastewater network as it has sufficient capacity to receive flows from the development and upstream catchment, and an extension of the public network (approx. 150m) will be required to connect the proposed development; and
- The Site can be serviced by the existing public water supply network, and a 150mm dia. Extension of the water supply pipeline (approx. 100m-200m) will be required.

Watercare has provided confirmation of this, attached to the civil assessment at **Appendix D, page 35**.

**Geotechnical** A preliminary geotechnical assessment has been prepared by Calvin Wu of Subsurface Consultants, which addresses the site stability and earthworks components of the proposal (Appendix G). **Urban Amenity / Urban Design** With respect to amenity,

Ian Munro has undertaken an assessment of the urban design principles adopted to develop the design, layout, and intended interface and characteristics of the proposal and is attached at Appendix B.

### **Ecology**

Graham Ussher of RMA Ecology has prepared an ecological assessment of the Site, at Appendix E. Mr Ussher identifies that the Site has features with some ecological values, including an intermittent stream and toe slope wetlands, all of which are very degraded and support a low level of ecological value in their current form. Mr Ussher confirms that while the concept plan layout for the Site will involve loss or modification of an intermittent stream and parts of the periphery of the wetland areas, the proposed mitigation to be applied across the Site and the proposed programme of ecological enhancement to the stream and wetland areas will prevent loss and damage to wildlife and prevent adverse effects to the stream and wetland areas.

Accordingly, Mr Ussher concludes that the proposal will avoid or otherwise manage potential adverse effects and enhance the areas of stream and wetland at the Site, resulting in a no-net-loss or a clear net-gain benefit for ecology of the Site and local area.

### **Auckland Unitary Plan – Anticipated effects assessment**

With regard to effects anticipated under the FUZ, the following sets out the key Zone Statement, Objectives and Policies, and provisions in support of this proposal. Objectives and policies

With specific regard to the FUZ objectives and policies and zone description (in Chapter H18 AUP), the planning assessment considers that it is clear that the FUZ is land that has been identified as suitable for urbanisation, stating that “the FUZ is a transitional zone which applies before the land is rezoned for urban purposes; and urbanisation of FUZ land is to proceed in accordance with a structure plan prepared in accordance with the structure plan guidelines in Appendix 1 of the AUP (**Appendix A**, at 7.3).

The planning assessment (**Appendix A**) provides a detailed assessment of the proposal in regard to each of the relevant FUZ objectives and policies; therefore, it is only necessary to note that overall, the planning assessment confirms that the proposal is consistent with the objectives and policies of the FUZ.

It is also emphasised that the proposal is consistent with other fast track applications (including Hall Farm, Orewa) where resource consents have been issued for (larger scale) developments in the FUZ without the need for a plan change.

Again, this is discussed in more detail in the planning assessment.

#### **Standards and application approach**

The development is likely to trigger the need for a non-complying resource consent. On that basis, a review of the section 104D RMA gateway tests has been undertaken. This is addressed in detail in the planning assessment, at **Appendix A**.

In summary:

Gateway 1 – potential adverse effects no more than minor

The planning assessment confirms that the potential adverse effects of the proposal are those typically associated with a medium to high density development and notes that these effects have been identified through the suite of technical reports appended to this application, and the reports address (at a high level), the following potential effects:

- Effects associated with construction and preparation of land for subdivision and residential and mixed use, including:

- o Effects from earthworks (namely erosion and sediment and land stability), general construction effects, contamination effects, effects on freshwater and terrestrial ecology, and cultural or heritage effects; and
- Effects associated with subdivision and use of land for residential and mixed-use purposes, including:
  - o Landscape/visual amenity effects, urban design effects, stormwater effects (including effects of developing land subject to a floodplain and a stream/overland flow path), effects on infrastructure and utilities, economic effects, and traffic effects.

These potential effects are considered in detail in Mr Tollemache's planning assessment (**Appendix A**, at 6.6 – 6.89). Overall, Mr. Tollemache confirms:

*"Having considered the above, the proposal adopts the most practicable options to avoid and/or mitigate any actual and/or potential effects on the receiving environment resulting from the proposed earthworks, subdivision, and integrated land use component for the residential and mixed-use development. Thus, the potential effects generated will be no more than minor."*

The planning assessment therefore concludes that the proposal would meet the gateway test under section 104D(1)(a) of the RMA.

