

MEMORANDUM

To: Auckland Council: Michael Luong
From: Barker & Associates
Date: 30 April 2020
Re: Waihoehoe Plan Change: Second RFI Response

Waihoehoe Plan Change Request – Oyster Capital

We write in response to your request dated 28 April 2020 for further information under Clause 23(1) to Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 relating to the above private plan change request. This letter sets out our responses to the matters raised in your letter, and is supported by the following attachment prepared by the technical specialists supporting the plan change request:

- Attachment 1: Waihoehoe Plan Change dated 30 April 2020
- Attachment 2: Response to Transport Request for Further Information (Stantec)

The requests and our responses are set out below.

1.0 STORMWATER

1.1 STREAM CORRIDORS

Request 1: *Please provide further clarification of the costs and benefits of mapping streams.*

Chapter E3 of the AUP effectively manages streams, and in our opinion, there is no resource management reason to spatially identify streams on a precinct plan given that it does not link with any specific method in the Waihoehoe precinct. Furthermore, as stream alignments can vary over time, the introduction of a precinct plan which spatially defines streams could create uncertainty and potentially mislead future property owners. Despite these reasons we understand that the Council would still prefer streams to be spatially depicted for consistency with other greenfield precincts.

Some stream reclamation may be required within Waihoehoe to facilitate efficient urban development, including for the construction of supporting infrastructure. Therefore, to accurately map the future stream network within Waihoehoe we need to undertake further work to understand the extent of this proposed reclamation and ensure that any mapped streams indicate areas where potential reclamation may be necessary. An additional policy has been included within the precinct to signal this approach:

(11) In addition to the matters in Policy E.3.3(13), recognise that there may be no practicable alternative to stream works, including culverting, diversion and/or reclamation, where they are required to construct critical infrastructure.

We acknowledge that further work with Council is required to develop this policy and the supporting provision, and that further discussions with iwi will be required. We will continue to engage with Council and iwi regarding this and develop a supporting rule and assessment framework.

MEMORANDUM



Urban & Environmental

1.2 RIPARIAN MARGINS

Request 2: *Could you please clarify the various provisions relating to margins and planted strips as they apply to the range of circumstances that are likely to be encountered and within this context, review whether the proposed riparian planting standard and a riparian margin policy or standard should be re considered.*

The table below provides an overview of the building setback and the minimum required planted riparian margin.

<i>Circumstance</i>	<i>Building Setback – Total Width</i>	<i>Riparian Planting</i>
<i>Intermittent streams (Note that Intermittent Streams can be greater or less than 3m)</i>	20m if the stream is 3 metres or more in width in accordance with Standard IX6.3 Riparian Margins 10m if the stream is less than 3m in width in accordance with Standard H6.9.6 Yards	10m in accordance with Standard IX6.3 Riparian Margins
<i>Stream of less than 3m in width, within a site that is not to be vested or otherwise subject to public access, or which forms part of a wider ecological corridor</i>	10m in accordance with Standard H6.9.6 Yards	10m in accordance with Standard IX6.3 Riparian Margins
<i>Stream less than 3m in width that will likely be vested, and/or form part of a wider ecological corridor</i>	10m in accordance with Standard H6.9.6 Yards	10m in accordance with Standard IX6.3 Riparian Margins
<i>Streams over 3m in width which are subject to Esplanade reserve requirements</i>	20m in accordance with Standard IX6.3 Riparian Margins	10m in accordance with Standard IX6.3 Riparian Margins

We understand that the Council would prefer a 20m building setback along the entire length of regardless of the width of the stream to provide enough space for flood conveyance and re-establishment of natural meanders. The reasons for Council requesting this larger building setback are twofold. Firstly, the Council is concerned that from a natural hazards perspective more space is required between streams and buildings to provide space for additional conveyance in extreme rain events. The Council is also seeking a wider building setback for amenity reasons to enable provision for connected paths and cycle paths along streams.

.....

An additional building setback from streams is not required to provide for additional conveyance during extreme rain events as Chapter E38 requires proposed subdivisions to respond to the presence of natural hazards. Floodplains will be modelled in detail as part of future subdivision consent applications to ensure the proposed layout can accommodate the 100 year ARI in a way that ensures development will not be impacted by flooding. This assessment is a more effective response to providing adequate space to manage flooding rather than a building setback.

An additional building setback from streams is also not required from an amenity perspective as the precinct has been updated to include additional assessment criteria for roads to encourage the alignment of roads, cycle paths and footpaths with open space and streams, which will support the provision of public access in appropriate locations and in a manner more flexible than a rule:

(c) Whether roads are aligned with the stream network, or whether pedestrian and/or cycle paths are provided along one or both sides of the stream network, where they would logically form part of an integrated open space network.

Where pedestrian and/or cycle paths are proposed within proposed open spaces, whether they are located adjacent to, and not within the 10m planted riparian area.

To ensure this policy intent is clear and to create a linkage to this assessment criteria amendments are proposed to Policy 2 with amendments shown underlined:

(2) Ensure that development provides a local road network that achieves a highly connected street layout and integrates with the collector road network within the precinct, and the surrounding transport network, and supports the safety and amenity of the open space and stream network.

In addition, we note that the subdivision policies (E28.3(25) in particular) include the ability to take an integrated approach to the assessment of esplanade reserve requirements. This policy recognises that a reduced width may be appropriate in some locations, where it can be offset by an increase in width in other locations that would result in a positive public benefit in terms of access and recreation. This would provide scope for some averaging to occur across the length of streams if parts of it trigger the requirement for an esplanade reserve. This approach is preferred, over a more inflexible setback requirements that does not respond to the specific characteristics of the site and development.

2.0 TRANSPORT

Please refer to the RFI response prepared by Stantec for the transport information requests, with the exception of Request 5 below.

2.1 FUNDING AGREEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADES

Transport Request 5: *Can you please advise on progress developing a funding agreement.*

A funding agreement is being progressed however this cannot be finalised until we understand the Governments decisions regarding the funding of “shovel ready” projects and until we have an update from the Strategic Growth Alliance on the Drury Transport Implementation Programme. We will continue to update the Council about progress on this funding agreement.