

APPENDIX 3: SUMMARY OF SECTION 53 COMMENTS RECEIVED

Note: This document is a summary only to provide an overview of comments received in relation to the Sunfield Masterplanned Community. Please refer to the submitted documents from invited parties for the full text. The panel has read and considered all comments received in full.

No.	Party/ Agency	Summary of Comments/ Key Issues Raised	Relief Sought
Comments received on application			
1.	Auckland Council	<p>Overall Auckland Council does not support the proposal and listed the following key concerns:</p> <p><i>Strategic Planning and Policy Alignment</i> –The Council notes that the proposal is inconsistent with multiple levels of the planning policy hierarchy including the Future Development Strategy, Auckland Unitary Plan, and relevant National Policy Statements.</p> <p><i>Stormwater and flood management:</i> – The level of development proposed poses unacceptable risks to flood management, water quality and public safety. There is a high risk of significant adverse impacts and worsening existing flood hazards in the downstream Papakura Stream catchment and Pahurehure Inlet catchment. There are significant gaps and unresolved issues in the proposal.</p> <p><i>Lack of Integration with other services</i> – The proposal does not integrate with Council’s planned and funded infrastructure projects for transport, wastewater, water and storm water.</p> <p><i>Ecological and Environmental Effects</i> – The Council has</p>	<p><i>Decline the Application</i> – The Council recommends that the application be declined on the basis that the adverse impacts are sufficiently significant to be out of proportion to the project’s claimed regional or national benefits, even after considering potential mitigation or compensation.</p> <p>Should the application proceed, the Council seeks the following relief:</p> <p><i>Address Information Gaps</i> - the Council requests that significant information gaps be addressed, particularly in relation to infrastructure, stormwater, transport, ecological effects, and integration with the Mill Road corridor.</p> <p><i>Require Comprehensive Conditions</i> - robust and comprehensive conditions to ensure that infrastructure, environmental, and amenity issues are fully addressed.</p> <p><i>Protect Highly Productive Land</i> – urbanisation of highly productive land be avoided unless it is clearly demonstrated that there are no viable alternatives and that the land is not suitable for ongoing primary production.</p> <p><i>Ensure Integrated Planning</i> – any development in this area is fully integrated with Council’s strategic planning, infrastructure funding, and sequencing priorities.</p>

		<p>identified information gaps which mean adverse effects on freshwater and terrestrial ecology, including stream diversions and loss of ecological values have not been adequately assessed.</p> <p><i>Loss of Highly Productive Land</i> – The Council is concerned about the permanent loss of a large area of highly productive land (LUC 2 soils) because of the proposal.</p> <p><i>Urban Form and Amenity</i> – The Council notes that development proposes low density urban form with no provision for terraced housing or 3+ storey apartment combined with the transport issues. These factors, combined with airport noise do not contribute to a well-functioning urban environment.</p> <p><i>Provision of Recreation</i> – The Council considers that the proposed open space network is inadequate, with most parks located within flood-prone drainage reserves. This limits their recreational value and suitability for vesting as public reserves, and does not meet the needs of the future community.</p>	
2.	897 Alpha	<p>897 Alpha is generally supportive of the urbanisation of the Sunfield Site.</p> <p><i>Position on Urban Development</i> - 897 Alpha considers the wider Papakura/Takanini area, including the Sunfield Site and the 897 Alpha property, suitable for urban development and is generally supportive of urbanisation in this area.</p> <p><i>Need for Planning Processes</i> - Urbanisation should only</p>	<p>897 Alpha is generally supportive of the urbanisation of the Sunfield Site and considers that the wider Takanini / Papakura area out to Hamlin Road should be zoned FUZ and brought within the RUB.</p> <p><i>Plan change process required</i> - unless an equivalent of a structure planning and plan change process can be achieved through the Fast-track process and via conditions on the Application, then the Application will result in</p>

