



FTC#116: Application for referred project under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act – Stage 2 decisions:

Application 2021-074 Waimarie Street

Date Submitted:	3 March 2022	Tracking #: BRF-1136	
Security Level	In-Confidence	MfE Priority:	Urgent

	Action sought:	Response by:
To Hon David Parker, Minister for the Environment	Decisions on recommendations	TBA

Actions for Minister's Office Staff	Return the signed briefing to MfE.
Number of appendices: 6	<p>Appendices:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Waimarie Street application documents 2. Stage 1 Briefing Note and decisions 3. Statutory framework for making decisions 4. Draft Notice of Decisions letter to Sanctum Projects Limited 5. Section 17 Report 6. Comments received from Ministers and Auckland Council

Ministry for the Environment contacts

Position	Name	Cell phone	1 st contact
Principal Authors	Samantha Maxwell and Jess Hollis		
Manager	Stephanie Frame	s 9(2)(a)	✓
Director	Caroline Hart	s 9(2)(a)	

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

FTC#116: Application for referred projects under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act – Stage 2 decisions

Key Messages

1. This briefing seeks your decisions on the application received under section 20 of the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 (FTCA) from Sanctum Projects Limited for referral of the Waimarie Street project (the Project) to an expert consenting panel (a panel). A copy of the application is in Appendix 1.
2. This is the second briefing relating to this application. The first (Stage 1) briefing (BRF-1028) with your initial decisions annotated is in Appendix 2.
3. The Project is located at 43A and 45 Waimarie Street and 819 Riddell Road, Saint Heliers, Auckland. It is to redevelop 3 suburban properties covering approximately 7300 square metres, to create approximately 58 residential lots accommodating approximately 58 terraced 2 to 4-bedroom residential units between 2 and 3 storeys high. The Project will also create a jointly owned, private-access lot and a pedestrian accessway to Waimarie Street.
4. The Project will involve activities such as:
 - a. subdividing land
 - b. demolishing existing buildings and other structures
 - c. clearing vegetation
 - d. undertaking earthworks (including disturbance of potentially contaminated soils)
 - e. diverting and discharging stormwater and contaminants onto land
 - f. taking, diverting and discharging groundwater
 - g. constructing residential buildings
 - h. placing structures in or over an overland flow path
 - i. constructing vehicle and pedestrian access and parking areas
 - j. constructing infrastructure for three-waters services
 - k. landscaping and planting
 - l. any other activities that are:
 - i. associated with the activities described in a to k
 - ii. within the Project scope.
5. The Project will require subdivision and land use consents, and water and discharge permits under the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP), and land use consent under the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011 (NES-CS).
6. The Project site is zoned Residential–Mixed Housing Suburban in the AUP. Based on the information provided with the application we understand that the zone standards and Auckland-wide rules applicable to the Project have controlled or restricted discretionary status, including those relating to density and building height greater than permitted zone standards.
7. We do not consider there are significant reasons to decline Project referral. We recommend you accept the referral application under section 24 of the FTCA and refer the Project to a panel for fast-track consenting. We seek your decision on this recommendation and on our

recommendations on directions to the applicant and a panel, and notification of your decisions.

Assessment against Statutory Framework

8. The statutory framework for your decision-making is set out in Appendix 3. You must apply this framework when you are deciding whether or not to accept the application and when deciding on any further requirements or directions associated with Project referral.
9. Before accepting the application, you must consider the application and any further information provided by the applicant (in Appendix 1), the Section 17 Report (in Appendix 5) and comments from Ministers and Auckland Council (in Appendix 6). Following that, you may accept the application if you are satisfied that it meets the referral criteria in section 18 of the FTCA. We provide our advice on these matters below.
10. We have also considered if there are any reasons for declining the Project, including the criteria in section 23(5) of the FTCA, and provide our advice on these matters to assist your decision-making.

Further information provided by applicant

11. You did not request any further information from the applicant under section 22 of the FTCA.

Section 17 Report

12. The Section 17 Report indicates that there are 16 iwi authorities, 8 Treaty settlements and 11 Treaty settlement entities relevant to the Project area.
13. No specific cultural or commercial redress provided under the settlements would be affected by the proposed Project. The relevant Treaty settlements do not create any new co-governance or co-management processes that would affect decision-making under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) for this Project.

