

Attachment 1:

Additional information requested under Clause 23(2) First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991

Planning, statutory and general matters	2
Transport matters – Andrew Temperley, Traffic Planning Consultants.....	4
Landscape matters – Rebecca Skidmore, R A Skidmore Urban Design.....	8
Urban design matters – Rebecca Skidmore, R A Skidmore Urban Design	10
Stormwater and flooding matters – Healthy Waters, Auckland Council	12
Geotech – Nicole Li, Auckland Council.....	19
Ecology - Maddieson White, Auckland Council	20
Infrastructure – David Russell, Auckland Council.....	24

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
Planning, statutory and general matters		
P1	Please confirm whether consultation has been undertaken with the Supporting Growth Alliance regarding future connections with the Proposed North East Arterial road, particularly in regard to the indicative connection locations shown on the precinct plans.	As new vehicular (and potentially walking and cycling) connections are proposed to connect to the eastern and western sides of the proposed North East Arterial road, it would be useful to understand the SGA's views on the proposed connection locations and timings, along with any other issues they may wish to raise.
P2	Please confirm if any consideration was given to the provision of a road connection between the south-eastern corner of the site and the adjoining FUZ site.	<p>The proposed North East Arterial road essentially fences off the south-eastern corner of the site from the rest of the site. As such, a connection to the proposed Arterial is required to allow for access to the wider road network.</p> <p>If a connection is made on the eastern side of the arterial road, presumably this could also allow for vehicle access from the wider area onto the proposed North East Arterial Road.</p> <p>While the precinct does mention potential future connections to adjoining sites, this is not clearly set out in the precinct text/plans in terms of connections between the south-eastern corner and the adjoining FUZ site.</p>
P3	Please provide an explanation as to why there are no infrastructure triggers in the precinct to address wastewater and water infrastructure.	While the need for upgrades to wastewater and water infrastructure is discussed in the AEE and supporting infrastructure report, there are no infrastructure triggers provided in

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
		the precinct to ensure that sufficient wastewater and water infrastructure is available at the time of development.
P4	Please confirm whether there are any proposed transport, wastewater, stormwater management or any other infrastructure proposed for servicing the land to be 'live' zoned, which would be located within land not owned by the requestor.	<p>We require this information to understand the potential effect of proposed infrastructure provision on land not owned by the requestor.</p> <p>If there is no mechanism to deliver infrastructure that requires third party land, third party process, third party agreement, and/or third party funding, then the reasonableness of assuming that this infrastructure will be available to support future development needs clarification.</p>
P5	Please provide a table indicating the "what", "how", "when" and "by whom" for the funding and delivery of infrastructure required to support the plan change area, including consideration of funding strategies such as infrastructure funding agreements to ensure funding is available for necessary infrastructure.	<p>We require a clear and detailed understanding of the funding strategy necessary to fund and deliver the infrastructure required as a result of the plan change, particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An itemised list of new or upgraded infrastructure the applicant believes is necessary to service the plan change area; • who is expected to pay for each item; and • if the applicant is proposing to meet that cost, identification of the method.
P6	Please confirm if any 'open spaces' were intended to be shown on the precinct plans.	<p>The precinct text at I4XX.7.2 (2)(g) states:</p> <p><i>'whether a neighbourhood park is appropriate and provided generally in the location on Precinct Plans X, X and X.'</i></p> <p>There are however no indicative open space locations shown on the precinct plans.</p>

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
P7	Please confirm if the property at 70 Lisle Farm Drive is included in the plan change area.	Confirmation is sought as to whether the site is included in the plan change area as the precinct plan includes 70 Lisle Farm Drive as part of the 'plan change area' and the 'precinct boundaries'.
P8	Please confirm if any Cultural Values Assessment/s will be provided?	From the AEE, it is noted that a cultural values assessment was discussed with Ngati Tamaoho and that Ngati Te Ata had also indicated an interest in the plan change. Please confirm whether Ngati Tamaoho and Ngati Te Ata will be providing a CVA now that the plan change has been lodged.
P9	Has any consideration been given to the potential effects of increased development density within the precinct, over what has been anticipated and assessed in the application (i.e. 192 dwellings), and how these effects might be managed?	The proposed zone for the precinct is the MHU zone. It allows for greater development potential than what the anticipated yield is, which is one dwelling per residential lot (192 dwellings) as set out in the subdivision concept plan and AEE. While it is acknowledged that exact dwelling numbers will be determined at the resource consenting stage, it is still important to understand the potential implications of greater density on infrastructure supporting the development.
Transport matters – Andrew Temperley, Traffic Planning Consultants		
T1	<p>Please provide an assessment on the ability of the subject site to fulfil the functional transport requirements for the Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of walkable neighbourhoods, which requires convenient proximity of residential areas to local services and opportunities, such as retail activities, education and health services. • Proximity to the public transport network 	<p><u>Gap in the information lodged</u></p> <p>Alignment of PPC with functional Transport Requirements for Residential – Mixed Housing Urban Zone</p> <p>I do not consider that the ITA, AEE and other supporting information provide sufficient information to demonstrate appropriate alignment between the PPC proposal and the</p>

