

Attachment 1:

Further information requested under Section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Contents

Watercare Services Limited 1

Traffic matters – Traffic Planning Consultants Limited 2

General comments - Contaminated land – Ruben Naidoo, Contamination, Air and Noise, Auckland Council 6

General comments - Stormwater and flooding matters – Healthy Waters 6

#	Category of information	Specific Request	Reasons for request
Watercare Services Limited			
WSL1	Water/wastewater	Please confirm there is sufficient water and wastewater capacity to enable the development.	<i>Discussions with Watercare Services Limited (WSL) indicated there was a concern in sufficient capacity to provide for the increase from 350 students to 1000 students. If there isn't sufficient capacity then mitigation should be identified and suitable conditions drafted. This should involve engagement with WSL.</i>
WSL2	Water/wastewater	Sections 5.2 and 5.3 of Appendix G included commentary on water and wastewater assets that are visible on Geomaps. Please confirm whether there are any Watercare assets on the site, that may not be visible in Geomaps.	<i>To gain a full understanding of the water and wastewater assets. This should involve engagement with WSL.</i>

#	Category of information	Specific Request	Reasons for request
Traffic matters – Traffic Planning Consultants Limited Review of Integrated Traffic Assessment (Jacobs)			
T1	Dwelling densities and consequent traffic generation rates	<p><u>Gap in the information submitted:</u></p> <p>The ITA report considers two alternative traffic modelling scenarios, one based on Panuku’s trip generation rate of 3.9 trips per day per household, and a second ‘sensitivity test’ at the request of Auckland Transport, based on a higher trip rate, of 6.5 trips per day per household.</p> <p>However, the ITA does not confirm what residential densities these trip rates would be expected to equate to (in terms of numbers of dwellings per hectare) and hence does not confirm whether these trip rates are comparable with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Recently developed residential areas in the immediate vicinity of the site b) Dwelling densities envisaged in the Hobsonville Point Precinct Plan, in Table I 605.6.1.1. <p><u>Request for information:</u></p>	<p><i>This information is required to confirm that the intersection capacity assessments are underpinned by appropriate future development scenarios that are commensurate with dwelling densities envisaged in the Hobsonville Point Precinct Plan.</i></p>

#	Category of information	Specific Request	Reasons for request
		<p>Confirmation of residential dwelling densities, of both existing nearby residential areas and of expected future residential development underpinning future forecast trip generation rates.</p> <p>In the event that there are notable discrepancies between forecast and existing residential densities, and/or inconsistencies with densities envisaged in the Precinct Plan, alternative trip generation and traffic modelling scenarios should be considered, that are representative of future residential development activities in the area.</p>	
T2	Scope of Intersection Modelling Assessments – wider network	<p><u>Gap in the information submitted:</u></p> <p>The ITA does not consider the traffic impacts of proposed new school and ECE upon the adjoining road network beyond the immediate vicinity of the subject site, while it estimates that the catchment area for the school is expected to extend as far as within 1.5 km of the site.</p> <p><u>Request for information:</u></p>	<p><i>One of the identified functions of the proposed new school and ECE is to relieve pressure on the existing Hobsonville Point Primary School, located around 0.5 km from the subject site and within the estimated 1.5 km catchment area for the proposed new school and ECE. It is thus expected that the proposal could influence significant changes in travel patterns at the intersections identified above.</i></p>

#	Category of information	Specific Request	Reasons for request
		<p>A further assessment of the impacts of traffic generated by the school within the wider catchment area. This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation of additional traffic generated at the intersections of Hobsonville Point Road / De Havilland Road and Hobsonville Point Squadron Road, as the next closest points on the adjoining road network to be affected traffic generated by the proposal. • Undertaking capacity assessments at these intersections, in the event that the proposal is demonstrated to result in significant increases or changes to traffic levels at these locations. 	
T3	Scope and Staging of Transport Mitigation Measures	<p><u>Gap in the information submitted:</u></p> <p>Section 1.1 of the ITA refers to an opening school roll of 350 students, increasing to an ultimate masterplan roll of 1000 students. However, no further information appears to be provided in relation to any intermediate phasings for the school's eventual growth to its full masterplan roll.</p>	<p><i>To confirm that the transportation effects of the proposal can be appropriately mitigated in a timely manner, in line with the growth in the school roll, and in turn, in line with residential growth within the wider area.</i></p>

