

From: [Chris Khouri](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Kumeū Secondary School NoR Lodgement - Minister of Education
Date: Wednesday, 1 April 2026 3:35:00 pm
Attachments: [Kumeū Secondary NoR - 2nd s92 letter.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Good afternoon Chris & Gemma,

Please find the attached s92 requests, following review of the 1st s92 response.

Any queries, feel free to discuss.

Kind regards,

Chris Khouri / Policy Planner
Regional, North, West & Islands Planning
Planning & Resource Consents
Auckland Council, Level 16, 135 Albert Street, Auckland Central
Visit our website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz



*Together we can create an
Auckland we can
all be proud of.*

From: Chris Horne <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, 19 March 2026 3:29 pm
To: Chris Khouri <chris.khouri@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>; Gemma Hayes <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Peter Vari <[REDACTED]>; Rod Aros Aravena <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Kumeū Secondary School NoR Lodgement - Minister of Education

Hi Chris

Further to the Minister's further information response yesterday, a change has been made to the response table in relation to point A3.

Auckland Transport – Advisory comments on designation conditions			
#	Provision	Comment/Recommendation	
A3	Condition 4: On-Site Car Parking and Pick Up and Drop Off	AT recommends the deletion of Condition 4 in its entirety. The draft conditions already state that the standard conditions for all Minister of Education (which include a car parking condition) do not apply. In addition, AT supports on-site PUDO.	The Requiring authority prefers to keep a condition clarifying there is no specific on-site car parking or PUDO minimum standards and that this will be addressed in outline plans to avoid confusion and ensure clarity for plan users. However, as worded it doesn't make sense, so the condition should be amended to the following: <u><i>There are no onsite car parking or pick up and drop off facility conditions for this designation. Car parking and pick up and drop off will be determined for each development phase increasing teaching space numbers and will be addressed in the outline plan for that phase.</i></u>

Can you please replace the previous version of the response table with this one.

Thanks

Chris Horne
Director



1st April 2026

Gemma Hayes
Principal Planning Advisor – Resource Management and Planning
School Property
Ministry of Education

Dear Gemma,

Request for further information in accordance with section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Notice of requirement: Kumeū Secondary New Site - D002497.01

I am writing with respect to the notice of requirement described above.

After completing a preliminary assessment of the notice of requirement documents, it is considered that further information is required to enable an adequate analysis of the proposal, its effects on the environment and the way in which any adverse effects on the environment may be mitigated.

The information requested below will enable the council to undertake a full and proper assessment of the notice of requirement and provide a recommendation on it. The information requests below are in response to the first s92 letter sent on 13/02/2026.

Under section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991, I request the following further information:

Transport / Traffic

Item 1

1. Please provide further analysis to justify the mode share (all modes) assumed in the assessment for this proposed school.

Reason/s for request:

- *This is necessary as the mode share will influence the traffic generation, including traffic traveling through the SH16 intersections and potential traffic at the school gate.*
- *This s92 query was in relation to the mode share of public transport, cycling, and walking. The s92 response focused on public transport.*
- *There is no certainty as to the future public transport in the area. Therefore, improvements such as rapid transit or other bus service improvements cannot be assumed. As a result, public transport could remain relatively limited. Therefore, due to the uncertainty of future public transport provision, it is important to understand the mode share in locations where there is limited public transport.*
- *It is acknowledged that the mode share used is an average across different schools in different locations. However, there is no information on the schools that were used to derive the average mode share and thus a bias of schools in urban areas where public transport or walk and cycling is more realistic could affect the assumed average mode share.*
- *It is noted that the spreadsheet referenced in response to Item 3 states that the public transport mode share of existing schools is only 12.9% for secondary schools in the Auckland Region. Public Transport in rural areas is up to 36%; however, this will be due to school buses collecting students*

and taking them to and from school. There is no commitment of school buses for the proposed school.

