

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

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

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

Local authority providing comment	Auckland Council
Contact person (if follow-up is required)	Tracey Grant
	Matthew Paetz
	Ian Smallburn

Comment form

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

Project name	The Botanic
General comment – potential benefits	Provision of a retirement village is seen as a positive for the region, however significant concerns exist with the proposal.
General comment – significant issues	As outlined in the attached documents, the following experts have raised significant concerns with the proposal: planning, policy, landscape, engineering and stormwater. In addition the following Council Controlled Organisations have raised significant concerns with the proposal: Auckland Transport, Healthy Waters and Watercare. The local board have also raised significant concerns. The key issues predominantly relate to the lack of appropriate infrastructure in the area, the lack of coordinated approach with the wider area, the landscape and transportation effects, and the potential effects of stormwater. It is noted that other significant issues may exist, but no other specialists were engaged by Auckland Council to consider this initial stage.
Is Fast-track appropriate?	Fast track is not appropriate for this application for a number of reasons. The key reasons are outlined in the Policy response attached, and also in many of the other comments including from the local board.
Environmental compliance history	There is no environmental enforcement action or outstanding compliance issues for Matvin Group Limited and/or its directors in Auckland Region.
Reports and assessments normally required	In addition to the information summarised in the attached documents, we would also expect assessments on groundwater, contamination, watercourses (including assessment against NES-FW), noise (including during construction of site and operation of a childcare facility), private road dimensions, earthworks and urban design assessment.
Iwi and iwi authorities	Refer to Auckland Council website which contains all the latest iwi information: https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/building-and-consents/resource-consents/prepare-resource-consent-application/Pages/engaging-with-mana-whenua.aspx .
Relationship agreements under the RMA	Click or tap here to summarise any JMAs, Mana Whakahono a Rohe, transfers of power, MOUs, accords or other relationship agreements under the RMA. Include the parties involved.

Insert responses to other specific requests in the Minister's letter (if applicable)	The majority of the questions have been addressed above. The exception is question 4. 4. Are there any known structure planning or plan change processes in progress that apply to the Botanic, Riverhead site and may be relevant to the project, and if not, do you consider it appropriate for the project to be developed in this location ahead of a structure plan and plan change process? As identified by the majority of the expert and local board comments provided, Auckland Council strongly considers that this application should not proceed in advance of a structure plan and plan change process. This is to ensure a integrated approach to the development in the area. Council is aware that a structure plan and private plan change process is being considered by developers in the area, however this has not formally been lodged yet.
Other considerations	

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

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

Your reference: BRF772

19 November 2021

Dear Minister Parker,

RE: COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-Track Consenting) Act 2020 – The Botanic – Comments sought

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

The application to Ministry for the Environment is made by Matvin Group Limited and is a retirement village/childcare facility/retail complex proposed for Riverhead.

Having reviewed the application material provided, we can advise that Auckland Council has significant concerns with the proposed development. The concerns are outlined in the attached documents and include the following key concerns:

- Auckland Council's Plans and Places expert, summarises the implications of bringing forward the timing of this development. This includes the lack of a structure plan for the area, the lack of infrastructure and the implications for infrastructure funding for other developments in the area. The timing of this development has also been raised a significant concern by many of the other experts, infrastructure providers and local board (see attached).
- Auckland Transport have raised a number of concerns relating to the transportation effects of the proposal. This includes the need for strategic transport infrastructure to service the area.
- Auckland Council's landscape, Plans and Places, and Planning experts have identified concerns with the height, mass and form of the proposal – particularly the proposed 3-5 storey buildings. The area currently consists of 1-2 storey dwellings. The site is reasonably flat, and the proposed large buildings would be difficult to incorporate into the existing and anticipated landscape
- Auckland Council's stormwater expert and Healthy Waters have also both raised concerns with the flood risk in the area and the need for an integrated approach.
- Watercare have raised concern with the water infrastructure requirements in the area.

Auckland Council's Independent Māori Statutory Board have also advised that the proposal should identify any benefits to the local Iwi from the development and also provide a plan of how the benefits might be achieved.

Auckland Council's view is that this application should not proceed through the Covid -19 Recovery (Fast Track Consenting) Act, and should instead go through a Private Plan Change process to ensure a coordinated and comprehensive approach.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Ian Smallburn'.

Ian Smallburn
General Manager – Resource Consents
Auckland Council
Enclosed:

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

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

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

Date: Wednesday 17th November 2021

Overall Summary:

Auckland Transport does not support the Project being accepted for fast-track consenting. The site is located in Future Urban zoned land under the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP(OP)). The AUP(OP) states that Future Urban zoned land should not be developed for urban purposes until it has been through a structure planning and plan change process (refer Policy B2.2.2(3), Objective H18.2(1) of AUP(OP)). The Auckland Plan, and the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (FULSS) provide the Development Strategy for Auckland, including the sequencing and timing for when future urban areas will be ready for development to commence which requires necessary underpinning zoning and bulk infrastructure to be in place. It is considered more appropriate for the Project to proceed through existing RMA private plan change processes rather than the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 (Covid Act). The development will not help achieve the purpose of the Covid Act given a well-functioning environment will not result due to the misalignment between the timing to provide the minimum necessary infrastructure and services ahead of the first units being occupied. The project does not align with the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP(OP)), or the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS UD).

Strategic transport infrastructure is needed to service the area as identified in FULSS and identified by Supporting Growth Alliance (a partnership of Auckland Transport and Waka Kotahi). The FULSS informs the Auckland Plan Development Strategy, the spatial plan for Auckland as per the Local Government (Auckland Council) Amendment Act 2010. The FULSS and Development Strategy helps to inform wider network infrastructure asset planning and funding priorities and, in turn, enables development capacity to be identified in a coordinated and cost-efficient way. Any misalignment between the timing of infrastructure and services and the urbanisation of greenfield areas brings into question whether the proposed development area is "development ready". The FULSS identifies this area as intended to be development ready in 2028-2032.

The proposed development is a Non-Complying Activity. Two of the objectives of the Future Urban zone in the AUP(OP) are 'Future urban development is not compromised by premature subdivision, use or development'; and 'Urbanisation on sites zoned Future Urban Zone is avoided until the sites have been rezoned for urban purposes' (H18.2. (3) and (4)). Policies of the Future Urban zone require subdivision to maintain and complement rural character and amenity, avoid fragmentation compromising future urban development; and avoid subdivision, use and development which will compromise the efficient and effective operation of the local and wider transport network.

Upgrades to the roading network required to support urbanisation of land in this area include corridor upgrades with active modes and stormwater provision (to urban standard), upgrades to the existing roundabout at Coatesville Riverhead Highway/Riverhead Road intersection and a new roundabout on Riverhead Road. The Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) sets the 10-year plan for the transport network in Auckland (out to 2031). No funding is currently set aside for these works, meaning these upgrades are more than 10-years away.

Integrated Transport Assessment

Auckland Transport requests that should the Project be accepted for fast-track consenting, the requirement for an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) is formally stated in the referral order

to accompany any resource consent application for the Project lodged with the Environmental Protection Authority.

The main objective of an ITA is to ensure that the transportation effects of a new development proposal are well considered, that there is an emphasis on efficiency, safety and accessibility to and from the development by all transport modes where practical; and that the adverse transport effects of the development have been effectively avoided, remedied or mitigated.

The preparation of an ITA seeks to ensure that appropriate thought is given to the land use proposed, so that integrated transport and land use outcomes occur that are in keeping with the intent of the area. [Guidance](#) to assist in preparing an ITA is available, along with a draft template, on the Auckland Transport website.

An ITA provides a more comprehensive assessment than a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), with an emphasis on considering the full range of transport modes. An ITA considers measures to reduce travel demand, utilise the existing network more efficiently, encourage other modes and then finally adding road capacity as a last resort.