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
	<p>One potential tool for such assessment could be isochrone style plans to indicate walking and cycling distances from key services and land use activities.</p>	<p>functional transportation requirements associated with the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban (MHU) Zone.</p> <p>Specifically, the Zone Description for the Residential – MHU policy of the Auckland Unitary Plan refers to the strategic aim of the zone to support increased residential capacity and intensity over time and promote <u>walkable neighbourhoods, fostering a sense of community and increasing the vitality of centres.</u></p> <p>The objectives for the zone further recognise the importance of the proximity of <u>higher density residential areas to the public transport network.</u></p> <p>The above functional transportation characteristics of the Residential Mixed Housing Urban Zone distinguish it from the Residential Mixed Housing Suburban Zone (MHS), the policy for which does not refer to these characteristics in supporting comparatively lower density residential development. Given the background policy context in relation to the adoption of PC78, resulting in the rezoning of land from MHS to MHU (which includes significant future residential land to the east of Pukekohe), it is important to differentiate these zones in terms of their functional characteristics.</p> <p><u>Reason for request</u></p> <p>This information is needed to ensure that the PPC proposal can be integrated safely into the existing urban environment and appropriately fulfil desired transport outcomes of the Unitary Plan policy for the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban Zone, including promoting walkable neighbourhoods and proximity to public transport.</p>

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
T2	Please provide an assessment of trip distribution for a scenario that includes the completion of the North East arterial road (including access to it from the subject site) and other improvements to the adjoining strategic road network.	<p><u>Gap in the information lodged</u></p> <p>Traffic distribution across wider network</p> <p>In terms of operational traffic impact of the PPC on the adjoining road network, the ITA considers only the traffic impact at the intersection of Anselmi Ridge Road / Pukekohe East Road.</p> <p>The ITA adopts an assumption that 80% of total traffic generated by the PPC is likely to pass through this intersection, however, the basis for this 80% assumption is not clear, including whether this takes account of wider network improvements, such as the proposed new North East arterial road to the east of the PPC site.</p> <p><u>Reason for request</u></p> <p>This information is needed, in order to gain a full understanding of the transport effects of the PPC in the context of the future transport network and future growth of Pukekohe.</p>
T3	Please confirm that new roads and transport connections within the subdivision can achieve compliance with appropriate Standards for vertical alignment, e.g., a maximum longitudinal footpath gradient of 12.5%, as stipulated in AT's Transport Design Manual (TDM).	<p><u>Gap in the information lodged</u></p> <p>Indicative vertical alignments and gradients of subdivision roads</p> <p>The ITA and accompanying information do not confirm indicative gradients and vertical alignments along the subdivision roads, while it is notable that the site comprises undulating terrain.</p> <p><u>Reason for request</u></p>

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
		<p>The information is needed in order to confirm convenient access within the subdivision for all road users, particularly active mode users, for whom steep gradients are likely to reduce attractiveness and the likelihood of uptake of these modes.</p>
T4	<p>Please provide a further assessment of vehicle intervisibility at the currently proposed site access point, with confirmation that vertical alignments of the approaches to the access have been fully taken into account and consideration of mitigatory measures to address shortfalls in vehicle intervisibility.</p>	<p><u>Gap in the information lodged</u></p> <p>Assessment of Safe Intersection Sight Distance (SISD) at proposed Site Access Intersection on Lisle Farm Drive</p> <p>While the ITA undertakes an assessment of Safe Intersection Sight Distance (SISD) available at the proposed site access intersection location on Lisle Farm Drive and evaluates sight distance to the west as 73 metres, in compliance with the Austroads requirement for an operating speed of 40km/hr, I consider this to be an over-estimate of the available sight distance.</p> <p>While I consider the adopted operating speed of 40km/hr to be representative of a typical vehicle speed on site, it is not clear as to whether the assessment appropriately takes account of the uphill ascent of Lisle Farm Drive from the west, on the approach to the intersection location.</p> <p>Based on my own photos, observations and assessment of the intersection location, I would consider the SISD to be 45 metres from the west, based on the uphill ascent of the approach from Lisle Farm Drive.</p> <p><u>Reason for request</u></p> <p>The information is needed in order to confirm that as the principal access to the subject site is able to function safely and efficiently, noting constraints both in terms of the horizontal road layout (adjacent to a 90-degree bend) and the vertical profile of the approach roads to the intersection location.</p>

