

28 March 2025

PRR00042504 - Pre-application Resource Consenting Planning Comments

PROPOSAL

The proposal is to develop land owned by Te Kawerau a Maki (TKAM) on the southern part of Riverhead Forest. Noting the pre-application status and stage of development of the proposal the development envisaged is for:

- A 210-lot vacant-lot rural lifestyle subdivision (sites of 1ha average) on Lot 1 DP 590677 (222ha), to be carried out over a total of 14 stages.
- An approximate 260-unit retirement village on Lot 2 DP 590677 (174ha) (reduced from 350 unit with the original lodgement package).

It is understood that the proposal will accommodate:

- Revegetation and protection of all areas outside the proposed specified building areas of each rural lifestyle lot and accessways;
- Revegetation and protection of areas within the Retirement village “area” but not the remainder of the lot 2 extent outside the retirement village area subdivision boundary (identified below as a WIP);
- Retention of all existing walking and cycle tracks within the site, with easements to be provided for public access;
- Establishment of a privately owned public car park at the central access point off Old North Road to provide for public parking to use the existing walkways within the site and wider Riverhead Forest area;
- Establishment of a shared community facility for the rural lifestyle subdivision adjacent to the public car park area;
- Upgrade of the portion of Forestry Road which is public road but in gravel condition, Extension of the public road up Forestry Road to the entrance point to the retirement village, and vesting of that road to Auckland Transport;
- Establishment of a new pedestrian connection from the retirement village site to Riverhead in the south-eastern corner of the site;
- Establishment of public retail activities at the site entrance to the retirement village site; and
- Development of a Residential Design Guidelines document to manage the design and development outcomes on the countryside living subdivision to an appropriate scale and design.

It is also understood that the applicant is currently considering including a subdivision of Lot 2 around the retirement village site.

We acknowledge that the proposal is developing at pace and is regularly changing in scope and details. These preliminary planning comments are based on the general understanding of the application summarised above and provide high-level “in principle” comments for the overall proposal. It is not an exhaustive review of all elements of the scheme against relevant matters given the stage of the process with all consent matters and technical reports to be development and the extent of advice being sought.

RURAL LIFESTYLE/COUNTRYSIDE LIVING SUBDIVISION

It is understood that the proposed subdivision will be a non-complying activity pursuant to E39.4.2 (A15) – subdivision that does not comply with E39.6.5.2. The proposal establishes 210 residential lots at a minimum site area of 1ha, where E39.6.5.2 requires a minimum site area of 2ha. A subdivision activity complying with standard E39.6.5.2 is a discretionary activity.

At this stage, we have unresolved concerns in regard to the intensity of development proposed and with respect to the consistency of the development with the Rural – Countryside Living zone provisions and associated potential plan integrity issues as relevant matters of consideration under s104(1)(c). These are highlighted below before being discussed alongside other relevant provisions including regard to be given to Treaty Settlement provisions.

- Enabling lot sizes in the Countryside Living zone of under 2ha without using the TRSS pathway could essentially undercut the TRSS system. It gives away the incentive without the offset. If sites under 2ha can be created through a Non-Complying resource consent, then it opens up a far less onerous avenue than having to use the TRSS system. With the incentive undermined, there would likely be less overall environmental benefits and more in-situ rural-residential development in the wider rural area.

We have discussed the identified difference of opinion between Campbell Brown’s position and ours regarding the need and/or consideration that would be required to be given to revegetation planting and potential protection of wetlands when assessing the subdivision and in particular the density and lot sizes proposed. In reviewing this from the Council position, as a benchmark there is currently a gap between the AUP subdivision standards and revegetation guidance (appendix 15 and 16) for revegetation planting and protection of wetlands and the measures and mechanisms as described. This has been identified in other correspondence, and we are aware may be something that is being reviewed by the applicant team but is highlighted again for completeness.

- The objectives and policies of the Countryside Living zone seek to ensure that the rural character and amenity values of the area are maintained and to avoid an urban form and character of development. The zone description summarises that the zone provides for rural lifestyle living that is characterised as low-density rural lifestyle dwellings on rural land. The proposal does not seek to utilise the TRSS provisions of the in-situ subdivision provisions, and as such the minimum density of the relevant standard is 2ha. This forms a benchmark for the anticipated character and amenity outcomes for the area under the Countryside Living zone and raises concern with respect to the consistency of the development with the objectives and policies that seek to provide for and maintain a certain rural character and amenity outcome.