Assessing the full range of transport modes and the utility provided by each mode is crucial in determining the forecasted transport effects, by mode, of this development. The most suitable way to determine an appropriate trip rate and modal split for the proposed development, and its proposed uses, is to undertake surveys of similar occupied and operational developments, as the travel behaviours and mode choices would be reflective of such a development, and the feasibility of any proposed modal splits for trips generated.

The ITA should include an assessment of whether the surrounding roading network is able to accommodate the additional traffic volumes generated by the proposed development. The Riverhead Road/Coatesville Riverhead Highway intersection should be assessed, along with the proposed access points onto Riverhead Road and Coatesville-Riverhead Highway as these are both Arterial roads where vehicle access restriction applies. In addition, Coatesville-Riverhead Highway is a Limited Accessway Road and separate approval is required from Auckland Transport as Road Controlling Authority, under section 346 of the Local Government Act (outside of the RMA and Covid-19 Recovery Act consenting framework).

The ITA should consider the proposal in the context of the North West Indicative Strategic Transport Network identified by the Supporting Growth Alliance as needed to service the North West Growth Area.

The ITA and application material should also include an assessment of:

- the proposed vehicle crossings, including engineering drawings with dimensions, details of the width, visibility assessment, right turns and queuing, and an assessment of effects on the transport network (including the safe and efficient operation of the operation of the network and street and pedestrian amenity), under Rule E27.4.1 (A5) AUP(OP);
- pedestrian amenity including provision for footpaths. The site frontages should be upgraded with kerb and channel, footpaths and cycle lanes;
- cycle storage facilities in accordance with the AUP(OP) requirements;
- queuing analysis and tracking to confirm whether vehicles entering the site will experience conflict points;
- loading/servicing details for waste trucks and other service vehicles; and
- assessment of effects for any other reason for consent under Chapter E26 Infrastructure and Chapter E27 Transport of the AUP(OP);
- it is noted that a turning head is shown at the northern end of the 'New Road' in land beyond the site boundary. This should be within the Applicants' land.

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

**From: Mark Iszard, Growth and Development Manager, Auckland Council
Kedan Li, Senior Healthy Waters Specialist, Auckland Council**

Date: 12th November 2021

Overall Summary:

The development site is part of the wider Future Urban Zone in Riverhead planned for development in the 2nd decade of the Auckland Future Land Supply Strategy (circa 2028-2032). Currently a consortium of landowners and developers are seeking to progress a private plan change for the area which would include this site. A series of initial meetings have been held with the consortium technical team to discuss stormwater matters including those supporting the Botanic development.

The primary focus of these discussions has been to highlight the known flood risk within the existing downstream Riverhead township and residential properties. As the site is currently relatively undeveloped, the additional impervious surfaces will increase SW flows, timings and volumes from the site that have the potential to increase the risk to the immediate downstream properties which are already predicted to be at risk of habitable floor flooding in flood events.

The location of the future urban zoned land (and hence the Botanic) within the wider stormwater catchment is such that; unless an integrated approach to Stormwater Management and flood mitigation is taken for the entire Future Urban Zone, any standalone development risks increasing the flood risk of the downstream properties, through the coincidence of peak flows from this development with the large rural upstream catchment of around 808Ha.

We have been working with the consortium to assist them in developing a suitable flood model to assess the impacts of both this development and the wider future Urban Zoned land to ensure that the solution proposed does not increased the flood risk of the downstream properties. However to date this model has not been completed or any analysis done to understand and mitigate the flooding risks or justify why this is the Best Practical Option (BPO).

A Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) would normally be required through NDC Schedule 4 to ensure that the proposed stormwater management for the development is integrated and aligned with the wider catchment objectives and issues. The SMP would specifically identify the proposed stormwater management approaches for stormwater quality and quantity at a sub-catchment level based on the topography and at a minimum what assets/approaches will be implemented via private and/or public interventions.

This is the route that most plan changes and or major developments adopt, however the NDC did not anticipate or contemplate the urbanisation of rural land outside of a plan change process and hence the discharge consent was only set up to authorise

stormwater discharges for land within the urban boundary. This will require the application to seek a private SW discharge consent which is likely to lead to a more discrete and fragmented stormwater outcome for this catchment and increase the risk of adverse effects

We are continuing to work closely with the consortium team to support the development of a suitable stormwater flood model for analysis to support the wider land use changes including this proposal. However without a suitable stormwater catchment modelling at a suitable scale and scope there is significant risk of increased flooding occurring as a result of this proposal.

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: Amir Karimi, Development Engineer, Watercare

Date: 16 November 2021

Overall Summary:

There were no infrastructure report, engineering plans, capacity assessments, fire/water supply-demand, or information on wastewater flow and connection points provided as part of this application.

Based on very limited data provided, Watercare has completed a very high-level assessment for the proposed development at 1092 Coatesville Riverhead highway. The proposal is for a retirement village with 264 apartments (31 1.5-bedroom, 202 2-bedroom and 31 3-bedroom); 158 villas (121 2-bedroom and 37 3-bedroom) and approximately 80 care beds, a childcare centre, medical centre, café, and retail premises.

Water supply: The water network currently is operating near its capacity. The proposed development will trigger the requirement of a significant local network extension.

Wastewater: It is proposed to service the development through an extension of the pressure sewer system. More detailed information needs to be provided to assess the impact of the development on the wastewater network.

Water Supply

The existing supply to the Riverhead Water Supply Zone (WSZ) is via a single 200mm ID WM. The proposed development will trigger the need for a second supply feed due to the number of properties supplied via a single feed for resilience considerations. This will need to be installed at the developer's cost.

The potential firefighting sprinkler requirements have not been identified and, therefore, have not been assessed at this stage. Upgrades linking to the firefighting requirements may still be required. The developer must carry out the upgrades and extensions based on the agreed solution at no cost to Watercare.

The following information needs to be provided:

- The developer should supply expected proposed water demands based on the different users
- Possible sprinkler supply requirements (approximate flow rates).

Wastewater

Currently, the site has no wastewater connection. It is proposed to extend the existing pressurised sewer system to service the development. The existing wastewater network seems to have enough capacity to service the proposed development. However, more detailed information, including a capacity assessment and a design report, is required to identify the exact impact of the development on the wastewater network and the upgrades linking to the proposed development. The developer will need to carry all the extensions and upgrades based on the agreed solution at no cost to Watercare.

Parks Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: Sean Stirling – Senior Parks Planner

Date: 16/11/2021

Overall Summary:

Background information:

Zone: Future Urban Zone

Precinct: -

Controls: Controls: Macroinvertebrate Community Index – Exotic, Rural & Urban
Natural Resources: High-Use Aquifer Management – Kumeu Waitemata Aquifer

Designations: Airspace Restriction Designations – ID 4311, Defence purposes – protection of approach and departure paths (Whenuapai Air Base), Minister of Defence

Background information:

This response is prepared based on the information received as outlined in the email from Tracey Grant, Principal Project Lead, Premium Resource Consents dated 10 November 2021.

The overall application has been identified to be a non-complying activity (because of subdivision in the future urban zone).

The proposal seeks to establish a retirement village, including a public playground structure, retail and medical facilities, and associated subdivision to create separate lots for a childcare centre and café. The proposal also seeks to vest land as road for widening Riverhead Road and a new through road off Cambridge Road.

The AUP (OP) defines an integrated residential development as:

A residential development on sites greater than 2,000m² which includes supporting communal facilities such as recreation and leisure facilities, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (inclusive of hospital care), and other non-residential activities accessory to the primary residential use. For the avoidance of doubt this would include a retirement village.

Due to Covid-19 level restrictions, a site visit has not been undertaken to date.