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
Landscape matters – Rebecca Skidmore, R A Skidmore Urban Design		
L1	Please confirm whether the 'Paerata – Pukekohe Structure Plan Landscape and Visual Assessment Background Investigation for Auckland Council' (Opus, 2017) was reviewed and whether this broader landscape analysis contains any pertinent information to inform the PPC.	Section 3.3 of the ALVE notes that a review of background information was carried out to identify key landscape and environmental factors that would potentially be affected by development enabled by the PPC.
L2	Please provide a map identifying the various features identified in the site and context analysis set out in Section 4 of the ALVE (including contour information for the Site an immediately surrounding context).	
L3	Given the considerable topographical constraints of the land, please consider whether any Precinct-specific provisions are necessary to ensure the amenity outcomes sought by the policy framework will be achieved, given the scale and intensity of built development enabled by the Residential: Mixed Housing Urban zone.	
L4	The landscape effects analysis contained in the ALVE notes (Para. 6.20) notes that the concept masterplan has been designed with an extensive green open space network with retention, enhancement and protection of the stand of taraire-totara-pukatea forest and swamp maire forest and retention of other areas of indigenous vegetation. Please confirm how the PPC will ensure this open space network will be delivered and associated vegetation retained.	
L5	Please provide further analysis of the visual effects on established residential properties immediately to the west, enabled by the	The ALVE includes an assessment of visual effects in relation to immediately adjoining properties, noting that while development enabled by the PPC would constitute a distinct change to the existing rural character, it would not be entirely out of context in

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
	Residential: Mixed Housing Urban zone compared with the Residential: Single House zone (as anticipated by the Structure Plan).	relation to the AUP planning context and the established surrounding residential settlement pattern.
L6	Precinct Plan 1 identifies areas of 'existing bush'. Please identify which provisions would require the retention of this vegetation.	
L7	<p>The Proposed Concept Plan contained in Annexure 1 of the ALVE is not consistent with the Concept Scheme Plan contained in Attachment 12. I assume the version contained in Attachment 12 is an updated version.</p> <p>Please confirm whether this version has been reviewed in carry out the assessment (acknowledging that the concept plan demonstrates just one potential subdivision layout).</p>	

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
Urban design matters – Rebecca Skidmore, R A Skidmore Urban Design		
UD1	Please provide a map identifying the various features described in the context analysis provided in Section 4 of the UDA to better understand the relationship of these features to the Site.	
UD2	<p>Given the site characteristics and noting the proposed MHU zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please identify any constraints this would place on achieving the objectives of the Precinct, particularly Objective 2 and supporting Policy 1, and 2. b. Please advise whether any Precinct-specific provisions are recommended to ensure development that is suitable to the location and avoids adverse amenity effects is achieved. 	<p>At the time that the Pukekohe-Paerata Structure Plan (2019) (the “SP”) was prepared, it was proposed that this area of the SP would be zoned Residential: Single House.</p> <p>With the changed legislative framework and the introduction of PC78 to the AUP, the Residential: Mixed Housing Urban (“MHU”) is proposed. This zone enables a considerably increased intensity of residential activity. Section 5.4 of the UDA notes that the indicative concept plan used to demonstrate a possible development scenario in accordance with the proposed Precinct provisions is based on typically 400m² – 600m² allotment (derived from what has been subdivided to date locally). This is a considerably lower density than enabled by the MHU zone. I note that the PPC land is very steep in parts.</p>
UD3	<p>While the Concept Scheme Plan (Attachment 12) that has been used to inform the UDA shows a public street connection from the Precinct to Lisle Farm Drive, the UDA notes (Paragraphs 5.5 and 6.5(a)) that this connection may only be in the form of a pedestrian/cycle link). Included in Attachment 5 is a series of diagrams showing possible connections considered.</p> <p>Please advise why a full street connection may not be achievable in this location.</p>	
UD4	The UDA includes an assessment in relation to achieving a well-connected and integrated built form outcome (Paragraphs 6.4 – 6.6).	

