

**Appendix 1:**

**Additional information requested under Clause 23 First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991**

**Contents**

Planning, statutory and general matters – Chloe Trenouth, Hill Young Cooper Ltd .....2

Urban Design matters - Lisa Mein, Mein Urban Design and Planning Ltd.....3

Ecological matters - Mark Lowe, Morphum .....4

Landscape and visual effects matters – Rob Pryor, LA4 .....5

Transport matters – Martin Peak, Progressive Transport .....6

Stormwater and flooding matters - Sameer Vinnakota, Environmental Planner, Jacobs Ltd .....8

Parks and open space matters – Lea van Heerden, Senior Parks Planner, Auckland Council .....10

#	Category of information	Specific request	Applicant Response	Further request	Applicant's further response
Planning, statutory and general matters – Chloe Trenouth, Hill Young Cooper Ltd					
P2	Section 32	The section 32 considers three zoning options – Mixed Rural, Mixed Housing Suburban, and Large Lot. It would be helpful to understand the benefits and costs of imposing a precinct over the plan change area to deliver the mitigation measures recommended by technical experts.	<p><i>Two additional options have been considered in the amended s32 evaluation (<b>attached</b>). These are a MHS option with a precinct (Option 4), and a MHU option with a precinct (Option 5). Both of these options have some advantages over a simple rezoning because the precinct provides for additional benefits, and so a precinct is now proposed. Option 5 is proposed to align with the Government's proposed Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, and the MDRS that would apply if the Bill becomes law in its current form. A final decision on whether Option 4 or Option 5 is most appropriate will depend on the outcome of the Bill, so will be made once that is known.</i></p> <p><i>It is anticipated that at this stage we will reissue the formal plan change request report to cover this.</i></p>	Please update the s32 assessment now that the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill has been enacted.	<p>It now appears that the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill (as enacted) would apply intensification measures to Waiuku, as the population of the town is more than 5,000 people and it is within a Tier 1 territorial authority area. As a consequence, the selected zoning for the PPC land needs to take account of, and provide for, the future introduction of the MDRS.</p> <p>For these reasons, and to maintain scope for minor amendments through the PPC process, the applicant is now proposing that Option 5 (MHU zone with a precinct) be advanced for the PPC application.</p> <p>The s32 evaluation has been amended to reflect that (refer <b>attached</b>). Revisions have also been made to the PPC application report and some of the technical reports, to ensure a consistent and accurate package of information is provided to stakeholders and interested parties at the time of public notification.</p>
P9	Infrastructure	Please clarify whether any bulk infrastructure upgrades are required to support the plan change and provide a funding plan for any such works.	Refer <b>attached</b> Letter from Fraser Thomas dated 17 November 2021.	Please provide an assessment that addresses whether the recently enacted Medium Density Residential Standards will have any impact on the assessment of bulk infrastructure in terms of capacity.	<p>Figure 38 in the Urban Economics report sets out theoretical dwelling numbers within the PPC land based on differing zoning. The proposed Mixed Housing Urban Zone would provide between 790 lots and 970 lots, depending on housing configurations and the provision of a retirement village. For the purpose of confirming a specific yield from the site, a figure of 910 dwellings has been chosen, being set conservatively toward the high end of that range.</p> <p>However, the previously provided memo from Urban Economics as part of the earlier Clause 23 response advised that, in reality, market forces would mean that there would actually be little difference in yield between the MHU Zone/MDRS outcome and that arising from a MHS Zone.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that, even a yield that was at the high end of MHU/MDRS projections would be well within Watercare population projections for Waiuku. Those projections are used as the basis for Watercare's capacity planning in terms of the Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant and water reticulation. This suggests that the proposed shift to MDRS yields within the PPC land will not result in any impact on the capacity of bulk infrastructure.</p> <p>The current growth situation in Waiuku, taking into account the PPC land coming on stream, is summarised in the Urban Economics report as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waiuku is forecast to increase by 70 households (dwellings) per year;</li> </ul>