Comments received

14. Comments were received from Auckland Council and s 9(2)(f)(ii), s 9(2)(g)(i) The key points of relevance to your decision are summarised in Table A.
15. s 9(2)(f)(ii), s 9(2)(g)(i)
16. Auckland Council did not identify any significant concerns but included comments from the Orakei Local Board which opposed Project referral.
17. Auckland Council identified several reports and assessments that would normally be required for a project of this type in this area. We consider that these are generally covered by the requirements of clause 9, Schedule 6 of the FTCA but recommend you require the applicant to submit to a panel the information detailed in Table A, to assist a panel with timely consideration of specific matters raised by Auckland Council.
18. s 9(2)(f)(ii), s 9(2)(g)(i)

s 9(2)(f)(ii), s 9(2)(g)(i)

Section 18 referral criteria

22. You may accept the application for Project referral if you are satisfied that the Project does not include ineligible activities (section 18(3)) and will help to achieve the purpose of the FTCA (section 18(2)).
23. The Project does not include any ineligible activities, as explained in Table A.
24. The matters that you may consider when deciding if a project will help achieve the purpose of the FTCA are in Section 19 of the FTCA. Our assessment of these matters is summarised in Table A. We consider the Project will help achieve the purpose of the FTCA, and thus meet the requirements of section 18(2), as it has the potential to:
 - a. generate employment by providing approximately 212 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs over a 2 to 3-year construction period
 - b. increase housing supply through the construction of approximately 58 residential units
 - c. contribute to a well-functioning urban environment by providing a variety of housing types in a location that has good access to community services, public transport, and natural and open spaces
 - d. progress faster than would otherwise be the case under standard RMA process, provided that the applicant lodges their applications for resource consent in a timely manner following Project referral.
25. We consider that any actual and potential effects arising from the Project, together with any measures to avoid, remedy, mitigate, offset or compensate for adverse effects, could be tested by a panel against Part 2 of the RMA and the purpose of the FTCA.

Issues and Risks

26. Even if the Project meets the referral criteria in section 18 of the FTCA, section 23(2) of the FTCA permits you to decline to refer the Project for any other reason.

Section 23 FTCA matters

27. Section 23(5) of the FTCA provides further guidance on reasons to decline an application,

and our analysis of these matters is summarised in Table A. Note that you may accept an application even if one or more of those reasons apply.

28. We consider that referring the Project could be viewed negatively by the wider community who may expect to be involved in a standard consenting process under the RMA due to the proposed density of the development and its potential effects on the existing neighbourhood. If you decide to refer the Project, a panel must invite comments from adjacent landowners and occupiers under clauses 17(6)(g) and 17(6)(h), Schedule 6 of the FTCA. A panel also can invite comments from any person they consider appropriate (clause 17(8), Schedule 6 of the FTCA). We consider a panel will be best placed to assess the Project's effects, including on existing amenity and character, with the benefit of a complete resource application before them. Therefore, we do not consider that you should decline the referral application on the basis that it would be more appropriate for the Project to go through the standard consenting process under the RMA (section 23(5)(b)).

29. s 9(2)(f)(ii), s 9(2)(g)(i)

Auckland Council did not identify any environmental regulatory compliance history for the applicant and noted that past abatement notices issued to other companies where Mr Ghee was a director or shareholder have been met and are no longer active. Auckland Council noted there are no significant outstanding compliance concerns and we do not consider that you should decline the referral application on the basis of a poor history of environmental regulatory compliance (section 23(5)(f)).

Other matters

30. Sanctum Projects Limited is a New Zealand registered company. An internet search of media articles relating to Sanctum Projects Limited and Mr Ghee has revealed two articles from 2016 relating to disputes over developments undertaken by PHI Construction Limited, a separate legal entity that Mr Ghee is the sole director of. We do not consider litigation involving other legal entities to be directly relevant to your referral decision.

31. s 9(2)(f)(ii), s 9(2)(g)(i)

Auckland Council noted that other recent and similar developments in Auckland have been subject to judicial review applications on the basis of the Council's failure to notify the applications to affected persons in accordance with the requirements of the RMA and the AUP. Whilst the judicial review applications indicate a level of community interest in terraced housing developments in the Residential-Mixed Housing Suburban zone, we note that this referral application is being considered under the FTCA and we do not consider the judicial reviews on the basis of non-notification and failure to comply with the AUP are relevant to your referral decision.

Conclusions

32. We do not consider there are any significant reasons for you to decline to refer the Project. You could accept the application under section 24 of the FTCA and all of the Project could be referred to a panel.

