

Minutes

What: Pre-lodgement meeting for 53 Schnapper Rock Road

Where: Room 2, Level 28, 135 Albert Street

When: Tuesday 19 January 2021, 10.30am – 12.00pm

Who attended:

Abu Hoque (planning and urban design)	Emily Ip (Senior Policy Planner)
Edison Xin, (developer/applicant)	Eryn Shields (Team Leader – Planning)
Wayne Liu, (developer/applicant)	Gemma Chuah (Healthy Waters)
Will Moore (civil, infrastructure and stormwater)	Nick Williamson (Align, consultant for Parks)
John Duran (civil, infrastructure and stormwater)	Liam Burkhardt (AT)
Shane Ingley (transport)	Rory Power (AT)
	Ilze Gotelli (Watercare)
	Wes Edwards (Arrive Ltd, transport)

Apologies: Katherine Dorofaeff (AT), Rue Statham (ecology)

Key points discussed and actions

1. Overview of plan change proposal

- Proposal seeks to rezone land at 53 Schnapper Rock Road from Large Lot to Single House and Mixed Housing Suburban Zones.
- The applicant noted that the accompanying master plan is indicative only and will not form part of the plan change documentation.
- No new provisions are proposed i.e. no additional precinct however the proposal will seek to remove the subject site from the Greenhithe Precinct.
- 14 iwi groups have mana whenua status over the area; so far, four have expressed an interest in the proposal. Meetings will be held between the applicant and iwi groups in the first week of February.
- The applicant considers that there are no significant site constraints and that 90% of the site is developable.
- The site is generally flat at the northern end and slopes down towards the southern side.
- There is an area of Significant Ecological Area (SEA) to the west of the site within a stream environment. It is proposed that some sections with SEA will be covenanted.
- An incorporated association is proposed to ensure maintenance of the protected area. The applicant pointed out that this method has been used for developments in Greenhithe and Albany and is not uncommon.
- Streams onsite will require further assessment to see if protection is required. Riparian margins will be provided if required.
- No public park is proposed.

2. Technical inputs and key issues

Status of technical reports:

- Geotechnical report to be circulated. (EI)

Key points discussed and actions

- Civil engineering report to be updated.
- Transport report to be completed.
- Contamination report is final.
- Archaeology report is final.
- Landscape and visual report and ecology report to be provided before pre-lodgement meeting with the landscape experts and ecologists. (AH)

Transport

- The applicant proposes one public loop road and a number of private accessways. The public road is proposed to be 14m wide.
- Shane (transport specialist for the applicant) sought clarity around the expected level of assessment as the expected yield of 93 dwellings is below the 100-trip generation threshold for requiring an ITA. *Please see attached transport note from Wes summarising what was discussed.*
- Wes expressed that a pedestrian link/access along the Watercare site would be beneficial.
- AT expects a sufficient level of analysis to assess effects on key intersections. Approved subdivision next door should be used as baseline.
- AT supports rear lot access.
- Footpath along the site will be upgraded to an urban standard. After the meeting, AT has advised that the applicant will be required to upgrade the Watercare section of the road frontage to ensure the entire length of frontage is at an urban standard. The email dated 26 January 2021 has been forwarded to Abu.

Infrastructure

- While not required for the plan change, Ilze from Watercare queried how water will be supplied for the dwellings down private accessways and noted that a bulk watermain at the entrance of the accessway is not an optimal solution.
- One way that this could be resolved would be to build a new public mains and a body corporation can on-charge the residents. However, this can be assessed via the resource consent process.
- The applicant to continue working with Watercare to find optimal solution for servicing the development. (AH)
- In respect of wastewater, the applicant is considering a low pressure system and a gravity option.
- Ilze noted that if a new pump station services over 50 lots it will need to be made public.

Stormwater

- The site is within SMAF1 with the need for onsite retention.
- A stormwater management plan (SMP) will be provided and submitted concurrently with the plan change request.
- Healthy Waters (HW) notes that the SMP is key and the applicant should work closely with Gemma to work through any stormwater issues.
- AT's preference is not to have raingardens due to maintenance costs – further conversations between the applicant, HW and AT will be needed.
- The SMP will also need to be submitted to the AT stormwater specialists for review.

