



Telephone (09) 216 9857  
Email [daniel@sfhconsultants.co.nz](mailto:daniel@sfhconsultants.co.nz)  
168 Hibiscus Coast Highway,  
Orewa, Auckland 0932

**To:** Sarah Wong  
**From:** Stephen Havill  
**Date:** 11 September 2024  
**Re:** **Clause 23 further information request – Private Plan Change Request by Windsor Park Community and Multisport Hub Incorporated**

---

Dear Sarah,

We attach our reply to Council's Clause 23 Further Information Request dated 25<sup>th</sup> July 2024, regarding the Private Plan Change Request by Windsor Park Community and Multisport Hub Incorporated at 20 Noel Williams Place (Windsor Park).

The AEE has been updated to include the information provided by the response. Please find the attached updated assessment;

**Attachment A** – Assessment of Environmental Effects (Updated)

In general, many of the questions below have asked for further clarification regarding the 'Masterplan'. The AEE has been updated to explicitly state that the 'Masterplan' is not included within the Proposed Plan Change as a Proposal, rather as an 'Indicative Concept Plan' to assess the realistic affects that may be experienced by a future residential proposal as the result of the rezoning. Any future proposed development for the site will require a separate land use consent. Please refer to the Updated AEE within Attachment A, particularly, section 2.1.4 Indicative Assessment Concept for more detail.

Please find attached the following information responses from the relevant experts;

**Attachment B** – Planning Response (SFH Consultants)

**Attachment C** – Proposed Windsor Park Precinct (SFH Consultants)

**Attachment D** – Urban Design Response (Wayne Bredemeijer)

**Attachment E** – Traffic Response (Commute Transportation Consultants)

**Attachment F** – Updated Infrastructure Capacity Assessment (Land Works)

**Attachment G** – Updated Stormwater Management Plan (Land Works)

**Attachment H** – Updated Indicative Concept Plan (GMC Architects)

Other Attachments have also been referenced within this response and have been included as part of this response for ease of access;

**Attachment I** - WPCMSH Background Memo

We address the questions in order as follows;

### **Planning Statutory & General Matters**

#### **P1 – Mana Whenua Consultation**

Please refer to the Planning Response within Attachment B. It is noted that 11 Iwi groups were notified on 30.11.2023 with no responses to date.

Please Note that reference to sections within the AEE has been updated to correctly correspond with Mana Whenua Consultation. Please refer to the Updated AEE which has been provided as Attachment A.

#### **P2 – Incorporating MDRS**

Please refer to the Planning Response within Attachment B, and the Updated AEE which has been provided as Attachment A.

The chosen method of incorporating the MDRS rules was discussed with Council and the decision to propose a Windsor Park Precinct which followed the MDRS rules, was the best way to achieve this. The proposed Windsor Park Precinct has been included as Attachment C.

#### **P3 – Legal Implications**

Please refer to the Planning Response within Attachment B, regarding the details of legal easement and covenants.

#### **P4 - General (S32 Evaluation)**

Please refer to the Planning Response within Attachment B, and the Updated AEE which has been provided as Attachment A.

### **Urban Design Matters**

#### **UD1 - Site Interface**

Please refer to the Urban Design Response within Attachment D. As mentioned in section 2.1.4 of the Updated AEE within Attachment A, this is a PPC application, not a land use application. As such this application refers to rezoning only and there are no physical changes proposed. While there is the possibility to retain the trees in question, there are therefore no plans or mechanisms in place to keep or remove the trees, and no plans as to how this boundary of the site will interact with the adjoining car park.

#### **UD2 - Loop Road Mechanism**

Please refer to the Urban Design Response within Attachment D, and section 2.1.4 of the Updated AEE within Attachment A. At this stage there are no mechanisms in place to ensure that the loop road will be implemented as per the Indicative Concept Plan. Again, the Indicative Concept Plan is just one option as to how the site could be designed by a future developer and has been used as a tool for potential effects assessment only.

#### **UD3 - Club Room Facilities**

Please refer to the Urban Design Response within Attachment D, as well as section 2.1.5 The Future of the Updated AEE within Attachment A. This highlights the plans

that the WPCMSH would like to implement with the capital raised from the selling of the land included within this plan change. The Clubroom is one of these new/upgraded facilities. However, it should also be noted that the club rooms are not part of this Proposed Plan Change. A future Land Use Application by WPCMSH will be required to propose a new club rooms facility.