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
	Please provide further analysis of how suitable connectivity will be achieved with the existing urban environment to the west if a full street connection to Lisle Farm Drive is not achieved.	
UD5	<p>Section 6.5(g) of the UDA discusses integration between the stream network and the road network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please advise which AUP and proposed Precinct provisions are relied on to ensure an appropriate integration is achieved. b. Please advise whether any additional Precinct provisions are recommended to ensure good integration is delivered. 	
UD6	<p>Section 6.14(b) of the UDA notes that if the open spaces associated with the streams and riparian areas through the Precinct were vested as drainage reserves (or similar) it would be possible to provide pedestrian trails through them. I note that indicative walking and cycle ways are indicated on proposed Precinct Plan 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please advise which Precinct Provisions would secure their delivery and the constraints to their delivery if these open spaces are retained in private ownership. b. Also please advise whether there are topographical constraints to achieving these indicative connections. 	
UD7	Section 6.14(f) of the UDA discusses the way private development adjacent to the stream corridors would interface with these open spaces. The author notes they see benefit in, but do not see a specific need for, additional Precinct controls on fencing to ensure a suitable interface is created. This issue was considered in the recent PC76 which created the now operative Pukekohe East – Central Precinct.	

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
	Please provide comment on the applicability of the fencing and drainage reserve boundary control contained in that precinct (14XX.6.1) to this PPC precinct.	
Stormwater and flooding matters – Healthy Waters, Auckland Council		
SW1	Please confirm if the proposed stormwater management approach has considered the type (streams, wetlands, lakes, underlying aquifers) and condition (possible erosion risk, capacity and required infrastructure upgrades, SEAs) of the downstream receiving environments?	<p>Assessment and understanding of the condition of the receiving environment is required to inform the most suitable methods of stormwater management for the proposed development.</p> <p>Any proposed stormwater management should consider the location where runoff is discharged from the site all the way to the ultimate receiving environment from the wider catchment.</p> <p>Please refer to section 1.6 of the Stormwater Management Plan Template – Explanatory Notes (Stormwater Management Plan Template (aucklanddesignmanual.co.nz)) for further details on what is expected in the SMP.</p>

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
SW2	<p>Please provide an assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre- and post-development flows entering the watercourse. • Potential changes to erosion risk at the discharge points from the development enabled by the plan change. • Locations of outlets and proposed mitigation measures. 	<p>The SMP identifies steep site features with large scale land movement of the gully flanks and stream banks.</p> <p>Increases in peak stormwater discharges associated with development can result in increased erosion and scour of stream channels during storm events. Any actual and potential effects in relation to stormwater discharge should be assessed and identified.</p>
SW3	<p>Please show in the SMP the location of any natural hydrological features within the plan change area, including natural wetlands, and demonstrate how the development and proposed stormwater management will ensure the vitality of these wetlands.</p> <p>It is noted that earthworks are being proposed in close proximity to some of the wetlands. Erosion effects and how they are intended to be avoided and/or mitigated should be addressed in the SMP.</p>	<p>As shown on Figure 2 of the Ecological Assessment, there are five wetlands within the plan change area. It is stated in the assessment that:</p> <p><i>Alternations to topography at the gully heads has the potential to result in changes to the hydrological inputs that feed the natural wetlands within the gullies. This is proposed to be addressed by achieving hydrological neutrality through the installation of an underground drainage network. If this drainage network functions as expected effects on the wetland hydrology should be negligible.</i></p> <p>Any actual and potential effects on the wetland in relation to stormwater management should be assessed and identified.</p> <p>Please also refer to section 1.7 of the Stormwater Management Plan Template – Explanatory Notes for further details on what is expected in the SMP.</p>