- *The proposed school has a large catchment area. Therefore, it would not necessarily be feasible or practical for students to walk or cycle from much of the wider area that the school is intended to serve.*

Item 2

2. Please provide justification for the assumed 30% public transport mode share.

Reason/s for request:

- *Refer to Item 1. There is no certainty on improvements to public transport that would service this particular area.*
- *The spreadsheet referenced in response to Item 3 indicates that the public transport mode share for secondary schools in Auckland is 12.9% and for primary schools 8.7%. This is significantly lower than the assumed 30%.*
- *A lower public transport mode share not only affects the operation of the SH16 intersections but also the operation of the transport network in the vicinity of the school gate(s). Therefore, it is important that a realistic mode share is considered in the assessment.*

Item 3

3. Please provide further justification that 1.4 students per car is appropriate, when the average occupancy for secondary schools is 1.26 and the primary school is 1.4.

Additional note:

- *It is acknowledged that there is scope for siblings to ride share when attending both the primary and secondary schools.*

Item 4

4. a) Please confirm how the count data has been converted to hourly flows.

b) Please provide details as to how the school related traffic over the assumed 30-minute period has been applied to the SIDRA modelling, noting that spreading the school traffic (assumed to occur over 30 minutes) over a 60-minute period would result in under reporting potential traffic affects.

Reason/s for request:

- *The traffic surveys only cover a half-hour period. SIDRA usually models hour periods.*
- *Furthermore, the school peak is assumed to be over a 30-minute period.*
- *Please refer to Item 12 in relation to the finish time for the secondary school, as this impacts on the modelled periods.*

Item 5

5. a) Please update the modelling for the SH16 intersections with more appropriate right turn bay lengths.

b) Please update the modelling for the school site access and the Schoolside Road / Station Road intersection taking into account right turning bays on Station Road.

Reason/s for request:

- *The right turn bays on SH16 are modelled as 100m and 150m for the Trigg Road and the Station Road intersections, respectively. Whilst there may be these distances available for right turners to use taking into account the flush median, motorists in general will not travel the full length of the flush median unless there is queueing at the intersection. Modelling the right turn bays longer than is available / used will affect the modelling results. The right turn bays should be modelled at a more appropriate length.*
- *The modelling of the Station Road / Schoolside Road intersection does not include the right turn bay on Station Road. Whilst unlikely to affect the modelling results, the site layout should be reflected in the model layout. Similarly, the site access intersection modelled should take into consideration the flush median, if this would be present at the site access.*

Item 6

6. a) Please confirm that the 10% traffic growth has been applied, and if this has not been included, please update the traffic models to include this background growth.

b) Please update the traffic modelling to include the full 2,500 student roll.

Reason/s for request:

- *Traffic modelling output for the base case at the SH16 / Trigg Road and SH16 / Station Road intersections has been provided.*
- *It is noted that the ITA states that 10% background traffic growth has been applied to the base traffic volumes. However, this does not appear to be the case for the AM peak.*
- *It is noted that the ITA SIDRA model titles refer to a 1,500 school roll, whilst the ITA text refers to the modelling assessing the full 2,500 students.*
- *This information is required to understand the effects of the full 2,500 students including background traffic growth, as the full roll is not anticipated for some time.*

Item 8

8. Please correct the traffic distribution based on the table in the s92 response and review the traffic assignment to SH16 for traffic from Muriwai. Please update the traffic modelling accordingly.

Reason/s for request:

- *The table states that 11% arrive from Taupaki and 6% from Muriwai. Figure 13 of the ITA assigns 11% of trips to Trigg Road and 6% to Station Road. This is contradictory to the assessment of vehicle routes and traffic journey times presented in Figure 2.2 and 2.3 of the s92 response that indicates that Muriwai traffic would use Trigg Road and Taupaki traffic would use Station Road. Whilst not making a fundamental difference to the assessment, this should be corrected.*
- *It is noted that the travel time for Muriwai in Figure 2.3 is the same via SH16 as it is via the rural local roads. Therefore, this should be taken into account in the assignment of traffic.*
- *Traffic travelling to and from the south along SH16 has been split between Station Road and Trigg Road. The choice of route is likely to be influenced by the location of a PUDO facility and how entry and exit points to the facility would operate.*

Item 12

12. a) Please update the traffic assessment, including traffic modelling utilising the correct time period for the end of the secondary school day.

b) Please provide an assessment of the operation of the PUDO as per the original Item 12 request. This is needed to understand the potential effects on the operation of the road network and any measures that may be necessary to manage those effects.