		<p>proceed after a comprehensive structure planning and plan change process. Rezoning to Future Urban Zone (FUZ) and relocating the Rural Urban Boundary (RUB) would allow for proper consideration of environmental constraints, such as stormwater and traffic, and ensure infrastructure is delivered appropriately.</p> <p><i>Resource Management and Urbanisation</i> - The resource management system coordinates urbanisation through a sequence of structure planning, plan changes, and resource consents. This framework for the Takanini/Papakura area is not yet established.</p> <p><i>Concerns with the Application</i> - The current application seeks large-scale urban development in the Mixed Residential Zone (MRZ) outside the RUB, before wider strategic and integration issues are resolved. Significant infrastructure upgrades are needed but remain unplanned and unfunded.</p> <p><i>Preferred Approach - 897</i> Alpha believes the best outcomes would be achieved by relocating the RUB to the North-South Leg of Hamlin Road and rezoning land within this boundary to FUZ, enabling comprehensive planning and infrastructure provision.</p>	<p>significant adverse effects on the environment and foreclose on, or limit, future urban development opportunities in the wider area and there will be a failure to realise the regional economic benefits of urbanisation that are central to the purpose of the FTAA.</p> <p><i>Decline application</i> - If the Panel considers that it cannot impose conditions on the Application that would adequately address 897 Alpha's concerns raised in these comments, then the appropriate course of action would be to decline the Application and for the wider area to be subject to structure planning and plan change(s) to bring down either FUZ or live urban zonings in the usual way.</p>
3.	Aaron Papp	<p>The submitter believes the fast-track application demonstrates thorough assessment of the development's impacts. However, there are concerns regarding the:</p>	<p>The submitter suggests should be revised to address the deficiencies in site management, ground and rainwater management, and noise mitigation.</p>

		<p><i>In-adequacy of the site management plan, - specifically the ground and rainwater management measures, which are insufficient for a flood-prone area. Without proper monitoring and management, there is an increased risk of flood damage to neighbouring properties and residents.</i></p> <p><i>No plans to manage noise for both the airport and surrounding residents. These are key examples of missing details in the plan, which may not be exhaustive.</i></p> <p><i>Site management plan does not meet the recommendations and requirements of the fast-track application and, if implemented as is, would undermine effective environmental management during development.</i></p>	
4.	Andrew and Sandra Beard	<p>The Submitters oppose the proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The disestablishment of Hamlin Road will sever their direct access to Takanini and the north, isolating our street and properties between Sunfield's to the west and Ardmore Airport to the east. • The development will negatively affect the water table and drainage on their property at the eastern end of the site. • The proposed flood and drainage area directly behind their property will create a water catchment, encouraging insects and vermin. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fast-tracking of this development has led NZTA to incorporate it into the Mill Road project, resulting in the new road being constructed approximately 60 metres from the rear of their property. 	
5.	Ardmore Airport Limited	<p>Ardmore Airport identified the following concerns with the proposal in its submission:</p> <p><i>Reverse Sensitivity Concerns</i> - Reverse sensitivity is a key issue for Ardmore Airport in relation to the proposed Sunfield development. Airports have previously faced reduced operations due to pressure from new communities or special interest groups.</p> <p>Future residents may find airport noise and activity objectionable, likely resulting in lobbying for restrictions or closure. Such development near airports can impose constraints that threaten the airport's current and future operations and growth.</p> <p><i>Airport Economic Activity</i> - Ardmore Airport, operating since the 1940s, is experiencing significant growth, with aircraft numbers expected to double in the next 5 to 10 years. The airport supports essential services such as rescue, police, ambulance, and coastguard helicopters. Over 108 aviation businesses rely on the airport remaining open and unrestricted. Any new restrictions would seriously threaten these businesses, their employees, and the wider New Zealand aviation sector.</p>	<p>Relief Sought:</p> <p><i>Land Use Configuration</i> - Relocate Health Care land use out of the 60 dB inner control boundary to the north of the development.</p> <p>Move some proposed employment land, currently outside the Aircraft Noise Overlay, into the inner noise contours.</p> <p><i>Noise Mitigation</i> - Require all new noise-sensitive activities within the Aircraft Noise Overlay to be designed, constructed, and maintained with sound attenuation and related ventilation.</p> <p>Recognise that these measures do not address all adverse effects, particularly in outdoor areas and with open doors or windows.</p> <p><i>Transport and Access</i> - Maintain full, unrestricted 24-hour access to Ardmore Airport via Hamlin Road and Airfield Road at all times.</p> <p>Construct the realigned section of Hamlin Road before closing the existing section, ensuring continuous access.</p> <p>Integrate the Sunfield development with the proposed Mill Road Stage 2 alignment, including:</p> <p>A new roundabout at the intersection of Mill Road Stage 2 and the existing alignment of Hamlin Road.</p>

