

6 April 2020

Ms Rachel Morgan

Issued via email: rachelm@barker.co.nz

Dear Rachel,

RE: Clause 23 RMA Further Information – 520 Great South Road Private Plan Change Request

Further to your private plan change request under Clause 21 to Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 in relation to 520 Great South Road from 520 Great South Road Ltd, Council has now completed an assessment of the information supplied.

Pursuant to Clause 23 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (please see Appendix 1), Council requires further information to continue processing the private plan change request.

The table in Appendix 2 attached to this letter sets out the nature of the further information required and reasons for its request. It also includes non-Clause 23 advisory notes as labelled.

Should you wish to discuss this matter or seek a meeting to clarify points in this letter please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,



Sanjay Bangs
Planner
Plans & Places Department
021 619 327

Appendix 1

Basis for the Information Sought

First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

Clause 23 Further information may be required

(1) Where a local authority receives a request from any person under [clause 21](#), it may within 20 working days, by written notice, require that person to provide further information necessary to enable the local authority to better understand—

- (a) the nature of the request in respect of the effect it will have on the environment, including taking into account the provisions of [Schedule 4](#); or
- (b) the ways in which any adverse effects may be mitigated; or
- (c) the benefits and costs, the efficiency and effectiveness, and any possible alternatives to the request; or
- (d) the nature of any consultation undertaken or required to be undertaken—

if such information is appropriate to the scale and significance of the actual or potential environmental effects anticipated from the implementation of the change or plan.

(2) A local authority, within 15 working days of receiving any information under this clause, may require additional information relating to the request.

(3) A local authority may, within 20 working days of receiving a request under [clause 21](#), or, if further or additional information is sought under subclause (1) or subclause (2), within 15 working days of receiving that information, commission a report in relation to the request and shall notify the person who made the request that such a report has been commissioned.

(4) A local authority must specify in writing its reasons for requiring further or additional information or for commissioning a report under this clause.

(5) The person who made the request—

- (a) may decline, in writing, to provide the further or additional information or to agree to the commissioning of a report; and
- (b) may require the local authority to proceed with considering the request.

(6) To avoid doubt, if the person who made the request declines under subclause (5) to provide the further or additional information, the local authority may at any time reject the request or decide not to approve the plan change requested, if it considers that it has insufficient information to enable it to consider or approve the request.

Appendix 2:

Further information requested under Clause 23 First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Planning, statutory and general matters – Sanjay Bangs, Plans & Places | 1 |
| Transport matters – Mat Collins, Flow Transportation Specialists Ltd | 4 |
| Development engineering matters – Arun Niravath, Regulatory Engineering South | 6 |
| Stormwater and flooding matters – Chloe Trenouth, Healthy Waters Consultant..... | 6 |
| Geotechnical matters – Shane Lander, Lander Geotechnical Consultants Limited | 10 |

Note: No further information has been requested by:

- Sarah Lindsay, Auckland Design Office

| # | Category of information | Specific Request | Reasons for request |
|---|-------------------------|--|---|
| Planning, statutory and general matters – Sanjay Bangs, Plans & Places | | | |
| P1 | Section 32 assessment | Please expand on the section 32 analysis contained in Section 9.0 of the Section 32 Assessment to outline the costs and benefits of the identified options at a finer grain level. | <p>The section 32 analysis provided does not contain a sufficient depth of information to understand why the proposed rezoning is the most appropriate option. As per section 32(1)(c) RMA, such an assessment should contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of effects anticipated.</p> <p>Section 32(2) requires an assessment of the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the</p> |