Reason/s for request:

- *The response states that the PUDO operation would be more efficient if the secondary school finishes after the primary school. This contradicts the ITA that states that the secondary school would finish before the primary school (Section 6.1). Furthermore, the traffic analysis is based on the half hour period prior to the finish time of the primary school.*
- *The response does not provide an assessment of the PUDO taking into account the different characteristics of the morning and afternoon activities of picking up and dropping of students.*

Item 14

14. Please provide assessments of the effects of PUDO on the operation of the surrounding road network for:

- a) an on-site PUDO including options for how the PUDO may operate if it connects to Station Road and Trigg Road, e.g. in a one-way direction along the existing link between Station Road and Trigg Road or accessed just from Station Road or just from Trigg Road.
- b) off-site PUDO.

The assessment should identify measures that would be required to address those effects.

Reason/s for request:

- *The s92 response does not provide an assessment of the potential effects of PUDO on the operation of the transport network. The ITA and the s92 responses do not commit to providing an on-site PUDO. Should the proposed school ultimately rely on PUDO on the road network, the effects of this need to be considered at the designation stage so that those effects are understood and mitigation measures can be identified, as appropriate.*
- *The s92 responses indicate that a PUDO could be accessed solely from Station Road or via the lane that connects Station Road and Trigg Road. If an on-site PUDO is located within the existing internal lane, this could impact the distribution of traffic e.g. if the facility were to operate in a one-way direction (such as from Station Road to Trigg Road). This would impact the turning movements at the SH16 intersections.*

Item 15

15. Please provide further details as to how vehicles would be able to safely turn around either on Station Road or Trigg Road in the absence of an on-site PUDO.

Reason/s for request:

- *There is no commitment to provide an on-site PUDO, and therefore, should PUDO occur on the street, this will necessitate vehicles to potentially turn around on-street. Whilst there are options for*

motorists on Station Road using existing roads, there are no options on Trigg Road west of the existing school access point.

- *Turning around within the carriageway or using driveways is a potential safety hazard, particularly when there are school students present.*
- *The response does not address the matter of how vehicles would be able to turn around safely.*

Item 16

16. Please provide detail as to how the identified measures in the ITA will be delivered by the proposed designation conditions.

Reason/s for request:

- *Condition 6(c)(ii) relates to providing a summary of consultation with Auckland Transport in relation to transport measures. This does not ensure that the measures identified within the ITA would be provided.*

Recommendations / comments (non s92 matters)

Items 7, 9, 11, 18, 20

- Responses noted.

Item 10:

- Response noted. The proposal to discourage parking within the immediate area of the school will mean students park further afield.
- The proposed mitigation measures of introducing parking restrictions in the vicinity of the school are reliant on Auckland Transport making those changes.

Item 13:

- The response is acknowledged and it is noted that the modelling was for a worst-case scenario with all traffic using the facility.
- However, queuing within the PUDO will impact on its efficient operation and could impede vehicles accessing or exiting parking spaces, although this will be dependent on the design of the facility itself.

Item 17:

- Response noted.
- The indicated location for the pedestrian crossing has a limited pedestrian catchment for the existing residential area, but assuming that the FUZ area will develop over time this will extend the catchment to the south so this would accommodate trips from future residential areas to the south.

Item 19:

- MOE has advised that dedicated school buses are not proposed for the high school at this stage. This may change at later planning stages.
- Further information will need to be provided with the Outline Plan of Works (OPW) and associated Transport Assessment.
- Based on its experience with other similar schools, AT is of the view that it is likely that some school buses and associated bus stops will be required.

Item 21:

- Response noted.
- The existing cross-section on Station Road north of the school access is unlikely to be acceptable for the future cross-section of the proposed future upgrade if parking bays are proposed along the site frontage, as this creates safety conflicts between vehicles and cyclists. This would need to be determined at the time of the OPW.