#	Category of information	Specific request	Applicant Response	Further request	Applicant's further response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The estimated Waiuku dwelling demand is 120 dwellings per year (2020-2030);</li> <li>• Estimated feasible capacity is for 77-309 additional dwellings in Waiuku over the next decade under current AUP provisions, which equates to 1-3 years of demand;</li> <li>• Estimated feasible capacity is for 536 additional dwellings in Waiuku over the next decade under an MDRS scenario, which equates to 4-5 years of demand;</li> <li>• There are only 12 undeveloped residential zone sites in Waiuku that are 4,000m<sup>2</sup> or larger, which could provide an estimated yield of 154 dwellings (supports the view that there is very little remaining residential capacity in Waiuku);</li> <li>• PPC would bring an extra 390-970 dwellings to the market, increasing short to medium term capacity to 5.8-10.7 years.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion relating to population and infrastructure capacity projections for Waiuku is contained in the Urban Economics report and in the infrastructure report.</p> <p>That information sets out the applicant's population estimate for Waiuku by 2038 as 11,160. The FTL engineering calculations based on Watercare projections for wastewater and water supply demand give estimated population at the same year of 13,074 (wastewater estimate) or 16,155 (water estimate). As these figures exceed the applicant's estimates, they indicate Watercare has provided for a higher level of population growth than the applicant's consultant (Urban Economics) and hence both water and wastewater demand should be satisfied by the associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Furthermore, Watercare refers to the Southwestern WWTP catering for a population of 16,000 from Waiuku in 2050, while its water demand projections to 2050 are equivalent to an estimated population of 18,105.</p> <p>Watercare's population projections for both water and wastewater demand therefore more than adequately provide for the estimated Waiuku population growth, through to 2050, exceeding Statistics NZ projected growth rates over this period. Any development intensification within the PPC area to a MDRS level is not expected to significantly increase the demand for housing and hence the population growth rate, but will help to satisfy Waiuku's projected housing shortage over a longer period.</p>
Urban Design matters - Lisa Mein, Mein Urban Design and Planning Ltd					
UD4	Place based provisions	Please clarify how the Outline Development Plan and Urban Design Concept is intended to be implemented if there is no precinct plan and the whole site is blanket	<i>The PPC request has now been modified to include a precinct. The key elements that were identified in the Outline Development Plan and Urban Design Concept have been incorporated into the precinct plan and the associated precinct</i>	Please clarify why only one greenway arm is identified on the precinct plan.	There are a number of greenways shown on the indicative concept plan for the site. While the applicant intends at this stage to progress the development of the land in that format, there may be practical reasons for an amended approach that utilises fewer greenways or a different site layout.