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
SW4	<p>Please provide details of Mana Whenua engagement undertaken to date and/or how and when it is intended to be undertaken.</p>	<p>Mana Whenua engagement is required to inform the proposed stormwater management approach.</p> <p>The Precinct Description (proposed as part of the Lisle Farm Drive Precinct provisions) acknowledges the cultural significance of this area to local iwi and states that the cultural values including hydrological and ecological features within the precinct need to be recognised and appropriately managed, including through consultation with Ngāti Te Ata and Ngāti Tamaoho. However, at the time of preparing the SMP, no Mana Whenua engagement has been undertaken.</p> <p>It is important that Mana Whenua engagement takes place as per the objectives and outcomes outlined in Schedule 2 of the NDC to ensure that the proposed stormwater management recognises and integrates with the cultural values Mana Whenua have for the area. It should also be noted that Mana Whenua engagement must be undertaken as per Schedule 4 of the NDC for greenfield sites.</p>
SW5	<p>Please confirm the stormwater management approach proposed for different areas and activities and update the SMP accordingly.</p> <p>Please confirm and/or clarify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The table in the executive summary does not propose any water quality measure for residential lot – roof areas, whereas elsewhere the use of inert building materials is sought. • Pre-treatment devices are specified for residential hardstand areas in the figure in Section 5.2.1 and the table in the executive summary, but not in the first figure in Section 5.2.9. • The figure in Section 5.2.1 and the table in the executive summary does not include centralised bioretention devices, rain garden or rain smart tank as a measure to achieve hydrological 	<p>There are inconsistencies presented throughout the SMP which leads to uncertainty of what stormwater management approach is being proposed.</p>

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
	<p>mitigation for residential hardstands, though this is proposed in the first figure in Section 5.2.9.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider adding attenuation requirements to the table in the executive summary and the figure in Section 5.2.1 so it is clear that this is a requirement in some catchments. Section 2.3.4 of the Stormwater Assessment mentions the use of five communal stormwater devices, which contradicts Section 5.2.8 of the SMP, stating the design of three communal stormwater devices. Please confirm the number of communal devices being implemented within the SMP. <p>The stormwater management approach for catchments A, E, F and G as described in Section 5.2.9 suggests use of permeable paving for residential hardscapes. This should be incorporated into the second figure in Section 5.2.9.</p>	
SW6	<p>Please confirm and clarify if all impervious areas are proposed to be treated to meet GD01 requirements as per the requirement of the NDC's water quality performance criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.2.1 of the SMP specifies deep sump cesspits as pre-treatment devices for Public Roads and Hardstand Area. The deep sump cesspit does not achieve GD01 treatment. We recognise that this pre-treatment option in series with bioretention devices would achieve GD01 treatment, but discharge via a tank would not provide any additional treatment. Similarly, the SMP specifies Gross Pollutant Traps for pretreatment only for the residential surfaces in catchments A, E, F, G. Catchment E, F, and G then discharge directly into natural wetlands. 	This information is required to enable a full assessment of water quality effects.


#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.2.2 promotes the use of bio-retention swales and rain gardens for roads, though these are not included in any figures. 	
SW7	Please provide an assessment and justification of why the proposed treatment methods for private residential roofs, private residential hardstand, and public roads and hardstand area are considered the Best Practicable Option (BPO) and how they meet the requirements of the NDC and the relevant policies under Chapter E1.3 of the Auckland Unitary Plan.	This information is required to enable a full assessment of water quality effects.
SW8	Please provide information on how stormwater runoff from any communal waste storage areas in apartments and/or multi-unit developments is proposed to be managed and treated.	This information is required to enable a full assessment of water quality effects.
SW9	<p>The SMP specifies that “no soakage is proposed” due to the “geotechnical constraints and steep site features”.</p> <p>Please comment on the underlying soil materials, infiltration potential (including whether any site-specific percolation testing has been completed) and any other known “geotechnical constraints” which preclude infiltration.</p>	This information is required to enable a full assessment of stormwater runoff effects.
SW10	Please confirm whether and where retention can be provided.	The second figure in Section 5.2.9 of the SMP suggests that re-use and soakage is not feasible for the residential hardstand. Similar to the proposal to achieve hydrological mitigation for the ROW, could the stormwater management approach specify to “offset compensate” these surfaces to achieve retention.


