

## **Explanation**

- You may make a “further submission” to support or oppose any submission already received (see summaries that follow).
- You should use Form 6.
- Your further submission must be received by 5pm on 22 May 2026
- Send a copy of your further submission to the original submitter as soon as possible after submitting it to the Council.

## **Summary of Decisions Requested**

Plan Change 125 (Private) - 40 Mahi Road, Helensville

Summary of Decisions Requested

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter Name	Address for Service	Summary of Decisions Requested
1	1.1	Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust	<a href="mailto:tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com">tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com</a> <a href="mailto:admin@kaiparamoana.com">admin@kaiparamoana.com</a>	Request adequate stormwater instruments be applied to eventual titles for residential sections, so that homeowners are obligated to maintain retention devices.
1	1.2	Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust	<a href="mailto:tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com">tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com</a> <a href="mailto:admin@kaiparamoana.com">admin@kaiparamoana.com</a>	Request a suitably engineered and guaranteed communal scale wetland for stormwater treatment and detention.
1	1.3	Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust	<a href="mailto:tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com">tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com</a> <a href="mailto:admin@kaiparamoana.com">admin@kaiparamoana.com</a>	Request a more thorough archaeological assessment evaluation.
1	1.4	Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust	<a href="mailto:tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com">tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com</a> <a href="mailto:admin@kaiparamoana.com">admin@kaiparamoana.com</a>	Request that through the ensuing Section 32 analysis Water Treatment Plant and Wastewater Treatment Plant capacity is clarified in the context of what is proposed.
1	1.5	Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust	<a href="mailto:tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com">tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com</a> <a href="mailto:admin@kaiparamoana.com">admin@kaiparamoana.com</a>	Request that the reported visual amenity affects not being high, and the positioning of the various densities and typologies of housing development, be reviewed in Council's assessment of the proposal.
1	1.6	Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust	<a href="mailto:tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com">tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com</a> <a href="mailto:admin@kaiparamoana.com">admin@kaiparamoana.com</a>	Request that local whanau benefit from the procurement of engineering and construction services.
1	1.7	Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust	<a href="mailto:tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com">tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com</a> <a href="mailto:admin@kaiparamoana.com">admin@kaiparamoana.com</a>	Request there be iwi involvement in pest control and conservation efforts in the riparian and planting restoration areas.
1	1.8	Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust	<a href="mailto:tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com">tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com</a> <a href="mailto:admin@kaiparamoana.com">admin@kaiparamoana.com</a>	Request significant efforts be made with intensive and ongoing weed control.
1	1.9	Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust	<a href="mailto:tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com">tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com</a> <a href="mailto:admin@kaiparamoana.com">admin@kaiparamoana.com</a>	Request weed control is carried out in perpetuity, with such controls being legally bound and privately funded.
1	1.10	Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust	<a href="mailto:tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com">tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com</a> <a href="mailto:admin@kaiparamoana.com">admin@kaiparamoana.com</a>	Request that when devising consent conditions about ground disturbance protocols and potential archaeological discoveries, Nga Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust are given the opportunity to review what is proposed.
1	1.11	Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust	<a href="mailto:tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com">tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com</a> <a href="mailto:admin@kaiparamoana.com">admin@kaiparamoana.com</a>	Request that Nga Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust have the opportunity to review proposed site-specific erosion and sediment controls.
2	2.1	Auckland Council	<a href="mailto:Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a>	Decline the plan change in its entirety, unless the matters raised in the Council's submission are addressed.
2	2.2	Auckland Council	<a href="mailto:Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a>	Include a precinct over the urban zones with detailed precinct provisions to address concerns of the submission: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precinct description</li> <li>• Objectives and policies</li> <li>• Activity table</li> <li>• Standard for water and wastewater servicing</li> <li>• Standard for stormwater quality treatment.</li> <li>• Matters of discretion and assessment criteria</li> </ul>

Plan Change 125 (Private) - 40 Mahi Road, Helensville

Summary of Decisions Requested

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter Name	Address for Service	Summary of Decisions Requested
2	2.3	Auckland Council	<a href="mailto:Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a>	<p>Include precinct provisions to require bulk water supply and wastewater to be completed and commissioned prior to an application for subdivision being lodged and/or construction of a dwelling occurs or a resource consent is required as a non-complying activity.</p> <p>Provisions to be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert text in Precinct description to recognise bulk water supply and wastewater constraints.</li> <li>• Insert objectives and policies that ensures subdivision and development is aligned with the availability of water supply and wastewater.</li> <li>• Insert Activity Table rules to identify non compliance with the water supply and wastewater standard as a non-complying activity.</li> <li>• Insert Standard to require bulk water supply and wastewater to be completed and commissioned prior to subdivision or development.</li> <li>• Include a special information requirement to address water supply requirements.</li> </ul>
2	2.4	Auckland Council	<a href="mailto:Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a>	<p>Insert Objective into a precinct as follows:</p> <p>1. Subdivision and development is coordinated and does not occur in advance of the availability of operational infrastructure including bulk water supply, wastewater and stormwater services.</p> <p>Or words to this effect</p>
2	2.5	Auckland Council	<a href="mailto:Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a>	<p>Insert policies into a precinct as follows:</p> <p>Avoid subdivision, use and development prior to the availability of operational bulk water supply, wastewater, and stormwater to service development.</p> <p>Insert Standard as follows:</p> <p>(1) Bulk water supply and wastewater infrastructure required for servicing of all development within the Precinct must be completed and commissioned:</p> <p>(a) in the case of subdivision, prior to release of Resource Management Act 1991 section 224(c) certificate for any residential lots; and</p> <p>(b) in the case of land use only, prior to the construction of any dwelling(s) or residential activities.</p> <p>Or words to this effect.</p>
2	2.6	Auckland Council	<a href="mailto:Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a>	<p>Insert the SMAF1 Control Map over the proposed urban zones (MHS and SHZ).</p>