33. If you decide to refer the Project, we consider that you should specify under section 24(2)(d) of the FTCA (as requested in comments) that the applicant must provide the following information, additional to the requirements of clause 9) of Schedule 6 of the FTCA, with their consent applications to a panel:

- a. a three-waters infrastructure capacity and funding assessment
- b. a stormwater and flood risk assessment and draft stormwater management plan

- c. an integrated transport assessment
 - d. an urban design assessment
 - e. a contaminated soils assessment.
34. The above information is required to assist a panel in assessing the adverse effects of the Project.
35. If you decide to refer the Project, we consider that you should specify under section 24(2)(e) of the FTCA that a panel must invite comments on the applicant's consent applications from the following parties:
- a. Ngāti Koheriki Claims Committee
 - b. Watercare Services Limited.
36. We consider that if you decide to refer the Project, the application and notice of decisions should be copied to Ngāti Koheriki Claims Committee and Watercare Services Limited.
37. Our recommendations for your decisions follow.

Next Steps

38. You must give notice of your decisions on the referral application, and the reasons for them, to the applicant and the persons, entities and groups listed in section 25 of the FTCA.
39. We have attached a notice of decisions letter to the applicant based on these requirements and our recommendations (refer Appendix 4). We will assist your office to give copies to all relevant parties.
40. To refer the Project, you must recommend that a referral order be made by way of an Order in Council (OIC).
41. Cabinet has agreed that you can issue drafting instructions to the Parliamentary Counsel Office without the need for a policy decision to be taken by Cabinet in the first instance.¹

¹ Following the first OIC, the Minister for the Environment (and Minister of Conservation for projects in the Coastal Marine Area) can issue drafting instructions directly to the Parliamentary Counsel Office. Cabinet has also agreed that a Regulatory Impact Assessment is not required for an OIC relating to projects to be referred to a panel [ENV-20-MIN-0033 and CAB-20-MIN-0353 refer].

Recommendations

1. We recommend that you:

- a. **Note** section 23(1) of the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 (FTCA) requires you to decline this application for referral unless you are satisfied that the Project meets the referral criteria in section 18 of the FTCA including that it would help to achieve the FTCA's purpose.
- b. **Note** when assessing whether the Project would achieve the FTCA's purpose, you may consider a number of matters under section 19, including the Project's economic benefits and costs, and effects on social or cultural well-being; whether it may result in a public benefit (such as generating employment or increasing housing supply); and whether it could have significant adverse effects.
- c. **Note** before deciding to accept the application for Project referral under section 24(1) of the FTCA you must consider:
 - i. the application
 - ii. the report obtained under section 17 of the FTCA
 - iii. any comments and further information sought and provided within the required timeframe.
- d. **Note** if you are satisfied that all or part of the Project meets the referral criteria in section 18 of the FTCA you may:
 - i. refer all or part of the Project to an expert consenting panel (a panel)
 - ii. refer the initial stages of the Project to a panel while deferring decisions about the Project's remaining stages
 - iii. still decline the referral application for any reason under section 23(2) of the FTCA.
- e. **Note** if you do refer all or part of the Project you may:
 - i. specify restrictions that apply to the Project
 - ii. specify the information that must be submitted to a panel
 - iii. specify the persons or groups from whom a panel must invite comments
 - iv. set specific timeframes for a panel to complete their process.
- f. **Agree** the Project meets the referral criteria in section 18 (3) of the FTCA. Yes/No
- g. **Agree** the Project will help achieve the purpose of the FTCA (and therefore meets the referral criteria in section 18(2) of the FTCA) as it has the potential to:
 - i. generate employment by providing approximately 212 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs over a 2 to 3-year construction period
 - ii. increase housing supply through the construction of approximately 58 residential units
 - iii. contribute to a well-functioning urban environment by providing a variety of housing types in a location with good access to community services, public transport, and natural and open spaces