Gateway 2 – the proposal is not contrary to the objectives and policies of the AUP and other relevant plans

In the planning assessment, Mr. Tollemache confirms that he has reviewed the relevant objectives and policies of the AUP in respect of determining that the application would meet the gateway test in relation to objectives and policies. The planning assessment addresses the proposal against the relevant objectives and policies in detail (**Appendix A**, at 7.2). Therefore, it is only necessary to note that ultimately, the planning assessment found that the proposal, when considered overall, is consistent with the relevant objectives and policies.

The planning assessment therefore concludes that the proposal would meet the gateway test under section 104D(1)(b) of the RMA.

## Part VIII: National policy statements and national environmental standards

General assessment of the project in relation to any relevant national policy statement (including the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement) and national environmental standard:

### **National Policy Statement on Urban Development ("NPSUD")**

The overall intent of the NPSUD is clear in that where intensification is practical, Councils are required to be responsive to such proposals – particularly in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity, as set out in Objective 6, Policy 6 and 8. The direction for increased intensity in appropriate locations is further obviated under Policy 3, which, for Tier 1 urban environments, seeks that planning documents **enable** building heights to maximising intensification as much as possible. Policy 3(c)(i) seeks to enable building heights of at least six stories within at least a walkable catchment of existing and planned rapid transit stops. This applies to this proposal, being within a short walk / cycle to Albany Village, with a number of bus routes, although the proposed project is a

variety of diverse dwelling types. However, this aligns with the NPS-UD's direction under Policy 1(a)(i) to provide a variety of homes that meet the needs of people in terms of price, location, and different households.

#### **Employment**

The Economics assessment (**Appendix V**) states that the proposal will provide employment and a range of housing types and would contribute to the social and cultural well-being of current and future generations. The report estimates that the proposal will generate 300 FTE jobs, sustaining approx. 6 FTE jobs on an ongoing basis across the development.

#### **Housing supply**

The proposal will contribute an additional 138 dwellings, providing a range of dwelling types including apartments, terraced houses, and "live-work" units. Providing a range of housing typologies to meet a wide variety of needs and preferences helping to meet expected demand as directed in Policy 1(a)(i) of the NPS-UD.

#### **Well-functioning urban environments**

The proposal enables the ongoing health and vitality of the metropolitan centre, plus the nearby Albany Village, supporting the ongoing economic activity within those centres while assisting to established urban design assets for future and nearby residences. Enabling construction in areas like Albany, makes Auckland more equipped to provide sufficient capacity to meet the expected demand for housing and business land over the short, medium and long term, as stipulated through Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The Urban Design report (**Appendix B**) confirms the design is complemented by the specific amenity elements of the proposal (per Policy 6(b)(i) of the NPS-UD). Mr Munro concludes that the proposal forms a logical "Stage 1" for urban development of the area; it is contiguous with the existing urban environment to the east and has direct access to Stevensons Crescent to connect traffic and infrastructure. A summary of the proposal's establishment / contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, consistent with Policy 1 of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020 ("NPS-UD") has also been included in Mr Tollemache's report, at **Appendix A**.

#### **National Policy Statement for Fresh Water Management 2020**

In the ecology assessment (**Appendix E**) Mr. Ussher concludes the natural inland wetlands defined under the NPS-FWM have extremely low value which do not support indigenous plant communities and are unlikely to provide core, key or important habitat for native wildlife. Due to the quality and magnitude of the natural inland wetland, any residual adverse effects would be addressed by providing biodiversity offsets to at least a no-net loss level in accordance with Appendix 8 of the AUP and Appendix 6 of the NPS-FM. The ample stream (Stream A) and wetland that is available to be protected and restored, which can provide the necessary quantum of offset to achieve no-net-loss. Overall, the proposal is not expected to compromise any outcomes anticipated in the NPS-FWM. This assessment has been made in Mr Tollemache's report, at **Appendix A**, where he concludes that proposal is considered to be consistent with the NPS-FM because it retains and enhances the streams and wetlands within the site, utilising buffer and riparian planting.

#### **New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS) N/A**

#### **National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation N/A**

#### **National Policy Statement on Electricity Generation N/A**

#### **National Environmental Standard for Air Quality 2004**

While the proposed development will result in additional traffic movements, it is unlikely that these would exceed the levels specified in the Air Quality NES. The

proposal will not likely result in discharges exceeding specified standards in the NESAQ, particularly as this is already future urban zoned land.