#	Category of information	Specific request	Applicant Response	Further request	Applicant's further response
		zoned Mixed Housing Suburban Zone.	<i>provisions. The precinct addresses each of the key elements identified in the request. Matters that are not directly addressed through the precinct are able to be managed appropriately through the subdivision process and through Council's powers under the RMA and Local Government Act. For example, road typologies will be subject to approval by Council and Auckland Transport and will not be accepted for vesting unless they meet specified standards for engineering and design.</i>		<p>The purpose of the Precinct Plan and associated Precinct provisions is to ensure that critical elements of the development concept for the PPC land are carried through into the ultimate subdivision. The applicant considers that only one of the greenways is essential, and that is the greenway that would connect the existing area of reserve adjacent to the PPC land with the proposed stormwater/drainage reserve in the western corner.</p> <p>The other greenways are a 'nice to have' rather than an essential component of acceptable development and, as a result, are not shown on the Precinct Plan.</p>
Ecological matters - Mark Lowe, Morpnum					
E1	Freshwater	Please include a map of the drainage features across the plan change area (45A, 92 and 130 Constable Road) that have been assessed and that determines the classifications (as per the AUP:OP and/or the NES:FW). Also provide further information and evidence to understand if the 'constructed drains' identified in the north-western corner of the site are artificial or modified natural features.	<i>Refer attached memo dated 17 November 2021 prepared by Boffa Miskell.</i>	Please include a map of drainage features within the ecological assessment to assist the reader, rather than relying on the hydrological map in the Infrastructure Report.	It is noted (from the email Chloe Trenouth to Philip Brown, dated 16/12/2021) that Mark Lowe, the Council's specialist ecologist, has now indicated that he has located the 'Existing Drainage Features Plan' (Drawing No. 32897/20) in the Infrastructure Report and has stated that it has clarified aspects and is sufficient.
E4	Freshwater	Please comment on, and map, any actual or likely natural wetlands located within 100 m of the subject site. If any potential wetlands are present within 100 m, please assess any potential adverse effects on such features (if present) as a result of the proposed zone change; particularly as a result of diversion or discharge of water.	<i>While no wetland surveys have been undertaken on neighbouring properties to confirm or delineate natural wetland features as defined in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management, the adjacent property at 146 Constable Rd evidently encompasses areas of rush and pasture dominated wetland that connect with identified drainage features at 130 Constable Rd. The upper reaches of the watercourse to the north-west of the site may also encompass areas of wetland. No adverse effects on the neighbouring wetland or associated water table are anticipated, as we understand that the northern portion of 130 Constable Rd is earmarked for open space and wetland restoration, not drainage or diversion. Nor do we anticipate that the development will reduce groundwater recharge to the watercourse northward of the site.</i>	Please update the ecological report to ensure it is consistent with the other application documents and considers the proposed infrastructure in northern portion of 130 Constable Road, including proposed diversion or reclamation of watercourses and earthworks in providing the ecological effects assessment.	<p>Sarah Flynn, the applicant's consultant ecologist, has reviewed these outstanding queries and provided advice to include in the summary responses. Ms Flynn has noted as follows:</p> <p><i>"My reference to the area identified below for stormwater management being intended for "open space and wetland restoration, not drainage or diversion" was in the context of NES-F provisions, in response to the S92 question about impacts on neighbouring wetlands. My understanding is that this figure is conceptual, and that the intention for this area is that it will be developed as a combined stormwater wetland/ amenity feature, ensuring that groundwater recharge &amp; clean water flows into the natural watercourses are maintained. This area will be enhanced as a 'wet feature' rather than being reclaimed and developed, and therefore won't have any adverse effect on the water table of neighbouring wetlands.</i></p> <p><i>I acknowledge that there will be earthworks within this area and it's likely that the existing drainage channels will be realigned which may result in some change in overall length, but this can be achieved without draining adjacent wetland features, while impacts and required mitigation for stream diversions will be assessed at the resource consent stage."</i></p>