- iv. progress faster than would otherwise be the case under standard Resource Management Act 1991 process
- Yes/No
- h. **Agree to refer** all of the Project to a panel.
- Yes/No
- i. **Agree** to specify under section 24(2)(d) of the FTCA the following additional information that the applicant must submit with any resource consent application lodged with the Environmental Protection Authority:
- i. a detailed infrastructure assessment that addresses –
 - i. the condition and capacity of the existing infrastructure for three-waters services to service the completed Project
 - ii. what upgrading is required to that infrastructure to service the completed Project
 - iii. how any upgrading is to be funded
 - ii. a stormwater assessment, which must include –
 - i. a flood risk assessment, including pre- and post-development effects on the upstream and downstream catchment, as well as any mitigation measures
 - ii. a draft stormwater management plan
 - iii. information about any discussions held, and any agreements made, with the Auckland Council Healthy Waters department regarding stormwater management
 - iii. an integrated transport assessment, including information about any discussions held, and any agreements made, with Auckland Transport
 - iv. an urban design assessment, which must include –
 - i. shading diagrams and visual simulations to show the effects of shading and visual dominance from the proposed buildings
 - ii. a detailed landscape plan
 - iii. an assessment of the overall landscape quality provided on-site and along the boundaries/interface with neighbouring properties
 - iv. an assessment of the effects on the neighbourhood character, residential amenity, safety and the surrounding residential area from the building intensity, scale, location, form and appearance
 - v. in relation to the land in the Project site, a report on a preliminary site investigation and, if required, on a detailed site investigation, within the meaning of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011, that shows how the requirements of those regulations will be met.
- Yes/No

j. **Agree** to specify under section 24(2)(e) of the FTCA that a panel must invite comments from the following additional persons or groups:

- i. Ngāti Koheriki Claims Committee
- ii. Watercare Services Limited.

Yes/No

k. **Agree** to the Ministry for the Environment issuing drafting instructions to the Parliamentary Counsel Office for an Order in Council to refer the Waimarie Street project to a panel in accordance with your decisions recorded herein.

Yes/No

l. **Sign the attached (Appendix 4)** notice of decisions to Sanctum Projects Limited.

Yes/No

m. **Agree** to copy the application and notice of decisions to Ngāti Koheriki Claims Committee and Watercare Services Limited.

Yes/No

n. **Note** to comply with section 25(3) of the FTCA, you must ensure that the decisions, the reasons, and the Section 17 Report are published on the Ministry for the Environment's website. We will work with your office to complete this task.

Signatures



Manager – Fast-track Consenting
Date

Hon David Parker
Minister for the Environment
Date

Table A: Stage 2 - Project Summary and Section 24 Assessment

Project details	Project description	Does all or part of the Project meet the referral criteria in section 18?		Summary of comments received (Note: for analysis and/or recommended responses to these comments refer to column 7)	Section 23 assessment – potential reasons for declining	Referral conclusions & recommendations
		Project eligibility for referral (section 18(3)(a)–(d))	Section 18(2) - does the Project help achieve the purpose of the FTCA (as per section 19)?			
<p>Project name Waimarie Street</p> <p>Applicant Sanctum Projects Limited c/- Berry Simons (agent)</p> <p>Location 43A and 45 Waimarie Street, 819 Riddell Road, Saint Heliers, Auckland</p>	<p>The Project is to redevelop three suburban properties covering approximately 7300 square metres to create approximately 58 residential lots accommodating approximately 58 terraced 2 to 4-bedroom residential units, between 2 and 3 storeys high. The Project will also create a jointly owned, private-access lot, and a pedestrian accessway to Waimarie Street.</p> <p>The Project will involve activities such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> subdividing land demolishing existing buildings and other structures clearing vegetation undertaking earthworks (including disturbance of potentially contaminated soils) diverting and discharging stormwater and contaminants to land taking, diverting and discharging groundwater constructing residential buildings placing structures in or over an overland flow path 	<p>The Project is eligible for referral under section 18(3)(a)–(d) as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it does not include any prohibited activities it does not include activities on land returned under a Treaty settlement it does not include activities in a customary marine title area under the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011. 	<p>Economic benefits for people or industries affected by COVID-19 (19(a))</p> <p>The applicant has provided an economic assessment that estimates the Project will provide approximately 212 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs over the 2 to 3-year construction period, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 49 FTE jobs in building construction 115 FTE jobs in construction services 48 jobs in professional services. <p>Economic costs for people or industries affected by COVID-19 (19(a))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A <p>Effect on the social and cultural well-being of current and future generations (19(b))</p> <p>The Project has the potential for positive effects on the social wellbeing of current and future generations as it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> generate employment through the provision of approximately 212 FTE jobs increase housing supply through the construction of approximately 58 residential units. <p>Is the Project likely to progress faster by using this Act? (19(c))</p> <p>The applicant considers that the fast-track process will allow the Project to progress approximately 5 to 11 months faster than under the standard Resource Management Act (RMA) process. The applicant considers that there is a high likelihood consent applications would be publicly notified under standard process. They also noted a risk of judicial review if consent applications were non-notified, and we</p>	<p>s 9(2)(f)(ii), s 9(2)(g)(i)</p>	<p>Section 23(5) matters:</p> <p>Insufficient information (23(5)(a)) The applicant has provided sufficient information for you to determine whether the Project meets the criteria in section 18 of the FTCA.</p> <p>More appropriate to go through standard RMA process (23(5)(b)) s 9(2)(f)(ii), s 9(2)(g)(i) [redacted] e do not consider it would be more appropriate for all or part of the Project to proceed through the standard consenting process under the RMA.</p> <p>Inconsistency with a national policy statement (23(5)(c)) We do not consider the Project is inconsistent with any relevant national policy statements.</p> <p>Inconsistent with a Treaty settlement (23(5)(d)) The Project does not directly affect any Treaty settlement redress.</p> <p>Involves land needed for Treaty settlements (23(5)(e)) The Project site does not include any land needed for Treaty settlement purposes.</p> <p>Applicant has poor regulatory compliance (23(5)(f)) Auckland Council has not identified any environmental regulatory compliance history for the applicant. Auckland Council advised that there are no significant outstanding compliance concerns associated with the applicant, Mr Aaron Ghee (GHEE Teik Huat), and other companies of which Mr Ghee is a director/shareholder. No enforcement action has been taken against Sanctum Projects Limited and past abatement</p>	<p>In response to key comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> s 9(2)(f)(ii), s 9(2)(g)(i) [redacted] Auckland Council and its CCO's identified several reports and assessments that would normally be required for a project of this type in this area. We consider that these are generally covered by the requirements of clause 9 Schedule 6 of the FTCA but recommend you require the applicant to submit to a panel certain specific information, as detailed below, to assist a panel with timely consideration of the application. Watercare, via Auckland Council, commented that additional analysis is required to understand the capacity of the water and wastewater line and considered that the applicant should provide a three-waters infrastructure assessment to a panel. We have included this in our recommendations and also recommend that you provide your notice of decisions to Watercare.