**National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health (“NESCS”)**

The proposal will avoid adverse effects on human health arising from contaminants in soil. The Applicant will engage a suitably qualified expert to undertake a Detailed Site Investigation at the resource consent stage.

**National Environmental Standard for Sources of Drinking Water** N/A

**National Environmental Standard for Telecommunication Facilities** N/A

**National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities** N/A

**National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry** N/A

## Part IX: Purpose of the Act

Your application must be supported by an explanation how the project will help achieve the purpose of the Act, that is to “urgently promote employment to support New Zealand’s recovery from the economic and social impacts of COVID-19 and to support the certainty of ongoing investment across New Zealand, while continuing to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources”.

In considering whether the project will help to achieve the purpose of the Act, the Minister may have regard to the specific matters referred to below, and any other matter that the Minister considers relevant.

Project’s economic benefits and costs for people or industries affected by COVID-19:

The proposal’s economic costs and benefits have been assessed by Fraser Colegrave and Danielle Chaumeil of Insight Economics, and this is included in **Appendix V**. The report responds to the project’s economic benefits and costs for people or industries affected by COVID-19.

Mr. Colegrave and Ms. Chaumeil have stated that the project would create jobs across several industries and has estimated that the construction of this project would generate future:

1. Planning/design/consenting full-time employment for approximately 6 people for 12 months;
2. Full-time employment related to site preparation for approximately 40 people for 9 month; and
3. Construction full-time employment for 130 people for over 2 years (split across the various stages of development).

The immediate estimated economic impacts of the proposal are estimated to make a \$40.1 million contribution to the national GDP, with 300 full-time equivalent workers employed (“FTEs”).

Specifically for the construction industry, which generally fluctuates with economic variability (including that brought by the COVID-19 pandemic), Mr. Colegrave and Ms. Chaumeil expect that the construction of the 138 dwellings and associated commercial activities to provide full-time employment for around 130 people for 2 years (again, split across various stages), with around \$17m paid in wages and salaries.

There will also be associated indirect economic benefits to the local retail economy, from having more people introduced to the area.

Project’s effects on the social and cultural wellbeing of current and future generations:

Fraser Colegrave and Danielle Chaumeil of Insight Economics, in their economics report included in **Appendix V**, have assessed the social and cultural well-being of current and future generations.

Mr. Colegrave and Ms. Chaumeil consider that the proposal would provide employment and boost the housing supply, which would have a positive impact on social and cultural well-being by providing a range of smaller and more affordable dwellings to meet the region's rapidly evolving needs. On this basis, the proposal enables a range of dwelling types to be provided onsite, including apartments, terraced houses, and "live-work" units. The future onsite activity across the development is expected to sustain approximately 6 FTE jobs on an ongoing basis.

Additionally, there are social and cultural benefits associated with the proximity of the site to community and cultural facilities, which will enable new residents to become active members of the community. As examples:

- a) As well as the recreation features of the proposal (i.e dairy and café establishments), the site is proximate to nearby Albany Village, allowing the proposal to support the ongoing health and vitality of the metropolitan centre;
- b) The proposal is in a suitable location to connect traffic and infrastructure to the wider Albany area, the jointly owned access lots allowing the street to be visually high-quality and pedestrian / cycle dominant as possible, allowing for well-overlooked and safe-feeling streets; and
- c) The proposal is located close to public transport connections within walking and cycling distance from the site, along with direct and convenient pedestrian cycle access to Albany Village, enabling people to utilise public transport and reduce reliance on cars.

The design of the proposal, together with the benefits of the location, provides for the social and cultural well-being of future generations without adversely affecting current residents in the area. The proposal supports ongoing economic activity within nearby centres while assisting them in establishing attractive destinations and amenities for the existing and future residents in the area.

Whether the project would be likely to progress faster by using the processes provided by the Act than would otherwise be the case:

The fast track process enables the development of this 2.5 ha to be undertaken by way of resource consents. A number of other resource consents for discrete activities on land in the Future Urban zone have been approved in this manner. Given the FUZ, the Auckland Council would be likely to require that a plan change process be undergone first, which if undertaken by Council would be at least a decade away or if through a private plan change request is likely to take 3-5 years. The FTA process therefore has significant benefits in delivering the social and economic benefits more rapidly.

