

FAST TRACK PARKS CONSULTATION

Meeting Date: 12th May 2026

Meeting Time: 13:00 to 14:00

Attendance:

In person			
Brett Russell	BSLP	Adonica Giborees	AC
Graeme Harvey	RPG	Brooke Dales	AC
Vijay Lala	UNIO	Rahman Bashir	Parks
Nick Roberts	UNIO	Roja Tafaraji	Parks
Stuart Dunn	SPA		
Khai Azizi	RPG		
Apologies			
Alistair Ray	Jasmax		
Nick Barratt-Boyes	SPA		

Executive Summary

The meeting focused on the proposed open space strategy, including the scale, distribution, typology, acquisition, development, and long-term management of parks and ecological areas within the development. The strategy provides a substantial open space quantum of approximately 37.5 hectares, excluding the golf course, which is significantly above the policy requirement of approximately 14 hectares for the projected population. Discussion centred on whether the proposed network adequately balances quantitative provision, functional usability, environmental protection, connectivity, and future community needs.

A key matter requiring further resolution is the location and function of the suburban park. While the current central location provides strong accessibility for higher-density residents and supports integration with the town centre and schools, Council representatives raised concerns regarding potential over-concentration of open space in the central area and the need to better serve the future urban zone. Further assessment is required to test the trade-offs between accessibility, catchment coverage, land acquisition cost, park hierarchy, and long-term community benefit.

The meeting also identified the need to refine the role, size, and functionality of neighbourhood parks, particularly the southern neighbourhood park, to ensure provision for both passive recreation and usable active recreation space. Council feedback emphasised the importance of meeting functional requirements, including kickable spaces, and ensuring that parks operate as usable community assets rather than relying solely on overall open space quantity.

Several implementation matters remain open, including school field ownership and shared use arrangements, developer responsibilities for park construction, Council acquisition and maintenance obligations, development contribution mechanisms, and the future management of ecological protection areas. These matters should be resolved through clear documentation, agreed responsibilities, and coordinated engagement with relevant parties, including Council, MOE, and existing community park representatives.

FAST TRACK PARKS CONSULTATION

Priority next steps are to confirm the preferred suburban park location, adjust neighbourhood park sizing where required, clarify school and community use arrangements, document developer delivery obligations, coordinate with TPO Park, and agree acquisition and maintenance responsibilities for EPAN 2 and EPAN 3.

Key Decisions

1. The open space strategy remains broadly supported in principle, with the development providing approximately 37.5 hectares of open space, excluding the golf course, compared with an estimated policy requirement of approximately 14 hectares.
2. Further work is required before confirming the suburban park location. The central location has strong accessibility benefits for higher-density residents, but Council raised concerns regarding over-concentration and service to the future urban zone.
3. The park network should be assessed by function as well as quantity. Council feedback emphasised the need for usable recreation outcomes, including both passive open space and active kickable areas.
4. The southern neighbourhood park may need to be increased or adjusted to meet the expected 30 by 30 metre kickable space requirement and align with Council expectations for high-density environments.
5. School field ownership and shared-use arrangements remain unresolved. Further clarification is required with MOE on whether school fields form part of the public open space network or remain separately owned and managed.
6. The developer is expected to deliver open spaces, including infrastructure and playgrounds, but this must be clearly documented alongside timing, handover, maintenance, and quality requirements.
7. Coordination with existing community facilities is required, particularly TPO Park, to ensure proposed parks and sports fields complement rather than duplicate or conflict with existing provision.
8. Acquisition and maintenance responsibilities for EPAN 2 and EPAN 3 remain to be agreed, including Council's role, operational cost implications, and developer obligations under the plan change.

Meeting Notes

1. Open Space Strategy and Provision:

Stuart Dunn, supported by Brett Russell and others, presented the open space strategy for the development, detailing the quantitative and qualitative assessments, the types and locations of parks, and the integration of environmental protection areas, with input and feedback from Council representatives including Rahman Bashir and Roja Tafaraji.

- 1.1. **Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment:** Vijay Lala and Stuart Dunn explained that the open space provision was assessed both quantitatively, based on population and policy requirements, and qualitatively, focusing on the unique environmental and community character of the site. The development provides 37.5 hectares of open space, excluding the golf course, which is significantly above the required 14 hectares for the projected population.
- 1.2. **Types and Locations of Parks:** Stuart described the different categories of open space, including a suburban park, civic event space, Fairway Park, and two neighborhood parks, as well as stormwater ponds integrated into the open space network. The suburban park is centrally located to maximize accessibility for high-density residents, while additional parks serve local communities and provide both passive and active recreation opportunities.
- 1.3. **Integration of Environmental Protection Areas:** The strategy includes linking large ecological protection areas and the coastal edge with walkways and connections, enhancing the

FAST TRACK PARKS CONSULTATION

experience of residents and providing ecological and recreational value. Stuart emphasized the importance of connectivity between these areas and the broader open space network.

- 1.4. **Feedback and Policy Alignment:** Council representatives, provided feedback on the distribution and typology of open spaces, stressing the need for both passive and active recreation, and alignment with Council's 2025 strategy. Discussions included the adequacy of park sizes, the importance of connectivity, and the need for parks to serve both current and future communities.
- 1.5. **Design Principles and Community Character:** Stuart highlighted design principles that celebrate the unique qualities of the site, such as its coastal environment and openness, aiming to create spaces that foster a symbiotic relationship with nature and support the distinctive character of the community.