Project details	Project description	Does all or part of the Project meet the referral criteria in section 18?		Summary of comments received (Note: for analysis and/or recommended responses to these comments refer to column 7)	Section 23 assessment – potential reasons for declining	Referral conclusions & recommendations
		Project eligibility for referral (section 18(3)(a)–(d))	Section 18(2) - does the Project help achieve the purpose of the FTCA (as per section 19)?			
	<p>i. constructing vehicle and pedestrian access and parking areas</p> <p>j. constructing infrastructure for three-waters services</p> <p>k. landscaping and planting</p> <p>l. any other activities that are:</p> <p>i. associated with the activities described in a to k</p> <p>ii. within the Project scope.</p> <p>The Project will require subdivision and land use consents, and water and discharge permits under the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP), and land use consent under the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011 (NES-CS).</p>		<p>consider this risk remains under the FTCA.</p> <p>Will the Project result in a public benefit? (19(d))</p> <p>Based on the information provided by the applicant we consider that the Project may result in the following public benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> generating employment increasing housing supply contributing to a well-functioning urban environment <p>Potential to have significant adverse environmental effects, including greenhouse gas emissions (19(e))</p> <p>The Project has the potential for adverse environmental effects relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> earthworks and disturbance of potentially contaminated land construction traffic the proposed buildings dominating, overlooking, shading, and causing loss of privacy for neighbouring properties changing amenity and character of neighbouring residentially zoned land. <p>The applicant has stated that overall adverse effects will not be significant.</p> <p>We note that a panel can consider this and any appropriate mitigation, offsetting, or compensation to manage adverse effects of the development.</p> <p>Other relevant matters (19(f))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<p>s 9(2)(f)(ii), s 9(2)(g)(i)</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Local authorities</p> <p>Auckland Council did not oppose Project referral and did not have any significant concerns with the Project nor see any reason why it is more appropriate for the Project to proceed under the RMA. Auckland Council noted that further information will be required to understand the impact on infrastructure and other effects; however, considered there is nothing to suggest the Project will be inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the AUP, nor that it would result in significant adverse environmental effects. The Auckland Council Healthy Waters department noted that they would require a site-specific stormwater management plan from the applicant and that the Project presents the risk of downstream habitable floor flooding.</p> <p>Auckland Council did not identify any environmental regulatory compliance history for the applicant and other companies where Mr Aaron Ghee is a director/shareholder. Auckland Council included comment from the Orakei Local Board which opposed Project referral and raised concerns regarding the lack of community engagement, significant adverse environmental effects, and inconsistency with the criteria under the FTCA.</p> <p>Auckland Council's response included comments from their Council-controlled organisations Auckland Transport and Watercare Services Limited (Watercare).</p> <p>Auckland Transport requested that if the Project is referred, the applicant be required to provide an integrated transport</p>	<p>notices issued to Phi Construction Limited and St Andrews Residential Limited (both with Mr Ghee as director) were met and are no longer active.</p> <p>Insufficient time for the Project to be referred and considered before FTCA repealed (23(5)(g))</p> <p>There is sufficient time for the application to be referred and considered before the FTCA is repealed.</p> <p>Other issues & risks:</p> <p>Sanctum Projects Limited is a New Zealand registered company. An internet search of media articles relating to Sanctum Projects Limited, and Mr Ghee has revealed two articles from 2016 relating to disputes over developments undertaken by PHI Construction Limited, a separate legal entity that Mr Ghee is the sole director of. We do not consider litigation involving other legal entities to be directly relevant to your referral decision.</p> <p>s 9(2)(f)(ii), s 9(2)(g)(i)</p> <p>Auckland Council noted that other recent and similar developments in Auckland have been subject to judicial review applications on the basis of the Council's failure to notify the applications to affected persons in accordance with the requirements of the RMA and the AUP. Whilst the judicial review applications indicate a level of community interest in terraced housing developments in the Residential-Mixed Housing Suburban Zone, we note that this referral application is being considered under the FTCA and we do not consider the judicial reviews on the basis of non-notification and failure to comply with the AUP are relevant to your referral decision.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> we recommend you accept Auckland Transport's request to require the applicants to submit an integrated transport assessment to a panel. <p>We consider that you could accept the application under section 24 of the FTCA and refer all the Project to a panel, as it will have positive effects on generate employment, increase housing supply, and contribute to a well-functioning urban environment.</p> <p>We also recommend you require the applicant to provide the following information with their resource consent applications to a panel:</p> <p>a. a detailed infrastructure assessment of –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the condition and capacity of the existing infrastructure for three-waters services to service the completed Project what upgrading is required to that infrastructure to service the completed Project how any upgrading is to be funded <p>b. a stormwater assessment, which must include –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a flood risk assessment, including pre- and post-development effects on the upstream and downstream catchment, as well as any mitigation measures a draft stormwater management plan information about any discussions held, and any agreements made, with the Auckland Council Healthy Waters department regarding stormwater management <p>c. an integrated transport assessment, including information about any discussions held, and any agreements made, with Auckland Transport</p> <p>d. an urban design assessment, which must include –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> shading diagrams and visual simulations to show the effects of shading and visual dominance from the proposed buildings a detailed landscape plan an assessment of the overall landscape quality provided on-site and along the boundaries/interface with neighbouring properties an assessment of the effects on the neighbourhood character, residential amenity, safety and the surrounding residential area from the building