#### UD4 - Additional Parking Area

As per the Urban Design Response within Attachment D, and the Updated Indicative Concept Plan within Attachment H, this additional parking has been removed.

#### UD5 - Character Impact

Please refer to the Urban Design Response within Attachment D. This information has been used to update the AEE, Attachment A. In particular please refer to the updates to section 6.1.1 Character and Amenity.

### **Traffic Matters**

#### Traffic Engineer

##### T1 - Transport - Document Version

Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E. This includes the RFI response and the final Traffic Assessment Report Document

##### T2 - Transport Plans and Policies

Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E. A separate document has been included as part of this attachment which sufficiently assesses the relevant transport objectives and policies.

##### T3 - Trip Distribution

Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E. This notes that the 'Commuter Waka' data is from 2018, and considered to be out of date. The data used within the ITA is based on traffic survey data from February 2024, and therefore considered to be more accurate.

##### T4 - Traffic Modelling

Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E.

##### T5 - Traffic Modelling

Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E

##### T6 - Car Parking

Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E.

Again, as has been reiterated by the Urban Design Response, the Indicative Concept Plan is one option with regard to the potential redevelopment of the site. This options provide 1-2 parking spaces per dwelling in the form of both garage parking and/or driveway parking. The MHU zones does not require any parking as per the AUP and therefore cannot be required to provide for a certain level of parking.

##### T7 - Car Parking

Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E. This confirms that there will be no formal arrangement to provide residents with access to the parking at 542 East Coast Road. The existing arrangements regarding the use of this parking will continue.

As mentioned above in T6, the Indicative Concept Plan option provides 1-2 parking spaces per dwelling and this, or a similar development design is considered appropriate as there are no minimum parking requirements.

#### T8 - Transport Infrastructure

Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E. This application is for a proposed plan change and change of zoning, not a land use application. Concerns regarding transport infrastructure can be conditioned at resource consent stage if considered necessary, or included in the Proposed Precinct relating to the Private Plan Change.

#### T9 - Standard of Internal Road

Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E. Any internal road, potentially the loop road option provided as part of the attached Indicative Concept Plan option, will be public and therefore vested with council. The proposed road layout and cross section can be assessed and conditioned as part of a future land use application.

#### T10 - Vehicle Access

Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E. The detailed design of the intersection has not been completed as this is not a land use application, however it is noted that there is sufficient road frontage to provide a safe and efficient road network. The proposed road layout can be assessed and conditioned as part of a future land use application.

### Auckland Transport

#### AT1 – Anticipated Yield

Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E. The urban design analysis determined a potential yield of 80-100 units within the MHU, and has been the base of this assessment. It is agreed that an increased yield would increase traffic affects, however an increase to a level which would affect the operation of the intersection is unlikely.

#### AT2 – Noel Williams Place / East Coast Road Intersection

Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E. An extended crash search shows no injury crashes within the last 10 years, and no reported crashes in the last 9 years. It is therefore considered to have an excellent safety record. Based on traffic modelling the development is considered to have minimal effects, and therefore this safety record is unlikely to change.

#### AT3 – Public Transport

Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E where new pedestrian connections are shown to provide improved pedestrian access to bus stops #3143 and #3145.

### **Healthy Waters (Stormwater)**

Please note that there has been a delay to these reports as further changes were needed. FINAL UPDATED PLANS AND REPORTS ARE TO BE SENT THROUGH TO AUCKLAND COUNCIL WHEN THEY ARE COMPLETE.

#### **SW1 – SMP General**

Please refer to the Updated Infrastructure Capacity Assessment within Attachment F, and the updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G. The site description identifies the Proposed Plan Change site, and that of the wider Windsor Park as a whole. It is important to note while the Plan Change will result in zoning changes, and a future land use consent for residential development, the remainder of Windsor Park will always be involved as adjoining property, located downstream from the Proposed Plan Change Site, and therefore will experience some degree of effects as a result of the future residential development.

#### **SW2 – SMP General**

Please refer to section 4.1 of the Updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G. Updates have also been made to section 6.1.4 of the Updated AEE within Attachment 1.

#### **SW3 – SMP Stormwater Management**

Please refer to the Updated Infrastructure Capacity Assessment within Attachment F, and the updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G. Updates have also been made to section 6.1.4 of the Updated AEE within Attachment A.

