21 August 2023

PPC Application – Clause 23 Requests from Auckland Council including Further Information Requests

Applicant: Aedifice Development No.1 Limited

Address: 47 Golding Road and 50 Pukekohe East Road, Pukekohe

Proposed activities: PPC – Pukekohe East-Central Precinct 2

#	Category of information	Clause 23 Specific Request (19/09/22)	Reasons for Request	Applicant Initial 07/03/23)	Responses	(30/09/22 a	nd (Clause 23 (2)) Councils Further Requests Arising from Applicant Responses (16/03/23)		Clause 23 Councils Further Request Arising from Applicant Responses (11/08/2023)
HEA	LTHY WATERS (CO	ONTACT: SUSAN AN	DREWS: PRINCIPAL - HEALTHY WATERS 027 2						
SW 1	Flood risk and hazard	Please provide the Flood model with all the relevant files.	The flood model is referred to in the SMP but has not been provided in its digital form. This is a fundamental piece of information to inform an assessment of stormwater, flooding and freshwater effects of the plan change Only a Flood modelling methodology report has been provided.	A TuFlow model h provided to Hea approval. Refer to	Ithy Waters	for review a	,	updated as per Healthy Waters comments. Latest model is provided in the Attachment 1.	Thank you for providing this information. Upon review of this information, we note that the flood model uses a CN value of 50 percent as an average for the two soil groups. Please clarify the reason behind this (average CN) assumption
SW 7	Drainage reserves	Please clarify the purpose of the drainage reserve areas mapped in the Concept Master Plan, function and Precinct Plan.	· ·	Similar to PC-76, a created to attenu within the site and caused to the d drainage reserve a ponds will be local area. Please refer to Dra Extent Plan within	ate up to 1% of that no adverse ownstream error will be vested within the awing 20000 –	6 AEP flood everse effects will environment. To sted to Council. e drainage reserved.	drainage reserve. All ve	comparable strategy to PC76. The region identified as a drainage reserve serves the purpose of mitigating floods with a frequency of up to 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP). Therefore, these areas are deemed unsuitable for any residential or habitable developments. We will show the landscape areas on the Concept Plan. However, the	Waters would be maintaining would be below the waterline of the stream channels (i.e. generally the channel defined by the annual fullest flow or
							intersects with Road 12 (refer to the Concept Plan). There are no comments made in the SMP around	As the stream is recognized as a natural wetland, no alterations to the stream/riparian are planned. Consequently, a bridge is proposed to facilitate the crossing of Road 12 over the stream.	

#	Category of information	Clause 23 Specific Request (19/09/22)	Applicant Initial 07/03/23)	Responses	(30/09/22	(Clause 23 (2)) Councils Further Requests Arising from Applicant Responses (16/03/23)	Requests	Clause 23 Councils Further Request Arising from Applicant Responses (11/08/2023)
						Road 12 and the stream on site. Assessment comments should discuss how the proposal minimises the need to have engineered structures in streams, so perhaps justification around why that layout has been selected.		