		<p><i>Infrastructure and Transport</i> - The Sunfield proposal includes closing and realigning Hamlin Road, which is a primary access route to Ardmore Airport. Any closure of Hamlin Road is unacceptable, as the airport requires full, unrestricted 24-hour access for emergency and business purposes.</p> <p>Ardmore Airport has significant growth plans, with transport being a key factor. There are also concerns about how the new Notice of Requirement for Mill Road will integrate with existing access and growth plans. A commitment to a working group is needed to resolve these access and wider infrastructure issues.</p> <p><i>Safety and Operational Concerns – Public, Aircraft and Pilot Consequences</i> - The main runway at Ardmore Airport has defined minimum approach angles, which set allowable obstruction heights to ensure safe clearance from ground obstacles. The Sunfield application does not appear to consider the risk of aircraft engine failure or loss of performance, leaving minimal buffer between proposed building heights and required flight paths. This increases risks to pilots, the public, and residents, especially due to a lack of safe landing areas.</p> <p>Aircraft can experience turbulence, varying performance, or engine failure, requiring pilots to respond quickly and have options for emergency landings or sufficient height to regain control. These risks are highest</p>	<p>Incorporation of the Mill Road Stage 2/Airfield Road two-lane roundabout into the Sunfield transport network.</p> <p>Ensure the design of the Mill Road/Airfield Road intersection considers Ardmore Airport’s traffic and maintains access during all construction stages, managed via a Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p><i>Staging and Clarity</i> - Provide greater clarity on the timing and staging of the Hamlin Road realignment, including when it will be constructed and operational.</p> <p><i>Integrated Transport Network</i> - Develop and agree on a comprehensive, integrated transport network for the wider area, including Ardmore Airport, Sunfield, and Mill Road Stage 2, that accounts for all planned developments and traffic effects.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>during initial take-off, when training for simulated engine failures often occurs—potentially over the Sunfield development. This not only poses a safety risk but also increases the likelihood of reverse sensitivity, as residents and businesses under low-flying aircraft may raise safety concerns and lobby for changes or restrictions to airport operation</p> <p><i>Noise Sensitivity Concerns -</i> Ardmore Airport generally supports the extent and location of the proposed Employment Precinct adjoining the airport’s southwestern boundary. This precinct is within the Aircraft Noise Overlay (65 dB inner noise boundary) and will be subject to significant noise from airport operations.</p> <p>However, Ardmore Airport does not support the proposed location of the Health Care land use within the 60 dB inner control boundary, as hospital and healthcare facilities with overnight stays are sensitive to noise. The airport’s preference is to relocate the Health Care land use to the north of the development and to bring some of the proposed employment land, currently outside the Aircraft Noise Overlay, into the inner two contours. While Ardmore Airport acknowledges the proposed condition requiring all new noise-sensitive activities within the overlay to be designed, constructed, and maintained with sound attenuation and related ventilation, this will not address all adverse noise effects, particularly in outdoor living</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>spaces and when doors and windows are open.</p> <p>Ardmore Airport notes that the Sunfield development proposes residential and aged care uses within the 55 dB (outer noise boundary) of the Aircraft Noise Overlay, both of which are sensitive to noise. While this is not the preferred land use in the outer noise boundary, Ardmore Airport acknowledges that such activities are classified as Restricted Discretionary in this greenfield development. Sunfield has proposed a range of conditions and measures to manage the adverse effects of the airport's ongoing and established operations.</p> <p><i>Coordination of Ardmore Airport Stages 2 and 3 and Mill Road Stage 2</i> - The traffic modelling in the Sunfield Transportation Assessment does not account for traffic from Stages 2 and 3 of the Ardmore Airport industrial development. Stage 2 is consented but not yet operating, and Stage 3 is currently being processed by Auckland Council. Stage 4 should also be considered, as aviation-related industrial activities are permitted in the Ardmore Precinct.</p> <p>A comprehensive and integrated transport network is needed for the area, including the traffic effects of the recently lodged Mill Road Stage 2 Notice of Requirement by NZTA.</p> <p>Ardmore Airport considers it essential to develop and agree on a transport network that integrates planned development at Ardmore Airport, Sunfield, and the Mill Road Stage 2 project.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><i>Mill Road Stage 2</i> - It is important that the Sunfield development integrates with the proposed alignment of Mill Road Stage 2, recently lodged with Auckland Council.</p> <p>Ardmore Airport seeks the inclusion of a new roundabout at the intersection of the new Mill Road Stage 2 corridor and the existing alignment of Hamlin Road within the Sunfield development. Ardmore does not support a road network where Hamlin Road is terminated on either side of Mill Road Stage 2.</p> <p>Ardmore Airport also supports the proposed two-lane roundabout at the Mill Road Stage 2/Airfield Road intersection and requests that Sunfield incorporates this intersection into its transport network.</p> <p><i>Essential Access Requirements</i> - Access to and from Ardmore Airport for staff, users, and visitors must be always maintained along Hamlin Road and Airfield Road to ensure business continuity and emergency services access.</p> <p><i>Road Realignment</i> - The proposed realignment of Hamlin Road to provide an east-west link through Sunfield is generally supported. However, the staging and timing of the realignment need clarification, and any temporary effects on the transport network must be addressed. While the upgrade to the Walter Road/Cosgrave Road/Hamlin Road intersection is required after the first 50 dwellings, the timing for the Hamlin Road realignment is</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>unclear. Ardmore Airport seeks greater clarity on when the realigned Hamlin Road will be constructed and operational.</p> <p>Upgrades to the Mill Road/Airfield Road intersection are proposed as part of the Sunfield development. The intersection design must consider Ardmore Airport's traffic generation and ensure access via Airfield Road is maintained throughout all construction stages. It is recommended this be managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p>	
6.	Auckland Transport	<p>Overall Auckland Transport (AT) is not supportive of the application. Several key concerns are raised:</p> <p><i>Trip Generation Rate</i>- AT suggests the underlying assumptions, specifically the trip generation rate relied on in the Commute transport assessment are aspirational, as such suggests that underestimating the infrastructure required, specifically intersection upgrades. Beca has identified eight specific intersections that will require upgrades, including two not assessed by the applicant, these upgrades will require additional land acquisition.</p> <p><i>Operation of the large privately funded public transport services</i> - Concerns with the operation of this service and the ability of existing service networks to cater to demand of the proposal before a frequent service is in place</p> <p><i>Major gaps in storm water and flooding assessment</i> - Major</p>	<p>AT recommends the application be declined.</p> <p>If the Application is not declined, AT request robust conditions regarding transport, infrastructure and storm water.</p>

