

BEFORE AN EXPERT CONSENTING PANEL

IN THE MATTER of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (**FTAA**)

AND

IN THE MATTER of an application for approvals by Winton Land Limited to subdivide and develop 244.5 hectares at Old Wairoa Road, Cosgrave Road, and Airfield Road between Takanini and Papakura, Auckland into approximately 3,854 homes, consisting of individual homes and 3 retirement villages containing independent living units and associated features such as a 7.5 hectare town centre, a school, 4 local hubs, open spaces, green links, recreation parks and reserves and ecological areas (**Application**)

JOINT STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT AND AUCKLAND COUNCIL

Infrastructure Funding and Financing

Dated: 28 November 2025

PART A: INTRODUCTION

1. The Panel's Minute 13 directed the Applicant and Auckland Council to file a joint statement by 5pm on 28 November 2025 providing an update on arrangements for the funding of infrastructure for the development.¹
2. Following issuance of this minute, Brigid Duffield for the Auckland Council and Simon Ash for the Applicant met to discuss the requirement to provide this update on infrastructure funding and financing arrangements for the development. Following that meeting, and receipt of the joint witness statements after the completion of expert witness conferencing, it was suggested by Auckland Council that a single joint statement on infrastructure funding and financing issues be prepared with three parts:
 - a. **Part A:** a brief introduction;
 - b. **Part B:** an Applicant position statement on infrastructure funding and financing issues; and
 - c. **Part C:** a Council position statement on infrastructure funding and financing issues.
3. The advice from the Applicant and from Auckland Council in **Parts B** and **C** below utilises a common table format so that differences in view can be readily identified and contrasted by the Panel. The tables for each infrastructure category identify the required infrastructure and the funding status of each element.
4. **Part B** has been prepared by **Simon Ash**, the Applicant's Chief Operating Officer.
5. **Part C** has been prepared by **Brigid Duffield**, an infrastructure financing and funding specialist employed as Chief Advisor Growth Infrastructure Funding and Finance within the Policy, Planning & Governance directorate at Council. Ms Duffield prepared the Funding and Financing Memo, dated 4 August 2025, which is attached to the Council's comments as Annexure 1.
6. Parts B and C have been collated by counsel for Auckland Council.

¹ Minute 13 dated 5 November 2025, at [29].

7. The parties have not yet had an opportunity to review or comment on Parts B or C, as these have been separately prepared and collated.

PART B: APPLICANT STATEMENT

8. Winton Land Limited ('Winton') is a NZX and ASX listed New Zealand residential developer of note, which is credible, well capitalised, with a proven track record of designing, consenting and delivering large scale masterplanned residential communities throughout New Zealand.
9. In addition to the Sunfield masterplanned community ('Sunfield'), Winton currently has 10 masterplanned residential communities under development throughout New Zealand. An overview of Winton's current projects and executives were detailed within the 'Winton Credentials Documents' which was submitted as part of the Sunfield Substantive Application. Winton has funded and constructed infrastructure upgrades across its master planned communities similar to those required to be undertaken to enable Sunfield. It considers these works to be part of the normal process of undertaking residential development in New Zealand.
10. Winton acknowledges that Sunfield is of significant scale and will be developed over a period of time. As is detailed within the Sunfield Substantive Application, and as is the normal course of business with all large scale masterplanned residential communities, Sunfield will be developed in stages which allows for the cost of the required infrastructure upgrades to be undertaken on a staged basis.
11. Notwithstanding the statements made by Council within Ms Duffield's Funding and Financing Memo:
 - Winton has been very clear throughout the Fast-track Approvals 2024 Act process that it is our intention to fund all of the required infrastructure upgrades to enable Sunfield.
 - This approach will ensure that Sunfield will not displace Council's planned investment in other areas of Auckland where funding is already in place.
 - The current Long-Term Plan makes no provision for either capital or operational expenditure for Sunfield, nor does it make any provision for the significant rates that will be generated by the Sunfield rating base. Council is not precluded from including Sunfield within the Long-Term Plan at its next review which it will need

to do in any event if consent is granted to adjust the HUE for the area in the Development Contributions Policy to avoid unlawful over-recovery.²