Positives of the application:

From the draft subdivision layout plans and associated architectural plans and specialist reports, provided by the applicant it can be determined that:

- Works to Cambridge Road and Riverhead Road provide an opportunity to enhance the streetscape of these areas, however further information is required to determine this outcome.

Key Issues from a Parks Planning Perspective

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

Parks Planning information, reports and assessment requirements:

- a) Landscape plans: providing sufficient detail with regard to any trees within road reserve to be removed, altered or have works undertaken within their root protection zone, along with proposed trees to properly assess the proposed assets in the streetscape and any other public areas to be vested.

- b) Planting plans with a schedule of species: To understand the extent of mitigation provided.
- c) Detailed arboricultural assessment of the proposed methodology of works as they relate to trees within road reserve.
- d) Detailed architectural plans that demonstrate the extent of any relevant standard infringements along with visual depictions of the proposal from the surrounding environment (including from Riverhead War Memorial Park).
- e) Details over the proposed ownership and any legal instruments required to delineate liabilities and responsibilities over proposed open space and any recreational infrastructure such as the playground in the publicly accessible entrance area shown on the Site Master Plan prepared by Gel Architects.

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

- Whether streetscape planting is appropriate. Council has significant experience in this area as an asset owner and promotes the Auckland Council Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy, species which provide attractive streetscapes but species which are also suitable from a maintenance perspective and are practical in their chosen location e.g. will not hinder drivers sight lines or reduce usability of footpaths over time.
- Whether any proposed works to or within the protected root protection zone of trees within road reserve are appropriate, are undertaken with a suitable methodology, and may require Tree owner approval from Council as the asset owner of these trees.
- The potential adverse effects on the near-by Riverhead War Memorial Park from the proposed development with a particular emphasis on the visual and amenity effects from the multi-level apartment type buildings not anticipated by the underlying zone provisions.
- Whether privately owned, developed, and maintained open spaces and recreational facilities are accessible to the public, and will be appropriately managed and maintained with clear information such as sign posting to inform users of its private management and ownership. This is particularly important as the application has indicated that the playground area to the south of the site will be publicly accessible.

Overall position of Parks Planning

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

It appears that the effects resulting from the inevitable building standard infringements are yet to have been adequately assessed and considered. Much greater detail will be necessary to assess the potential adverse effects of the proposal on the surrounding environment. It is therefore uncertain what the adverse effects would be and how these could be avoided or mitigated.

Details of the proposed ownership, management (including liabilities), and maintenance structure and approach will be required to assess the appropriateness of the proposed private open spaces and ensure that appropriate legal mechanisms are established to ensure these spaces are appropriately designed and managed to satisfy public safety requirements and are maintained by the relevant owners or legal entity in perpetuity.

Prepared by:


Sean Stirling, Senior Parks Planner
Parks Sports and Recreation

Parks Agency Lead:


Hester Gerber, Parks Planning Team Leader
Parks Sports and Recreation

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: Ryan Bradley, Senior Policy Planner, Auckland Council

Date: 15 November 2021

Overall Summary:

Proposed residential land use: At a high level, the land is suitable for future urban development, being zoned in the Auckland Unitary Plan as Future Urban. Furthermore, the Auckland Plan Development Strategy (2018) and the Spatial Land Use Strategy – North West (2021) identify the subject land as ‘Future Residential and other uses’, rather than a future centre or an area for future business/industrial land. Therefore, the residential nature of the proposal (retirement village) is generally consistent with these high-level plans.

Proposed heights and densities: There are some high-level policy concerns with the density and heights of buildings in the proposed development. Riverhead’s residential area is currently mostly 1-2 storey detached dwellings, with some new terraced housing in the Mixed Use zone around the centre. Being a small rural town, Riverhead has never been anticipated to have the level of density and heights in this proposal (Regional Policy Statement B.2.4.2(4)).

Such heights and densities are generally considered more appropriate in the main urban area of Auckland in and around centres, identified corridors, and close to public transport, social facilities (including open space) and employment opportunities (Regional Policy Statement Policy B2.2.2(5)). If such heights and densities were to be located in Riverhead, it would generally be located around a centre. As a structure plan for the area has not been finalised or tested, it is too early to know where any future centre land might best be located in relation to this proposal.

It is also noted that the subject site is essentially flat meaning that the proposed large buildings would be difficult to incorporate into the existing and anticipated landscape. The council’s landscape specialist will cover this aspect in more detail.

Timing of development: The council has identified around 15,000ha of greenfield land (currently rural) for future urbanisation over a 30-year period. Providing the bulk infrastructure to enable these areas to develop all at the same time would be both economically impractical and inefficient. Therefore, the council has developed a sequencing for when each Future Urban zoned area across Auckland will be ‘development ready’ (structure planned, rezoned, and bulk infrastructure provided).

The Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (2017) does not sequence the Riverhead Future Urban zone to be ‘development ready’ until between 2028 and 2032. The Auckland Plan Development Strategy (2018) adopts the same timing as the FULSS.

The applicant states that *“the timing of this project is positive because it will enable all of the surrounding Future Urban zoned land to be developed and serviced in a*

coordinated and logical manner". However, this fails to acknowledge a number of issues that arise from the 'out of sequence' nature of this proposal:

Structure Planning: Determining the land use pattern and infrastructure in the large greenfield growth areas of Auckland is an important issue that requires the input of many parties including mana whenua, infrastructure providers, local boards, and the wider community. The intention of the council is that these identified greenfield growth areas should have comprehensive and coordinated planning carried out before they are urbanised. The greenfield areas should not be developed in an ad-hoc basis based on individual landowner's different aspirations. This is the very antithesis of structure planning and undermines the council's strategy for the greenfield growth areas.

The Regional Policy Statement sets out the method to develop the Future Urban zone – undertake a structure plan followed by a plan change (Regional Policy Statement B2.2.2(3)). The urban development of ad-hoc sites pre-empts and potentially undermines the structure planning process.

The applicant states that *"the proposal is in keeping with the provisions of the...Auckland Unitary Plan Regional Policy Statement."* It is unclear how the applicant views B2.2.2(3) above.

Currently, there is no structure plan for this Future Urban zoned land and therefore there is nothing against which to assess the proposal's consistency. We understand that a structure plan is being developed by the landowners in the Future Urban zone in Riverhead (Fletcher Living and Neill Group).

However, the council has not seen the structure plan and in any case the plan would still need to be tested through a public process (i.e. notified private plan change).

Wider infrastructure: The applicant states that *"infrastructure can be provided with efficient and planned extensions to the water, wastewater, and transportation networks"* and *"it will not compromise the efficient and effective operation of the local and wider transport network; or require significant upgrades, provisions of extensions to the three waters networks because any necessary extensions will be provided by the Developer and these extensions are planned because of the Future Urban zoning of the land."*

However, it is not clear how the development will not impact on wider infrastructure, particularly transport. The future transport network required for the greenfield growth areas across Auckland is being determined by the Supporting Growth Alliance. To date, the Alliance has determined an Indicative Strategic Transport Network for the north-west. The Alliance is currently working on a Detailed Business Case for the north-west projects and it is anticipated that the routes will begin to be designated (through Notices of Requirement) late in 2022.

It is important to note that the Alliance is only funded to carry out the route protection stage and there are no budgets for full land acquisition or construction of the routes. Therefore, in terms of transport capacity, the Future Urban zoned land in Riverhead will not have the necessary wider transport infrastructure in place for many years yet.

SH16 is a major point of congestion, and the long-term plan as shown in the Indicative Strategic Transport Network is to alleviate this through extending the Rapid Transit Network to cover the north-west, and to construct an alternative state highway corridor to the south of Kumeu. Both these projects will have long lead in times due to the amount of land to be designated and acquired and the extremely large cost for construction.