2. Suburban Park Location and Function Debate:

Discussed the optimal location and function of the suburban park, weighing accessibility for high-density residents against future urban zone needs, and considering trade-offs between central and southern placements, with input from other stakeholders.

- 2.1. **Central vs. South Location:** The team debated whether the suburban park should remain centrally located, adjacent to the town centre and schools, or be moved further south to better serve the future urban zone. Stuart argued for central placement to maximize accessibility for high-density residents, while Parks suggested a more south-central location to balance current and future needs.
- 2.2. **Accessibility and Catchment Analysis:** Stuart presented walking distance analyses, showing that a central location covers the majority of the current development, especially high-density areas. Moving the park south would place many high-density residents outside the immediate catchment, potentially reducing utility for those populations.
- 2.3. **Trade-Offs and Overlap Concerns:** Rahman Bashir raised concerns about over-concentration of open spaces in the centre, suggesting that overlaps between suburban and neighbourhood parks should be minimized. The group discussed the possibility of relocating the village green or adding another park to address these concerns.
- 2.4. **Cost and Acquisition Implications:** Brett Russell and Rahman discussed the financial implications of acquiring land for parks, noting that moving the suburban park to a different location could significantly increase costs, with figures up to \$10 million for certain parcels.
- 2.5. **Community and School Use:** The conversation included considerations for shared use between the community and schools, with discussion on whether fields should be owned by the Council or schools, and how this would affect park function and accessibility.

3. Park Typology, Size, and Functionality:

The meeting examined the typology, size, and functionality of neighbourhood and suburban parks, referencing Council policy requirements and discussing the provision of active and passive recreation spaces.

- 3.1. **Policy Requirements for Park Sizes:** Parks referenced Council policy, which specifies neighbourhood parks should be between 0.15 and 0.2 hectares in high-density environments, and ideally 0.3 to 0.5 hectares in medium-density areas. The team discussed whether smaller parks could still meet functional requirements given the overall quantum of open space.
- 3.2. **Active vs. Passive Recreation:** The group distinguished between passive recreation, including connectivity and ecological areas, and active recreation, including kickable spaces and sports

FAST TRACK PARKS CONSULTATION

fields. Rahman emphasized the need for 30 by 30 metre kickable spaces in neighbourhood parks.

- 3.3. **Functional Integration and Connectivity:** Stuart described how stormwater ponds and other features are integrated into the open space network, enhancing connectivity and supporting both recreation and environmental functions.
- 3.4. **Scenario Planning for Park Functions:** The team considered various scenarios, such as keeping both the village green and suburban park, relocating parks, or adjusting sizes to meet policy and community needs, with Rahman and Roja providing input on potential trade-offs and design adjustments.

4. **Acquisition, Development, and Maintenance of Open Spaces:**

Rahman, Vijay, Roja, and Brett discussed acquisition, development, and maintenance responsibilities for open spaces, including financial arrangements, developer obligations, and Council's role.

- 4.1. **Land Acquisition and Valuation:** Rahman and Roja discussed the process and costs of acquiring land for parks, including valuation methods and the impact of location on price. Rahman noted that Council would not acquire certain ecological preserves at capital cost, but would take on future operational costs.
- 4.2. **Developer Responsibilities:** Brett and Roja clarified that developers are expected to build the open spaces, including infrastructure and playgrounds, to ensure quality and timely provision. If Council does not support certain parks, developers may need to manage them within precinct societies.
- 4.3. **Maintenance and Operational Arrangements:** discussed maintenance responsibilities, including scenarios where resident associations manage planted berms or where Council takes on operational costs for certain assets.
- 4.4. **Funding and Development Contributions:** addressed funding mechanisms, such as development contributions, and the need for agreements between Council and developers to ensure asset development and maintenance.

5. **School Land Use and Community Integration:** discussed the integration of school land use with community open spaces, including timing, shared use of fields, and potential conflicts.

- 5.1. **Timing and Acquisition for Schools:** Brett outlined the anticipated timeline for school development, with primary school land acquisition expected around 2027–2028 and high school later, noting the reserved right to buy land at set prices and the need for modelling to determine exact requirements.
- 5.2. **Shared Use and Community Access:** The group discussed scenarios where school fields could be shared with the community, considering operational hours and potential alienation of local residents during school use, with Rahman emphasizing the importance of prioritizing public usability.
- 5.3. **Coordination with Existing Community Parks:** Brett and Rahman highlighted the need to coordinate with existing community parks, such as TPO Park, to avoid overlapping functions and ensure complementary activities.

Follow-up actions:

FAST TRACK PARKS CONSULTATION

1	Evaluate and confirm the preferred location and typology of the suburban park, including trade-offs between central placement, southern relocation, catchment coverage, land acquisition cost, and service to future communities.	Parks and BSLP
2	Review and adjust the size of the southern neighbourhood park to ensure it can accommodate a 30 by 30 metre kickable space and meet Council expectations for high-density environments.	Stuart Dunn
3	Clarify the arrangement with MOE regarding acquisition, ownership, and use of school fields, including whether fields will form part of the urban park network or remain separately owned.	BSLP
4	Confirm and document developer responsibilities for delivering open spaces, including infrastructure, playgrounds, quality standards, timing, and asset handover requirements.	Roja
5	Engage with TPO Park representatives to coordinate existing community park activities, potential expansion plans, and the relationship with proposed new parks and sports fields.	BSLP
6	Agree acquisition and maintenance responsibilities for EPAN 2 and EPAN 3 coastal ecological areas, including operational cost implications and obligations under the plan change.	Parks