12. The table below provides details of the required water, wastewater, stormwater, transport, parks and open space infrastructure required for Sunfield and how it is to be funded.
13. Winton acknowledges the statements made by Ms Duffield in her Funding and Financing Memo relating to Council's unwillingness to accept any of the water, wastewater, stormwater, roads, parks and open space assets within Sunfield for vesting at this time. It is Winton's experience that positions and comments such as this can evolve over time following consents being issued, development of large scale masterplanned residential communities commencing and Long-Term Plans being reviewed (with the next review to commence in 2027). As such, all infrastructure / assets within Sunfield have been designed to Council's prescribed Engineering Code of Practice to allow the infrastructure / assets to be vested with Council should their position on this matter change in time. As detailed within the proposed conditions of consent for Sunfield, Winton is proposing Defect Liability Periods and Maintenance Periods that are considered 'standard' across greenfield developments in Auckland, being:
 - water assets – 12 months
 - wastewater assets – 12 months
 - stormwater assets – 12 months
 - stormwater assets (landscape maintenance) – 36 months
 - roading assets – 12 months
 - parks and open spaces (landscape maintenance) – 60 months
14. In the event that Council elects not to accept the assets for vesting following the Defect Liability Periods and Maintenance Periods specified above, Winton will continue to

² Noting the current Development Contribution Policy allocates only 21 HUE to Sunfield (which is the number of titles that currently comprise the Sunfield site). As an example, the local Stormwater Manurewa Papakura GPA funding area includes 2,373 HUE (of which only 16 are attributable to Sunfield) to calculate a development contribution of \$50,150 per HUE to cover stormwater infrastructure. In the event the consent is granted, the HUE in this funding area will need to be adjusted to reduce the stormwater infrastructure Development Contribution per HUE payable across the local Stormwater Manurewa Papakura GPA funding area. If this adjustment is not made, then significant improper over-recovery of development contributions will occur. In this example, without the adjustment to the HUE in the funding area, the over-recovery amount will be in excess of \$150m. This is an example of one individual funding area only, and for the avoidance of doubt, the adjustment to the number of HUE used to calculate the Development Contribution per HUE attributable to Sunfield needs to occur across all Development Contribution funding areas that include Sunfield.

fund the required OpEx and maintenance in the interim before transferring this requirement to the relevant residents' societies and will seek a reduction to the rates levied on the properties at Sunfield to compensate for this approach being adopted by Council.

Water supply infrastructure

What is required?	Funding status
All internal reticulated water infrastructure to service the Sunfield development.	To be funded by the Applicant.
The required Bulk Supply Point (BSP) upgrade on Airfield Road to the Takanini No. 2 Watermain.	To be funded by the Applicant.
The required upgrade of the Takanini No. 2 Watermain.	As per the Joint Witness Statement, the completion date for this upgrade is anticipated to be December 2031 by Watercare and is planned and funded. The Applicant is open to discussing with Watercare undertaking this work on behalf of Watercare in an earlier timeframe with appropriate development contribution offsets.
Opex and Maintenance during the Defect Liability Period.	To be funded by the Applicant.
Opex and Maintenance following the Defect Liability Period.	In the event the assets are vested with Council, then Council. Or, in the event the assets are not vested with Council, then the Applicant and ultimately the Sunfield residents' societies which are to be established.

Wastewater infrastructure

What is required?	Funding status
All internal reticulated wastewater infrastructure to service the Sunfield development.	To be funded by the Applicant.
Extension of a local line connecting the Sunfield development to the Takanini Branch Sewer.	To be funded by the Applicant.

The planned diversion of flows via the Hingaia Wastewater Pump Station from the southern interceptor.	As per the Joint Witness Statement, the completion date for this upgrade is forecast to be 2029 by Watercare and is planned and funded.
Any other future upgrades to the Bulk Network required to provide wastewater capacity to Sunfield.	To be funded by the Applicant to the level required to service Sunfield.
Opex and Maintenance during the Defect Liability Period	To be funded by the Applicant.
Opex and Maintenance following the Defect Liability Period	In the event the assets are vested with Council, then Council would fund. Or, in the event the assets are not vested with Council, then the Applicant and ultimately the Sunfield residents' societies which are to be established.