Plan Change 125 (Private) - 40 Mahi Road, Helensville

Summary of Decisions Requested

Sub #	Sub Point	Submitter Name	Address for Service	Summary of Decisions Requested
2	2.7	Auckland Council	<a href="mailto:Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a>	<p>Include precinct provisions to require stormwater quality treatment for all impervious surfaces.</p> <p>Provisions to be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert text in Precinct description to recognise stormwater quality treatment is required.</li> <li>• Insert objectives and policies that ensures stormwater quality treatment is achieved for all impervious surfaces.</li> <li>• Insert Standard to require stormwater quality treatment of all impervious surfaces consistent with the approved SMP.</li> <li>• Insert restricted discretionary matters of discretion and assessment criteria for development that does not comply with stormwater standard.</li> </ul>
2	2.8	Auckland Council	<a href="mailto:Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a>	<p>Insert precinct provisions that require a flood hazard assessment at the time of subdivision or development, whichever comes first.</p> <p>Provisions to be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precinct description identifying precautionary approach to downstream flooding risk.</li> <li>• Objective and policy outlining precautionary approach to ensure downstream flood risks are avoided.</li> <li>• Rule identifying non-compliance with flood standard as a non-complying activity.</li> <li>• Standard requiring flood hazard modelling to demonstrate downstream flood effects will be avoided.</li> <li>• Special information requirement detailing the flood hazard assessment requirements.</li> </ul>
2	2.9	Auckland Council	<a href="mailto:Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a>	Delete the subdivision variation control from areas of CSLZ to be rezoned SHZ.
3	3.1	Foundry Developments Limited	<a href="mailto:Penny@formeplanning.co.nz">Penny@formeplanning.co.nz</a>	That PC125 be approved as notified.

## **Submissions**



Planning Technician  
Auckland Council  
Private Bag 92300  
Auckland 1142

[unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](mailto:unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz)

13 April 2026

Dear Sir or Madam:

### PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 125 (PRIVATE) – 40 MAHI ROAD, HELENSVILLE

On behalf of Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust, this letter forms our Submission on Plan Change 125 (Private) – 40 Mahi Road, Helensville, formally lodged with Auckland Council. This submission has been prepared on behalf of the iwi, by Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust - Environmental Business Unit: Te Tari Tai Ao. Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust is the legal entity that governs the operations and management of Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara and has responsibilities to uphold the cultural heritage and values of Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara.

Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara refers to the uri or descendants from ancestors of each of the five marae of Kaipara; namely Reweti (Whiti te Ra) to the South and Haranui (Nga Tai i Turia ki te Maro Whara) to the Northwest, and Kakanui (Te Kia Ora) and Araparera (Te Aroha Pa) to the East and Puatahi (Te Manawanui) to the North. These descendants are also linked across the wider Ngāti Whātua and as such their interests are interrelated and serves to uphold and strengthen the mana (customary authority) of Ngāti Whātua within the Auckland region.

The rohe (tribal area) of Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara, representing Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara, is centred around the southern Kaipara Harbour in the Auckland Region. It encompasses approximately 148,265 hectares, primarily within the Rodney Local Board area, with extensions into the Hibiscus and Bays and Upper Harbour areas. This 1483km<sup>2</sup> represents approximately 30% of the land area within the Auckland Region. Key geographical features include the Kaipara River catchment, Hōteo River, Arapārera River, Makarau River, Te Korowai-o-Te-Tonga Peninsula, Riverhead Forest, and Woodhill Forest. Significant maunga (mountains) such as Atuanui (Mount Auckland), Taranaki, Tuhirangi, Tarawera and Tauwhare hold cultural importance for affiliated marae. This rohe is recognized for the purposes of kaitiakitanga (guardianship) under the Resource Management Act 1991.

We have considered the proposed Private Plan Change, by Hounslow Holdings Ltd, described as follows:

**17.3660**      *Ha (Lot 2 DP 586879, RT 1164429)*

- *to re-zone from Future Urban Zone and Rural – Countryside Living Zone to Residential – Single House Zone, Residential – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone, and Rural – Countryside Living Zone.*

### NGA MAUNGA WHAKAHII O KAIPARA

P | 09 420 8410 ~ E | [admin@kaiparamoana.com](mailto:admin@kaiparamoana.com)  
A | 5 Rere place, Parakai, 0830, Aotearoa NZ



# KAIPARA

Our comments pertaining to relevant matters within the re-zoning proposal, are as follows:

- The application site is located at the front of the South Kaipara catchment (runoff ultimately draining to the Kaipara harbour, via the Awaroa Stream and lower Kaipara River). This is mentioned to promote cultural understanding and appreciation of what we regard as the receiving environment.
- Adequate instruments would need to be applied to eventual titles for residential sections, so that homeowners are obligated to maintain retention devices. It is claimed in the AEE that stormwater discharge impacts (from the proposed development area) will be less than minor. We understand the receiving environment to include the Awaroa Stream and so forth. A communal scale wetland (for stormwater treatment and detention) would need to be suitably engineered and guaranteed as such. 1.1  
1.2
- The archaeological assessment provided as part of this application is considered to be relatively short and superficial. It contains less than 5 pages of written material, which is not necessarily a reflection on the authors, however the applicants should be aware that the location could justify a more thorough evaluation. There are known cultural artefacts in the vicinity from past occupation. 1.3
- We note the letter from Watercare to Civix/Lance Hessell, dated 9 August 2024. It related to potable water supply and wastewater infrastructure matters. Because assessment of the capacity of the local network is required at the time of resource consent, this plan change assessment process by Council must very carefully consider the current status of these municipal services. It is unclear from Appendix 25 (an official CCO letter) what the answer is and notwithstanding that was almost 2 years ago. We request that through the ensuing Section 32 analysis by Council they clarify Water Treatment Plant and Wastewater Treatment Plant capacity in the context of what is proposed. 1.4
- Considering the private proposal to re-zone the said area, avoidance of visually interfering housing on the hillside is important from a cultural values perspective. The Landscape Visual Assessment provided with the PPC documents discusses visual amenity effects. This is reported as not being high, however that is subjective and a matter of personal opinion. It is therefore requested that this be reviewed in Council’s assessment of the proposal and the positioning of the various densities and typologies of housing development. The author of Appendix 13 regards the area as an “urban setting” (and the proposal as appropriate accordingly) but we challenge this description, because it could be considered significantly rural. It is on the edge of town and the edge of rural areas. 1.5
- Future development works (earthmoving, infrastructure creation etc) have a potential employment factor, for local whanau, and to contribute to GDP in the area long-term. Although to discuss procurement of engineering and construction services is premature and not a resource management issue, it would be hoped that local whanau may benefit somehow should a development on the 17.3ha lot eventuate. There should also be the potential for iwi involvement in pest control and conservation efforts in the riparian and planting restoration areas, as there is a relevant skillset. 1.6  
1.7

Comments pertaining to possible conditions for future development of the described allotment:

- In order to achieve an overall improvement in the ecological health of the land area, significant efforts will be required with intensive and ongoing weed control. The hillside and valley have been left to deteriorate with widespread coverage of noxious weeds. As part of any development for residential purposes (regardless of the specific zoning), weed control for perpetuity will be necessary to enable establishment and ongoing success of ‘ecosystem protection areas’ and riparian plantings. We would 1.8  
1.9

## NGA MAUNGA WHAKAHII O KAIPARA

P | 09 420 8410 ~ E | admin@kaiparamoana.com  
A | 5 Rere place, Parakai , 0830, Aotearoa NZ



# KAIPARA

need to be satisfied, through this plan change assessment process, that Council and current and future landowners can be legally bound to achieve this and that the monitoring is privately funded.

1.9 cont.

- It is requested that when devising consent conditions about ground disturbance protocols and potential archaeological discoveries, we are given the opportunity to review what is proposed.
- It is asserted in the application that site-specific erosion and sediment controls consistent with Auckland Council's GD05 will be sufficient to protect the surrounding environment during bulk earthworks. If detailed design of this will be undertaken for resource consent applications, it is requested that we have the opportunity to review what measures are proposed. Clays are a predominant soil type in the area and its ongoing disturbance has led to irreversible impacts on downstream aquatic and marine environments. There are many examples in recent years where developers gave assurance that improvements in erosion and sediment control will make effects negligible. This does not happen in the high rainfall environment and the degradation continues to come. This is evidenced by the choking of waterways around the Kaipara harbour.

1.10

1.11

We would also like to take this opportunity to comment on a remark in Civix's Assessment of Environmental Effects document – specifically on Page 34. It says that in October 2024 an attempt was made to physically visit an office of Ngati Whatua o Kaipara, and presumably this was the Nga Maunga Whakahii office at 5 Rere Place in Parakai. At that time, no staff were present in that location, however have been working there since. Between then and receiving the public notice (in March 2026) from Auckland Council about proposed private Plan Change 125 we have not been consulted by the applicant.

In summary, we would not have an objection to this proposal, providing it is amended accordingly (i.e. suitably considering all of the matters above). We wish to have the opportunity to be heard at a Council hearing regarding this application. We are not a trade competitor of the applicant. If you have any questions about our feedback on the Plan Change proposal, please do not hesitate to get in touch with Resource Management Services of the Trust: [tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com](mailto:tetaritaiao@kaiparamoana.com)

Nāku iti noa, nā,

*Shona Oliver*

Kaiwhakahaere Te Tari Taiao  
Nga Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Development Trust

## NGA MAUNGA WHAKAHII O KAIPARA

P | 09 420 8410 ~ E | [admin@kaiparamoana.com](mailto:admin@kaiparamoana.com)  
A | 5 Rere place, Parakai, 0830, Aotearoa NZ

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of a submission under clause 6 of the First Schedule to the RMA on Plan Change 125 – 40 Mahi Road, Helensville

**SUBMISSION ON NOTIFIED PROPOSAL FOR PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 125 TO THE AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN (OPERATIVE IN PART)**

To: Auckland Council

**Name of submitter:** Auckland Council  
Contact: Craig Cairncross

Address for service: Auckland Council  
135 Albert Street  
Private Bag 92300  
Auckland 1142