| # | Category of information | Specific Request | Reasons for request |
|----|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | | provisions. Further explanation is required to understand the benefits and costs of each option in relation to the anticipated effects of the rezoning, particularly in relation to transport, stormwater/flooding and urban design. |
| P2 | Consultation | Please expand on the consultation undertaken with iwi groups outlined in Section 6.3 of the Section 32 Assessment report, including the timeframes, scope of engagement and documents provided to iwi groups (including all iwi groups with an interest in the land). | Further clarification is required to understand the nature of the consultation undertaken, in terms of timeframes, scope and documents supplied to mana whenua in Section 6.3 of the Section 32 Assessment report. This should include all iwi groups with a potential interest in the land, as outlined the Auckland Council's mana whenua contacts facility: https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/building-and-consents/understanding-building-consents-process/prepare-application/prepare-resource-consent-application/Pages/find-hapu-iwi-contacts-for-your-area.aspx |
| P3 | Urban design | Please provide further comment on the quality of access from the site to convenience retail and commercial services. | <p>Section 8.2 of the Section 32 Assessment notes the following:</p> <p><i>In relation to social facilities, the Plan Change area is within approximately 1.5km of the existing Drury Centre and 3km of the Papakura Metropolitan Centre. Both are accessible by bus services on Great South Road. The closest local shop is located approximately 200m to the south of the Plan Change area, although the site is not zoned as a Neighbourhood Centre. Given this, the local day-to-day needs of residents would be met within walking distance of the Plan Change area. Larger commercial and community facilities would be available within a short bus ride or moderate walking distance.</i></p> <p>Further information is sought as to the type of neighbourhood shop located within walking distance and the retail and commercial services present at the Papakura and Drury centres. The availability of these amenities is important to understand the local day-to-day needs of residents would be met within walking distance of the Plan Change</p> |

| # | Category of information | Specific Request | Reasons for request |
|----|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>area, particularly if the build-out of this PPC land occurs well-ahead of the development of the future Drury East centre.</p> <p>Commentary on the quality of pedestrian and cycling facilities and frequency of public transport is also sought to understand whether these will be genuine travel choices for future residents.</p> |
| P4 | Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (FULSS) | Please expand on the assessment of the PPC against the FULSS in Section 6.2.2 of the Section 32 Assessment report to consider the matters set out in Appendix 1 and 2 of the FULSS, | <p>Appendix 1 of the FULSS outlines the high level reasoning underpinning the staging and sequencing set out in the FULSS. Appendix 2 identifies the specific considerations for each geographic location within Future Urban areas.</p> <p>Further assessment against these specific considerations is sought to better understand how the PPC aligns with the FULSS and the Auckland Plan 2050.</p> |
| P5 | Regional Policy Statement (RPS) Assessment | Please expand on the RPS Assessment provided as Appendix 4 to the request to clarify how the PPC is consistent with the identified RPS matters. | <p>Further clarification is sought in relation to the following RPS provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B2.2.2(5) and B2.4.2(2) which seeks to enable residential intensification close to centres, public transport, social facilities and employment opportunities; • B2.3.2 in relation to achieving the built form outcomes sought, particularly whether any precinct provisions are required to achieve these outcomes (also expressed in B2.4.2(8) relating to whether place-based planning tools are appropriate); • B7.3 in terms of whether a Stormwater Management Area – Flow Control is necessary to achieve hydrological mitigations outlined in the Stormwater Assessment (refer to Item HW4). |

| Transport matters – Mat Collins, Flow Transportation Specialists Ltd | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|--|
| T1 | Access visibility | Please provide further information on measures that could be put in place to address restricted visibility. The assessment should also address the additional volume of traffic likely to use the new road as an alternative. | The Transport Assessment (TA) states that visibility from Gatland Road/Great South Road intersection towards the south is restricted but concludes that increased use of this intersection will have minimal effect on the safety. An increase in traffic movements through this intersection will increase the likelihood of a crash occurring and, with a speed limit of 70 km/hr on Great South Road, the consequences of any crash are likely to be serious. Measures to eliminate the visibility shortfall, such as speed treatments, removal of sightline obstructions such as vegetation which sits within the road reserve should be considered. |
| T2 | Pedestrian network | Please confirm how pedestrian connectivity between the existing network and the development site will be provided. | <p>Drury School is located approximately 1km south of the subject site (about a 13-minute walk) and is considered a reasonable walking distance. The Drury School website also indicates that the Site is within their walking school bus route. Both Rosehill College and Rosehill Intermediate are located to the north of the site, on the opposite side of Great South Road.</p> <p>Further, there are existing bus stops on either side of Great South Road. Pedestrian demand can be expected to be generated, however the PPC does not confirm how this will be provided for.</p> <p>Can commentary please be provided on the existing pedestrian network, including any improvements considered necessary to ensure safe connections exist for those generated by the PPC.</p> |
| T3 | Great South Road improvements | Please confirm the how mitigation measures for Great South Road will be delivered – relating to both Great South Road/Gatland Road sightline improvements and the new intersection. | Section 8.3 of the Section 32 report states that <i>“TPC also assume that widening of Great South Road outside of the Plan Change area will occur to provide for a dedicated right turn pocket into the Plan Change area. The detailed design and location of this would be determined through a future resource consent process under E27 Transport.</i> |

| | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|--|---|
| T4 | Great South Road improvements | Please confirm if the proposed road widening on Great South Road, including compliant berm formation, can be accommodated within the current road boundary and what setbacks are proposed to accommodate the required infrastructure, noting that the road reserve width adjacent to the site narrows relative to the upstream and downstream width. | <p><i>We note that this approach for assessment was accepted by Council and Auckland Transport as part of Plan Change 8 to the AUP (Kings College)."</i></p> <p>The mitigation measures suggested by the applicant seem acceptable, however it is unclear how the delivery of the measures are secured through a future resource consent(s). It could be that once zoned, access relies on Gatland Road only, and the new access is not delivered. Council could then be faced with a situation where individual consents are sought, each of which are considered permitted, that cumulatively trigger the need for mitigation identified within the TA but cannot be required under the Auckland-wide rules of the AUP (i.e. if E27.6.1. Trip Generation is not triggered). This is particularly relevant for those measures that are not immediately adjacent to the property boundary.</p> <p>The delivery of the mitigation anticipated in the ITA, particularly that not adjacent to the development needs to be secured through a sound framework which ensures a safe and efficient outcome for all users, Auckland Transport and Auckland Council. At this time, a risk exists in relation to the best outcome when considering the effects of the PPC and how identified effects are mitigated.</p> |
| T5 | Traffic generation | Please clarify the distribution of the predicted traffic volumes at both Gatland Road and the new road intersections. | <p>Section 3.3 in the TA states that <i>"The new flows have been distributed at the intersections in the same proportions as the existing turning movements recorded at the Great South Road/Gatland Road intersection."</i> However, different turning volumes are calculated in some of the scenarios. For example, Figure 9 in the TA assumes a 50/50 in/out split at the new road during the midday period, but the same proportion split has not been applied at Gatland Road intersection. Although they could be minor differences, clarification of the assumed split from the applicant is requested.</p> |
| T6 | Future Road Connection | Please comment on how the PPC aligns with AUP objectives for urban growth and urban subdivision in relation to the future | <p>In order to ensure connectivity between potential future urban areas, the transport network within the PPC should allow for future extension. Connectivity of the transport network reduces the reliance on private vehicle transport, increases accessibility,</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | | extension of the public road network to the FUZ land to the south. | <p>permeability and increases resilience. Connectivity is supported by the following AUP policies and objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy B2.3.2(1) • Policy B3.3.2(2) • Policy E38.3(10) • Objective B3.3.1.(1) |
| Development engineering matters – Arun Niravath, Regulatory Engineering South | | | |
| Advice notes (non-Clause 23) | | | |
| DE1 | Wastewater capacity | <p>Veolia Water have been consulted and have advised the following:</p> <p><i>“At present, there is insufficient capacity to service the proposed development. Upgrades to the downstream gravity wastewater network as well as pump station and storage will be required. Water network upgrades may also be required.”</i></p> <p>As cited above, there is insufficient capacity in the wastewater network to service the proposed area and there may be some upgrades required in the water supply reticulation. At the future subdivision or land use resource consent stage, necessary upgrades to the infrastructure network will be required in consultation with Veolia Water.</p> | |
| Stormwater and flooding matters – Chloe Trenouth, Healthy Waters Consultant | | | |
| HW1 | Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) | <p>Please provide a Stormwater Management Plan to support the plan change.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> It is recommended that a meeting between the applicant and Healthy Waters be arranged to discuss the requirements of the SMP.</p> | <p>The plan change land is in the Future Urban zone and seeks to apply live zonings. An assessment of effects and proposed mitigations should be included in a SMP as part of the AEE and Section 32 Assessment to demonstrate how the Regional Policy Statement and regional plan provisions in Chapter E1 will be met, in particular policies E.1.3(3), E1.3(8) and E1.3(10).</p> <p>The SMP should:</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • address the Drury-Opaheke SMP and also discuss downstream effects; and • Assess why the proposed stormwater treatment and flood mitigation is the Best Practicable Option. |
| HW2 | Network Discharge Consent (NDC) | Please confirm whether it is intended that the plan change come under the Council's Global NDC for stormwater discharges. | <p>It is unclear from the plan change documents whether it is intended for the stormwater discharges from the site to come under the Council's global NDC. This should be clearly identified in the SMP. The Stormwater Assessment supplied does not constitute a SMP in accordance with the Council's NDC.</p> <p>A clear statement on the methods that are intended to be used to meet Schedule 4 NDC performance requirements is needed in the SMP and these should be tied to the proposed land use.</p> <p>It is recommended that a meeting between the applicant and Healthy Waters be arranged to discuss what is required to come under the NDC.</p> |
| HW3 | Precinct | Please explain why precinct provisions have not been proposed to achieve the outcomes of the proposed stormwater management approach. | <p>Section 8 of the stormwater assessment identifies options, including use of inert building materials, green outfalls, and quality treatment of all roads. These are not currently requirements of the AUP and therefore would may not be implemented without precinct provisions.</p> <p>Further discussions regarding appropriate precinct provisions will be required once an SMP is provided.</p> |
| HW4 | SMAF Control | Please confirm whether Stormwater Management Area (SMAF) - Flow Control is to apply to the site. | <p>The stormwater assessment appears to require hydrological mitigation but it is unclear whether the plan change proposes to apply the SMAF Control to the site.</p> <p>Further assessment of the erosion risks should be undertaken to understand whether the SMAF Control will adequately mitigate potential effects. Additional mitigation may be required. The SMP should identify whether this is the best practicable option.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|----------------------|---|--|
| | | | <i>Advice note (non-Clause 23): If hydrological mitigation is proposed then it is recommended that the SMAF Control be applied to the land through this PPC.</i> |
| HW5 | Stormwater Modelling | <p>Please provide further information is on the modelling to be included within the SMP including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more description on the modelling undertaken to support the development, in particular where there are discrepancies between the Council model and the TP108 graphical assessment. • demonstrate that the Council Rapid Model is suitable for undertaking the assessment of impacts from a specific site. • confirmation that Tonkin & Taylor have not amended the HW model as part of this work. • provide clarification of the MPD imperviousness used for the rural areas. | <p>Modelling information is required to understand the effects of the plan change in terms of increased stormwater runoff, peak flows and effects on the flood plain both upstream and downstream.</p> <p>It appears that the HW model has been used to assess flows within the watercourse through 520 Great South Road and TP108 graphical has been used to assess the local discharge from 520 Great South Road. However, there does not appear to be any commentary around how the development would impact the catchment flows. Even if this is negligible then this should still be worked through.</p> <p>Section 5.2 states that ‘...rural areas increases by 20% compared to the ED scenario...’ Is this correct, or has the rural imperviousness increased to 20%? This clarification is required to confirm the model that is being used and the accuracy of flow volumes assumed through the site.</p> |
| HW6 | New asset ownership | <p>Please provide discussion on the future ownership of the proposed stormwater devices.</p> | <p>It is unclear whether the proposed stormwater management approach will result public assets to be vested in Healthy Waters, or whether they would remain private assets The vesting of stormwater devices in Healthy Waters has implications for the design of these assets and future maintenance costs for Council.</p> |

