

MEMORANDUM – RESPONSE TO MINUTE 3 OF THE PANEL CHAIR

[RANGITOOPUNI] [FTAA-2505-1055]

To: Expert Panel (Panel), Kitt R M Littlejohn, Expert Panel Chair

From: Joe Wilson, Principal Project Lead – Premium Unit, Planning & Resource Consents, Auckland Council
Emma Chandler, Consultant Planner, Acting on behalf of Planning & Resource Consents, Auckland Council

Subject: Fast-Track Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA) – FTAA-2505-1055 – Rangitooopuni Fast-track Proposal – Response to the request for Council comment on the matters set out in Minute 3 dated 08 October 2025

Date: 17 October 2025

1. Auckland Council thanks and acknowledges the Expert Panel's request for a track change version on the applicants' proposed conditions by the 17.10.25 within Minute 3, aswell as the workstream of the applicants' representatives in the drafting of the original conditions which we provide comment on. Auckland Council also acknowledges and aware of the requests for information 's67 matters' set out in the letter dated 08.10.25 (RFI 2) to the applicants' representatives.
2. Attached to this response as requested is a track changed condition document. To assist the Panel and applicant representatives please note the following in respect to the provision of these comments:
 - a. Within the condition document we have included a range of comments (comment boxes) to assist the Panel and the applicants' representatives understanding, which can be typically grouped into the following categories:
 - i. Providing further reasoning/explanation around the proposed alteration or additional condition suggested.
 - ii. Very limited matters where at this point it is considered more efficient for the applicant to provide a clarification on their original drafting.
 - b. For the Panel's awareness a collaborative meeting has been held with the applicants' representatives on the 15.10.25 along with other communication which has been of assistance to both parties in progressing this condition workstream. We have confirmed to the applicants' representatives that should they wish we are happy to engage further directly with them on these conditions through the period 17.10.25 as they then progress their response on these conditions to the Panel by the 24.10.25.
 - c. In respect to RFI 2, points 3 and 4, the applicant's representatives has shared with Auckland Council, Auckland Transport and Healthy Waters further information. A constructive meeting and initial feedback were provided on the 15.10.25 between parties, with further workstreams and discussions planned before the provision of information requested by the Panel. There are currently ongoing and constructive discussions around the following matters which is considered important for understanding in reviewing the conditions at this stage in the process:
 - i. Discussions are ongoing in respect to the methodology used for the flood model, applicant is in receipt of Council feedback and questions on these matters and is responding ahead of meeting on 21.10.25.

- ii. Information provided has raised further questions in respect to the design and scale of attenuation and potential dam classification of culverts on Forestry Road which is noted in the comments and drafting of condition 261 and 262 within the conditions document in respect to any vesting to Council. The applicants' engineers are reviewing these questions and consider that further information can be provided to provide clarification and further certainty on these matters as part of our next engagement.
 - iii. Council have asked the applicant team to consider any necessary sequencing of stormwater and flood effects management/attenuation measures and features, in respect to the phasing of the development. This is not limited to, but appears particularly relevant to, the CSL stages in the eastern catchment flowing to Forestry Road and Riverhead. Clarifications on this may be relevant to sequencing conditions (no.6).
 - iv. Review of the effects and resilience of the stormwater pond/dam within 49 Forestry Road which forms part specific stages of the CSL subdivisions discharge network.
 - d. We have acted to the best of our abilities in providing comments on draft conditions but note that the provision of additional information (within RFI 2) will be relevant to the assessment of the proposal and potentially some of the proposed conditions. If additional information is received in response to the Panels requests within RFI 2 we will await clarification as to whether the Council will be invited to comment on this information in terms of its relevance to our overall substantive response, as well as condition response noting the provision in Minute 2 item 2c in respect to conditions.
 - e. In preparing and to assist our response on the conditions it has been helpful, efficient to the process, and necessary to understand and review the applicants 'response to comments received' including documentation in so far as this assists with comments on these proposed conditions. An example of this is where further information on traffic related matters including updated engineering drawings to respond to Council comments can be reflected in the condition wording.
 - f. We are aware under item 1 of RFI 2 that conditions may be considered in respect to access to Riverhead and have not proposed any drafting in the attached document as a result and with an understanding of this request from the Panel.
3. In terms of our substantive overall comments, we consider that it would be helpful to the Panel to identify the following in respect to the four summarised points (headline issues) provided in the Auckland Council response (paragraph 372 and 387 of Memorandum of Planning Matters for Auckland Council dated 17.09.25):
 4. **Potential Natural Hazards/Flooding and Stormwater Effects.**
 5. Panel have requested further information in item 3 and 4 within RFI 2 on which the applicant team is engaged with Auckland Council. Auckland Council will await Panel clarification as to whether updated comments will be sought following and subject to receipt on 24.10.25.
 6. **Potential Freshwater Ecological Effects**
 7. It is noted that the Panel received updated information from the applicants' representatives in respect to these matters and no further information was considered necessary under RFI 2. Our understanding would be that the Panel consider they have sufficient information in respect to these matters and assessment at this point but will await any clarification if further comment is sought from Auckland Council.
 8. **Potential Road Safety and Network Capacity/Performance Effects**

9. A review of the updated information (including further assessment, welcomed amendments and commitments to traffic safety measures) provided by the applicant's representatives in respect to road safety effects within and immediately adjacent to the site. Conditions (in particular condition no 42) have been drafted on this basis. This condition includes under bullet point 4 for the provision of an alternative access 4 for Lot 68 which we identify as an outstanding point of disagreement in terms of these safety effects between relevant specialists.
10. In terms of the network capacity and performance effects and the SH16 upgrade, Council have drafted condition 119, 291,299(Q) which, subject to agreement, we consider would manage this effect. This includes an exemption for 20 dwelling equivalent units, mechanisms to ensure the effective implementation, and the occupation restriction being linked to either completion of the upgrade or certain evidence in respect to the upgrade being under construction as a response to the applicants' comments on this matter.
11. **Potential Reverse Sensitivity and On-Site Amenity Effects from noise generated by the Waitemata Clay Target Club**
12. Council is aware the Clay Target Club has responded directly to the Panels invitation, as well as the applicants' representatives providing further comment on this matter. In conclusion on this matter from Council condition 298 has been amended (and relocated) to refer to the lawful ability of the club. It is not considered that there is any evidence at this point to substantiate an alternative lawful operation to that considered in the application, and we have reflected that in an advice note. An additional consent notice has been drafted to assist the Panel with respect to management of potential on-site amenity effects from gun club noise as raised in our Memorandum of Planning Matters for Auckland Council dated 17.09.25, should the Panel be minded to consider that management of this is appropriate in this case.