**INTRODUCTION**

1. This is a submission on Private Plan Change 125: 40 Mahi Road, Helensville (**PPC125**) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (**AUP**) by Hounslow Holdings Ltd.
2. PPC125 proposes to rezone approximately 17.37 hectares of land from Future Urban Zone (**FUZ**) and Rural – Countryside Living Zone (**CLZ**) to a mix of Residential – Single House Zone (**SHZ**), Residential – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone (**MHSZ**), and Rural – Countryside Living Zone in the AUP.
3. This submission by the Council in its capacity as submitter (**ACS**) relates to PPC125 in its entirety.
4. ACS could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

**THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF THE PROPOSAL THE SUBMISSION RELATES TO**

5. The submission relates to the plan change in its entirety.

**GENERAL REASONS FOR THE SUBMISSION**

6. ACS is concerned that the proposed zoning is not the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA, due to lack of certainty that downstream flood risks can be

appropriately managed, and timing of infrastructure prerequisites identified in the Auckland Future Development Strategy 2023-2053 (**FDS**).

7. ACS opposes the plan change, unless the matters raised in this submission are addressed.

#### **Strategic context**

8. Future urban areas, such as the PPC125 area, play a critical role in Auckland's growth. The Council supports the future urbanisation of land within Helensville South to provide for growth in northwest Auckland. The purpose of the request is broadly recognised as providing for efficient use of FUZ land to provide for residential activities to meet demand.
9. However, there are a number of aspects to PPC125 that are of concern to ACS to the extent that ACS opposes the plan change in its entirety and seeks that if approved, the matters raised in the submission are addressed.
10. Based on ACS's review of the plan change information, ACS' broad concerns with PPC125 are as follows:
  - a. It does not give effect to Part 2 of the RMA and in particular sustainable management of natural and physical resources.
  - b. It does not give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (updated May 2022) (**NPS-UD**) expectations of a well-functioning urban environment.
  - c. It does not give effect to key objectives and policies of Chapters B2 Urban Growth and Form, B3 Infrastructure, Transport and Energy, and B10 Environmental Risk of the Regional Policy Statement (**RPS**) of the AUP.
  - d. The sequencing of development is not consistent with the Future Development Strategy (**FDS**).
  - e. If PPC125 is approved, ACS requests the following be addressed:
    - precinct provisions to cover any timing or funding issues affecting bulk wastewater and water servicing
    - precinct provisions needed to ensure integrated land use and infrastructure and implementation of the Stormwater Management Plan outcomes
    - uncertainty of information to demonstrate that downstream flood risks will not be exacerbated
    - application of Stormwater Management Area Flow 1 Control to the urban zoned land; and
    - deletion of the Subdivision Variation Control from the SHZ.
11. The above matters are discussed in more detail below and in **Attachment 1** to this submission.

#### **Infrastructure prerequisites**

12. The NPS-UD and RPS Chapters B2 and B3 of the AUP contain objectives and policies that place strong emphasis on the importance of ensuring the integration of infrastructure with land use / urbanisation. Examples of these provisions include:
  - a. Objective 6 of the NPS-UD requires local authority decisions on urban development that affect urban environments to be "Integrated with infrastructure planning and funding decisions".
  - b. The range of RPS provisions in chapters B2 and B3 that address the need for the integration of infrastructure provisions, planning and funding with land use, and the timely, efficient, and adequate provision of infrastructure, including B2.2.1(1); B2.2.1(5)(a); B2.2.2(3); B2.2.2(4) and (7)(c); B3.2.1(1); B3.2.1(5). For example, Policy B2.2.2(7) enables rezoning of land zoned future urban zone *'to accommodate urban growth in ways that contribute to a well functioning urban environment and that do all of the following ....(c) Integrate with the provision of infrastructure.'*
13. Auckland Council adopted the FDS in November 2023, replacing the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (2017). The FDS meets the intent behind the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and focuses on the long-term future of Tāmaki Makaurau. A key component of the FDS is to integrate long-term land use and infrastructure planning while meeting future climate, environmental, population, housing and employment needs.
14. The FDS introduces infrastructure prerequisites, linked to the development readiness of areas. This is to ensure that bulk infrastructure for development is well-coordinated and can provide a safe, sustainable environment on which communities can be based. The FDS identifies the timing for Helensville Area 1, including the plan change area, with live zoning not to happen before 2035+. The infrastructure prerequisites for the Helensville area to support full build out are:
  - a. Helensville Wastewater Treatment Plant upgrade; and
  - b. Helensville Water Treatment Plant upgrade.
15. ACS understands that Watercare is concerned that there is currently no capacity within the Helensville Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) or the Water Treatment Plant (WTP) to service growth within the Helensville Stage 1 FUZ. Unanticipated growth has the potential to impact Watercare's ability to deliver its planned infrastructure programme or result in reprioritisation or reallocation of funding set out in the Asset Management Plan or result in constraints to growth in existing live zoned areas.
16. The Helensville Water Supply Scheme Upgrade will provide for the anticipated growth within the existing live zoned areas and the FUZ and projects are funded in Watercare's current Asset Management Plan (AMP). However, the timing is subject to confirmation of the Helensville water take consent, which is due for renewal in 2026. Water supply servicing for the PPC area cannot be supported by the public water supply network until the Helensville Water Supply Scheme is completed and commissioned, which is not expected before 2028+.
17. The Helensville WWTP has recently been upgraded to accommodate medium to long term growth based on the Council growth projection at the time of planning. However, due to limitations associated with the existing discharge consent, capacity to service the PPC is currently constrained. A new discharge consent application is expected to be lodged in early 2027.