Whether the project may result in a 'public benefit':

Examples of a public benefit as included in Section 19(d) of the Act are included below as prompts only.

Employment/job creation:

As noted above, Mr. Colegrave and Ms. Chaumeil in their report, included in Appendix V have calculated that the project would create an estimated 300 FTE jobs, in roading, construction, landscaping, planting, land surveying, administration, support services and other related activities. This is clearly in alignment with the necessary response needed to address the housing crisis and stimulate job creation.

Additionally, Mr. Colegrave and Ms. Chaumeil have estimated that the proposal, once operational, will also provide ongoing employment for future workers. The proposed

dairy and café expected to sustain approximately 6 FTE jobs on an ongoing basis across the development.

#### Housing supply:

As noted above, Fraser Colegrave and Danielle Chaumeil of Insight Economic, in their economics report included in Appendix V, have confirmed that the project will increase the housing supply by 138 dwellings, providing a range of dwelling types including apartments, terraced houses, and “live-work” units. The dwellings are anticipated to sell between the \$650k and \$1M price bracket, which MRL considers comfortably falls within an affordable price bracket in the Albany area.

The diversity of dwelling types is consistent with and directly gives effect to the NPS-UD, which requires high high-growth areas in Auckland to not only provide for rising capacity and expected demand but also accommodate for a range of housing typologies to meet a variety of needs and preferences.

Additionally, the high-density nature of the smaller and more affordable dwellings makes efficient use of the site’s land, which helps to meet the changing needs and budgets of Auckland’s regional growth while following the direction set out in the Auckland Plan 2050.

#### Contributing to well-functioning urban environments:

The NPS-UD requires that planning decisions contribute to “well-functioning urban environments”. As stated above Fraser Colegrave and Danielle Chaumeil of Insight Economics, in their economics report included in Appendix V, have stated that the proposal assists to a well-functioning urban environment as required by the NPS-UD by providing a range of housing typologies to meet a wide variety of needs and preferences, helping to meet expected demand.

Additionally, Mr. Colegrave and Ms. Chaumeil have outlined how the proposal supports critical mass and nearby centres to help establish a well-functioning urban environment. This is especially important as Albany is one of Auckland Region’s fifteen Metropolitan Centres, which are subsidiary only to the Auckland CDB. The proposal supports the ongoing health and vitality of the metropolitan centre, plus the nearby Albany Village, supporting the ongoing economic activity within those centres while assisting in establishing urban design assets for future and nearby residences.

Ian Munro has provided a brief summary of the proposal in urban design terms, at **Appendix B**, which confirms that the design is complemented by the specific amenity elements of the proposal. Mr Munro has concluded that the proposal form’s a logical “Stage 1” for urban development of the area, in part because it is contiguous with the existing urban environment to the east and also because it has direct access to Stevensons Crescent to connect traffic and infrastructure.

In a financial sense, the proposal will also generate development contributions towards services infrastructure, roading and reserves, will increase patronage of public transport, which may in turn incentivise transport providers to provide additional services and help to provide well overlooked and safe-feeling streets.

#### Providing infrastructure to improve economic, employment, and environmental outcomes, and increase productivity:

The proposal will contribute to the local economy through increasing population. Stormwater, wastewater and water supply servicing for the site are all available via the existing public networks adjacent to or running through the site. This is addressed in more detail in the civil engineering assessment (**Appendix D**). Fraser

Colegrave and Danielle Chaumeil of Insight Economics, in their economics report included in **Appendix V**, have stated that the proposal presents the highest and best use of land resulting in an economic efficient outcome to hold in the underlying land market.

Additionally, Mr. Colegrave and Ms. Chaumeil have confirmed that the proposal utilises existing infrastructure efficiently and effectively. The construction of apartments and terraced dwellings, such as those proposed, generate lower peak/summer water demand and less stormwater than lower-rise developments.

#### Improving environmental outcomes for coastal or freshwater quality, air quality, or indigenous biodiversity:

The proposal will not create any adverse effects that are more than minor in terms of freshwater or terrestrial ecology, or air quality.

The ecological assessment at Appendix E confirms that the proposed ecological enhancement programme for the Site will result in a greatly enhanced ecological state of the environment. In particular:

- (a) The setting aside of a 10m wide riparian margin around an intermittent stream which runs through the Site and planting up the margin in Site-appropriate native plants and shrubs will markedly improve the health and condition of the stream over its poor existing quality; and
- (b) The restoring of wetland areas including a 5m buffer margin around them, careful weed control, and wetland-appropriate planting, will considerably improve plant diversity, native plant cover, buffer protection and provision of habitat for wildlife.