		<p>gaps in the stormwater and flooding assessment provided by the applicant. AT's concern is road safety and asset damage, flooding effects both within the site and on adjacent neighbourhoods.</p> <p><i>Engineering design issues -</i> Detailed engineering design issues that must be addressed as part of the Fast Track application to avoid significant future delays and potential required amendments to the application.</p> <p><i>NZTA Mill Road – Stage 2 -</i> The transport assessment has not been updated since the applicant acknowledged the proposed alignment of NZTA's Mill Road Stage 2. It is important that development does not proceed ahead of the upgrade/construction of the required transport network, which includes Mill Road Stage 2. Without Mill Road Stage 2, the development relies on the existing transport network results in significant network congestion that has not been identified as requiring mitigation by the applicant</p>	
7.	Jessica Swales	<p>The submitter does not oppose the development in principle as it may bring positive amenities to the area but expresses that they had hopes to hold onto the semi-rural feel.</p> <p>Expressed concern re the NZTA Mill Road proposal which poses a significant impact on the property and surrounding area and wishes to understand if the Sunfield development can influence or support an alternative route that reduces the impact on current landowners.</p>	<p>Access for local residents to the development area so they can access and benefit from the new infrastructure and services.</p> <p>Green buffer to maintain current views of residence and reduce visual impact</p>