18. As the future discharge parameters for the WWTP are unknown at this stage there is some uncertainty that servicing growth out of sequence with the FDS is feasible. Dependent on the outcome of the discharge consent renewal, a further upgrade to the Helensville WWTP post renewal of the discharge consent may be required to support growth. Therefore, wastewater servicing for the PPC area cannot be supported by the public wastewater network until the Helensville WWTP discharge consent renewal process, and any associate WWTP upgrades, is completed.
19. The recent Environment Court decision in *Arvida Limited vs Auckland Council*<sup>1</sup> highlights the importance of the FDS and infrastructure prerequisites when considering plan changes .
20. It is considered technically feasible to service the PPC area by 2028+ for bulk water supply and potentially longer (subject to the discharge consent renewal) for bulk wastewater. Accordingly, the additional demand anticipated from the PPC land can be accommodated by the future upgrades in the short to medium term. However, the timing is uncertain.
21. If the plan change is approved, ACS considers precinct provisions are necessary to cover any timing or funding issues affecting bulk wastewater and water servicing. Precinct provisions would ensure that bulk water and wastewater servicing is integrated with development, particularly regarding the uncertainty around the WWTP upgrade requirements.

#### **Flooding and stormwater**

22. The NPS-UD and RPS Chapters B2 and B10 of the AUP (including Plan Change 120 amendments) contain objectives and policies that place strong emphasis on the need to have regard to the likely current and future effects of climate change, such as increasing flood risk. Examples of these provisions include:
  - a. Policy 1(f) and Policy 6 of the NPS-UD requires planning decisions to contribute to well-functioning urban environments to be resilient to and have regard to the likely current and future effects of climate change.
  - b. The range of RPS provisions in chapters B2 and B10 that address the need to avoid or mitigate the risks from natural hazards such as flooding, including B2.2.1(1); B2.2.1(5)(c); B2.2.2(3); and B2.2.2(7)(f); B10.2.1(3); B10.2.2(2); B10.2.2(4), (6) and (9A). For example, Policy B2.2.2(7) is to enable rezoning of land zoned future urban *'to accommodate urban growth in ways that contribute to a well-functioning urban environment and that do all of the following: ....(f) avoid natural hazard risks where the risks are significant or manage natural hazard risks where the risks are tolerable or acceptable.'*
23. Supporting technical reports for the PPC include a Flood Modelling Methodology and Stormwater Management Plan (**SMP**). Key concerns relate to the potential of increased flood risks to downstream properties and infrastructure; as well as ensuring that the stormwater management approach proposed will be implemented.
24. On 3 November 2025, the Council notified Plan Change 120 introducing a new risk management framework to respond to the level of risk associated with natural hazards, such as flooding. All subdivision, use and development is required to avoid creating or

---

<sup>1</sup> Arvida Limited vs Auckland Council [2026] NZEnvC 049.

worsening natural hazard risks on other properties, infrastructure or the environment. The greater the risks from natural hazards, the more stringent the controls – where there is significant risk new development is to be avoided.

25. The PPC area drains north to the Awaroa River, which is known to have significant flooding issues. Currently, there are residential properties, public roads and public open space areas downstream of the plan change area which intersect the published 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (**AEP**) floodplain. The published Council's flood maps indicate areas of High and Very High Flood Hazard downstream of the PPC area, noting that not all existing built environment is covered by the mapping extents. Therefore, stormwater discharges need to be managed effectively to ensure downstream flooding is not exacerbated.
26. The SMP identifies that the potential increases in flood hazards and risks will be managed by detention of the 1% AEP event within a communal wetland. However, the SMP and the supporting flood modelling are ambiguous on whether this is required for future development under the proposed plan change or not. Furthermore, the flood model has not been peer reviewed and the associated flood risk assessment lacks the necessary detail to demonstrate the potential effects on flooding can be successfully managed at the resource consent stage. Healthy Waters and Flood Resilience Department (**HWFR**) raised concerns through the clause 23 process regarding inaccuracies (including not accounting for development of housing areas to the north of the plan change area) and the need for peer review.
27. ACS is concerned that the potential impacts of flooding have not been adequately assessed by the applicant. This includes assessing the appropriateness of 1% AEP detention, to mitigate the potential increases in downstream flood hazards and risks, in a way that demonstrates its implementation will not lead to greater flood impacts due to coinciding of peak flows.
28. Relying on the resource consent stage to address flood related concerns is not considered acceptable because it is necessary to demonstrate that potential flooding effects can be appropriately managed at the plan change stage.
29. The SMP applies the Stormwater Management Area Flow 1 (SMAF1) hydrology mitigation requirements, and also applies water quality treatment for all impervious surfaces. ACS supports this. However, there are no corresponding plan provisions in the AUP to support these outcomes. For example, applying the SMAF Control layer would ensure the requirements for hydrology mitigation are applied to the new urban zones.
30. The SMP outlines the treatment of all impervious areas by water quality device (inert roofing material, communal scale wetland for public roads). While the approach is consistent with the advice of HWFR, without appropriate plan provisions there is a real risk that stormwater quality treatment will not be implemented. For example, the SMP includes use of inert building materials but there is no way of requiring this without precinct provisions.
31. The SMP indicates that more detailed SMPs will be provided at the time of future resource consent applications, allowing stormwater and flood mitigation outcomes to be integrated into the detailed design. However, in the absence of plan provisions, there is no certainty

that these outcomes will be delivered. Reliance on the Stormwater Network Discharge Consent (NDC) alone is insufficient as there is a risk that the SMP may not be adopted under the NDC at the time of resource consent, or the applicant may seek approval through a private stormwater discharge consent. In these circumstances, the stormwater and flood risk outcomes relied upon to support the plan change may not be achieved. Applying the SMAF control and precinct provisions for stormwater and flood risk is necessary to ensure these matters are appropriately addressed at the time of development.