Stormwater infrastructure

What is required?	Funding status
All internal infrastructure required to manage stormwater within the Sunfield development.	To be funded by the Applicant.
The required assessment and possible upgrade to McLennan Dam.	Any assessment and works required to cater for the additional flows associated with diverting the additional catchment shall be funded by the Applicant. As per the Joint Witness Statement, the cost associated with the assessment of the current status of McLennan Dam against the current dam safety standards and any required works to ensure that McLennan Dam does comply with the current dam safety standards should be funded by the Council.
Opex and Maintenance during the Defect Liability Period.	To be funded by the Applicant.
Opex and Maintenance following the Defect Liability Period.	In the event the assets are vested with Council, then Council. Alternatively, in the event the assets are not vested with Council, then the Applicant and ultimately the Sunfield residents' societies which are to be established.

Transport infrastructure

What is required?	Funding status
All internal roads and intersections required to service the Sunfield development.	To be funded by the Applicant.
The Commute Transportation document titled ' <i>Sunfield – Sensitivity testing / staging</i> ' dated 12 November 2025 as provided to Auckland Transport on 12 November 2025 provides further details of the actual upgrades detailed below:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID A: Cosgrave Road / Walters Road. 	To be funded by the Applicant.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID B: Cosgrave Road / Clevedon Road. 	Auckland Transport is in the process of undertaking the required upgrade to this intersection, as such this upgrade is to be funded by Auckland Transport.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID C: Okawa Avenue / Clevedon Road / Dominion Road / Papakura-Clevedon Road. 	To be funded by the Applicant.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID D: Cosgrave Road / Road 4. 	To be funded by the Applicant.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID E: Cosgrave Road / Road 2 / Bellbird Street. 	To be funded by the Applicant.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID F: Airfield Road / Mill Road. 	To be funded by the Applicant.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID G: Airfield Road / Road 1. 	To be funded by the Applicant.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID I: Pakaraka Drive / Old Wairoa Road / Road 1. 	To be funded by the Applicant.
For the avoidance of doubt, the Airfield Road / Road 7 intersection (ID H) was removed from the Sunfield masterplan following the integration of Mill Road stage 2 into the Sunfield Masterplan.	
Cosgrave Road and Mill Road Cycleway: A separated bi-directional cycleway / footpath along the frontage of Cosgrave Road and Mill Road.	To be funded by the Applicant.
Cosgrave Road Crossing: A signalised pedestrian / cycle crossing on Cosgrave Road (where the Awakeri Wetlands connect to Cosgrave Road).	To be funded by the Applicant.

Old Wairoa Road: An extension of the existing footpath on the northside of Old Wairoa Road.	To be funded by the Applicant.
Implementation of the Sunbus.	To be funded by the Applicant.
Ongoing operation of the Sunbus.	To be funded by the Applicant.
Opex and Maintenance of the internal roads during the Defect Liability Period.	To be funded by the Applicant.
Opex and Maintenance of the internal roads following the Defect Liability Period.	In the event the assets are vested with Council, then Council. Alternatively in the event the assets are not vested with Council, then the Applicant and ultimately the Sunfield residents' societies which are to be established.

Parks and open spaces

What is required?	Funding status
All internal parks and open spaces within the Sunfield development.	To be funded by the Applicant.
Opex and Maintenance during the Defect Liability Period.	To be funded by the Applicant.
Opex and Maintenance following the Defect Liability Period.	In the event the assets are vested with Council, then Council. Alternatively in the event the assets are not vested with Council, then the Applicant and ultimately the Sunfield residents' societies which are to be established.