		<p>Comments also raised that the car-lite idea will force car owners to park on streets like theirs.</p> <p>Also expressed concerns re construction impacts.</p>	
8.	John Cheng	<p>The submitter is generally supportive of the initiative as it will bring long term benefits to the local area incl. increased housing supply, infrastructure improvements, employment creation and urban growth.</p> <p>Expressed concerns re potential implications from future staging, design integration.</p> <p>Sought reassurance that the stormwater and drainage from the development will be managed to avoid downstream flooding and adverse impacts.</p>	<p>Request to be kept informed of timelines including those regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rezoning - Scope and duration of earthworks - Expected noise and visual impacts - Traffic disruptions and changes in access to property - Mitigation and rectification measures being proposed <p>Further engagement requested.</p>
9.	MC Investments (NZ) Ltd	<p>The submitter is supportive of the vision for the Sunfield proposal and identify it as a great asset for the area and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have a positive relationship with Winton and Simon Ash - Are supportive of the improved infrastructure for the area - Are supportive of the potential form improved employment opportunities in South Auckland <p>MC Investments identified the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development timing and construction impact – particularly being surrounded by a construction zone for up to a decade 	<p>Clarity requested regarding concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic disruption - Construction - Staging of the development

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uncertainty regarding their property's stormwater once the open drain is removed - Traffic Disruption during construction - Floodplain issues 	
10.	Ministry of Education	The Ministry of Education (MoE) note that proposed site for a new school is not appropriate as it is approximately 350m from an existing state school. The MoE are open to discussing alternatives with the applicant.	Amendment to condition 21 requested to include non-working/non-movement hours around educational facilities during pickup and drop off hours.
11.	Ministry for Seniors	<p>The Ministry for Seniors is supportive of projects that increase the supply of housing particularly for older new Zealanders and those that improve the provision of aged care residential facilities.</p> <p>Identified the village design to be well appointed and accessible to local amenities and transport to those further afield.</p>	
12.	New Zealand Transport Agency	<p>The Sunfield development site overlaps with land designated for the Mill Road – Takaanini section, a key component of Auckland's strategic transport network and a Road of National Significance. Both the Sunfield development and the Mill Road Project are listed under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024. However, the current Sunfield application does not address the presence of the Mill Road designation, leading to conflicts between the two projects, particularly regarding transport and stormwater management. Ongoing discussions between Winton and the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) aim to resolve these issues, but no</p>	<p>Relief Sought</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NZTA requests the opportunity to comment on the amended proposals once they are lodged with the Panel. - Enforceable staging and monitoring systems to manage potential adverse effects. - Each stage of development to be based on a new Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA). - NZTA requests the opportunity to provide comment on any updated information provided by Winton to the Panel.

		<p>amended application has yet been submitted to reflect any agreed solutions.</p> <p>NZTA has made the following comments on the current application:</p> <p><i>Transport</i> - NZTA has significant concerns regarding the effects of the Application on both the local and strategic southern Auckland transport network including SH1 and the future Mill Road corridor. The proposal relies on future residents being highly reliant on public transport. Effective mechanisms should be put in place to ensure this.</p> <p><i>Stormwater</i> - Application as it is conflicts with the Mill Road NOR and prevents construction of the Sunfield's proposed eastern diversion channel.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For stormwater, NZTA requires further information including flood levels on the western boundary of the NoR, detailed design information for the diversion channel, and modelling results to demonstrate no increase in flood levels after construction.
13.	Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki	<p>Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki expresses their continued inability to support the Sunfield development under the Fast Track process. The following concerns are identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Despite the mention of the Mana Whenua Engagement report, it was not available. - The Fast-track process circumvents due process and necessary diligence. - The high risk associated with high-density development on peat-heavy, flood-prone land. - Lack of evidence of consultation with iwi or representation of te Ao Māori in the planning process. 	<p>No explicit relief sought, but the submitter's position is that they cannot support the proposal as it stands.</p>