#### **Subdivision Variation Control**

32. A Subdivision Variation Control (**SVC**) applies to the operative CSLZ within the plan change area, which identifies the land as a receiver site for transferable rural sites subdivision. PPC125 does not propose any changes to the SVC, but does propose to rezone some portions of CSLZ to SHZ across the plan change area.
33. ACS seeks that the SVC be deleted from all areas proposed to be rezoned from CSLZ to SHZ to align it with the intention of the transferable rural sites provisions.

#### **DECISION SOUGHT**

34. ACS's position is that, unless the issues raised in this submission are properly addressed, it seeks the following relief:
- a. The primary relief sought by ACS is for the Panel to decline PC125 in its entirety, unless the matters raised in this submission are addressed.
  - b. Without limiting its primary relief, ACS seeks the following decisions if the plan change is approved as set out in Appendix 1 and summarised as follows:
    - i. Apply the SMAF 1 Control (Map) to the urban zones proposed by PC125.
    - ii. Apply a precinct to the urban zones proposed by PC125 to include precinct provisions that ensure:
      1. Timing of development and subdivision is aligned with the availability of water and wastewater services.
      2. Water quality treatment for all impervious surfaces is applied consistent with the SMP.
    - iii. Such further, other, or consequential relief, including in relation to PC125 explanatory text, objectives, policies, activity table, standards, matters of discretion, assessment criteria, special information requirements, and maps/plans that reflects or responds to the reasons for this submission.
35. ACS is willing and able to work through the matters raised in this submission with the applicant

**APPEARANCES AT THE HEARING**

36. ACS wishes to be heard in support of its submission.

37. If others make a similar submission, ACS will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

DATED 14 April 2026

On behalf of Auckland Council as submitter:



---

Celia Davison, Manager Planning Central -South

Address for service:

Craig Cairncross

Email: [Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](mailto:Craig.Cairncross@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz)

Telephone: 09 301 0101

Postal address:

Auckland Council

135 Albert Street

Private Bag 92300

Auckland 1142

Attachment 1

Issue/Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for submission	Decision requested
Overall	Oppose	ACS is concerned about the lack of certainty that downstream flood risks will be appropriately managed, and timing of infrastructure prerequisites identified in the Auckland Future Development Strategy 2023-2053	Decline the plan change in its entirety, unless the matters raised in this submission are addressed.
Precinct	Oppose	The plan change is for zoning changes only and does not include a precinct, which would enable the concerns about infrastructure timing and stormwater management to be addressed.	Include a precinct over the urban zones with detailed precinct provisions to address concerns of the submission: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precinct description</li> <li>• Objectives and policies</li> <li>• Activity table</li> <li>• Standard for water and wastewater servicing</li> <li>• Standard for stormwater quality treatment.</li> <li>• Matters of discretion and assessment criteria</li> </ul>
Water supply	Oppose	<p>Bulk water supply will not be available until 2028+. ACS seeks precinct provisions to clarify that the Helensville Water Supply Scheme must be completed and commissioned prior to an application for subdivision being lodged and/or construction of a dwelling occurs.</p> <p>The Helensville Waste Water Treatment Plant does not have capacity to service the PPC area until the discharge consent is renewed.</p>	<p>Include precinct provisions to require bulk water supply and wastewater to be completed and commissioned prior to an application for subdivision being lodged and/or construction of a dwelling occurs or a resource consent is required as a non-complying activity.</p> <p>Provisions to be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert text in Precinct description to recognise bulk water supply and wastewater constraints.</li> </ul>

2.1

2.2

2.3

Issue/Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for submission	Decision requested
		<p>This is particularly important as Helensville Stage 1 FUZ is not identified by the FDS as ready for development until 2035+. ACS is concerned that out of sequence developments can impact on the delivery of Watercare’s overall works programme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert objectives and policies that ensures subdivision and development is aligned with the availability of water supply and wastewater.</li> <li>• Insert Activity Table rules to identify non compliance with the water supply and wastewater standard as a non-complying activity.</li> <li>• Insert Standard to require bulk water supply and wastewater to be completed and commissioned prior to subdivision or development.</li> <li>• Include a special information requirement to address water supply requirements.</li> </ul>
<p>Integration of land use and infrastructure</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Subdivision and development must be integrated and sequenced with the delivery of infrastructure by not enabling it to occur in advance of operational transport, water and wastewater infrastructure.</p>	<p>Insert Objective into a precinct as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Subdivision and development is coordinated and does not occur in advance of the availability of operational infrastructure including bulk water supply, wastewater and stormwater services.</li> </ol> <p>Or words to this effect</p>
<p>Water and wastewater</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>ACS seeks amendments to ensure integration of land use with the provision of water supply and wastewater (including bulk services) prior to subdivision and/or construction of dwellings.</p>	<p>Insert policies into a precinct as follows:</p> <p><i>Avoid subdivision, use and development prior to the availability of operational bulk water supply, wastewater, and stormwater to service development.</i></p>

2.3 cont.