Item 22:

- Accepted and closed.
- Please note that for 1 in 1000 year event, the PGA can be up to 0.2g which could affect the detailed liquefaction assessment and foundation design. This will be reviewed in detail during the detailed design phase to confirm the suitability of the adopted seismic parameters.

Advisory comments on ITA

#	Section / topic	Previous Comments (10 Feb 2026)	Further Comments (25 Mar 2026)
A1	Bus routes	The ITA (sections 3.2 and 7) suggest that AT should be requested to provide additional Route 123 buses at school start and finish times. The 123 bus route is an hourly service. AT notes that this route would only be useful for school pupils living at the west end of Kumeu, which is a small residential catchment. The number of pupils likely to use the service may not warrant additional services during off-peak times. If students use the 122 or 125 bus routes, AT has concerns about student safety. There is no pedestrian crossing across SH16 for students to safely access eastbound bus services.	AT has reviewed the Abley response and has no further comments.
A2	Station Road	AT supports frontage upgrades to Station Road as recommended in section 5.8 of the ITA. AT notes that the pedestrian and cycling infrastructure should be to standard at time of construction. AT also notes the critical role Station Road plays in servicing future growth in the Kumeū-Huapai portion of the north-west growth area. It will be important in providing improved traffic safety, and transport connectivity to the future rapid transit network, employment zones, and social infrastructure. Supporting Growth identified this as a potential arterial road for designation in the Indicative Business Case with a 24m wide corridor being the preferred alignment. The route was subsequently not identified as a priority for designation as part of the Supporting Growth work. However, Station Road remains part of the strategic transport network, and a 24m wide arterial is still the	MOE has noted these comments. AT reiterates the importance of planning the school access and PUDO arrangements so that they are future-proofed for the future transport environment.

#	Section / topic	Previous Comments (10 Feb 2026)	Further Comments (25 Mar 2026)
		envisaged future form. Any existing parking within the corridor may need to be removed in future and this needs to be taken into account in planning for the school.	

Advisory comments on designation conditions

We have also provided advisory comments on the designation conditions as set out in the table below. These are not further information requests but are provided to inform the applicant of AT's position on aspects of the designation conditions.

#	Provision(s)	Previous Comments / Recommendations (10 Feb 2026)	Further Comments / Recommendations (25 Mar 2026)
A3	Condition 4: On-Site Car Parking and Pick Up and Drop Off	<p>AT recommends the deletion of Condition 4 in its entirety. The draft conditions already state that the standard conditions for all Minister of Education (which include a car parking condition) do not apply.</p> <p>In addition, AT supports on-site PUDO.</p>	<p>AT does not support the alternative wording proposed by MOE in its response. The amended wording gives the impression that there are no conditions related to parking or PUDO. This is not correct.</p> <p>If a condition is to be included, the wording set out below would be acceptable to AT. This more consistent with section 3.38 of the NPS-UD which applies to car parking requirements in district plans. It also has the effect of confirming that the MOE standard parking condition does not apply.</p> <p>AT notes that s176A(3)(d) of the RMA requires an outline plan to show 'the vehicular access, circulation, and the provision for parking'.</p> <p>On-site parking <i>There are no conditions requiring a minimum number of car parks to be provided.</i></p>
A4	Condition 6: references to PUDO	<p>It is AT's view that PUDO to accommodate demand should be provided within the footprint of the designation. This is the most effective way of providing safe PUDO and minimising adverse effects on the adjoining transport network. It is also not clear why the school travel plan is</p>	<p>The response states that there is bus parking on-street for the primary school. There is no dedicated parking for a school bus, the bus stop on Station Road is opposite the school. This bus stop is designed for scheduled buses.</p> <p>Should school buses use this bus stop for school trips this would prevent scheduled</p>