Project details	Project description	Does all or part of the Project meet the referral criteria in section 18?		Summary of comments received (Note: for analysis and/or recommended responses to these comments refer to column 7)	Section 23 assessment – potential reasons for declining	Referral conclusions & recommendations
		Project eligibility for referral (section 18(3)(a)–(d))	Section 18(2) - does the Project help achieve the purpose of the FTCA (as per section 19)?			
				<p>assessment which includes assessment of the following key areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposed vehicle crossings, including engineering drawings and an assessment of effects on for the vehicle crossing • pedestrian amenity • cycle storage facilities in accordance with the AUP requirements • queuing analysis and tracking, and loading/servicing for waste trucks • trip generation, including an assessment of effects for any other reason for consent under the AUP. <p>Watercare noted that no water and wastewater flow or water supply data was provided as part of the referral application and that point-of-supply options for both water and wastewater will need to be investigated in detail to determine the best servicing option for this development. Watercare noted that any infrastructure upgrades will need to be fully funded by the developer and that there are downstream capacity constraints with the local public wastewater network.</p> <p>All responses received by parties invited to comment are attached at Appendix 6.</p>		<p>intensity, scale, location, form, and appearance</p> <p>e. in relation to the land in the Project site, a report on a preliminary site investigation and, if required, on a detailed site investigation, within the meaning of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011, that shows how the requirements of those regulations will be met.</p> <p>We also recommend you direct a panel to invite comments on any resource consent applications for the Project from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ngāti Koheriki Claims Committee • Watercare Service Limited.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982