14.	Peter and Natalie Mckenzie	<p>The submitters oppose the application and identify the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Severe impacts on home, land, and personal safety for residents and livestock during development and construction phases. - Opposition to the plan to build an industrial complex on the southern boundary, as it would completely change the rural outlook. - The property is a designated flood plain and has experienced multiple floods, with concerns about inadequate drainage solutions and potential road damage due to heavy traffic. - The need for effective stormwater and flooding solutions before any land reformation or changes to the land surface. - The need to control dust from earthworks, particularly peat dust, which poses a serious health hazard and could contaminate rainwater supplies for both livestock and residents. - Request for noise from machinery to be restricted to normal work hours, excluding weekends, public holidays, and hours of darkness. 	<p>Relief Sought</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggestion that the industrial complex be built on Airfield Road frontage for better access. - Request for noise restrictions on construction activities.
-----	----------------------------	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern that constant vibration from construction activities could cause damage the brickwork on their house. 	
15.	Rimu Family Trust	No general position.	<p>Seeks further comment on how much of the land is proposed to be acquired for the new road?</p> <p>Requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gate allowing vehicle access to be installed on one side of the new road along with street number and fencing - Property be connected to and benefit from the new road and Sunfield's reticulated water supply and drainage system
16.	Roseanne Wills	<p>This neighbour's submission expresses the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project's location and overall planning. - Traffic issues in neighbouring streets due to narrow roads and increased vehicle movements. - Poor planning of road widths in new subdivisions, making navigation and emergency vehicle access difficult. - The Mill Road corridor remains incomplete, and proceeding with the development without it constitutes poor infrastructure planning and is detrimental to existing residents. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ‘car-less’ living concept is questioned due to the distance from the Papakura Train/Bus station and the reality of multiple vehicle ownership in Auckland. - Doubts about the development being a truly ‘self-contained suburb’, citing lack of facilities such as a hospital, cemetery, churches, and tertiary education. - Uncertainty regarding wastewater and water capacity, specifically whether Watercare has confirmed adequate capacity. - General disagreement with continued greenfield expansion, preferring investment in brownfield developments and densification of areas already well served by transport and retail/commercial connections. 	
17.	Ruby Pearce	<p>Notes that the development seems advanced in its planning and expresses the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Doubts about the viability of the car-free concept, citing cultural preferences for car ownership and lack of existing supporting infrastructure. - Risk that tenants in affordable housing will have multiple cars per dwelling, leading to parking overflow, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Every single dwelling must have at least one off-street car park. - Build initial stages with parking and public transport before implementing a car-free concept. - Evening and night-time restrictions on construction work. - Ensure sewerage and stormwater infrastructure is up to standard or over-

		<p>blocked roads, and illegal parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient off-street parking proposed for each dwelling; belief that every dwelling must have at least one off-street car park. - Concerns that the development is prioritising profit by reducing parking provision. - The rural location and lack of current public transport infrastructure make the car-free concept impractical. - Impact of construction and heavy vehicles on adjacent properties, local roads, and the environment, including noise, dust, debris, and increased traffic. - Potential negative effects on children playing in the park and walking to and from school due to increased activity and traffic. - History of significant flooding in the area; concerns about whether the infrastructure, including sewerage and stormwater, will be sufficient for the site's conditions (former swamp, soft peat earth, buried kauri trees). - Need for sewerage and stormwater systems to be up to standard or over-specified to cope with flooding. 	<p>specified for flood resilience.</p>
--	--	--	--

18.	Te Ākitai Waiohua & Te Ākitai Waiohua Settlement Trust	<p>Te Ākitai Waiohua expresses significant concerns about the proposed Sunfield development, opposes certain aspects such as stream reclamation, and seeks greater recognition and partnership in water governance and project design.</p> <p>Acknowledges the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledgement of the technical success of the Awakeri Wetlands in managing flooding effects within the project. - Recognition of the opportunity presented by the proposed Wai Mauri Stream Park to restore and enhance the environment and protect water health. - Support for aspirations to reduce car dependency, though with reservations about practicality. <p>The submitter raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The application of the Cosgrave Plan Change CVA recommendations to the wider Sunfield development is considered inappropriate due to different planning frameworks and zoning. - The scale and fast-tracking of the application, combined with insufficient detail and limited time for review, are problematic. - The proposed development is outside 	<p>Relief Sought</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Genuine partnership in water governance and planning to give effect to customary ownership of freshwater. - Ongoing engagement in the integration of cultural narratives into the landscape, particularly regarding Takaanini. - Full development of Wai Mauri Stream Park, including at least five years of monitoring and immediate commencement of iwi engagement in design, prior to residential occupation.
-----	--	--	---