#	Category of information	Specific request	Applicant Response	Further request	Applicant's further response
E5	Freshwater	Please comment on any ecological impacts of any reduction to the width of the riparian yard, and associated provisions, that applies to intermittent and permanent watercourses. The loss of potential enhancement and/or enabling a greater level of imperviousness within the stream margins.	<i>To the best of our knowledge there is no intention to reduce the riparian yard of the intermittent or permanent watercourses located within the northern portion of 130 Constable Road or the north-west portion of 92 Constable Road. As noted, this area is earmarked for open space and wetland restoration.</i>	Please assess the loss of potential values of the watercourses as a result of this proposed change in zoning and the measures proposed to address any adverse effects of this proposed zone change and associated changes in provisions. This may involve precinct provisions and standards requiring riparian enhancement for example.	<p>It is accepted that the change from a rural to an urban zoning will reduce the default riparian yard setback from 20m to 10m.</p> <p>However, all of the existing watercourses in the western corner of the site will be contained within an area of drainage reserve (as indicated on the Precinct Plan) and will be not have buildings located within close proximity to them. As a result, the change in depth of the riparian yard will have no material impact and will not give rise to any adverse effects on the watercourses.</p> <p>Rather, the development of the land will protect and enhance these watercourses, relative to their current state. It is noted that these features are currently maintained as drainage channels and are periodically cleared of vegetation, whereas the PPC creates an opportunity to naturalise and enhance them with riparian planting (currently grazed pasture), which constitutes an ecological benefit.</p>
<b>Landscape and visual effects matters – Rob Pryor, LA4</b>					
LV1	Landscape character and visual amenity	<p>Please provide a Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment (<b>LVEA</b>) prepared by a qualified NZILA landscape architect.</p> <p>An LVEA should be prepared addressing the effects of the proposed plan change on the immediate and surrounding environment in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape character values</li> <li>• Rural character and amenity</li> <li>• Visual amenity</li> <li>• Cumulative effects</li> </ul> <p>The LVEA should cover:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assessment methodology.</li> <li>2. Landscape context - detailed description and evaluation of the site and wider landscape setting with an emphasis on landscape and visual amenity considerations.</li> <li>3. Description of the plan change - description of the nature of the PPC and the ways in which landscape</li> </ol>	<i>Please refer to the <b>attached</b> Assessment of Landscape Effects prepared by Simon Cocker Landscape Architecture (dated 15 November 2021).</i>	<p>The Fraser Thomas cut and fill engineering plan shows that the ridge is to be cut down up to 3m and the unstable escarpment behind filled which would remove the 'gateway' feature.</p> <p>The Fraser Thomas 'proposed stormwater management plan illustrates that the 'south-western end of the subtle valley feature which defines the edge of the terrace' is to be cut up to 3m in depth and will form a '125,000m<sup>3</sup> wetland or other method of stormwater detention'.</p> <p>Please clarify the future status of these landscape features which the assessment is relying on for maintenance, protection and retention to support the PPC and in particular the 'gateway' ridge which is emphasised in the assessment as being the 'gateway feature and transition point between rural and urban'.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there was an element of conflict between Simon Cocker's aspirations for retaining the 'gateway' feature that is the small ridge that crosses Constable Road, and the engineering drawings that show the ridge being cut and partially levelled to improve its stability.</p> <p>This matter has been discussed between Simon and the civil engineers. It has been determined that the ridge can remain while still maintaining stability on the site and reasonable grades for future development.</p> <p>Amended engineering drawings showing the new finished contours and extent of earthworks have been provided. The amended earthworks proposals demonstrate that the conflict can be resolved in a manner that maintains the gateway feature.</p>

#	Category of information	Specific request	Applicant Response	Further request	Applicant's further response
		<p>attributes and visual amenity are provided for.</p> <p>4. Planning context - description of the relevant statutory context of the site and surrounding area. Consideration of the proposal in relation to key relevant statutory planning considerations applicable to this assessment.</p> <p>5. Evaluation of the proposal - detailed assessment of the landscape character, rural character and amenity and visual amenity effects of the plan change and their significance on the site and wider context.</p> <p>6. Summary and conclusions in relation to the key landscape and visual amenity effects of the plan change.</p>			
<b>Transport matters – Martin Peak, Progressive Transport</b>					
T13	Traffic modelling	<p>Please undertake a future year assessment of the traffic effects of the proposed plan change for the 10-year construction horizon. The assessment should include all the intersections modelled within the ITA.</p>	<p><i>Future year design life runs have been produced. I have assumed growth of 2% per year and applied that to all of the other movements at the Constable Road roundabout. The rezoning is effectively the growth for Constable Road movements in the morning and evening peaks. For the 3pm assessment I have applied the 2% assumption to all movements as the High school traffic may grow.</i></p> <p><i>For the Queen Street roundabout I have simply added 2% per year to all movements so there will be an element of double counting. Results of the models are shown in Attachment 1.</i></p> <p><i>The roundabouts have sufficient capacity to cope with the proposed rezoning and any expected growth. After 10 years some of the models approach capacity, however we have assumed all development traffic must use these two roundabouts when in reality many people might simply avoid the roundabouts and use Leonard</i></p>	<p>Please include traffic associated with development at 45 Constable Road development as part of the base traffic.</p> <p>Although 2% general growth seems reasonable (equates to 21.9% over 10 years). Growth has not been compounded, simple 2% per annum applied. As indicated above, traffic from the development at 45 Constable Road should be included in the assessment as the generic growth has not been applied to Constable Road, but this development will result in additional traffic to that</p>	<p>The approved development at 45 Constable Road would create 48 new residential lots. John Parlane, the applicant's consultant traffic engineer, has included these numbers into revised modelling. The modelling will also be updated to include compounded annual growth of 2%.</p> <p>Mr Parlane's revised modelling also gives further consideration to growth, by reference to historical traffic counts to determine realistic annual growth rates. That analysis demonstrates that there is no instance of future congestion beyond level of service C.</p> <p>In addition, the further traffic assessment indicates that the existing roundabouts are not at capacity and will continue to work well and operate below their capacity. No mitigation is required as adverse effects are avoided.</p>