#### Minimising waste:

The Applicant confirms in its letter (**Appendix H**) that as with MRL's other projects, standard construction methodologies will be used to minimise waste during construction and recycle materials where possible. In terms of sustainability, the contractors and builders will, where possible, specify and use building products from recycled, secondary, or sustainable sources and intend to instruct their onsite workers to use materials efficiently and achieve a 'low-carbon' construction goal. Additionally, earthworks will be designed to try and achieve a cut and full balance.

#### Contributing to New Zealand's efforts to mitigate climate change and transition more quickly to a low-emissions economy (in terms of reducing New Zealand's net emissions of greenhouse gases):

The construction of modern new houses to a high quality will mean that people can move out of old houses that are not as energy efficient. This will therefore have a net positive effect on the environment with regards to contributing to mitigating climate change, as the houses will be better insulated and require less energy for heating.

Additionally, as stated above Mr. Colegrave and Ms. Chaumeil of Insight Economic, in their economics report included in Appendix V, are satisfied that the proposal utilises existing infrastructure efficiently and effectively. The construction of the apartments and terraced dwellings, such as those proposed, generate lower peak/summer water demand and less stormwater than lower-rise developments.

Keith Bell, in his traffic assessment of the proposal, included as Appendix F, has assessed the surrounding transport, pedestrian and cycle connections. The proposal is within walking and cycling distance of direct transport links in Albany Village, enabling people to utilise public transport and reduce reliance on cars. This will also result in a positive contribution to efforts to mitigate climate change and lower emissions.

Promoting the protection of historic heritage:

The planning assessment (**Appendix A**, at para 5.40) confirms that the Project will not result in the loss of any identified historic or cultural heritage sites. Therefore, it is not anticipated that any adverse effects on heritage or culture that is more than minor will arise, although the Applicant intends to consult with the respective iwi groups and encourage the preparation of Cultural Impact Assessments.

Strengthening environmental, economic, and social resilience, in terms of managing the risks from natural hazards and the effects of climate change:

The geotechnical report at **Appendix G** addresses the general topography of the Site, which is generally situated on the toe of a ridge with a ground slope that varies from approximately 1V:10H to 1V:3H. Site stability will need to be addressed, but the geotechnical report confirms that through conventional engineering standards, stability can be ensured. The planning assessment (**Appendix A**) confirms that the proposed subdivision is laid out in a way that is safe from a stability perspective, and that this, paired with use of a suite of best practice stability methods, means that the Project will not increase hazard risk in the area.

There are four identified overland flow paths (shown in Figure 1, **Appendix X**) through the Site, with two of these identified as intermittent streams. To address this, a 10m offset will be provided from the bank of these streams to any proposed structure within the Site. The civil assessment (**Appendix D**) identifies that a 100-year floodplain is shown within the Site and therefore a floodplain assessment is recommended at design stage to confirm flood depths and extents. In regard to this, the civil assessment confirms that as long as the flood plain, streams and overland flood paths are considered as part of the design development, this will not present risk for natural hazards.

Overall, as long as detailed geotechnical investigation and assessments are carried out, the Site will not present any risk in terms of natural hazards or climate change.

Other public benefit:

The significant social and economic benefit of the proposal have been outlined above.

Whether there is potential for the project to have significant adverse environmental effects:

The proposal does not present any adverse environmental effects that will be more than minor.

## Part X: Climate change and natural hazards

Description of whether and how the project would be affected by climate change and natural hazards:

(This section essentially repeats the immediately previous commentary but is included for completeness.)

The Site is suitable for development in terms of natural hazards and climate change. As recognised above, the natural hazards that could potentially apply to the Site relate to ground stability and overland flow paths.

In regard to site stability, the preliminary geotechnical report (**Appendix G**) recognises that the steep portion of the elevated Site may require slope stabilisation improvements to meet engineering standards for residential developments but confirms that conventional engineering designs can ensure stability. Detailed geotechnical investigation and assessments will be required during the resource consent design stage to confirm site stability and potential stabilisation improvements. However, the geotechnical report ultimately concludes that the development undertaken in accordance with the OZAC concept plan (**Appendix C**) is feasible from a geotechnical perspective.