| | | | |
|------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| HW7 | Proposed stormwater management | Please clarify the proposed stormwater management principles that have been adopted and explain what stormwater management is considered to be the Best Practicable Option. | <p>It is unclear what the actual principles for this development are. Greater discussion needs to be provided in relation to what could be considered and why the proposed stormwater management is considered to be the Best Practicable Option.</p> <p>Swales are mentioned as being possible (Section 8.1 and 8.2); however, it is then proposed to convey runoff in a new pipe network (Section 8.3).</p> |
| HW8 | SMP | Please provide a location plan of the plan change area to demonstrate how it fits in with the local Slippery Creek catchment. | Section 2.1 of the Stormwater Assessment discusses the catchment. However, it does not consider the site location in the context of the wider catchment. The site is located upstream of a very large floodplain associated with flows from the urban Papakura catchment. It is important to understand the effects of the plan change on the wider catchment. |
| HW9 | SMP | Please address the impact of the embankment approximately 60m upstream of the south eastern property boundary. | It is unclear from Section 2.4 of the Stormwater Assessment what the impact of the identified embankment would have on the environment. Does it create ponding water above the embankment, or does it impact the floodplain? This issue needs to be identified in order to determine the extent of effects and potential mitigation required. |
| HW10 | SMP | Please include further discussion about the receiving environment identified as a Significant Ecological Area (SEA) and implications to stormwater management because it is identified as a SEA. | Section 2.5 of the Stormwater Assessment discusses the receiving environment but does not identify the importance of it as a Significant Ecological Area. This is a relevant consideration in terms of effects on the environment and in determining the Best Practicable Option for stormwater management, particularly quality. |
| HW11 | SMP | Please clarify the extent of impervious coverage anticipated by the plan change. | Section 3 of the Stormwater Assessment identifies that the impervious coverage will increase, with greater runoff volumes and higher flows. However, the document is confusing with regard to what area it actually covers. This needs to be clarified. |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|---|
| HW12 | SMP | Clarify that Table 5.2 identifies 100-year ARI peak flow levels rather than flood levels. | Table 5.2 indicates flood levels but they are not necessarily flood levels. This appears to be an error. |
| HW13 | SMP | Confirm whether the 24hour rainfall depth was used for the TP108 graphical assessment. | Section 6.2.1 discusses the assumption for runoff. Although HW assumes that the 24hr rainfall depths was used this is not explicitly identified in the document. |
| HW14 | Flooding | Clarify how it is proposed to manage discharges from each sub-catchment when flows will be passed forward into a floodplain. | Discharges to the south currently enter a floodplain area across 530 GSR. Will unattenuated flows increase the extent, depth or frequency of this flooding? Will it be affected by the Slippery Creek Catchment. Further information is required to determine the proposal not to require attenuation is the Best Practicable Option. |
| HW15 | Flooding | Confirm how Subcatchment B will work in relation to passing forward flows. This would need to rely on overland flow paths because there no pipe network | Section 6.1.3 discusses the proposal to pass forward flows without attenuation. Depending on what development area you consider, No. 522 GSR could be significantly affected with flows passed to the property every time there is rainfall. Insufficient information is provided to understand the downstream effects of passing flows forward without attenuation. |
| Geotechnical matters – Shane Lander, Lander Geotechnical Consultants Limited | | | |
| G1 | Land modifications | Please assess the geotechnical constraints that may arise within the watercourse in the eastern corner of the site, and provide recommendations on further site investigations required. | Historic aerial photos infer fills or land modifications may have occurred within the watercourse in the eastern corner of the site. It is recommended that ENGEO re-affirm their interpretation of land modifications on the site. Depending on the outcome, please clarify (in terms of Section 6.3.4) that if filling is likely to be present in the watercourse, whether there are any perceived geotechnical constraints or concerns. If there are concerns, ENGEO should also make |