PART C: AUCKLAND COUNCIL STATEMENT (BRIGID DUFFIELD)

15. As noted at paragraph 5 above, I prepared the Funding and Financing Memo, dated 4 August 2025, which is attached to the Council's comments as Annexure 1. I confirm the comments of that memorandum subject to the matters noted below.
16. There is still considerable uncertainty about nature of the bulk and network infrastructure is that is needed to support this Application and how that infrastructure is to be paid for.
17. There are no agreements confirming scope or how capital expenditure (**capex**) or ongoing operational expenditure (**opex**) will be paid.
18. Set out below is a summary of the infrastructure that has been discussed by the experts for the parties in relation to transport, three waters, parks as being required both within the Sunfield area, and to support its connection to the wider urban area in terms of both capex and opex, and its funding status.

Water supply infrastructure

What is required?	Funding status
<p>All experts agree that there is currently no existing local water supply infrastructure to service the proposed development.³ Additional infrastructure will be required.</p> <p>Additional Infrastructure required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Local water infrastructure• Bulk water infrastructure. <p>Additional infrastructure required, considered by Watercare to be developer funded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Airfield Road Bulk Supply Point requires upgrades and are dependent on demand and can be staged. Watercare considers that the BSP upgrades are to be developer funded as the development is out of sequence and unanticipated and would trigger the need to accelerate the requirement for upgrades.• Upgrades to the local network will be required. The developer will construct a full local network to the satisfaction of Veolia and Watercare to service all future lots. Noting that this may require the	<p>Applicant states they would be willing to enter into an Infrastructure Funding Agreement (IFA) with Council and other infrastructure providers, subject to appropriate offsets for Development Contributions (1. Section 55 Planning Report – Response to Feedback – section 5.3.1.2 p.g. 48).</p> <p>The staging conditions (120 and 175) outline what water supply and/ or wastewater infrastructure must be constructed and operational prior to any building within that stage being occupied. These staging conditions only relate to local infrastructure upgrades required – not bulk infrastructure.</p> <p>To date no IFA has been agreed or discussed.</p> <p>Any IFAs require complex negotiations. Offsets for Development Contributions is not a standard part of Council/Watercare policy.</p>

What is required?	Funding status
<p>upgrade of surrounding local networks. The construction of these works will be part of the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant's experts stated⁴ that to their knowledge the Clevedon aquifer has capacity to service approximately half of the site, based on preliminary investigations, and they would only view this as an option until the upgrades to the Watercare/ water supply network were completed. Watercare's experts state that Watercare has no groundwater source development or utilisation projects planned for the area. <p>Additional infrastructure required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takanini 2 watermain has remaining peak day capacity for 600 Development Unit Equivalent (DUE). These DUE's are necessary to cater for future development activities in live-zoned areas including infill housing. Noting that many (more than 100) of these 600 DUE are already accounted for through Veolia's development tracking process. • The Takanini 2 watermain requires upgrading and is planned and sized to support the Takanini FUZ areas and is funded in Watercare's Asset Management Plan (AMP). The completion date is anticipated to be December 2031. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Earlier delivery would require the deferral of other planned essential works • The Takanini 2 watermain therefore is not planned to serve the Rural areas. To serve additional capacity Watercare would need to implement upgrades that are unplanned technically and financially <p>There has been no modelling assessment of the rural portion of the Application area on the bulk water supply network. Because there has been no assessment, it is not possible to confidently confirm capacity for the rural land.</p> <p>Funding on its own does not ensure certainty of providing bulk infrastructure earlier than planned. Other matters such as, but not</p>	<p>Impact: No clarity about how water infrastructure is to be provided and funded (Capex or Opex).</p>

What is required?	Funding status
limited to, resourcing, statutory approvals, and construction timeframes constrain the ability to bring forward bulk infrastructure ahead of the planned programme.	