Parks

- A previous version of the master plan included a pocket park. Abu confirmed that this is no longer proposed.
- Nick notes that the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan is relevant (link to plan here: <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/about-auckland-council/how-auckland-council-works/local-boards/all-local-boards/upper-harbour-local-board/Documents/upper->

Key points discussed and actions

[harbour-greenways-plan-final-2019.pdf](#)). The provision of access to passive recreation in the area will be a relevant consideration.

- In the context of the Freshwater NES, Nick queried whether there were wetlands located on the site. Abu noted that the gully is prominent but is not considered a wetland. The stream will be assessed by the ecologist. Riparian margins will be provided as per AUP requirements.

Planning

- Abu confirmed that in addition to the request to rezone the site, the applicant will be seeking to remove the site from the Greenhithe Precinct. Emily noted that it will be important to include an assessment of this in the supporting section 32 report.

3. Timeframes and next steps

- Pre-lodgement meeting between the landscape specialists and ecologist will be held on Tuesday 9 February.
- Specialist reports will be completed end of the month.
- Iwi consultation will commence in February. Plan change expected to be lodged at the end of February.
- If any iwi group wishes to provide a cultural values assessment, it will need to be provided before the plan change is notified. Please also include discussions around the SMP/water issues when having conversations with iwi.
- Eryn provided an outline of the plan change process at the meeting. Plan changes get notified once a month. If this plan change is lodged at the end of February, the plan change may be included in the April round of notifications.

Attachments

- Geotechnical report
- Transport note from Wes
- Email and attachment from Gemma (HW)
- Stormwater layout plan for 55 Schnapper Rock Road

Date 20 January 2021
Ref 101135
Subject **PC 53 Schnapper Rock Road – Initial transport comments**

This note follows a meeting between the applicant's plan change team and Auckland Council officers and consultants. It summarises transport advice provided at the meeting by Wes Edwards of Arrive and responds to earlier questions around the scope of the transport assessment raised in an earlier email.

Scope of Transport Assessment

Earlier comments from Abley indicate they expect to provide a transport assessment "*focused on accessibility, frontage and internal factors*" as the thresholds for an Integrated Transport Assessment set out in Auckland Transport's ITA guidelines are not triggered by the proposal.

In addition, the Unitary Plan has a development activity status threshold of 100 dwellings, and the concept master plan suggests the site could accommodate 93 dwellings, but this is subject to change. Given the possibility that the yield could be beyond 100 dwellings there would be some benefit in undertaking a robust transport assessment at the plan change stage that could then be relied on at the subdivision consent stage.

Irrespective of any documentation desired by Auckland Transport, a fundamental question for Council and decision makers to consider is "*can the effects of developing the land be adequately and practicably addressed*". In my view it is not possible to properly answer that question if the transport assessment does not consider the transport network beyond the site frontages.

There are three routes available for traffic generated by the land:

- Schnapper Rock Road east leg via Albany Highway/ Bush Rd intersection
- Schnapper Rock Road north leg via Albany Highway (south of Oakway Dr)
- Oakway Drive via Albany Highway

As noted at the meeting, the Albany Hwy/ Schnapper Rock Rd/ Bush Rd intersection is likely to be the primary route for development traffic, and the other two intersections on Albany Hwy (Schnapper Rock Rd and Oakway Dr) are likely to carry smaller proportions of development traffic.

The Bush Rd intersection is close to the SH18 Albany Hwy interchange and these intersections impact one another and would be operated in a coordinated manner. This part of the network can experience significant congestion during peak periods.

Given the likely sensitivity of the Albany Hwy/Bush Rd intersection (and SH18 Interchange) to increases in side-road traffic volumes, I would expect to see some form of assessment of this intersection and the interchange. An assessment of the other intersections may be warranted depending on the relative increase in volumes.