#	Category of information	Specific request	Applicant Response	Further request	Applicant's further response
			<p><i>Street instead. The growth models are therefore a worst case scenario.</i></p>	<p>surveyed on this leg of the intersection.</p> <p>Please amend Table 12.9 to correctly identify the PM peak with development scenario rather than repeating Table 12.8.</p> <p>Please include future year models with and without development to demonstrate the relative effect of the plan change on the intersections.</p> <p>The Constable Road and Queen Street roundabouts are some 30m or so apart. The modelling shows that in some time periods that queues extend to and beyond the upstream roundabout. This blocking back will impact on the operation of the upstream roundabout. An assessment of the interaction between the roundabouts is required to determine the effects on the upstream roundabout. In addition, queues on King Street (East) at the Queen Street roundabout are forecast to block back beyond the Kitchener Road / King Street intersection.</p> <p>Please identify any proposed measures to mitigate effects on the operation of the roundabouts in the future and whether these need to be addressed through the plan change or can be addressed at the time of subdivision.</p>	
T14	Traffic modelling	Please include the traffic associated with the college in the assessment	<i>Because the plan change is seeking a rezoning and not a specific development or subdivision we</i>	The development increases traffic flows along Constable	It is noted that the site access intersection with Constable Road may not include traffic that is accessing Waiuku College. The Precinct proposed for

#	Category of information	Specific request	Applicant Response	Further request	Applicant's further response
		of the operation of the site access / Constable Road intersection.	<p><i>cannot confirm whether or not the option for an alternative access to the College will be taken up by them. Should it occur then an assessment would be provided as part of a future resource consent. We do not hold any traffic count data for the College. The applicant's land stops short of the College site so any future access would require an application by others.</i></p> <p><i>The ITA will be amended to simply note the rezoning would enable an alternative access to the College to be built by others. That is a potential option for later and the rezoning does not require this additional access to occur.</i></p>	<p>Road which will increase the interaction with vehicles and pedestrians crossing Constable Road associated with the College, and thus increase potential conflicts with these users. The precinct would facilitate an access to the College to be provided within the development which would alleviate some of these conflicts and</p> <p>Please demonstrate, as a sensitivity test, that the site access intersection (e.g. operation of the Constable Road / Site access intersection), can accommodate the college traffic as well as the development traffic.</p>	<p>the PPC would facilitate a road connection to the boundary of the existing recreation reserve but cannot provide access directly to Waiuku College because the reserve lies between the proposed road termination point and the College land. Council approval would be required (and approval from the Minister of Conservation) to form the road across the reserve, and the costs of the road would be met by others.</p> <p>As a result of this situation, it would be more appropriate to consider the combined effects of the College traffic and the PPC traffic on the proposed Constable Road intersection at the time that an access is advanced to the College from the PPC land. If that access never eventuates, then there is no point conducting an assessment.</p> <p>Mr Parlane notes that there will be an increase in traffic on Constable Road but that this alone does not suggest an adverse effect on pedestrians or school users as there is a pedestrian crossing located close to the school.</p>
T21	Mitigation Works	Please provide details of the timing of when the mitigation works listed in Table 3 in Section 9 of the ITA will need to be delivered to mitigate the effects of the Plan Change.	<i>The table will be amended to remove all items not required for the Plan Change itself. The timing for the internal roads and intersection will be listed as 'At Subdivision'</i>	<p>Table 7 of the ITA presents mitigation works, including the requirement for reducing the speed limit on Constable Road.</p> <p>Please provide details of how this mitigation will be incorporated into the precinct, as this is required for the safe operation of the site access on Constable Road.</p>	<p>Reduction of a posted speed limit on a public road is a function and power of the road controlling authority (Auckland Transport/Local Board). As a consequence, the applicant or any subsequent future developer of the land (if not the applicant) cannot require the reduction of the speed limit on Constable Road adjacent to the PPC site. For this reason, it would not be appropriate to incorporate such a provision into the proposed Precinct.</p> <p>However, in our experience, speed limits are routinely reduced where land moves from rural to urban use. It is not anticipated that the approach in this instance would be any different, particularly as the applicant's traffic engineer has identified the desirability of that action for road safety reasons. This matter can be addressed at the time of subdivision.</p>
Stormwater and flooding matters - Sameer Vinnakota, Environmental Planner, Jacobs Ltd					
SW1	Flood Risk and Hazard	Please provide a plan and assessment of the overland flow paths and 100yr floodplain within the development area and best practicable option to mitigate any adverse effects associated with this.	<i>Refer <b>attached</b> from Fraser Thomas dated 17 November 2021.</i>	Please show the details of the overland flow paths and 100yr floodplain within 45A Constable Road. It is noted that the SMP refers to the Crang Civil report, however those details need to be reflected in the current SMP	<p>The below response from Fraser Thomas Limited ('FTL') addresses this query:</p> <p><i>Drawing 32897/207 (already provided in the SMP) shows the flow direction of the 1% AEP OLFP through 45A Constable Road along subdivision roading. There is no 100yr floodplain within 45A Constable Road.</i></p> <p>In providing the response, FTL noticed that the OLFPs shown on Drawing 32897/202 (Proposed Stormwater Catchment Plan) did not match up with</p>