| | | | |
|----|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | recommendations on what (if any) site investigations will be required to address this (for example, during a Resource Consent phase). |
| G2 | Watercourse | Please provide comment on perceived geotechnical constraints if the low lying watercourse area was to be filled, and clarify what further site investigations will likely be required to assess these (for example, during a Resource Consent phase). This should also consider the point raised in G1 above | No investigations have been undertaken in the invert of the low-lying shallow watercourse feature (as per Section 5.1 of the ENGEO report). As stated in Section 3 of the ENGEO report, it is "...proposed to ease the steeper contours and fill the lower lying areas...". Further clarification is sought on the perceived geotechnical constraints in this area and further site investigations required at the resource consents stage. |
| G3 | 21 Gatland Road | Please clarify the nature of future site investigations for 21 Gatland Road. | Number 21 Gatland Road is included in the plan change submission, but this block of land has not been investigated as part of the ENGEO geotechnical report, however future investigations are recommended here. |
| G4 | Seismicity | Please provide comment on likely seismic site class and also the proximity of the site to any active faults. | The liquefaction potential reported in Section 6.5 of the ENGEO report is low based on the regional setting and hand auger borehole findings. In addition, NZS1170.5 seismic site class and seismicity have not been commented on in the ENGEO report. |
| G5 | Liquefaction | Please clarify whether more detailed liquefaction analyses of a deeper soil profile will be a necessary requirement for further assessment (e.g. during a Resource Consent stage). | Further comment is sought on likely seismic site class (e.g. based on their regional knowledge) and also the proximity of the site to any active faults. Also, please clarify whether more detailed liquefaction analyses of a deeper soil profile will be a necessary requirement for further assessment (e.g. during a Resource Consent stage). |