While the Indicative Concept Plan is not a land use proposal, it has enabled the consideration of stormwater management devices based on a residential development between 80-100 units. The supporting documents have considered the stormwater mitigation options for the site and has concluded that private stormwater tanks are likely to be the most viable option, especially given the intended residential use of the site in the future as a result of the PPC.

#### **SW4 – SMP Stormwater Management**

Please refer to the Updated Infrastructure Capacity Assessment within Attachment F, and the updated Stormwater Management Plan, specifically section 4.5.3 within Attachment G. This information has contributed to the updates made to section 6.1.4 of the Updated AEE within Attachment A.

#### **SW5 – SMP Geotechnical**

Please refer to section 2.1 of the Updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G, and section 2.1.4 of the Updated AEE within Attachment A. While a Geotechnical investigation will be required as part of a land use application, it is reiterated this application seeks a Plan Change for rezoning only. The Indicative Concept Plan is not a proposed development.

#### **SW6 – SMP Receiving Environment**

Please refer to section 2.1 of the Updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G. The SMP has been updated with information from the recent meeting with Healthy Waters, regarding the downstream Stormwater Pond "Ascension Place Pond".

#### SW7 – SMP Stakeholder Consultation

Please refer to the Updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G. The SMP has been updated to include information from the meeting with Healthy Waters. It is also noted that stormwater was not included in the initial Iwi Consultation.

#### SW8 – SMP Asset Ownership

Please refer to the Updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G. The SMP has been updated to include an information breakdown of ownership and maintenance.

#### SW9 – SMP Water Quality

Please refer to the Updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G. This information has contributed to the updates made to section 6.1.4 of the Updated AEE within Attachment A.

Please note that updates to the SMP have resulted in the 'Water Quality' section becoming section 4.2.

While the Indicative Concept Plan is only used for assessment purposes and is not a proposed development, the 85 units included provide for 89 parking spaces. Under the AUP onsite parking of more than 30 parking spaces is considered to be a high contaminant generating area. With the MHU rezoning likely to provide 80-100 units, it is likely that a similar number of parking spaces will also be proposed. As such it is considered appropriate to consider any future residential development as a high contaminant generating area.

#### SW10 – SMP Stream Hydrology

Please refer to the Updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G, and section 2.1.4 of the Updated AEE within Attachment A. While SMAF requirements and calculations will be required as part of a land use application, it is reiterated this application seeks a Plan Change for rezoning only. The Indicative Concept Plan and future development projects within the remainder of Windsor Park are not included as proposed developments.

Please note that updates to the SMP have resulted in the 'Stream Hydrology' section becoming section 4.3. This section has provided very surface level comments, and figurative values based on the Indicative Concept Plan, however a full and extensive assessment will be required as part of a future land use consent application.

#### SW11 – SMP Flooding

Please refer to the Updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G, and section 2.1.4 of the Updated AEE within Attachment A. While flooding assessments and mitigation measures will be required as part of a land use application, it is reiterated this application seeks a Plan Change for rezoning only. The Indicative Concept Plan and future development projects within the remainder of Windsor Park are not included as proposed developments. Please note that updates to the SMP have resulted in the 'Flooding' section becoming section 4.4.

#### SW12 – SMP Flooding

Please refer to the Updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G, and section 2.1.4 of the Updated AEE within Attachment A, as per SW11 above. Please note that updates to the SMP have resulted in the 'Flooding – Building for 1% AEP event' section becoming section 4.5.

#### SW13 – SMP Potential Risks

Please refer to the Updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G, section 4.6, and section 2.1.4 of the Updated AEE within Attachment A. The Updated SMP includes a table explaining the risks of stormwater management which range from low to medium risk. However, it is also acknowledged that these risks will need to be addressed during design, planning and construction phases. As such, while the risks can be identified at this stage, there is no proposed development to accurately determine any risks. This will be a part of a future land use application.

#### SW14 – SMP General

Please refer to the Updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G, section 5, and section 2.1.4 of the Updated AEE within Attachment A. While a Stormwater Management Plan with clear mitigation processes will be required as part of a land use application, it is reiterated this application seeks a Plan Change for rezoning only. The Indicative Concept Plan is not a proposed development. Any future land use application for a proposed development will need to propose mitigation measures, but this cannot accurately be done at this stage, hence why any measures are referred to as options.