#	Category of information	Specific request	Applicant Response	Further request	Applicant's further response
				drawings/plans as this is part of the plan change area.	those shown on Drawing 32897/207 for 45A Constable Road, so an updated version of Drawing 32897/202 is has been prepared.
SW2	Stream Hydrology	Please provide a plan indicating the hydrology features of the site; wetland areas, stream classification and other features relevant to site assessment	<i>Please refer to drawing number 32897/20 on page 70 of the <b>attached</b> Fraser Thomas SMP. Measures to maintain stream hydrology are set out at section 7.11.3 (p46) of the SMP. Additional information regarding the streams on the site is contained within the Boffa Miskell response memo to ecological matters dated 17 November 2021, which is also <b>attached</b>.</i>	The SMP notes that the downstream aquatic environment is subject to slumping and erosion scars in places. Please clarify how this effect will be managed as the majority of stormwater runoff from the plan change area will be directed to the Rangiwhea Stream via the communal wetland.	FTL responds as follows:  <i>The SMP provides for the retention of the first 5mm of runoff and detention and release over 24hr of the difference between the pre- and post-development runoff volumes from the 95th percentile rainfall event minus the 5mm retention. In peaty areas (Area B), recharge is preferentially promoted. Refer drawing 32897/204 Rev A.</i>  <i>The communal wetland is located within the lower part of the Rangiwhea Stream catchment. This wetland has been deliberately designed with a bypass weir structure to enable an appropriate proportion of its stormwater runoff to be discharged more quickly than the considerably larger external catchments, maintaining peak flows at or below pre-development levels. In GDO1, the 95th percentile storm is used as a design tool to protect streams, including from scour and erosion. Table 9 of the SMP shows that post-development flows for the 95th percentile storm event are all the same or less than corresponding pre-development flows at different points along the stream except for a minor change (0.64 to 0.65m<sup>3</sup>/s at the King St culvert), ensuring there is no change to the magnitude of these common storms that cause the majority of stream scour/erosion.</i>
SW3	Implementation of stormwater network	How will stormwater be managed under the potential development scenarios (i.e., whether the development will occur in parts or as a whole and anticipated timelines).	<i>Refer <b>attached</b> from Fraser Thomas dated 17 November 2021.</i>	Healthy Waters seeks the inclusion of stormwater provisions in the precinct to implement the stormwater management approach proposed by the SMP. Please see attached for discussion.  Please confirm that the SMAF 1 control will be applied to the plan change area (including 45A Constable Road) and provide a corresponding map to reflect this.	It is confirmed that the inclusion of stormwater management provisions in the Precinct are acceptable to the applicant. Amended Precinct provisions, largely consistent with those suggested by Council, are acceptable. A new version of the Precinct provisions has been provided, incorporating appropriate stormwater management provisions.  FTL responds as follows:  <i>The proposed precinct stormwater provisions are acceptable. Stormwater management for the proposed development already includes SMAF1 controls, requiring the retention of the first 5mm of runoff and detention and release over 24hr of the difference between the pre- and post-development runoff volumes from the 95th percentile rainfall event minus the 5mm retention. In peaty areas (Area B), an equivalent level of recharge is preferentially promoted. Refer drawing 32897/204 Rev A.</i>
SW5	Stormwater Management Plan	Please provide a Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) as a standalone document. The SMP should identify the anticipated stormwater effects of the plan change and subsequent development proposal and how effects will be managed to meet the			A standalone Stormwater Management Plan has previously been provided as part of the earlier Clause 23 response.