The timing of this infrastructure does not appear to sync with the proposed Botanic development (noting the 2-year lapse date for consents under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020).

There are policy concerns that the fast-tracking of this proposal would essentially repeat the Special Housing Area process that occurred in Kumeu-Huapai, in enabling urban development in the North West without providing the required new or upgraded wider infrastructure.

Infrastructure funding: The Future Urban zone is one of the few areas where the council has a 'lever' that can be used for sequencing growth so that it is timed to be developed as the infrastructure is available to support its development.

While any granted subdivision consent will be liable for development contributions, these cover only projects that are listed in the council's 10 year Long Term Plan. The transport projects in the Indicative Strategic Transport Network are still in the planning stage and are not included in the council's current Long Term Plan. That means that development contributions would not cover these projects. Therefore, if this proposal was granted consent it would distribute the costs of the future transport projects around fewer properties in Riverhead and Kumeu-Huapai, resulting in higher development contributions for future developers.

The proposal therefore would need to demonstrate how it would cover its share of the future transport projects that it will benefit from. I have not seen this proposed as part of the application, and therefore the proposal would not meet the Future Urban zone policy H18.3(6).

Precedent: Resource consent decisions need to be consistent. If this proposal was granted resource consent it could set a precedent for other landowners to follow. Therefore, to prevent the widespread development of the Future Urban zone ahead of its sequencing, there would need to be some specific factors about this application site or proposal that could not be easily replicated elsewhere. Currently, it is not clear what would set this application apart from other potential applications in the Future Urban zone.

Supply of 'development ready' land: Other greenfield areas in the North West of Auckland are sequenced to be 'development ready' before Riverhead, such as Redhills (2017) and Whenuapai (2018-2022). The Redhill's area is already 'live' zoned while a structure plan for Whenuapai was adopted in 2016 and a plan change process is underway to rezone the first stage of residential and business land – around 400 hectares. Therefore, there is currently no wider shortage of greenfield land for that is 'development ready' in the north-west.

Answers to specific questions from the Ministry for the Environment:

- *Q2: Are there any reasons that you consider it more appropriate for the project, or part of the project, to continue to proceed through existing Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) consenting processes rather than the processes in the FTCA?*

This proposal is to urbanise the Riverhead Future Urban area well ahead of its sequencing. Such a project has strategic implications as described in the comments above.

Determining the land use pattern and infrastructure in the large greenfield growth areas of Auckland is an important issue that requires the input of many parties including mana whenua, infrastructure providers, local boards, and the wider community. The intention of the Council is that these identified greenfield growth areas should have comprehensive and coordinated planning carried out before they are urbanised. The greenfield areas should not be developed in an ad-hoc basis based on individual landowner's different aspirations. This is the very antithesis of structure planning and undermines the council's strategy for the greenfield growth areas.

Noting that the government has stated that "*once a project is referred to the Panel there is a high level of certainty the resource consent will be granted*", the strategic issues at play in this proposal mean that it is unsuitable as a project for the FTCA. The project is more suited to a private plan change request under the existing RMA legislation.

- *Q4: Are there any known structure planning or plan change processes in progress that apply to the Botanic, Riverhead site and may be relevant to the project, and if not, do you consider it appropriate for the project to be developed in this location ahead of a structure plan and plan change process?*

The council has sequenced this land as being development ready between 2028-2032. The council would look to undertake its own structure plan for the Riverhead Future Urban zoned area in around 2025. However, the council is aware of a structure plan for the Riverhead Future Urban zone being developed by Fletcher Building and Neills Construction. They intend to lodge a private plan change to implement their structure plan.

At this stage the council has not seen either their structure plan or proposed private plan change for the Riverhead Future Urban zone. It is important that the land uses proposed in their structure plan are tested and scrutinised during the private plan change process.

Therefore, it is not appropriate for this retirement village project to be developed in this location ahead of a structure plan and plan change process. Further details on this are included in the previous section of this memo entitled "*Structure Planning*".

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: Jonathon Clarke, Intermediate Planner, Auckland Council

Date: 15 November 2021

Overall Summary:

It is proposed to construct and operate a new retirement village on a site located within Riverhead, Auckland. The retirement village will consist of 31 1.5-bedroom apartments, 202 2-bedroom apartments, 31 3-bedroom apartments, 121 2-bedroom villas, 37 3-bedroom villas, and up to 88 care beds. A total of 422 units will be provided as part of the proposal. In addition to the residential aspect, there will be a separate café and childcare centre, which is proposed to be subdivided off from the retirement village.

Under the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP(OP)), the sites are zoned as Future Urban Zone. This zone has identified land that is suitable for urban development at some point in the future, but until such time that a plan change changes the zone, the Future Urban Zone operates in a similar manner to that of the Rural – Rural Production Zone. Many of the objectives and policies seek to ensure land is used for rural production purposes until a plan change has been completed and specifically refer to the objectives and policies for the Rural – Rural Production Zone. Currently, there is no structure plan for the Riverhead Future Urban Zone, with timeframes within the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (FULSS) putting this area in the first half of decade two (2028-2032). Therefore, it is considered that the proposal is out of sequence and inconsistent, if not contrary, to the objectives and policies of the Future Urban and Rural – Rural Production Zones, and FULSS. While the applicant may be working on plan change(s) and a structure plan, these cannot be considered as no decision has been made on either nor have they been adopted by Council's Planning Committee.

Given the out of sequence proposal, there is the possibility that infrastructure to support the development may not be available. It is recommended that the applicant liaise with Council and its CCOs to determine the level of service currently available.

In terms of the effects on character and landscape values, these comments are deferred to Council's Landscape Architect for comment. However, I do note that Riverhead is a rural town, where the maximum height under the AUP(OP) is three storeys, which is located within the Business – Mixed Use and Business – Local Centre Zones of Riverhead. The proposal includes apartment blocks between 3 and 5 storeys and is incongruous with the existing small-town character and development within Riverhead.

In terms of transport, Coatesville-Riverhead Highway is a heavily used arterial road that is two lanes wide (i.e., one in each direction). Only a single bus route operates through Riverhead and operates hourly (bus route 126). Given the lack of a large supermarket in Riverhead, and an infrequent bus route, it is therefore likely that most trips to and from the site will be undertaken by private vehicle. These traffic movements are also more likely to utilise State Highway 16, which is also congested. A thorough assessment will need to be undertaken of the effects of the retirement village, childcare, retail and café on the already congested network. Given the childcare facility typically generate traffic

during peak periods, this is of particular concern. An assessment of the impact on the road network has been deferred to Auckland Transport.

Given the current share of EV's in Auckland and New Zealand as a whole, the limited public transportation and lack of supermarket options, this proposal is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions from Transport.

A pre-application meeting was held between Council officers and the applicants on 22 September 2021, the meeting minutes are as attached to this memorandum.