Wastewater infrastructure

What is required?	Funding status
<p>There is currently no existing wastewater infrastructure to service the proposed development. Additional infrastructure will be required.</p> <p>The experts did not agree at conferencing what the proposed solution is for the wastewater infrastructure and what the implications are.</p> <p>The areas of discussion include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the solution is a gravity or Low Pressure System • What the impacts are of these systems on the capacity in the southern interceptor. <p>Southern Interceptor Upgrades:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To understand the required upgrades of the southern interceptor Watercare would need 18-24 months to undertake detailed modelling, optioneering and concept design to gain certainty of what the required solution would be and the approximate cost and time frame to deliver it. • The time frame to undertake detailed design, construction and commissioning would depend on the scope of the solution but could take anywhere in the range of 5-8 years. This would all be dependent on the availability of resource and funding. • Watercare does not have this planning work scheduled and does not have resource to do this on top of the existing programme. <p>Further, it is unknown what the effects of servicing the portion of rural land will be on the wider network and the potential flow on effects of funding and financing other projects throughout the region.</p>	<p>Applicant states they would be willing to enter into an Infrastructure Funding Agreement (IFA) with Council and other infrastructure providers, subject to appropriate offsets for Development Contributions (1. Section 55 Planning Report - Response to Feedback – section 5.4.1.1 p.g. 51).</p> <p>The infrastructure solution that is required is uncertain. The funding for this is uncertain.</p> <p>The staging conditions (120 and 175) outline what water supply and/ or wastewater infrastructure must be constructed and operational prior to any building within that stage being occupied. These staging conditions only relate to local infrastructure upgrades required – not bulk infrastructure.</p> <p>To date no IFA has been agreed or discussed.</p> <p>Any IFAs require complex negotiations. Offsets for Development Contributions is not a standard part of Council/Watercare policy (Capex or Opex).</p> <p>Impact: No clarity about what wastewater infrastructure is required and how it is to be provided and funded.</p>

What is required?	Funding status
<p>Additional infrastructure required, considered by Watercare to be developer funded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The developer will be responsible for design and construction of the local network. Commencing at the Takanini branch approximately 500m from the site. <p>Funding on its own does not ensure certainty of providing bulk infrastructure earlier than planned. Other matters such as, but not limited to, resourcing, statutory approvals, and construction timeframes constrain the ability to bring forward bulk infrastructure ahead of the planned programme.</p>	

Stormwater infrastructure

What is required?	Funding status
<p>Auckland Council experts stated in the Stormwater/Flooding and Groundwater/Geotechnical JWS⁵ that the most resilient long-term solution for stormwater management is a new conveyance system that drains the Sunfield development north to the Papakura Stream. This system would provide integrated catchment management and avoid reliance on informal farm drains.</p> <p>Auckland Council experts did not agree on the efficacy of Sunfield's proposed mitigations, which rely on draining the development north through the existing informal network of farm drains outside their landholding.</p> <p>For the stormwater drainage system that discharges west to the Pahurehure Inlet, the Council expert position is that the McLennan Dam must be upgraded to meet Dam Safety Standards for a High Potential Impact Classification dam, plus analysis for the increased catchment area (i.e. potential further upgrading), before any additional catchment beyond the future urban zoned area of Sunfield is connected.⁶ This dam</p>	<p>Applicant states they would be willing to enter into an Infrastructure Funding Agreement (IFA) with Council and other infrastructure providers, subject to appropriate offsets for Development Contributions (1. Section 55 Planning Report - Response to Feedback – section 5.12.1 p.g. 70).</p> <p>The infrastructure solution that is required is uncertain. The funding for this is uncertain.</p> <p>The long-term ownership of the proposed solutions is also uncertain. If any land is to vest in Council for stormwater management, design amendments must be made to ensure that operation and maintenance can be undertaken cost-effectively. In addition, the Applicant would be required to fund maintenance costs until an agreed time such as when planting is fully established.</p> <p>To date no IFA has been agreed or discussed to cover capex, opex or vesting of land.</p>

⁵ E.g. at section C(i) of the Stormwater/Flooding and Groundwater/Geotechnical JWS.

⁶ Stormwater/Flooding and Groundwater/Geotechnical JWS, at section E(b).