#	Category of information	Specific request	Applicant Response	Further request	Applicant's further response
		Auckland Unitary Plan outcomes and, if intending to vest assets to council, the requirements under the regional network discharge consent (NDC).			
Parks and open space matters – Lea van Heerden, Senior Parks Planner, Auckland Council					
OS4	Open Space	<p>Please include further details about the overall concept of the open space network and grid layout including:</p> <p>a. While the open space network is aspirational, it is not clear what is driving the greenways proposed and the unusual layout of the development blocks?</p> <p>b. Can we assume the greenways will be drainage reserves to help assist the overall draining network? Will this be something Healthy Waters will accept? Similar to the point above, how will this be implemented?</p> <p>c. the layout of blocks and greenways are unusual, apart from not knowing how the applicant will be implementing the greenways, will the greenways force the development layout to resemble the same built pattern for adjacent sites?</p>	<p><i>The PPC now proposes a precinct to provide more certainty regarding the outcomes envisaged for the land. In terms of the open space network, the precinct proposes two areas of Indicative Open-space Reserve, an Indicative Greenway Connection between the existing reserve (north of the PPC land) and one of the proposed areas of reserve, a new road connection to the existing reserve, and a mechanism for providing an appropriate frontage to the existing reserve where it adjoins residential lots.</i></p> <p><i>Much of the two areas of Indicative Open-space Reserve is expected to vest in the Council as drainage reserve, but there may be some opportunities for a small area of recreation reserve at the western end of the PPC land. The Indicative Greenway Connection could be vested as reserve or held in private ownership (through a body corporate or incorporated society or similar mechanism). The same would apply to any of the other greenways that are proposed at the time of subdivision. There would of course be no obligation for Parks or Healthy Waters to acquire the greenways if there was no interest in owning and maintaining these assets.</i></p>	<p>Please clarify who will maintain community gardens. Council does not accept small open spaces that do not meet the open space provision policy. This may cause an issue at s224c stage if community gardens must be identified but cannot be able to be vested.</p>	<p>Community gardens, by their nature, are gardens that are maintained by the community.</p> <p>At this stage, it is anticipated that the community garden might be located within one of the areas of open space to be vested. The area is not particularly large (around 500m<sup>2</sup> or more, as noted in the Precinct standards), so could likely be accommodated within an area of reserve that would not otherwise be actively used.</p> <p>There are numerous examples of community gardens within Council's open space network (such as Kelmarna Gardens, Hukunui Reserve, Ponsonby; Serwayne Walk, Henderson), so the Council must have management mechanisms already in place for such facilities.</p> <p>If the Council refused to allow a small community garden on one of the areas of open space, then there may be private land options available that could be explored at the time of subdivision. Failing that, the applicant could seek consent under the precinct provisions to not provide the community garden.</p>