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

The Botanic – Preapplication Meeting

Meeting Record

Date	22/9/2021																				
Regulatory Team	<table> <tr> <th>Name</th><th>Role</th></tr> <tr> <td>Tracey Grant</td><td>Principal Project Lead</td></tr> <tr> <td>Jonathon Clarke</td><td>Intermediate Planner</td></tr> <tr> <td>Stephen Quin</td><td>Principal Landscape Architect</td></tr> <tr> <td>July Zhou</td><td>Development Engineer</td></tr> <tr> <td>Tessa Craig</td><td>Auckland Transport</td></tr> <tr> <td>Mark Iszard</td><td>Healthy Waters</td></tr> <tr> <td>Kedan Li</td><td>Healthy Waters</td></tr> <tr> <td>Nicola Livingston</td><td>Regional Stormwater</td></tr> <tr> <td>Ryan Bradley</td><td>Senior Policy Planner</td></tr> </table>	Name	Role	Tracey Grant	Principal Project Lead	Jonathon Clarke	Intermediate Planner	Stephen Quin	Principal Landscape Architect	July Zhou	Development Engineer	Tessa Craig	Auckland Transport	Mark Iszard	Healthy Waters	Kedan Li	Healthy Waters	Nicola Livingston	Regional Stormwater	Ryan Bradley	Senior Policy Planner
Name	Role																				
Tracey Grant	Principal Project Lead																				
Jonathon Clarke	Intermediate Planner																				
Stephen Quin	Principal Landscape Architect																				
July Zhou	Development Engineer																				
Tessa Craig	Auckland Transport																				
Mark Iszard	Healthy Waters																				
Kedan Li	Healthy Waters																				
Nicola Livingston	Regional Stormwater																				
Ryan Bradley	Senior Policy Planner																				
Applicants team	<table> <tr> <th>Name</th><th>Role</th></tr> <tr> <td>Jeremy Guiding</td><td>Matvin - Project manager</td></tr> <tr> <td>Matthew Ellingham</td><td>Matvin - Applicant</td></tr> <tr> <td>Burnette O'Connor</td><td>The Planning Collective - Planner</td></tr> <tr> <td>Keith Bell</td><td>Team Traffic - Transport</td></tr> <tr> <td>Nick Rae</td><td>Transurban - Urban Designer</td></tr> <tr> <td>Evan Peters</td><td>Aspire Consulting Engineers - Engineer</td></tr> <tr> <td>Graeme Wrack</td><td>Gel Architects - Architects</td></tr> <tr> <td>Robert White</td><td>GHD – Wastewater</td></tr> </table>	Name	Role	Jeremy Guiding	Matvin - Project manager	Matthew Ellingham	Matvin - Applicant	Burnette O'Connor	The Planning Collective - Planner	Keith Bell	Team Traffic - Transport	Nick Rae	Transurban - Urban Designer	Evan Peters	Aspire Consulting Engineers - Engineer	Graeme Wrack	Gel Architects - Architects	Robert White	GHD – Wastewater		
Name	Role																				
Jeremy Guiding	Matvin - Project manager																				
Matthew Ellingham	Matvin - Applicant																				
Burnette O'Connor	The Planning Collective - Planner																				
Keith Bell	Team Traffic - Transport																				
Nick Rae	Transurban - Urban Designer																				
Evan Peters	Aspire Consulting Engineers - Engineer																				
Graeme Wrack	Gel Architects - Architects																				
Robert White	GHD – Wastewater																				
Purpose	Preapplication Meeting for The Botanic – retirement village, childcare facility and café and associated infrastructure. Note: Because the applicant intends this application to go through the EPA Fast Track process, the preapplication was limited to focusing on key matters																				
Precirculated Plans	Latest plan provided 'Site Masterplan' Dated 17/9/2021																				
Introduction	Round table introductions occurred																				
Council Approach	Tracey confirmed that because the applicant was seeking to go through EPA Fast Track process, a high level approach has been taken by Council and only key experts and high level responses provided. Other assessments that would be required as part of an application include: earthworks/ noise/ groundwater/ contamination. It is also noted that Watercare were unable to attend.																				
Applicant update	Below are comments from the applicants' representatives. General and Planning update - Burnette: - Lodged a formal EPA referral request a week or so ago. EPA has identified 2 questions for the applicant to address now: - uplift the consent notices that currently exist on site. Tessa confirmed Burnette can contact her directly to discuss. - Addition of another adjacent property. - Matvin are involved in the Private Plan Change with Fletchers. This will be lodged with Council shortly. - Burnette confirmed there are no streams or wetlands (including wetlands that meet the definition of NPS: FW) on the site Architect update - Graeme: - Details include:																				

- 158 villas
- Care homes - 88 beds
- Apartment buildings – 264 apartments (1.5bedrooms – 3 bedrooms)
- Childcare – Single story and cater for 100 children
- Café - 300m²
- Small retail – hairdressers etc..
- Medical centre (i.e.: physio) - approx. 100m²
- Lower scale buildings on the boundaries of the site. For example units facing Cambridge Road mimic houses across the street
- Only one entrance to Riverhead Road is proposed
- Public café, public park and childcare is proposed on Riverhead Road to relate to the street.
- Hairdresser and small medical centre (ie: physio) will cater for the village, but also be open to the public.
- Carparking provided under apartment buildings
- Care building wrapped around the existing trees adjacent to Cambridge Road

Urban Design - Nick

- Activates the street – residents use the street network to access other parts of the village.
- Pedestrian link proposed through the site (North west to South east)
- Overland flow path / swale being created through the site and planted with native vegetation – purpose is to manage stormwater. It will be a feature that flows when it needs to and still looks good when it is dry. Creates separation between buildings

Stormwater - Evan

- Stormwater is front and centre of how the site is being developed. They are taking a belts and braces approach
- Currently no noticeable drainage channels on site
- 9-10m fall across the site from Riverhead Road
- Overland flow path and attenuation is key. They have been engaging with CKL who are undertaking the stormwater assessment for the wider catchment
- Will provide attenuation for 100yr as well as at source treatment and SMAF detention and reuse.
- Treatment train approach. A series of dry basins within the site, that distribute attenuation around the site, prior to directing it to the central spine.
- Avoiding single communal device.

Water and Wastewater - Robert

- Riverhead is a pressure sewer zone. Watercare have indicated it would have to be pressure sewer
- As part of plan change GHD have developed a validated model for the area. Allowed for a growth of 4500 people in the plan change area. Consider that sufficient capacity exists currently. Therefore no wastewater upgrade is required.
- Consider a watermain is required from a resilience perspective

Transportation - Keith

- 2 types of road configuration on the site:
 - South-eastern corner – commercial with parking each side.
 - Rest of site – 6m wide roads with no kerbs and 1.2m wide footpath.
- 1 access on Riverhead Road. Considering two lanes going out (to avoid holdup from people turning right).

	Existing intersection and road changes are proposed by AT. This includes widening approaches to intersection, and lowering speeds. Also Riverhead road is cycleway and pedestrian on both sites, and central medium. This development is not reliant on this work occurring.
Council team / General discussion	High Level Policy - Ryan: - Significant concerns about the proposal from a policy perspective - Regional Policy Statement sets out the method to develop the Future Urban zone. It is to do a structure plan followed by a plan change. Individual site development would follow that, otherwise it pre-empts the structure planning. - It is understood that there is a wider structure plan and private plan change going on in the background between the developer along with Fletchers and Neil's. This is to cover the whole Future Urban zone in Riverhead. - It is positive that the landowners are working together on this. However, the council had not yet been involved in the structure plan and in any case the plan would still need to be tested through a public process (i.e. notified plan change). A private plan change has no legal effect until it is made operative – so the lodging of a private plan change with a structure plan cannot influence the processing of this resource consent. - Determining the land use pattern and infrastructure in the large greenfield growth areas of Auckland is an important issue that requires the input of many parties including mana whenua, infrastructure providers, local boards, and the wider community. The intention of the council is that these identified greenfield growth areas should have comprehensive and coordinated planning carried out before they are urbanised. The greenfield areas should not be developed in an ad-hoc basis based on individual landowner's different aspirations. This is the very antithesis of structure planning and undermines the council's strategy for the greenfield growth areas. - The Future Urban Land Supply Strategy sequences the Riverhead Future Urban zone to be 'development ready' between 2028 and 2032. The strategy notes that for Riverhead, wastewater and transport are the major issues. - Other areas in the north-west are sequenced for greenfield expansion development ahead of Riverhead such as Redhills (2017) and Whenuapai (2018-2022). The Redhill's area is already 'live' zoned while a structure plan for Whenuapai was adopted in 2016 and a plan change process is underway to rezone the first stage of residential and business land – around 400 hectares. Therefore, there is not currently a wider shortage of greenfield land for development in the north-west. - Ryan is unaware of any council resolution requiring the updating of the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy. He noted that the Auckland Plan (2018) adopted the same timing as the strategy. However, he acknowledged there is allot of pressure on the Future Urban Zones across Auckland with multiple private plan changes being lodged that do not accord with the timing in the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy. - Wastewater for the Riverhead Future Urban zone is reliant on the Northern Interceptor. Ryan deferred to Watercare or the council development engineer to comment further on this. - In terms of transport, the future transport network required for the greenfield growth areas across Auckland is being determined by the Supporting Growth Alliance. To date, the Alliance has determined an Indicative Strategic Transport Network for the north-west. The Alliance is currently working on a Detailed Business Case for the north-west projects and it is anticipated that the routes will begin to be designated (through Notices of Requirement) late in 2022. It is important to note that the Alliance is only funded to carry out the route protection stage and there are no budgets for full land acquisition or construction of the routes. Therefore, in terms of transport capacity, the Future Urban zoned