		<p>the Rural Urban Boundary, on flood-prone rural land, and not anticipated by current zoning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approving all resource consents now for a 15-year development is risky, as it may not reflect future planning changes, best practice, or market demand. - There is insufficient evidence to guarantee that stormwater and flooding outcomes will be achieved, with concerns about the consequences of system failure. - The aspiration for reduced car dependency is not realistic for all, given limited public transport and employment suitability; limited parking may disadvantage residents. - Reliance on resource consents does not guarantee long-term outcomes, and future consents could undermine the car-less concept. - Strong opposition to stream reclamation, with emphasis on the fundamental importance of freshwater to identity and wellbeing, and the need to protect, restore, and maintain water health. - Te Ākitai Waiohūa has not committed to the Mana Whenua 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Consultative Group, preferring individual engagement to ensure recognition of their unique association with the land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern that collective arrangements may not fully reflect the whakapapa and narratives of each iwi. 	
19.	<p>Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated on behalf of Waikato-Tainui</p>	<p>Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Sunfield fast-track application and supports the provision of housing but remains cautious about unresolved flood risk matters and is committed to ensuring development upholds the highest environmental, cultural, and statutory standards. Waikato-Tainui supports the positions of our affiliated marae and hapū with interests in the site, while retaining the right to comment on iwi-level matters where appropriate.</p> <p>Waikato-Tainui acknowledges the importance of land development and the pressing need to provide quality housing to support regional growth and notes that the inclusion of cultural monitoring and mana whenua involvement in the draft conditions is positive in principle.</p> <p>Waikato-Tainui express the following concerns with the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All 19 iwi authorities were contacted in 2021, six indicated interest, but all were only advised of the Fast-track process in April 2024. This process 	<p>Relief Requested</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable iwi and hapu to revisit their input under the Fast-Track process, at the applicant's expense. - Ensure that cultural values are embedded in outcomes, not just acknowledged through process. - Provide clarity on Auckland Council's position regarding flood risk and infrastructure delivery. - Strengthen certainty around the implementation and long-term performance of stormwater infrastructure. - Reassess the treatment of productive land in line with the intent of the NPS-HPL.

		<p>change warrants a renewed opportunity for meaningful engagement and input. Feedback given under the original proposal may not fully capture iwi views in the context of the Fast-track process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A limited engagement or response from Council, especially regarding flood-prone areas and infrastructure. - Concerned that the classification of Highly Productive Land under the NPS-HPL may be too easily set aside. - Lack of clarity on flood risk management, long-term monitoring, and the wider hydrological context. <p>Waikato-Tainu will continue to monitor the inputs provided by our affiliated marae and hapu and may provide further feedback if interests are not fully reflected.</p>	
20.	Watercare Services Limited	<p>Watercare Services Limited (Watercare) opposes the Sunfield Project’s fast-track application. Specifically, the lack of planned or funded water and wastewater infrastructure to service the proposed development, which is largely out-of-sequence with Auckland Council’s long-term planning strategies.</p> <p>Concerns with the Proposal: <i>Infrastructure Readiness</i> - the Sunfield site is not currently serviced by public water or wastewater networks. The necessary bulk infrastructure</p>	<p>Relief Requested</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amendments to the proposed consent conditions to require private, rather than public, water and wastewater servicing for the development. - Deletion or modification of references to public network connections in the draft conditions. - Consequential changes to ensure the development is serviced privately and not by Watercare’s public infrastructure.