Any assessment should consider the future environment (minimum 10-year horizon), and I would expect the assessment to be informed by future traffic volume predictions from Auckland regional or local transport models allowing for other live-zoned land in the area to be fully developed as the baseline for the assessment.

With respect to the assessment baseline it is expected the assessment would provide an estimate of the number of dwellings that could be provided under the current zoning.

It is possible that the intersections are expected to operate satisfactorily in the future and that the proposal would result in a negligible increase in volume and negligible deterioration in network performance, but that would need to be established by the assessment. My initial expectation is that modelling of the network would be required to provide an adequate assessment. If modelled, the Bush Rd intersection should be modelled together with the SH18 Interchange.

New Zealand Transport Agency operate the SH18 interchange and could be interested in how the plan change may impact their network.

It needs to be demonstrated that adequate access can be provided to service the intended development. At least one appropriate access intersection location should be identified with sightlines meeting Austroads SISD for all vectors, and it should be demonstrated that an internal road capable of servicing the development could be provided.

If there are areas of the site frontage that should not be used for vehicle access it would be useful for that to be addressed in the transport assessment, and potentially reflected in some planning provisions.

As discussed at the meeting, if there is only one road access location and internal roading pattern that is practicable, or it is necessary for a particular layout to be adopted in any future development, then a method such as showing these items on a Precinct Plan may be appropriate. If multiple acceptable options are available there would appear to be no benefit in including them on a Precinct Plan or similar device.

Design of any subsequent subdivision would be subject to current rules and other provisions, so there appears to be no need to establish road cross-sections or corridor widths at the Plan Change stage unless there is something unique about this site that means the typical forms and methods would be inadequate or inappropriate.

Draft Minutes

What: 53 Schnapper Rock Road pre-lodgement meeting – ecology
Where: Room 1, Level 24, 135 Albert Street
When: Friday 12 February, 1.00-2.00pm
Who attended: Abu Hoque, Jamie MacKay, Rue Statham, Emily Ip

Key points discussed

1. The proposal

- The plan change proposal will seek to rezone 53 Schnapper Rock Road from Large Lot to Single House and Mixed Housing Suburban. No changes to the SEA are proposed.
- Riparian margin to be provided and retained in private ownership – width to be decided at the subdivision stage. It will be covenanted and included in the land title.
- Earthworks will be undertaken outside of the SEA.

2. Watercourses

- Rue suggested that the watercourse mapping be checked to align with the Freshwater Solutions report.
- He noted that there may also be a small wetland at the top of the site (northern end) and highlighted the need to comply with NES for Freshwater (wetland and stream protection).
- Abu noted that a surveyor has been engaged to survey the site contour and to provide a site plan, and to see if the stream bank of the southern watercourse can be identified.
- Rue would like to see the locations of the watercourses to be confirmed at this stage to assist with the subdivision and resource consent stage. It was agreed that these details do not need to be shown on the plan change map but should be included in the supporting technical material.

Southern stream:

- Abu noted further work needs to be undertaken to determine if this is a stream.
- Rue noted that under the NES for Freshwater and NPSFM, there needs to be a functional need for the stream to be reclaimed and need to demonstrate that there are no other alternatives available. He acknowledged that portion of the stream at 55 Schnapper Rock had been reclaimed but noted the development was consented before the new requirements came into force.
- Jamie to include a discussion in his report about the stream works at 55 Schnapper Rock Road and address matters in the NES.

3. Update on iwi consultation

- A hui be held in the week of 15 February.
- 5 iwi have expressed an interested however at the time of this meeting only one had responded.
- If a CVA is provided, it will be required at the time of notification.

4. Timeframes and notification

Key points discussed

- The plan change will likely be lodged at the end of this month (February). The plan change material will then be assessed to determine if further information is necessary. A decision will then be made whether to adopt the request, accept the request, deal with it as if it were a resource consent application or reject the request. If accepted for processing, the plan change will then be notified.
- Abu flagged that limited notification will be sought. Emily will keep Abu in the loop as to where we might be heading.