land in Riverhead will not have the necessary infrastructure in place for many years yet.

- SH16 is a major point of congestion, and the long-term plan is to alleviate this through extending the Rapid Transit Network to cover the north-west, and to construct an alternative state highway corridor to the south of Kumeu. Both these projects will have long lead in times due to the amount of land to be designated and acquired and the extremely large cost for construction.
- The timing of this infrastructure does not appear to sync with the proposed Botanic development (noting the 2-year lapse date for consents under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020).
- Burnette queried the relevance of the NPS-Urban Development. Ryan noted that a recent Environment Court decision had ruled that some parts of the NPS-UD did not apply to some planning decisions. He also noted that while the NPS-UD contains policies about 'responsive planning', the council had yet to set the thresholds for significant developments that would trigger this policy (due August 2022). Ryan would look further into the NPS-UD and how it impacts on this development proposal.

[NOTE: Following the meeting Ryan note that there is a resource consent practice and guidance note on the NPS-UD. It goes through each part of the NPS-UD and notes which parts of the NPS-UD apply and which parts don't apply to a resource consent application (based on Environment Court decision). See: <http://content.aucklanddesignmanual.co.nz/regulations/practice-notes/Documents/RC%203.12%20National%20Policy%20Statement%20-%20Urban%20Development.pdf>]

- Ryan noted that the Landscape specialist would be able to comment in more detail, but there are high-level policy concerns with the density and heights of buildings in the proposed Botanic development. Riverhead is mostly 1-2 storey, detached dwellings, with some new terraced housing in the centre. The subject site is essentially flat meaning that the proposed large buildings would be unable to be hidden in the landscape.

Healthy Waters - Mark / Kedan

- Healthy Waters support the integration with the wider Plan Change work that CKL are involved in for Fletchers and Neils.
- HW can not authorise the stormwater discharge under the Network Discharge consent. This is because it is outside the urban boundary, and (at this stage) is not part of a Plan change. Therefore a private discharge consent will be required.
- Healthy Waters assume all internal assets (including roads and stormwater infrastructure) will be private
- Healthy Waters don't yet understand the best Flood Management approach so are cautious about agreeing to the flood management approach at this early stage, however, if applicant makes provision for flood attenuation and it's determined that it may not be needed, then it resolves the issue.
- Site is relatively flat, so concerned that the approach of communal basins may struggle to work due to depth.
- New climate change numbers are released – they need to be considered as part of the flooding assessment.

Regional Stormwater - Nicola

- Ensure obtain land ownership for location of outlets

Landscape - Stephen

- Riverhead is a rural town / village currently and has a typical low-density suburban character, except for some terraces and commercial on the main road. This area is separated from the site by Single House Zone
- Currently the site is used as strawberry fields which contribute to rural character that extends through the FUZ to the surrounding rural zone

- The proposed density will not accord with or complement the existing rural and low-density suburban character – particularly density of 4 or 5 storey apartments
- Confirmed a comprehensive landscape assessment is required
- Graeme confirmed there are symbolic gates (ie: Access 3) provided that may be closed at night time

Auckland Transport - Tessa

- Full ITA would be required – covering childcare, café, retail, retirement village activities
- Pedestrian crossing on Riverhead Road proposed – unclear if it is signalised, raised, or painted
- Unlikely to support extra left turning lane on entranceway due to visibility issues, road safety and width for pedestrians to cross
- Keith advised that Access 4 will be restricted to left in/left out onto Coatsville Riverhead. Tessa noted that there can be low compliance with this and applicant should consider options to prevent right turns (e.g. solid median)
- Tessa advised need to consider queuing into site for right turns on Riverhead Road
- Tessa noted that the new proposed road showed a turning head outside property boundaries. Keith advised turning head will be bought onto this property
- Strategic Growth Alliance route protection won't occur until the end of next year at the earliest.
- Consider set back of buildings against what is proposed by SGA (particularly in relation to the Childcare facility)
- Tessa noted interest in details of pedestrian/public access through the site
- Ensure no rat run behind the childcare facilities – Keith advised he is considering different surfaces. Graeme noted that part of the road was a shared space (like Fort St). AT would want to see more details of this.
- Keith confirmed that the Z petrol station cannot be accessed off turning head onto Coatseville Riverhead Road
- Keith confirmed that the Cambridge road extension will be built kerb and channel and to AT standards
- Tessa noted would want to see SW management details for roads
- Limited Access Road approval required for any new vehicle crossings/accesses on LAR roads
- Post Meeting Note- interested in details of consent notice preventing access on Riverhead Road and Coatesville Riverhead Highway. This was not discussed with AT previously during Masterplan discussions. AT would expect to be consulted if the consent notices are to be removed.

Development Engineer - July

- Stability of site – Geotechnical report required for site
- Stormwater and flooding – check groundwater level in relation to proposed stormwater detention basin
- Transport:
 - Road width, parking, street lighting etc. – AUP chapter 27 requirements
 - Onsite manoeuvring assessment required (including emergency vehicles)
- Wastewater and Water capacity needs to be assessed and should be liaised with WSL
- Consider Firefighting ability of site – adequate water pressure and flow
- Rubbish collection – Councils rubbish truck wont access private roads

Jonathon

- Noise report in relation to childcare – mechanical ventilation proposed for retirement village units should be considered.
- Pedestrian connectivity – more clarity required on interface between private/communal/public

	• Shared space – clarity required • Receiving Environment – concern with the 5 and 4 storey apartment blocks due to surrounding zoning – referred to Business – Mixed Used zone development with maximum height of 13m as per the height variation control. • Future Urban Zone –assessment would be against Objectives and Policies which are strongly worded. Concern how this development would pass through this gateway. • Zoning anticipates rural activities • Can't rely on unadopted Structure Plan – as it has no weighting. Also can't rely on a private plan change which has no decision or that has not been adopted by Council. • Internal amenity – Mixed Housing Suburban standards provides a good guide. (i.e. outlook space, outdoor living space, and daylight) • Jonathon to provide a copy of the referenced resource consent at 1064-1068 Coatesville Riverhead Highway and 23-25 Alice Street.
Next Steps	• Burnette to keep Tracey updated on any key EPA timeframes • All correspondence to the Council team to Tracey in the first instance • Applicant will provide plans and information to Tracey in two weeks. Tracey confirmed that in this instance we would prefer all the information in one package (not drip fed). • Tracey to arrange another preapplication meeting for 4 weeks time.

