

Memo

11 December 2025

To: Sunfield Expert Panel
cc: Ian Smallburn, Tattico
From: Karl Anderson, Senior Planner, Auckland Council

Subject: Review of Tattico Plan Change 120 Memorandum

1. I agree with the following conclusions of the Tattico Plan Change 120 Memorandum:
 - a. That the proposed zoning of the Sunfield Site remains the same as the operative zoning.
 - b. PC120 seeks to strengthen the objectives, policies and rules associated with natural hazards and flooding.
 - c. That the area of the Site subject to flood hazard notation has not changed and is a relatively even amount of low, medium and high flood hazard areas mapped, with a very high flood hazard also traversing the site.
 - d. That the triggers for consent under PC120 amendments to Chapter E36 (with regard to Activities Sensitive to Natural Hazards and Activities Potentially Sensitive to Natural Hazards) are non-complying activities, and these have immediate legal effect.
2. I disagree with the conclusion that the Sunfield proposal is considered to meet the proposed objectives of Chapter E36 as amended by PC120. Based on the technical assessment undertaken by Healthy Waters, the subdivision and development will not avoid significant flooding risk, particularly as the proposed stormwater management system does not feature a formal conveyance network to the north of the development. The proposal as currently designed presents a high risk of increased flooding and uncontrolled stormwater discharge on other sites to the north.
3. In addition, based on the technical assessment undertaken by Healthy Waters, the proposal will present a high risk of increased flooding to the south/west if suitable consent conditions are not imposed to require the McLennan Dam to be upgraded prior to the discharge of any additional catchment area beyond the current Future Urban Zone area.
4. For clarity, it is considered that if an acceptable and physically feasible stormwater and flood management solution were to be included in the proposal, then it could be agreed that the development could meet the proposed objectives and policies with regard to flood risk matters. The matter of disagreement is therefore a technical/effects based matter.
5. It is further noted that the Applicant has not made comment with regard to landslide hazard risks, noting that the regional scale maps indicate that some parts of the subject site feature medium shallow landslide susceptibility. This would trigger the need for a landslide hazard risk assessment (E36.9 special information requirements), which would ultimately determine the activity status under E36.4.1B.