		<p>(including watermains and sewer extensions) is not planned or funded before 2034.</p> <p><i>Planning Alignment</i> - the development is out-of-sequence with the Auckland Plan 2050 and the Future Development Strategy, which do not anticipate development of this area until at least 2050.</p> <p><i>Capacity and Funding</i> - existing Bulk Supply Points are at full capacity, and upgrades (such as the Waikato-2 Watermain) are not scheduled for completion until 2034 or later. Funding alone cannot guarantee earlier delivery due to statutory and practical constraints.</p> <p><i>Technical Feasibility</i> - the applicant's proposed low-pressure sewer system is considered unsuitable for a development of this scale and is not compliant with Watercare's Code of Practice.</p> <p><i>Operational Risks</i> - Out-of-sequence development could strain existing infrastructure, reduce service levels (e.g., water pressure, increased risk of wastewater overflows), and delay or reprioritise upgrades needed elsewhere.</p> <p><i>Wastewater Treatment</i> - The Mangere Wastewater Treatment Plant's capacity is limited by its current resource consent, and additional unplanned flows could require premature upgrades.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Watercare requests that any amendments to the application be subject to further review.
21.	Xian Zhang	Neighbouring property that undertakes market gardening, no comment on whether the proposal is supported.	Requested further information requested regarding:

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts of the development on current flooding/ stormwater in the area. - Possibility of Sunfield to include the property as part of the development
Late comments accepted by the panel			
22.	Jana Benson	<p>Opposes the application due to impacts it will have on home, Village Way (residential street) and ability to live safely and peacefully during both the construction and operational phases of the development:</p> <p>Reasons for Opposition of the Proposal:</p> <p><i>Industrial Zoning and Isolation of the Residential Street</i> - the masterplan for employment places industrial building along the boundary with the commenter's residential street, surrounding the street with industrial development. This is different to the village look and feel promoted when Sunfield was first discussed and severs the street's connection to the new community.</p> <p><i>Loss of Rural Character and Sun Aspect</i> - large scale development and high density building along the boundary will permanently remove rural views and significantly reduce natural light and sun aspect into homes representing a loss of amenity and lifestyle.</p> <p><i>Flood Plains, Stormwater & Topography</i> - expresses concerns about poor drainage and flooding getting worse and earthwork or raising of land diverting stormwater onto properties.</p>	<p>Relief requested:</p> <p>Decline the application in its current form due to the unacceptable adverse effects on residents.</p> <p>Potential mitigations suggested in the situation of an approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relocate or rezone the industrial land adjacent to Village Way to residential/ mixed use or provide for a substantial green buffer - Require stormwater/ flood mitigation to protect adjoining properties before land movement or construction can begin. - Require geotechnical assessment and construction management plans to protect existing homes on peat soils from vibration, subsidence and damage. - Impose strict construction conditions including limited work hours, dust, noise and vibration plans, early and ongoing communication with affected residents. - Undertake genuine consultation with Village Way residents to integrate street into the community - Consider and mitigate the permanent loss of rural outlook

		<p><i>Construction Impacts (Short-term but severe)</i> - notes that homes are older house on piles sitting on peat soil with heavy machinery, ground compaction and vibration risking causing damage to foundations and property structure.</p> <p><i>Operational Impacts (Long-term)</i> - Industrial buildings and employment activities will permanently impact lifestyle and amenity.</p> <p><i>Cumulative Effects – NZTA Arterial Route</i> - Concerns about being sandwiched between a highway and warehouses and no consideration of resident’s quality of life</p> <p><i>Property Depreciation and Potential Acquisition</i> - Concerned that the combined impact of the Sunfield development, Ardmore Airport and NZTA arterial route will depreciate the value of properties.</p> <p><i>Lack of Consultation & Limited Notification</i> - Concerns that residents on the street were not consulted with as immediate neighbours and not given appropriate time to read, understand and respond to an application of this scale.</p> <p><i>Overflow Parking and Traffic Management</i> - Deeply concerned that due to the proposed limit of car ownership and parking within the Sunfield community residential streets nearby will become informal overflow parking areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider gated entry for Village Way to prevent overflow parking - Investigate whether acquisition of Village Way properties as a fair and reasonable outcomes given the impact on the street
23.	Si Hao Li & Hong Ling & LK Trustee	No comment on the proposal	<p>Relief requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further information requested regarding how much of the

	(No 93) Limited		land is proposed to be acquired for the new road. <ul style="list-style-type: none">- A gate for vehicle access to be installed on one side of the new road along with street number and fencing- The submitter's property be connected and benefit from the new road and reticulated water supply and draining system.
--	--------------------	--	--