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: Nicola Livingston, Stormwater and Industrial & Trade Activity Specialist, Specialist Unit, Resource Consents, Auckland Council

Date: 15 November 2021

Overall Summary:

My assessment summary relates to the management of stormwater runoff from the proposed impervious areas associated with the Project, specifically water quality and water quantity, and how this aligns with the stormwater provisions of the AUP(O-P). This assessment is based on the indicative stormwater design details provided in the supporting information and does not include any quantifiable analysis of the proposed design.

A private stormwater diversion and discharge consent under Chapter E8 of the AUP(O-P) is triggered as the proposal would not (at this stage) be authorised under Auckland Council's regionwide Network Discharge Consent (NDC). From a qualitative perspective the stormwater management proposal generally aligns with the intent and overall requirements of Chapter E8. The applicant has provided a water sensitive design approach that is focused towards on-site management of stormwater. The selected stormwater management devices (detention basin/wetland, swales) align with Auckland Council's GD01 requirements for both water quality and water quantity control. (It is noted that the stormwater management approach for proposed new roads to be vested has not been specifically addressed in the supporting information).

As stormwater runoff from the site will discharge to a stream receiving environment, hydrology mitigation is expected as per Policy E1.3(8) to minimise adverse effects on freshwater systems. Given the underlying clay and high groundwater table on this site, (as mentioned in the applicant's Geotechnical report), the approach taken to provide for retention via water reuse as opposed to infiltration is reasonable.

Although flooding is considered under Chapter E8, further technical assessment of the suitability of the selected devices as they relate to any potential flooding effects has not been addressed here as this matter is predominately addressed by other specialists within Council. However, I understand the high groundwater table on the site, the downstream 1% AEP flood plain and the use of detention basins on site that may restrict flows from the large upstream rural catchment are matters that need careful consideration.

Chapter E9 water quality requirements for a *high contaminant generating carpark* on the site have been considered in selecting devices that can meet the treatment requirements of GD01. As mentioned, the stormwater management approach for the development of new or redevelopment of existing roads including any that may meet the definition of a *high use road* under the AUP(O-P) (greater than 5,000 vehicles per day) has not been specifically considered in the supporting materials.

Other matters for consideration:

1. Authorising a private stormwater diversion and discharge consent for an urban activity purpose within the future urban zone (FUZ) is anomalous in that consents in this AUP(O-P) zone are issued for range of general rural activities. I understand this is not the intent of the FUZ which acts as a transitional zone to support Council's Healthy Waters Department role in strategically managing stormwater catchments in a holistic way so future urban development reliant on new public stormwater network are not faced with implications e.g., high flow rates, stormwater discharge volumes, flooding

effects etc. This strategic approach ensures the quality and health of Auckland's freshwater resources within future urban catchments so that the Objectives and Policies of Chapters E1 (*Water quality and integrated management*) and E2 (*Water quantity, allocation and use*) of the AUP(O-P) can be achieved.

2. The written approval of affected persons at 30 Cambridge Road, Riverhead adjoining the site to the north has not been signed. Although outside the resource consenting process, landowner approval would be required from this property as it appears stormwater runoff from the site will discharge onto this land which is owned by another party. It is advisable these approvals are sought prior to consenting as if they are not provided this can result in unexpected changes to the proposed stormwater design.
3. Natural wetlands (if any) beyond the site boundaries have not been considered in the ecology memo. Any natural wetlands within 100m of the proposed stormwater diversion and/or discharge, including on neighbouring sites should be assessed for potential effects as per Regulation 54 c of the NES-F 2020.
4. Ongoing maintenance of proposed stormwater devices is crucial to ensuring that the effects continue to be mitigated. Any devices, such as roadside stormwater devices where long-term ownership is intended to be transferred to another entity (e.g., Auckland Transport) need assurances at consenting stage that these devices will be accepted and maintained on an ongoing, long-term basis.

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: Stephen Quin, Principal – Landscape Architect. Auckland Council

Date: 15.11.2021

Overall Summary:

From the information sent through, I hold the following preliminary views:

- The height, mass and form of the proposed 3 – 5 storey buildings will discord with the rural landscape character, and not complement the low-density suburban character of the adjacent Single House Zone that provides a transition of density to the rural landscape.
- The 3 – 5 storey buildings will potentially appear visually prominent and detract from the amenity of adjoining properties to the south and east of the site.

Further Information:

I consider the application documents presents the proposal at a 'preliminary/conceptual' stage. While I have some preliminary concerns regarding the proposal (as outlined above), I am of the view that to enable a more detailed assessment on the landscape effects of the scheme, the following information is required:

- Landscape Assessment to address the proposed development's effects on:
 - the biophysical landscape,
 - rural and low-density suburban landscape character, and
 - visual amenity effects from private and public vantages towards the development.
- The landscape assessment should be supported by photographs and visual simulations.
- Details on proposed heights, area dimensions, materials, colours and finishes of buildings and ancillary structures.
- Plans showing the setbacks of all proposed buildings from adjoining streets and properties.
- Long elevations depicting the form and scale of development along the adjoining streets, and also identifying buildings that are behind and higher than those adjoining the street.
- Details on heights, design, materials and colours of any street facing retaining and fencing.
- Detailed Landscape Plan to enable a better understanding of the overall landscape treatment provided on-site and along its boundaries/interfaces, particularly in response to the rural and suburban character, and mitigation of amenity effects on adjoining properties.

Asset Owner / Specialist Response

From: *July Zhou – Development Engineer, Auckland Council*

Date: 16/11/2021

Overall Summary:

Based on the received information, I have concerns regarding to following aspects:

Traffic

- The traffic assessment should include the provision of traffic lighting
- The individual tracking curves should consider the vehicle parked within the parking pad, this may affect the traffic movement safety and pedestrian safety
- Movements of special vehicles will need to be considered such as firefighting trucks, rubbish trucks etc

Geotechnical

- The groundwater is expected to be very high. This may affect the construction methodologies and stability of building developments. A robust investigation and analysis will be required at the later stage. Please note specific groundwater take or diversion consents may be triggered, but it may be challenging to discharge groundwater downstream as there is not adjacent public stormwater system

Stormwater

- The available space for stormwater management may not be sufficient. Please note the storm surge from groundwater may overwhelm the provided basins and swales and cause significant flooding
- While discharging into the ground on site may not be feasible due to high groundwater table, discharging of stormwater will probably involve a private discharge consent

Wastewater and Water

- The applicant shall liaise with Watercare Services Ltd to confirm if the existing wastewater system has sufficient capacity to accommodate the development
- The applicant shall liaise with Watercare Services Ltd to confirm if there is sufficient flow and pressure available for both potable water supply and firefighting water supply

From: Phelan Pirrie (Rodney Local Board)

Date: 15 November 2021

Comments:

1/. It is more appropriate for this to go through the existing RMA process as;

- This land is currently zoned Future Urban and under the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy is not due for development release until 2028.
- There is no structure plan for the area, and this isn't going to happen until 2025.
- There is Private Plan Change process underway with Fletchers Development for the adjoining land, this should be part of that process to allow an integrated development.
- If this proceeds under the fast track process then there will be no opportunity to better integrate this into other planned development or the existing community.

2/. The first thing required is a Structure Plan, non exists, so it is impossible to properly integrate this into the existing community.

3/. No comment.

4/. As above, no structure plan exists and this shouldn't be developed ahead of the formal structure plan process, and definitely not ahead of the Private Plan Change process Fletchers is undertaking.