2.4

2.5

Issue/Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for submission	Decision requested
			<p>Insert Standard as follows:</p> <p><i>(1) Bulk water supply and wastewater infrastructure required for servicing of all development within the Precinct must be completed and commissioned:</i></p> <p><i>(a) in the case of subdivision, prior to release of Resource Management Act 1991 section 224(c) certificate for any residential lots; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) in the case of land use only, prior to the construction of any dwelling(s) or residential activities.</i></p> <p>Or words to this effect.</p>
Stormwater	Oppose	Application of Stormwater Management Area Flow 1 requirements for hydrology mitigation as identified in the SMP should be implemented by inserting the SMAF1 Control map over the urban zones.	Insert the SMAF1 Control Map over the proposed urban zones (MHS and SHZ).
Stormwater	Oppose	There are no Auckland-wide provisions within the AUP that address stormwater quality treatment. Therefore it is appropriate to include precinct provisions to set out the requirements to treat 100% of impervious surfaces in accordance with the SMP.	<p>Include precinct provisions to require stormwater quality treatment for all impervious surfaces.</p> <p>Provisions to be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert text in Precinct description to recognise stormwater quality treatment is required.</li> <li>• Insert objectives and policies that ensures stormwater quality treatment is achieved for all impervious surfaces.</li> <li>• Insert Standard to require stormwater quality treatment of all impervious</li> </ul>

2.5 cont.

2.6

2.7

Issue/Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for submission	Decision requested
			<p>surfaces consistent with the approved SMP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert restricted discretionary matters of discretion and assessment criteria for development that does not comply with stormwater standard.</li> </ul>
Flooding	Oppose	<p>The flood modelling information supporting PPC125 has inaccuracies, has not been peer reviewed and is not considered sufficiently robust to demonstrate that downstream flood hazards (including High and Very High) and risks will not be exacerbated by development in the plan change area.</p> <p>Due to the uncertainty of flooding information supporting PPC125, ACS supports a precautionary approach consistent with RPS Policy B10.2.2(6). If the plan change is approved ACS seeks additional precinct provisions to ensure that potential flooding risks are considered at the time of subdivision or development.</p>	<p>Insert precinct provisions that require a flood hazard assessment at the time of subdivision or development, whichever comes first.</p> <p>Provisions to be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precinct description identifying precautionary approach to downstream flooding risk.</li> <li>• Objective and policy outlining precautionary approach to ensure downstream flood risks are avoided.</li> <li>• Rule identifying non-compliance with flood standard as a non-complying activity.</li> <li>• Standard requiring flood hazard modelling to demonstrate downstream flood effects will be avoided.</li> <li>• Special information requirement detailing the flood hazard assessment requirements.</li> </ul>
Subdivision Variation Control	Oppose in part	The subdivision variation control at this site applies to CSLZ as a receiver for transferable rural subdivision sites and is not an appropriate control for the SHZ.	Delete the subdivision variation control from areas of CSLZ to be rezoned SHZ.

2.7 cont.

2.8

2.9

## SUBMISSION ON A NOTIFIED PROPOSAL FOR POLICY STATEMENT OR PLAN, CHANGE OR VARIATION

### CLAUSE 6 OF SCHEDULE 1, RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

**To:** Auckland Council  
Private Bag 92300  
Victoria Street West  
Auckland 1142  
[unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](mailto:unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz)

**Plan change reference:** Private Plan Change 125 - Mahi Road, Helensville

**Name of submitter:** Foundry Developments Limited

#### Introduction

1. This is a submission on an application for Private Plan Change 125 (“**PC125**”) to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (“**AUP**”) by Hounslow Holdings Limited (“**Applicant**”).
2. The Applicant proposes to rezone land at 40 Mahi Road, Helensville from Future Urban Zone and Rural – Countryside Living to Residential – Single House Zone, Residential – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone, and Rural – Countryside Living Zone.
3. Foundry Developments Limited (“**Foundry**”) (formerly Cabra Developments Limited) is a land development company. Foundry specialises in greenfield subdivision within the western and northern parts of the Auckland region.
4. Foundry own the northern adjacent property at 19 Kanono Way, Helensville and obtained resource consent for 64 residential lots, three new roads and five commonly owned access lots at in August 2025 (BUN60434449). Foundry also obtained resource consent to develop 28 residential lots at 47 Urumaraki Avenue, Helensville in June 2023 (BUN60409221), to the east of the proposed plan change. Both sites are zoned Residential – Single House Zone.
5. Foundry is not a trade competitor for the purposes of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“**RMA**”).

#### Reason for Submission

6. Foundry **supports** the plan change as notified.
7. However, Foundry reserves the right to review additional information prepared by the Applicant and/or by specialists for or on behalf of Auckland Council. Foundry

also reserves the right to review changes to the plan change proposal as a result of the above.