What is required?	Funding status
<p>safety upgrade will be required for renewal purposes undertaken by Council but this is not currently forecast for specific delivery in the 2024 - 2034 Long Term Plan. Further upgrading of the dam for increased catchment area is not planned or funded by Council.</p> <p>Areas of discussion include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the solution proposed by Sunfield will work, which seeks to manage effects entirely within the site. This solution is on Sunfield land and then uses drainage channels outside their area. The Council expert view is that a proper conveyance system ("Northern Conveyance") is required, similar to Awakeri wetlands, servicing Sunfield, Mill Rd, and other developments. This solution is not on Sunfield land. A solution like this would require land purchase and development. It is currently unplanned and unfunded. <p>Additional infrastructure required, considered by Council to be developer funded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal stormwater infrastructure on Sunfield land. <p>Additional infrastructure required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> McLennan Dam upgrade: Required to meet new Dam Safety Standards. This is a prerequisite before connecting additional catchment beyond Sunfield's future urban zoned area. Not currently funded in the Long Term Plan (LTP). 	<p>Any IFAs require complex negotiations. Offsets for Development Contributions is not a standard part of Council/Watercare policy.</p> <p>Impact: No clarity about what stormwater infrastructure is required and how it is to be provided and funded (Capex or Opex).</p>

Transport infrastructure

What is required?	Funding status
<p>There is currently not sufficient existing transport infrastructure to service the proposed development. Additional infrastructure will be required.</p>	<p>Applicant states they would be willing to enter into an Infrastructure Funding Agreement (IFA) with Council and other infrastructure providers, subject to appropriate offsets for Development</p>

What is required?	Funding status
<p>The experts did not agree at conferencing what the proposed solution is for the transport infrastructure and what the implications are.</p> <p>The areas of discussion include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sunbus and related infrastructure • Intersections • Parking Enforcement and Management. <p>These are discussed below.</p>	<p>Contributions (1. Section 55 Planning Report - Response to Feedback – section 5.12.1 p.g. 70).</p> <p>The Applicant also states that the infrastructure upgrades that it would fund all relate to infrastructure within the Sunfield development site itself, and those infrastructure upgrades external to the site required under the staging conditions, being numbers 120, 123, 175, and 176, the details of which can be confirmed within an IFA.</p> <p>The infrastructure solution that is required is uncertain (as identified in the rows below). The funding for this is uncertain.</p> <p>To date no IFA has been agreed or discussed to cover capex, opex or vesting of land.</p> <p>Any IFAs require complex negotiations. Offsets for Development Contributions is not a standard part of Council/Watercare policy.</p> <p>Impact: Limited clarity about what transport infrastructure is required and how it is to be provided and funded (Capex or Opex).</p>
<p>Sunbus</p> <p><u>Private Service and Risk:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is Council's understanding that the proposed Sunbus is a private service. • If the Sunbus ceases to operate or operates at sub-optimal service rate this will have implications such as generating extra cars on the road - infrastructure implications, network wide congestion, and extra parking in local areas. This might also put pressure on Council to intervene at Council's expense. <p><u>Public Transport Integration:</u></p>	<p>It has been indicated via comments in the Transport JWS and Condition 114 that the Sunbus will be a private transport service:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public transport system equivalent to the Sunbus is not funded or planned to be provided by Council. • If the Sunbus ceases to operate (for any reason), Council does not have funding to either provide a replacement service, or to provide infrastructure to deal with increased cars/congestion/parking.

What is required?	Funding status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional bus priority measures (e.g. lanes) may be required to maintain reliability, which could require infrastructure upgrades by AT. Sunbus is proposed as a non-stop service between the development and Takanini/Papakura train stations. There will be residential, employment and education catchments that are not serviced by PT but require access to/from Sunfield. <p><u>Interchange Capacity:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current capacity at the Papakura interchange is insufficient for Sunbus demand. Major investment in interchange facilities would be required to accommodate extra services. <p><u>Sunbus Infrastructure:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure will be required within Sunfield for the privately funded bus service to function, eg bus stops (line markings, kerbs, bus shelters, bus signage). There has been no discussion about how these would be maintained in the long term. As the applicant has now confirmed the Sunbus service will be private, it is likely that AT will not maintain bus infrastructure within Sunfield as it is private. 	<p>Infrastructure to support additional bus priority measures is not funded or planned.</p> <p>Additional PT services to serve additional catchments are not funded or planned.</p> <p>Infrastructure to support additional capacity at the Papakura interchange is not funded or planned.</p> <p>Council does not have funding available to pay for maintenance of infrastructure for a private bus service.</p>
<p>Intersections</p> <p>A confirmed list of required intersections conditions/triggers was not included as part of the Transport JWS. An updated list has been provided directly to AT but not formally through the application. There remains uncertainty about whether all intersections are captured and the wording of intersection upgrade conditions.</p>	<p>It is still somewhat unclear if the intersections conditions/triggers are accurate and how this relates to what the Applicant is planning to fund.</p> <p>Council does not have funding available for the upgrade of any intersections.</p>
<p>Stormwater Infrastructure in the Road</p> <p>It is unclear if stormwater related infrastructure has been appropriately assessed for safety in the road and what the</p>	<p>It is unclear what the appropriate stormwater infrastructure is, and what the capex and opex funding solutions are for this infrastructure.</p>

