

Memorandum

To: The Sunfield Fast-Track Expert Panel

From: Neil Stone | Principal Development Planner (AT)

Date: 17/12/2025

Subject: Sunfield Master Planned Community - FTAA-2503- 1039 - Update on Bus Stop Infrastructure at Takanini and Papakura Train Stations and Summary of Auckland Transport Approval Requirements.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In accordance with the Panel's direction at the conclusion of the hearing on 10 December 2025, this memo also provides information on the Auckland Transport (AT) approvals required by the applicant. For context, this memo also sets out brief details of communication to date between the applicant and AT on the required transport upgrades at the Takanini and Papakura Train Stations.

2. CONTEXT – SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATION ON BUS UPGRADES REQUIRED AT TAKANINI AND PAPAKURA TRAIN STATIONS

- 2.1 The applicant has made contact with AT to investigate the feasibility of bus infrastructure upgrades at the Takanini and Papakura Train Stations. The applicant has not provided the exact extent of the required infrastructure, and it is unclear if later stages of the development will be serviceable by a single stop at Takanini and two stops at Papakura. The following comments should be read with this limitation in mind.
- 2.2 I summarise below the current position in relation to each train station below, as presently understood.

Papakura Train Station

- 2.3 In the absence of specific details regarding the required upgrades, the applicant and AT have been able to establish that upgrades at the Papakura Train Station are possible on Ron Keat Drive.
- 2.4 The likely location is approximately 150-200m walking distance from the station and 300m for accessibility users.
- 2.5 It is unclear how much space the infrastructure would occupy but, as discussed during the hearing on 10 December 2025, it appears that only two bus parking spaces are required. However, it is unclear whether additional spaces will be required at later stages of the Sunfield development. It is recommended that the applicant provide information on what level of infrastructure will be required at this station throughout the development.

Memorandum

- 2.6 It is also unclear what the safety implications of autonomous buses (if employed) will be on Ron Keat Drive, as the road is well used by pedestrians and for parking.
- 2.7 The resolution and specifically the removal of on-street parking would require local board consultation as well as consultation from adjacent landowners which includes private homeowners and Auckland Council.

Takanini Train Station

- 2.8 The applicant has worked with AT in identifying potential locations for bus infrastructure in proximity to the Takanini Station. A specific location on Station Road (east of the existing bus stop) has been identified that appears workable for a single new bus stop. However, it is unclear whether only a single bus stop is required to service the early and alter stages of Sunfield development.
- 2.9 It is unclear what level of upgrade is required as the applicant mentioned a single stop will be sufficient in the early stages of the development. Details regarding the full required upgrades are considered outstanding.
- 2.10 The resolution and specifically the removal of on-street parking would require Local Board consultation as well as consultation from adjacent landowners which includes private homeowners.

3. SUMMARY OF AUCKLAND TRANSPORT APPROVALS REQUIRED

Auckland Transport Asset Management Approval

- 3.1 AT, as the road controlling authority, has the delegation to accept or decline maintenance of assets within the road reserve, including new roads. Approval for this can directly be obtained from AT, however AT and Council generally use the Council's [Engineering Approvals \(EA\)](#) process to approve / reject new roading assets before they are vested.
- 3.2 Deferring certain matters to the EA stage can cause issues at that stage and can necessitate an amendment to an approved resource consent (for example, in the case of operational and / or road safety issues, or issues that might affect property boundaries, arising).
- 3.3 Permanent traffic controls that include bus stop-related infrastructure, although reviewed at the EA stage, are only approved through a separate resolution approval process – addressed in the section immediately below.

Auckland Transport Resolution Approval

- 3.4 There are two separate 'resolution' approvals required from AT, but for purposes of this memo, it is referred to as a single approval. A resolution approval, in short, is required to legalise a traffic or parking control, i.e. make it legally enforceable. This approval is provided by the road controlling authority as delegated through the Local Government Act. Examples of matters that require resolution approval include but are not limited to:

Memorandum

- Enforceable road markings such as broken yellow lines;
- Enforceable parking spaces, such as loading spaces, car-share spaces, paid parking, and bus stops;
- Intersection controls, for example signalisation.

3.5 Resolution approvals require affected party consultation. This will include the Local Board for any proposed bus stops at the Takanini and Papakura Train Stations and adjacent landowners.

3.6 The resolutions are signed off by the Traffic Controls Committee (TCC) within AT and includes a review of the proposal from various angles, including design, safety, legality, etc. AT does not undertake a full review of the resolution matters as part of a resource consent process and there should be no expectation that resource consent approval guarantees resolution approval. However, as part of the resource consent process AT generally tries to highlight resolution-related red flags to the applicant / Council to avoid Council approving a consent that is unlikely to obtain resolution approval. In this regard, based on the information provided in **Section 1** above:

- There is a moderate risk to the applicant of AT not approving a resolution for the proposed bus stops related infrastructure at the train stations.
- There is also moderate to high risk of AT not approving the resolution for the proposed loading bays indicated on the applicant's neighbourhood movement plans. AT does not approve loading on street to mitigate effects of private developments.
- There is also moderate to high risk of AT not approving the extent of broken yellow lines through resolution or AT might require significant more work/information.

3.7 The resolution process can take months to complete and must be initiated and paid for by the party providing the infrastructure to be resolved: [Traffic and parking controls](#)

Auckland Transport Encroachment Licence Approval

3.8 The development proposes private infrastructure in the road which will require maintenance from the applicant. These include but may not be limited to:

- All infrastructure required for a private bus service, such as bus stops, line markings, shelters, autonomous technologies, bus signage, etc.
- All infrastructure required for transition bus services if proposed, i.e layers, changing rooms, eating facilities if these are proposed within the road reserve.
- Possible private footpaths connections from lots to vested or future vested public footpaths.
- Any development signage in the road.

3.9 The encroachment licence is an AT process and is assessed on its own merit independent from any consent approval. The licence will require the owner of the asset (the consent holder's bus operating company) to maintain the infrastructure and likely pay rent to AT.

Memorandum

3.10 Based on the significant extent of the required bus infrastructure, it is unclear whether this will be supported by AT or not. The risk to the applicant in not obtaining this approval is considered moderate to minor if other approvals such as resolution, consent, Engineering Approvals are already granted. [Road encroachment approvals](#)

Auckland Transport Corridor Access Request Approval (CAR)

3.11 This approval is required from AT for any works within or occupation of the road reserve. The complexity of this approval can vary significantly, and for a development such as Sunfield, it will be a complex and lengthy process that will require separate construction traffic-related documents not provided as part of the Fast-Track application material.

3.12 The risk to the applicant of not obtaining this approval is minor, as the required works can usually be addressed after a consent but can be very costly to the applicant.

3.13 AT notes that based on the development's construction timeframe being more than 24 months, construction traffic is not considered a temporary activity as per the Auckland Unitary Plan Temporary Activities Chapter E40. AT would generally expect construction traffic effects to be addressed as part of a consent application. A detailed construction traffic effects assessment has not been undertaken by the applicant as part of the current process. As such the applicant will likely be expected to demonstrate to AT that construction traffic will not adversely impact the operation and safety of the network at CAR stage. This is likely to be a challenging task for the applicant at that stage as the CAR process isn't well equipped to assess non-temporary effects and might require more mitigation than provided by the applicant in this consent. [Corridor Access Requests](#)

Auckland Transport Vehicle Crossing Permit Approval

3.14 This is a standard approval required from AT and only looks at the vehicle crossing design in line with the required AT standard. [Vehicle crossing application](#)