#	Provision(s)	Previous Comments / Recommendations (10 Feb 2026)	Further Comments / Recommendations (25 Mar 2026)
		<p>referenced in Condition 6(b)(iii). The following amendments to Condition 6 are therefore recommended:</p> <p>Condition 6(a)(ii) <i>The general location of on-site parking areas (including <u>buses</u>, cars, cycle and scooter parks), and any on-site pick up and drop off areas if proposed.</i></p> <p>Condition 6(b)(iii) <i>On-site pick-up and drop-off (PUDO) area(s), if proposed, including ensuring their design <u>manages/accommodates demand (to the extent enabled by the School Travel Plan)</u>, including <u>and provides for</u> vehicular access, circulation, <u>and manoeuvring for cars and buses (if required)</u>.</i></p>	<p>services from using the stop. Should the proposed school have school buses to transport students to and from the school on a daily basis, an appropriate space would need to be provided for the buses either on street or on site. Whilst it is acknowledged that the exact type and size of facility would be determined at OPW stage, it should be demonstrated that provision for school buses is feasible.</p> <p><u>Please demonstrate how school buses could be accommodated on either Station Road or Triqq Road if school buses are required.</u></p> <p>MOE does not agree to the proposed changes.</p> <p>MOE advises that the school will determine any necessary provision for buses on-site, including circulation. For school trip buses, MOE suggests there is potential to share the bus parking provided on the road for the primary school. AT notes Mr Peake's advice that there is no dedicated on-street parking for a school bus.</p> <p>In response to the concerns raised, AT suggests that the conditions be modified as follows:</p> <p>Condition 6(a)(ii) <i>The general location of on-site parking areas (including <u>for buses if required</u>, cars, cycle and scooter parks), and any on-site pick up and drop off areas if proposed.</i></p> <p>Condition 6(b)(iii) <i>On-site pick-up and drop-off (PUDO) area(s), if proposed, including ensuring their design <u>manages/accommodates demand (to the extent enabled by the School Travel Plan)</u>, including <u>and provides for</u> vehicular access, circulation, <u>and manoeuvring for cars and buses (if required) <u>for buses</u></u>.</i></p>

#	Provision(s)	Previous Comments / Recommendations (10 Feb 2026)	Further Comments / Recommendations (25 Mar 2026)
			<p>The conditions do not require compliance with a specific heavy vehicle tracking curve and the school could propose circulation for buses which is tighter than otherwise required for public bus manoeuvring. The need for buses to access the site needs to be considered at the time the school is established. If the school requires on-site bus access to provide for its transport needs then the general location of any parking areas needs to be identified on the Design Concept Plan. The associated access and circulation needs to be addressed in the first Transport Assessment.</p> <p>AT remains of the view that PUDO to accommodate demand should be provided within the footprint of the designation. Some pick and drop off is likely to occur on Trigg Road and Station Road, if parking spaces are available. However, this should not be relied on and should not be the only facility.</p>
A5	Condition 6(b)(iv)(a)	<p>The recommended conditions do not require the Transport Assessment to consider the potential effects of the school on the safe and efficient operation of the surrounding transport network. Condition 6(b)(iv)(a) should therefore be amended as follows:</p> <p>Condition 6(b)(iv)(a) <i>Potential effects on the safe and efficient operation of <u>the surrounding transport network</u>, the proposed access points, school frontage and the internal school circulation.</i></p>	<p>The “surrounding transport network” could be more specifically defined. The MoE response states that the feasibility of the school site is determined at the designation stage with the outline plan focussing on the school design and interface with the surrounding road network.</p> <p>It is considered that the assessment has not sufficiently assessed the effects of the school on the adjacent road network. The responses indicate that these effects would be assessed at OPW stage. If the OPW is to focus on the internal design, then here is no certainty that the external effects on the adjacent transport network would be adequately addressed.</p> <p>MOE does not agree to the proposed changes. Rather MOE suggests that general school feasibility is determined at the designation stage, with subsequent outline plans focused on school design and the</p>