What is required?	Funding status
most appropriate and cost-effective practice would be.	
Enforcement and Parking Management It is uncertain what the impact will be for surrounding neighbourhoods and whether illegal parking will be a problem. If this occurs, AT does not have the operational budget to undertake increased parking enforcement that could be required.	AT does not have the operational budget to undertake increased parking enforcement either within Sunfield and the adjacent neighbourhoods where significant illegal and overspill parking is expected to occur. The applicant has signalled that it will not fund parking enforcement on public roads as this is the road controlling authority's role.

Parks and open spaces

What is required?	Funding status
<u>Neighbourhood Service Hubs and Private Green Pockets:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal amenity spaces within Commonly Owned Lots (COLs/COALs). Not proposed for public vesting and not suitable substitutes for formal recreation parks. • Safety and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) matters must be considered in design as these privately owned spaces are proposed for public use and access. • Long term management and maintenance of these open spaces (by way of body corporate/residents association etc) must be captured clearly in conditions. 	Assume funded by Applicant. Assume will not be vested in Auckland Council. Assumed to be delivered and maintained by the applicant through a residents' society or similar entity. These will not be Council assets.
<u>Formal Recreation Reserves:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicated, flood-free neighbourhood parks capable of accommodating structured recreation (e.g. play, sport), community and civic use (e.g. clubrooms, libraries). Required to deliver local catchment-level service provision. • There is political approval for one park located within the original FUZ, but it has 	It is unclear who is paying for these infrastructure items. Applicant is proposing to vest all drainage reserves. This has not been agreed to by Council. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant has verbally indicated that it will be paying all capex to plan and develop assets on top of this land (sport fields and play provisions and associated passive recreation

What is required?	Funding status
not been anticipated to be acquired until the 2050+ timeframe.	<p>infrastructure like seating and walkways), as per the plans, but there is nothing in writing to this effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No infrastructure solution proposed. <p>Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage reserves are not considered appropriate for flood-free reserves. • No funding or land dedication for flood-free reserves. • No CAPEX allocated in Council's 2024–2034 LTP. • Non provision of appropriate formal open space and social infrastructure would place reliance on existing Council infrastructure for upgrading/retrofitting outside of this development. • Vesting of un-planned or over designed infrastructure will cause infrastructure to be unaffordable to be maintained by Council. <p>Impact: No clarity about how infrastructure is to be funded for formal neighbourhood parks. Unclear how appropriate flood free reserve locations can be provided. Risk that appropriate parks will not be provided. Risk that infrastructure being developed would cause additional financial burden and not be fit for purpose.</p>

Community Facilities

What is required?	Funding status
This Application is not of a scale that on its own will trigger the need for a Community Facility such as a library. It will drive the need cumulatively with other growth, for additional community facilities.	Additional Community Facilities are not included in the plans for this specific area and there is no financing/funding in the 2024 to 2034 LTP to purchase or develop Community Facilities such as a library within this area.

What is required?	Funding status
	Impact: Community Facilities would be provided through the wider network of facilities across Auckland which will require people from this area to travel to the facilities. Cumulatively the growth will drive the need for additional Community Facilities which will require Capex and Opex costs.

19. There is still considerable uncertainty about what infrastructure is needed to support this Application and how that infrastructure is to be paid for. I do not repeat and continue to stand by the conclusions reached at paragraphs 1.6-1.8 of my Funding and Financing Memo, dated 4 August 2025.

ENDS