The geotechnical report identifies four potential over overland flow paths bypassing the Site, which are shown in Figure 1, **Appendix G**, with two of these identified as intermittent streams. The civil assessment (**Appendix D**) identifies that a 100-year floodplain is shown within the Site and therefore a floodplain assessment is recommended at design stage to confirm flood depths and extents. It is considered that as long as the flood plain, streams and overland flood paths are considered as part of the design development, is no unusual risk to the development in terms of flooding effects within the Site, or its immediate surrounds.

With regard to climate change, one of the main considerations is development levels for dwellings and access in terms of finished floor levels above the OLFP and 100-year floodplain. In this regard, the lowest contour of the Site is reduced level 15M above mean sea level ("AMSL"). The nearest coastline is 5.4km to the east (Brown's Bay).

The civil assessment (**Appendix D**) confirms that a resource consent proposal can be designed to accommodate conventional engineering approaches which includes calculations that account for the effects of climate change on buildings and infrastructure. Stormwater management devices would be sized at resource consent stage to account for the effects of climate change. Additionally, the Council's GIS system does not identify any areas susceptible to coastal instability or erosion at the Site.

## Part XI: Track record

A summary of all compliance and/or enforcement actions taken against the applicant by a local authority under the Resource Management Act 1991, and the outcome of those actions:

| Local authority  | Compliance/Enforcement Action and Outcome                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Auckland Council | <p>N/A</p> <p>The Applicant is an experienced investor and through her property development company, Mansion Rear Ltd, has previous developments.</p> <p>MRL has a strong history of environmental compliance and there has been no compliance or enforcement actions against it.</p> <p>The same approach towards ensuring strong environmental management that is central to MRL's values will be applied to the 8 Stevensons Crescent project.</p> |

## Part XII: Declaration

I acknowledge that a summary of this application will be made publicly available on the Ministry for the Environment website and that the full application will be released if requested.

By typing your name in the field below you are electronically signing this application form and certifying the information given in this application is true and correct.

Gary Gray - Developer's (Mansion Rear Ltd) Representative

23/02/2023

**Signature of person or entity making the request**

**Date**

### Important notes:

- Please note that this application form, including your name and contact details and all supporting documents, submitted to the Minister for the Environment and/or Minister of Conservation and the Ministry for the Environment, will be publicly released. Please clearly highlight any content on this application form and in supporting documents that is commercially or otherwise sensitive in nature, and to which you specifically object to the release.
- Please ensure all sections, where relevant, of the application form are completed as failure to provide the required details may result in your application being declined.
- Further information may be requested at any time before a decision is made on the application.
- Please note that if the Minister for the Environment and/or Minister of Conservation accepts your application for referral to an expert consenting panel, you will then need to lodge a consent application and/or notice of requirement for a designation (or to alter a designation) in the approved form with the Environmental Protection Authority. The application will need to contain the information set out in Schedule 6, clauses 9-13 of the Act.
- Information presented to the Minister for the Environment and/or Minister of Conservation and shared with other Ministers, local authorities and the Environmental Protection Authority under the Act (including officials at government departments and agencies) is subject to disclosure under the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA) or the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA). Certain information may be withheld in accordance with the grounds for withholding information under the OIA and LGOIMA although the grounds for withholding must always be balanced against considerations of public interest that may justify release. Although the Ministry for the Environment does not give any guarantees as to whether information can be withheld under the OIA, it may be helpful to discuss OIA issues with the Ministry for the Environment in advance if information provided with an application is commercially sensitive or release would, for instance, disclose a trade secret or other confidential information. Further information on the OIA and LGOIMA is available at [www.ombudsman.parliament.nz](http://www.ombudsman.parliament.nz).

### Checklist

Where relevant to your application, please provide a copy of the following information.

|     |                                                                                                                                                  |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Yes | Correspondence from the registered legal land owner(s)                                                                                           |
| Yes | Correspondence from persons or parties you consider are likely to be affected by the project                                                     |
| Yes | Written agreement from the relevant landowner where the project includes an activity that will occur on land returned under a Treaty settlement. |

|     |                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Yes | Written agreement from the holder of the relevant customary marine title order where the project includes an activity that will occur in a customary marine title area.                            |
| Yes | Written agreement from the holder of the relevant protected customary marine rights recognition order where the project includes an activity that will occur in a protected customary rights area. |