#### SW15 - SMP Stormwater Pipe Network

Please refer to the Updated Stormwater Management Plan within Attachment G, section 5, and section 2.1.4 of the Updated AEE within Attachment A. While a plan for existing and proposed infrastructure networks will be required as part of a land use application, it is reiterated this application seeks a Plan Change for rezoning only. The Indicative Concept Plan is not a proposed development. Any future land use application for a proposed development will need to consider the infrastructure network, but this cannot accurately be done at this stage.

### **Parks Planning**

#### PP1 – Open Space Provision Assessment

Please refer to the Urban Design Response within Attachment D. It is considered that a full Open Space Provision Assessment is outside the scope of this response. However, the Background Memo provided by WPCMSH, Attachment I, provides information regarding the current use of Windsor Park and how the future use will be absorbed within the remaining site. One of the projects proposed with the capital funds is flood lighting which will allow longer use of the remaining fields during the evening hours, and provides sufficient provision to absorb the 'losses' of open space used for trainings and/or games.

#### PP2 – Arboricultural and Architect Assessment – Existing Trees

Please refer to the Urban Design Response within Attachment D. This matter is considered to be outside the scope of this urban design response. Again the Indicative Concept Plan is an illustrative option and not a confirmed design. It is therefore

unknown how many, if any, trees may be removed in the future. The relevant urban design response has noted 15 Pohutukawa trees on site and there potential benefit to a future development on site. The Water Gum trees are outside of the site.

#### PP3 – Private or Public Vested Roads – Urban Forest Strategy

Please refer to the Urban Design Response within Attachment D. Again the Indicative Concept Plan is an illustrative option and not a confirmed design. Any future road design will be vested with Council and will provide some degree of street planting which will be agreed between Auckland Council and the future land owner/applicant.

#### PP5 – Pedestrian Connectivity – Greenway Connections

Please refer to the Urban Design Response within Attachment D. This includes reference to the WPCMSH Memo, Attachment I, and the planned projects the Board intend to complete, using the capital funds from the sale of the PPC site. Appendix 2 provides an illustration of the pedestrian connections that could be formed by the Perimeter Pedestrian Footpath project and the pedestrian greenway connections that would be formed as a result. It should be noted that these projects are not part of this application as they can only be achieved with the funds resulting from the PPC and sale of the rezoned PPC site.

#### General

Other comments not within the remit of clause 23 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991.

#### Planning

- 1 *Incorporating MDRS into proposed plan provisions*  
Refer to Attachment C - Proposed Windsor Park Precinct

#### Urban Design

- 1 *Consultation with Noel Williams Place Residents*  
No direct consultation with the residents of Noel Williams Place has been completed

#### Auckland Transport

- 1 *Noel Williams Place Extension*  
Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E, this has also been addressed briefly in T9 above
- 2 *Site Entrance at Noel William Place*  
Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E, this has been agreed and noted.
- 3 *Pedestrian provision on Noel Williams Place*  
Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E. Section 2.2.2 of the ITA mistakenly identified the pedestrian footpath on both sides and has been updated to reflect this.
- 4 *Proposed active modes connection to East Coast Road*  
This is agreed and noted in the Traffic Response within Attachment E
- 5 *Road Safety Audit*  
This is agreed and noted in the Traffic Response within Attachment E



- 6      *Parking Demand*  
Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E, this has also been addressed briefly in T6 above
- 7      *NSAAT markings*  
Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E. NSAAT markings are not required as the parking in this area will be removed to accommodate the new internal road connection.
- 8      *Road Damage*  
This is agreed and noted in the Traffic Response within Attachment E. Construction traffic affects will be addressed in the future through a CTMP.
- 9      *Certainty of Mitigation*  
Please refer to the Traffic Response within Attachment E. Again, this is a rezoning application, not a land use application. Appropriate forms of mitigation will be proposed by a future land use mitigation once the site has been rezoned and sold to a developer.

#### Parks Planning

- 1      *Legal – Property – Auckland Council*  
Please refer to the Planning Response, Attachment B, As per P3 above.
- 2      *Arboricultural and Architect Assessment – Existing Trees*  
Please refer to the Urban Design Response, Attachment D, As per PP2 above.
- 3      *Private or Public Vested Roads – Urban Forest Strategy*  
Please refer to the Urban Design Response, Attachment D, As per PP3 above.

We trust this reply will allow you to continue processing the application.

If you require any further clarification, please contact the office on (09) 216 9857, or by email [Stephen@sfhconsultants.co.nz](mailto:Stephen@sfhconsultants.co.nz)

Yours faithfully

**SFH Consultants Limited**