#	Provision(s)	Previous Comments / Recommendations (10 Feb 2026)	Further Comments / Recommendations (25 Mar 2026)
			<p>school interface with adjoining roads, along with any updates to the school travel plan.</p> <p>AT agrees that general school feasibility should be assessed at designation stage but is not yet satisfied that this has occurred. AT supports Mr Peake's requests for further information about the effect of the school on the transport network.</p> <p>AT maintains its position that further assessments of the traffic effects are warranted as the school develops and the surrounding transport network changes. MOE has suggested that the reference to the surrounding transport network is too wide and uncertain. AT accepts that this could be refined further and has discussed this with Mr Peake. This could be further defined as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Station Road between (and including) the intersection with SH16 through to Podgora Avenue;</i> • <i>Trigg Road between (and including) the intersection with SH16 to 150m south of the school access onto Trigg Road;</i> • <i>Schoolside Road for 150m from the intersection of Station Road; and</i> • <i>Podgora Avenue for 150m from the intersection of Station Road.</i> <p>In terms of immediate transport network considerations, AT also notes that the condition as currently worded (particularly 6(b)(iv)(a)) does not clearly require consideration of the effects of the location and design of the access points on the safe and efficient operation of the <u>adjacent</u> transport network. The reference to the safe and efficient operation of the school frontage is also unclear.</p>
A6	Condition 6(c)	AT supports the recognition of consultation and engagement with AT in this conditions.	MOE agrees with these changes. No additional comments.

#	Provision(s)	Previous Comments / Recommendations (10 Feb 2026)	Further Comments / Recommendations (25 Mar 2026)
		<p>However, additional wording is recommended to give more direction about the content of the engagement.</p> <p>Condition 6(c) <i>A summary of the consultation and engagement with Auckland Transport <u>recording agreements reached on the matters described below, and effects associated with the school on the adjacent existing and future transport network.</u> A copy of the draft Design Concept Plan and draft Transport Assessment prepared to support the Establishment Outline Plan shall be provided to Auckland Transport for the purposes of this consultation and engagement. <u>The specific transport matters to be considered and discussed include:</u></i></p> <p><i>(i) <u>Measures and treatments to ensure safe access is provided to the school for all transport modes</u></i></p> <p><i>(ii) <u>Measures and treatments to the adjoining road network, such as those included in Auckland Transport design standards which apply at the time of the preparation of the Establishment Outline Plan. These may include road widening, pedestrian and cycle facilities (crossings and paths), right turn bays, signs, road markings (e.g. No Stopping At All Times (NSAAT)), traffic management and calming measures to support forecast increases of traffic and travel modes that are attributed directly to</u></i></p>	

#	Provision(s)	Previous Comments / Recommendations (10 Feb 2026)	Further Comments / Recommendations (25 Mar 2026)
		<p><u>school traffic and transport;</u> <u>(iii) Bus access and the location of bus stops and shelters adjacent to the school.</u> <u>(iv) The provision of footpaths on pedestrian routes.</u></p>	
A7	Condition 6: Cycleway	<p>Providing safe separated cycle facilities along the Station Road frontage may require removal of current on-road carparks and a bus stop. AT recommends this should be covered by a condition as follows:</p> <p><u>Condition 6(b)(vi)</u> <u>If Station Road has not been constructed to Auckland Transport's urban road standard with separated walking and cycling facilities along the full school frontage at the time the first outline plan is submitted, the transport assessment shall detail how Station Road will be constructed to an urban road standard from the school boundary to the road centreline, unless any alternative standard is approved by the road controlling authority, prior to the school opening.</u></p>	<p>MOE agrees with these changes.</p> <p>No additional comments.</p>
A8	Condition 7: Subsequent Outline Plan of Works	<p>AT is of the view that an updated transport assessment should be provided for all increases in teaching spaces i.e. not only if the increase is six or more. It is important that ongoing assessment occurs parallel with increases in numbers of students. Condition 5 already satisfactorily addresses the types of works that do not require an outline plan. The following amendments to Condition 7 are therefore recommended:</p>	<p>AT accepts that similar conditions are included in the designations for Mangere College (4948) and Chapel Downs School (4912). However, that does not mean that it is an appropriate condition for this designation.</p> <p>Some designations require an assessment of on-site pick and drop off where there is an OPW which increases teaching spaces (4667 Trig Road, Whenuapai, 4668 Hobsonville Point Primary School, 4669 Primary School, Arohanui Special School, Northern Health School and ECE, 5064</p>