#### Watercare Consultation

8. Watercare have advised there is currently insufficient capacity to meet the water demand requirements of the plan change area. In the letter dated 24 August 2024, Watercare states that there is very limited capacity in the existing Helensville Water Treatment Plant (“**WTP**”). An additional water source to service Future Urban Areas (“**FUA**”) in Helensville (which includes the plan change area) also needs to be confirmed. Watercare indicates that servicing of the plan change area is not likely to occur until 2035+.
9. Watercare does not support PC125 given the above constraints. Watercare also do not support the proposal in principle as the plan change is out of sequence with the Future Development Strategy 2023-2053 (“**FDS**”), which foreshadows this FUA being developed in 2035.
10. Foundry considers that the servicing constraints outlined above are not justifiable grounds for opposing PC125. This is because the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (“**NPS-UD**”) provides for out of sequence development where alternative servicing arrangements can be provided at no cost to the Council. This is the case here.

#### Water Servicing Proposal

11. PC125 proposes alternative water servicing arrangements. On-lot potable water supply via water tanks are proposed. This can occur without having an impact on Watercare’s planned water infrastructure investment and without undermining the spatial strategy or funding priorities set out in the FDS.
12. In the absence of a Precinct, development will be assessed against the AUP zone provisions (Chapters H3, H4 and H19) and the urban subdivision provisions. All subdivision activities require resource consent based on an extensive set of considerations under Chapter E38 of the AUP. In relation to servicing and where there is no connection to the water supply network, the following provisions are relevant:
  - Policy E38.3(21)(c) which requires sites capable of containing a building, in areas with no reticulated water supply, stormwater or wastewater network, to be of a size and shape that provides for potable water.

- Standard E38.6.3(1)(c) which requires that lots are designed so that provision can be made for water supply.
  - Assessment criterion E38.8.2(6)(a)(ii) and (7)(b) require an assessment of the appropriate provision of infrastructure.
13. The rural (Countryside Living) lots will be of a size and shape that can be serviced by on-site water tanks noting there is no requirement in the AUP for these lots to be serviced by the public network, and this service arrangement is typical in this zone.
  14. Residential-zoned lots can be designed to be serviced by on-site water tanks either on a permanent basis, or until such time that public water supply is available. Development can be designed and/or staged accordingly in order to satisfy policy E38.3(21)(c) and the lower order provisions.
  15. This approach provides housing choice and flexibility.
  16. Ultimately Watercare can decide when or whether to approve water supply connections, ensuring that no additional demand is placed on the Helensville WTP until it is sufficiently upgraded or an alternative water source is provided. There are suitable alternatives in the meantime.

#### NPS-UD

17. The NPS-UD sits at the top tier of the relevant policy planning hierarchy as a matter to which the Council must have regard to under s74(1)(ea). The NPS-UD was prepared and approved under Part 5 of the RMA which governs national direction.
18. The NPS-UD requires responsive planning, particularly where a plan change will provide for significant development capacity that is not in sequence with planned land release and will contribute to well-functioning environments. PC125 is consistent with Objective 6(c), Policy 6(c) and Policy 8 of the NPS-UD as:
  - a) The proposal provides for unrealised development capacity in the range of 11-14 dwellings per hectare (approximately 110 dwellings) in the Helensville Stage 1 FUA, being around 10% of the total number of dwellings anticipated in Stage 1. In this location and having regard to the small population of Helensville, this is considered a material contribution to the FUA.
  - b) The plan change area can be serviced by the public wastewater network. There are options available for the provision of water supply in advance of public upgrades and service connections.

- c) The proposal will contribute to a well-functioning environment. In accordance with Policy 1 the proposal will:
- be contiguous with existing live-zoned land;
  - have good accessibility between housing, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public transport. The site is located in reasonable proximity to the Helensville town centre and other services and facilities such as Kaipara College and Helensville Primary School. There are several reserves in proximity to the site, including Rautawhiri Park;
  - provide a variety of zones and therefore lot sizes and housing typologies to meet the needs of different households, with smaller lots providing more affordable options;
  - be resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change as lots will be located on geotechnically stable land outside of flood plains; and
  - be well-connected with the southern-most point of the plan change area being a 2.2km trip to Commercial Road, the main street in Helensville. This distance is comparable to trips measured from existing live zoned residential areas to the main street. The nearest bus stop is located 450m to the west provides connections to Westgate (a planned rapid transit stop).

#### FDS

19. The FDS sits at the lowest tier of the policy planning hierarchy, as a matter to which the Council shall 'have regard to' under s74(2)(b). The FDS is a growth document that does not hold statutory weight – while it is required by the NPS-UD it has not been through a Schedule 1 process under the RMA and has not been public scrutinized or tested accordingly.
20. The FDS anticipates live zoning of the Helensville Stage 1 FUA being the closest future growth area to the town centre, from 2035. Watercare's correspondence advises that the plan change area can be serviced by the public water supply network following the upgrade to the WTP which is programmed to align with this date.
21. The proposal provides an alternative water supply solution to enable development ahead of the 2035 sequencing at no cost to Council or Watercare, consistent with Appendix 6 of the FDS. The proposal is not considered to undermine the purpose of the FDS, nor Watercare's strategic planning.

**Relief Sought**

22. Foundry seeks that the PC125 is approved as notified.

3.1

23. Foundry wishes to be heard in support of its submission. If others make a similar submission, the Submitter would consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

**DATED** at Auckland this 14<sup>th</sup> day of **April 2026**.

**Signature:**



---

Duncan Unsworth  
Chief Executive Officer  
Foundry Developments Limited

**Address for Service:**  
Forme Planning Ltd  
Suite 203, Achilles House  
8 Commerce Street  
Auckland 1010  
[penny@formeplanning.co.nz](mailto:penny@formeplanning.co.nz)