#	Category of information	Specific Request	Reasons for request
		<p>Section 5.8 discusses recommended transport mitigation measures, including pedestrian crossings, variable speed limits and Travel Demand Management measures. However, the ITA does not confirm the expected timing for implementation of transport mitigation measures and how these would relate to the growth in school roll.</p> <p>It is additionally noted that the ITA does not identify potential mitigation measures for the three intersections for which capacity assessments were undertaken, in the event that the higher forecast levels of local residential trip generation eventuate.</p> <p><u>Request for information:</u></p> <p>Confirmation of expected phasings for growth of the school roll and trigger points for the implementation of transport mitigation measures.</p> <p>Consideration of potential mitigation measures for the intersections of Hobsonville Point Road/ Waka Moana Drive, Wallace Road/ Hudson Bay Road and Waka Moana Drive/Wallace Road, to</p>	

#	Category of information	Specific Request	Reasons for request
		mitigate against a Level of Service 'F' in the event that this eventuates.	
General comments - Contaminated land – Ruben Naidoo, Contamination, Air and Noise, Auckland Council			
CL1	General comments only (not section 92 matters)	<p><i>Soil contamination testing found that contaminants are below background except in the northern part of the site where former sediment ponds and associated activities occurred. Low levels of PAH were detected in fill up to 1.9 m deep where settlement ponds had been filled and the site relevelled; however, no exceedances of NESCS or AUP criteria were reported.</i></p> <p><i>The applicant assessed the proposal as a CA in terms of the NES and considers that the AUP E30 does not apply.</i></p> <p><i>A site management plan (SMP) for managing potential contamination is required in support of the consent application.</i></p>	
General comments - Stormwater and flooding matters – Healthy Waters			
HW1	General comments only (not section 92 matters)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>All the relevant information has been provided considering the development stage of the NoR. The statement in the AEE that the details of stormwater management can be worked through the design process is supported.</i> <i>The floodplains presented on GeoMaps are dated and do not always reflect the development that has occurred since the catchment model was built.</i> <i>Overland flowpaths will be based on the 2016 LiDAR topography and will not reflect any development that has occurred since 2016. It is recommended that through the design process that a more detailed investigation be undertaken to determine the alignments of flowpaths and magnitudes through the site.</i> <i>The wetland that the MoE site is proposed to connect into is a Healthy Waters asset and should have been sized to provide the necessary stormwater management for the natural catchment draining to it. This includes at least part of this site. This will need to be confirmed through the design process where diversion of runoff from the North Harbour catchment may occur to the Whenuapai catchment.</i> 	

#	Category of information	Specific Request	Reasons for request
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Agreed with the submitted documents that the 750DN pipe is relatively large and should have capacity to drain this site particularly considering the relatively low proposed imperviousness. This should be confirmed through a detailed investigation during the design stage. Public drainage construction in this area often outpaces what is shown on GeoMaps which can result in incorrect connectivity issues and even incorrect pipes. Site investigation to confirm connection recommended early on in the design process.</i> • <i>Note: Relevant AUP rules relating HCGAs will be applicable. If there are any HCGA activities on site these will require GD01 treatment prior to discharging to the public network.</i> • <i>Note: Calculations provided in Appendix G appear to use NIWA's HiRDS data to estimate discharges from the site. It is noted that these rainfall figures appear to not include climate change. Design calculations should use 24-hour rainfall obtained from the TP108 hyetographs and be increased to reflect climate change.</i> 	