#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
SW11	<p>Please confirm and explain the values presented in Table 7 of the Stormwater Assessment.</p> <p>We note that for “To South East” the 10% AEP unmitigated peak flows increase, whereas the 1% AEP unmitigated peak flows decrease. “To South West” appears to have inconsistent decreases.</p>	This information is required to enable a full assessment of flood risk associated with the development enabled by the proposed plan change.
SW12	Please confirm the 1% AEP flow path for runoff from the residential lots in Post Stormwater Catchment A.	
SW13	Please provide a sensitivity assessment of device sizing allowing for 3.8 degree climate change increase to ensure that the device(s) can be incorporated into the proposed future urban layout.	This information is required to enable a full assessment of flood risk associated with the development enabled by the proposed plan change.
SW14	Where attenuation is proposed, please confirm which storm events this SMP is seeking attenuation for. The attenuation requirements for communal and “offset compensate” devices need to be clear.	Section 5.2.8 of the SMP “modelled communal devices were designed to accommodate the attenuation target under 50%, 10% and 1% AEP rainfall events” however the figures in Section 5.2.9 only specify attenuation to 76% of the unattenuated 10 year and 100 year ARI flow rate. It is unclear whether the SMP is seeking attenuation of the 50% AEP storm event, whether 76% attenuation is appropriate for the 1% AEP and whether this requirement needs to be adjusted for communal and “offset compensate” devices.
SW15	Please confirm the type of device that is proposed for communal attenuation.	The SMP describes it as a “centralised bioretention devices, rain garden or rain smart tank”, however bioretention devices typically aren’t designed to achieve attenuation


#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
		requirements (refer to table 11 and Section C3 of GD01). Elsewhere it is described as an “underground stormwater storage with designed ancillary system”.
SW16	<p>SMP implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please provide information on how the proposed stormwater management methods outlined in the SMP are intended to be implemented. b. Please confirm and clarify at what stage of the development the proposed communal device and other public network/devices are intended to be constructed. If staging of development is proposed, please provide information on how the SMP will be implemented corresponding to each stage of development. 	This information is required to enable assessment of whether any adverse effects will practically be able to be mitigated.
SW17	<p>Please provide an amended SMP which includes the further information and assessment as requested above.</p> <p>Please also consider the following feedback on other sections of the SMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.2.2 specifies promoting the use of permeable paving to achieve the water quality control target. However, it should be noted that permeable paving only provides limited treatment for active systems. Please amend this detail within the SMP. • Labelling of tables and figures would assist with future reviews. 	The SMP acts in the plan change process as an assessment of stormwater effects and forms part of the NDC authorisation process. An approved SMP is required for the authorisation of stormwater diversion/discharge under the NDC.

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please use consistent referencing to design storms i.e. 1% AEP or 1 in 100 year ARI throughout the SMP and stormwater assessment. • In addition to setting out the preferred stormwater management for a development, the SMP should also identify further investigative works that are required in the later stages of design. This should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - erosion study once the stormwater pipe network is conceptually designed to enable an assessment of whether SMAF 1 is appropriate, or whether a higher standard is required. - Site-specific infiltration testing. - Assessment to confirm that the vitality of the wetlands can be maintained and enhanced. 	
Geotech – Nicole Li, Auckland Council		
G1	<p>We note that the review of aerial photographs presented in the LDE geotechnical report has been limited to image from 2003/2004 and 2010/2011 and the site walkover survey was undertaken in 2022. Considering current availability of the aerial photographs from 2022 and 2023, observed instabilities on the site, and severe weather experienced in the Auckland area in 2023 resulting in numerous geotechnical instabilities,</p> <p>Please provide further review of aerial photographs and site walkover survey to support this proposed Private Plan Change.</p>	

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
G2	<p>We have undertaken a review of existing available geotechnical information from neighbouring properties. Findings from our review indicates that Tauranga Group Alluvium and recent alluvium of various strengths are likely to be present beneath the published geology South Auckland Volcanic Field in this area. We understand LDE considers the risk of consolidation settlement affecting the proposed private plan change to be low.</p> <p>Please clarify and confirm that LDE has taken the presence of potential low strength alluvium into account.</p>	
G3	<p>It is understood that a concept scheme plan was not provided to LDE at the time of report preparation.</p> <p>Please review the submitted concept scheme plan and confirm that the geotechnical recommendations presented in the geotechnical report remain valid and relevant. Subsequently, please update the geotechnical report accordingly.</p>	
Ecology - Maddieson White, Auckland Council		
E1	Please provide a relevant arboricultural assessment against applicable notable / scheduled tree criteria, and if these trees are deemed notable, please update the precinct standard to include the notable trees.	The application does not contain an arboricultural assessment of significant landscape trees. For example, large red oak trees (<i>Quercus rubra</i>) are present along the fence line of the northern gully (vegetation type 4 of the Ecological report), which may meet the intrinsic factor for notable trees.
E2	a. Please undertake a robust and best-practice long-tailed bat survey and provide an updated ecological report.	No formal assessment of bats has been undertaken on site. The council database shows bat records within 350m of the suitable habitat on the site.