#	Provision(s)	Previous Comments / Recommendations (10 Feb 2026)	Further Comments / Recommendations (25 Mar 2026)
		<p>Subsequent Outline Plan of Works <i>Where any subsequent proposal arises that increases the number of teaching spaces by six or more, or modifies any vehicle access, the Requiring Authority shall submit an Outline Plan which includes the following information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>A Design Concept Plan for the site showing the matters set out in Condition 6(a).</i> b) <i>An updated Transport Assessment prepared by a suitably qualified traffic engineer / transportation planner, which addresses all matters listed in Condition 6(b);</i> c) <i>A summary of engagement and consultation with Auckland Transport in accordance with Condition 6(c).</i> <p><i>For development of classrooms or buildings that increase the number of teaching spaces by fewer than six, an outline plan (if required and a waiver is not granted), shall not need to include the matters in (a)-(c) above.</i></p>	<p>Primary School and ECE 1043 Linwood Road, Kingseat, 5065 Secondary School and ECE, Drury West).</p> <p>Some designations require an updated Transport Assessment with any increase in teaching space (4669 Primary School, Arohanui Special School, Northern Health School and ECE, 4795 Wesley Intermediate, 4992 Sir Keith Park School, 5065 Secondary School and ECE, Drury West, 5066 Primary School, Flat Bush).</p> <p>While AT does not support the exclusion for proposals involving less than six teaching spaces (and reserves its position in this matter), if this approach is to be retained, then it needs to be clarified. The following wording is clearer:</p> <p>Subsequent Outline Plan of Works <i>Where any subsequent proposal arises that increases the number of teaching spaces by six or more <u>(when compared with the number of teaching spaces included in the most recent Outline Plan of Works that included a Transport Assessment)</u>, or modifies any vehicle access, the Requiring Authority shall submit an Outline Plan which includes the following information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>A Design Concept Plan for the site showing the matters set out in Condition 6(a).</i> b) <i>An updated Transport Assessment prepared by a suitably qualified traffic engineer / transportation planner, which addresses all matters listed in Condition 6(b);</i> c) <i>A summary of engagement and consultation with Auckland Transport in accordance with Condition 6(c).</i> <p><i>For development of classrooms or buildings that increase the number of teaching spaces by fewer than six, an outline plan (if required and a waiver is not granted), shall does not need to include the matters detail set out in</i></p>

#	Provision(s)	Previous Comments / Recommendations (10 Feb 2026)	Further Comments / Recommendations (25 Mar 2026)
			<i>(a)-(c) above. However the outline plan must include an assessment of the effects of the increase in demand for parking and pick up and drop off, and address any mitigation.</i>
A9	New condition	--	<p>While not noted previously, AT recommends that a new condition be included requiring a construction management plan to be prepared and submitted with any outline plan for major site works. A similar condition occurs on the following existing school designations:</p> <p>4667 Primary School and ECE Whenupai, 4668 Hob Point Primary School #2 4669 Primary School, Arohanui Special School, Northern Health School and ECE 5056 Kauri Flats School 5057 Tamaoho School 5059 Te Kura Kaupapa Māori, Kohanga Reo & Early Childcare Education 5061 Wesley Primary School 5062 Drury West Primary School 5063 Hingaia Peninsula School 5064 Primary School and ECE 1043 Linwood Road, Kingseat 5065 Secondary School (Years 7-13) and Early Childhood Education (ECE)</p>

You must provide this information within 15 working days (before 24th April 2026). If you are unable to provide the information within 15 working days, then please contact me so that an alternative timeframe can be mutually agreed.

If you do not respond within 15 working days, refuse to provide the information or do not meet an agreed alternative timeframe between the council and yourself, this application must be publicly notified as required by section 95C of the Resource Management Act 1991.

In accordance with the Resource Management Act, processing of your notice of requirement will remain on hold until the indicated date, pending your response to this request.

If you have any queries regarding the above, please contact Chris Khouri by emailing chris.khouri@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'CKH', written in a cursive style.

Chris Khouri
Policy Planner – Regional, North, West and Islands Planning Unit