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

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

Organisation providing comment	Auckland Transport
Contact person (if follow-up is required)	Tessa Craig
	Major Developments Interface Lead, Planning and Investment
	s 9(2)(a)

Comment form

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

Project name	The Botanic, Riverhead, Auckland (the Project)
General comment	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the referral of The Botanic, Riverhead for consideration under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 (Covid 19 Recovery Act). Auckland Transport does not support the Project being accepted for fast-track consenting. The site is located in Future Urban zoned land under the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP(OP)). The AUP(OP) states that Future Urban zoned land should not be developed for urban purposes until it has been through a structure planning and plan change process (refer Policy B2.2.2(3), Objective H18.2(1) of AUP(OP)). The Auckland Plan and the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (FULSS) provide the Development Strategy for Auckland, including the sequencing and timing for when future urban areas will be ready for development to commence which requires necessary underpinning zoning and bulk infrastructure to be in place. It is considered more appropriate for the Project to proceed through existing RMA private plan change processes rather than the Covid 19 Recovery Act. The development will not help achieve the purpose of the Covid Act given a well-functioning environment will not result due to the misalignment between the timing to provide the minimum necessary infrastructure and services ahead of the first units being occupied. The project does not align with the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP(OP)), or the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS UD). Strategic transport network infrastructure is needed to service the area as identified in FULSS and identified by Supporting Growth Alliance (a partnership of Auckland Transport and Waka Kotahi). The FULSS informs the Auckland Plan Development Strategy, the spatial plan for Auckland as per the Local Government (Auckland Council) Amendment Act 2010. The FULSS and Development Strategy helps to inform wider network infrastructure asset planning and funding priorities and, in turn, enables development capacity to be identified in a coordinated and cost-efficient way. Any misalignment between the timing of infrastructure and services and the urbanisation of greenfield areas brings into question whether the proposed development area is "development ready". The FULSS identifies this area as intended to be development ready in 2028-2032. The proposed development is a Non-Complying Activity in the AUP(OP). Two of the objectives of the Future Urban zone in the AUP(OP) are 'Future urban development is not compromised by premature subdivision, use or development'; and 'Urbanisation on sites zoned Future Urban Zone is avoided until the sites have been rezoned for urban purposes' (H18.2. (3) and (4)). Policies of the Future Urban zone require subdivision to maintain and complement rural character and amenity, avoid fragmentation compromising future urban development; and avoid subdivision, use and

	development which will compromise the efficient and effective operation of the local and wider transport network. Upgrades to the roading network required to support urbanisation of land in this area include corridor upgrades with active modes and stormwater provision (to urban standard), upgrades to the existing roundabout at Coatesville Riverhead Highway/Riverhead Road intersection and a new roundabout on Riverhead Road. The Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) sets the 10-year plan for the transport network in Auckland (out to 2031). No funding is currently set aside in the RLTP, meaning any bulk or strategic network upgrades are more than 10-years away.
Other considerations	<u>Integrated Transport Assessment</u> Auckland Transport requests that should the Project be accepted for fast-track consenting, the requirement for an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) is formally stated in the referral order to accompany any resource consent application for the Project lodged with the Environmental Protection Authority. The main objective of an ITA is to ensure that the transportation effects of a new development proposal are well considered, that there is an emphasis on efficiency, safety and accessibility to and from the development by all transport modes where practical; and that the adverse transport effects of the development have been effectively avoided, remedied or mitigated. The preparation of an ITA seeks to ensure that appropriate thought is given to the land use proposed, so that integrated transport and land use outcomes occur that are in keeping with the intent of the area. Guidance to assist in preparing an ITA is available, along with a draft template, on the Auckland Transport website. An ITA provides a more comprehensive assessment than a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), with an emphasis on considering the full range of transport modes. An ITA considers measures to reduce travel demand, utilise the existing network more efficiently, encourage other modes and then finally adding road capacity. An ITA (and application material) will also need to clearly identify how the required transport infrastructure is being delivered to ensure certainty that the development will provide for its network demands. Assessing the full range of transport modes and the utility provided by each mode is crucial in determining the forecasted transport effects, by mode, of this development. The most suitable way to determine an appropriate trip rate and modal split for the proposed development, and its proposed uses, is to undertake surveys of similar occupied and operational developments, as the travel behaviours and mode choices would be reflective of such a development, and the feasibility of any proposed modal splits for trips generated. The ITA should include an assessment of whether the surrounding roading network is able to accommodate the additional traffic volumes generated by the proposed development. The Riverhead Road/Coatesville Riverhead Highway intersection should be assessed, along with the proposed access points onto Riverhead Road and Coatesville-Riverhead Highway as these are both Arterial roads where vehicle access restriction applies. In addition, Coatesville-Riverhead Highway is a Limited Accessway Road and separate approval is required from Auckland Transport as Road Controlling Authority, under section 346 of the Local Government Act (outside of the RMA and Covid-19 Recovery Act consenting framework). The ITA should consider the proposal in the context of the North West Indicative Strategic Transport Network identified by the Supporting Growth Alliance as needed to service the North West Growth Area. The ITA and application material should also include an assessment of: • the proposed vehicle crossings, including engineering drawings with dimensions, details of the width, visibility assessment, right turns and queuing, and an assessment of effects on the transport network (including the safe and efficient operation of the operation of the network and street and pedestrian amenity), under Rule E27.4.1 (A5) AUP(OP)); • pedestrian amenity, including provision for footpaths. The site frontages should be upgraded with kerb and channel, footpaths and cycle lanes; • cycle storage facilities in accordance with the AUP(OP) requirements; • queuing analysis and tracking to confirm whether vehicles entering the site will experience conflict points; • loading/servicing details for waste trucks and other service vehicles; and

	assessment of effects for any other reason for consent under Chapter E26 Infrastructure and Chapter E27 Transport of the AUP(OP). It is also noted that a turning head is shown at the northern end of the 'New Road' in land beyond the site boundary. This should be within the Applicants' land.
[Insert specific requests for comment]	Click or tap here to insert responses to any specific matters the Minister is seeking your views on.

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

Released under the provisions of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982

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

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

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

Comment form

Please use the table below to comment on the application.

Project name	The Botanic, Riverhead
General comment	There were no infrastructure report, engineering plans, capacity assessments, fire/water supply-demand, or information on wastewater flow and connection points provided as part of this application. Based on very limited data provided, Watercare has completed a very high-level assessment for the proposed development at 1092 Coatesville Riverhead highway. The proposal is for a retirement village with 264 apartments (31 1.5-bedroom, 202 2-bedroom and 31 3-bedroom); 158 villas (121 2-bedroom and 37 3-bedroom) and approximately 80 care beds, a childcare centre, medical centre, café, and retail premises. Water supply: The water network currently is operating near its capacity. The proposed development will trigger the requirement of a significant local network extension. Wastewater: It is proposed to service the development through an extension of the pressure sewer system. More detailed information needs to be provided to assess the impact of the development on the wastewater network.
Other considerations	Water Supply The existing supply to the Riverhead Water Supply Zone (WSZ) is via a single 200mm ID WM. The proposed development will trigger the need for a second supply feed due to the number of properties supplied via a single feed for resilience considerations. This will need to be installed at the developer's cost. The potential firefighting sprinkler requirements have not been identified and, therefore, have not been assessed at this stage. Upgrades linking to the firefighting requirements may still be required. The developer must carry out the upgrades and extensions based on the agreed solution at no cost to Watercare. The following information needs to be provided: • The developer should supply expected proposed water demands based on the different users • Possible sprinkler supply requirements (approximate flow rates).

	Wastewater Currently, the site has no wastewater connection. It is proposed to extend the existing pressurised sewer system to service the development. The existing wastewater network seems to have enough capacity to service the proposed development. However, more detailed information, including a capacity assessment and a design report, is required to identify the exact impact of the development on the wastewater network and the upgrades linking to the proposed development. The developer will need to carry all the extensions and upgrades based on the agreed solution at no cost to Watercare.
[Insert specific requests for comment]	

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

Released under the provisions of the Official Information Act 1982