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
	<p>b. Please provide appropriate precinct standards to address adverse effects on bats such as the use of PIR sensor lights, low lux, hooded lighting options etc.</p>	
E3	<p>Please provide a herpetofauna survey, and if present appropriate precinct standards to address adverse effects on indigenous herpetofauna.</p>	<p>Suitable lizard habitat was observed during the site visit.</p>
E4	<p>Two intermittent streams were identified in the Ecology Report by assessing the streams against the definitions of 'permanent', 'intermittent' and 'ephemeral' streams in chapter J of the AUP. During the site visit, both streams classed as 'intermittent' (IS1 & IS2) had continuously flowing reaches, which meets the definition of a permanent stream. Please reevaluate this assessment.</p>	
E5	<p>Stream Reach IS2 contained wetland habitat and was found to be a broad gully system of up to 8m wide; it appears under-represented in the Ecology report and Precinct Plan 1 (Figure 1). Please resurvey and classify.</p>  <p>Figure 1: stream reach IS2, showing a broad gully system.</p>	

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
E6	<p>Please update the ecological report and precinct plan to include a buffer for upstream of the permanent stream crossing, the soft-water celery rush land wetland and addition wetlands identified onsite.</p> <p>This should include the vegetation type 9 in the Ecological report.</p> <p>Figure 2 below shows the areas mentioned above outed in a thick red line.</p>  <p>Figure 2: Aerial of addition buffer areas outlined in thick red line to be included in the ecological and precinct plan.</p>	
E7	<p>An additional wetland was identified during the site visit.</p> <p>Please identify additional areas of wetland and provide a wetland delineation in accordance with the wetland delineation protocol (MfE 2020).</p> <p>Note: Below is a non-exhaustive map (Figure 3) of additional areas (circled area with green arrow pointing at the additional wetland) that should be included in your assessment.</p>	

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
	 <p>Figure 3: Aerial of additional wetland circled in green with an arrow pointing to it.</p>	
Open Space / Parks / Community Facilities - Lea van Heerden, Auckland Council		
OS 1	<p>Please provide a clear delineation showing which areas of proposed open spaces are required / proposed for stormwater purposes and which areas are proposed for recreation purposes.</p>	<p>A clear distinction needs to be made in respect of the types of open space to be provided. For instance, drainage reserves should be shown as such on the precinct plan and should take into account existing or potential flood areas. As part of the response to this RFI confirmation is sought that this accurately reflects the potential for flooding on proposed open space land that is identified as subject to flooding on the council's GIS so that the council can objectively assess its suitability for potential acquisition for open space purposes, even at no cost.</p> <p>The council has no obligation to accept open space that does not align with our policies or network plans, including drainage reserves. Therefore, any mention of land vesting should be removed from the plan change, precinct plans, and concept plans. The matter can be addressed during the further subdivision of the land.</p>

#	Further information requested	Reasons for request
For information only	<p>For information only – no response required.</p> <p>There is an over provision of open space, and council would not seek to acquire the proposed open space located north within the plan change area, even at no cost to council unless an esplanade is triggered under the subdivision process or Healthy Waters has agreed to and has established that these areas will form part of stormwater network.</p> <p>Therefore, any mention of land vesting should be removed from the plan change, precinct plans, and concept plans. The matter can be addressed during the further subdivision of the land</p>	<p>For information only – no response required.</p> <p>The Pukekohe-Paerata Structure Plan 2019 (p 28) shows a neighbourhood park in the PC area.</p> <p>Council reviewed the indicative park locations shown in the P-PSP 2019 and based on existing provision, and assessment against the Open Space Provision Policy 2016, the indicative neighbourhood park has move to the north outside the PC area, from my policy perspective, no open space provision is supported within the PC site.</p> <p>The council has no obligation to accept open space that does not align with our policies or network plans, including drainage reserves.</p>
Infrastructure – David Russell, Auckland Council		
L1	<p>The proposed road up from Lisle Farm Dr will be significantly flatter than the existing accessway grade. I would estimate that an up to 5m cut will be needed along the boundary with 82 and 84 Lisle Farm Drive.</p> <p>Please confirm that the road reserve can be designed to function as intended given the land slope. An option is to provide a cross section for the road at the rear of 84 Lisle Farm Dr and lot 137 showing retaining wall details and all road features.</p>	