Note: While the Treaty Settlement provisions are noted as being relevant to this site and proposal, they must be read in conjunction with other relevant parts of the AUP including Chapter H19 – Rural zones. They do not circumnavigate but are to be read alongside the Countryside Living provisions, and nor, importantly, do they manage subdivision activities. They only apply to land use activities, for up to 10 dwellings per site (see discussion below for more detail). The Treaty Settlement provisions can be viewed as providing an additional

consideration and potentially enabling a level of additional development of the site beyond the zoning (as long as it is still appropriate in terms of character, scale, intensity, etc). However, the current weighting proposed to utilise the 1 dwelling per 1 hectare permitted activity (up to 10 dwellings a site) appears imbalanced when assessing the proposal in the context of also objectives and policies within E39 and H19.

Discussion

It is understood that the land meets the definition of Treaty Settlement Land. The application will need to demonstrate that this is the case. Please carefully review the exclusions within Chapter J definition which the Council has an example of a site no longer meeting the definition as result of a change of ownership where the claimant group no longer had majority interest.

We acknowledge the Treaty Settlement provisions could offer a context for the anticipated intensity of use for the site in the manner specified in the applicant's submitted Policy assessment - i.e.: the 222ha lot subject to the proposed subdivision could first be subdivided into 22 10ha lots, and then developed to each accommodate 10 dwellings (i.e.: 1 dwelling per hectare intensity). This would not be a permitted baseline argument, as the initial subdivision would require discretionary resource consent which would technically provide the opportunity to consider the effects of permitted activities which would take place in vacant subdivision was proposed. It is noted, however, that subdivision around approved or existing development is not provided for in the Countryside Living Zone, and as such the future subdivision around those 10 dwellings on each site would be a non-complying activity and would face the same policy challenges noted above. As such, we are not satisfied that the Treaty Settlement provisions alone are sufficient to justify the proposed density of the subdivision.

The proposal does, however, accommodate a range of other benefits and positive outcomes that could, if substantiated, be a factor in assessing the proposed density of development provided these are developed and offered as mitigation elements for the proposal as part of the substantive application. These include the proposed revegetation and protection mechanisms; protection measures for wetlands; the legalisation of the existing public walking tracks and associated long-term maintenance of these elements; and anticipated enhancement of stormwater quality and associated ecosystems. At this stage, with an awareness that the applicant is looking into these matters alongside this pre-app, the details of these elements have not been sufficiently clarified to give substantive weight to these elements when undertaking an assessment of the non-complying subdivision in the context of the policy framework (notably including the objectives and policies of E39 and subdivision of rural land). It is understood from pre-application discussions that the applicant's position is that 1ha lots sizes will be the retained size in the substantive lodgement, and that these benefits are not needed as "mitigation" for the proposed lot sizes as the Treaty Settlement provisions are sufficient to support the densities proposed. As noted above, we are not yet satisfied with this approach and have unresolved concerns with the density. As such, in the spirit of the pre-application and engaging on matters where we can reach agreement and secure improvement, we strongly recommend the substantive application includes and develops the following to strengthen your proposals and provide a stronger basis for the proposal to assist in resolving our outstanding concerns:

- Draft revegetation plans that include species, spacings, timings etc and are in accordance with Appendix 15 and 16;
- Details of proposed revegetation and wetland protection mechanisms in accordance or using the benchmark of Appendix 16, including draft long-term maintenance and management plans, who would be responsible for implementing the maintenance; covenant/consent notice wordings, etc;
- Details of proposed easements for public accessibility across existing and any proposed new walkways/cycleways

- Details of boundary structures and how fragmentation of wetlands and revegetated areas is avoided; and
- Details for proposed stormwater management (quantity and quality) measures.
- Review calculations in respect to *“It is estimated that around 16 additional lots could be realised across the two sites through the combination of native revegetation and wetland protection.”*¹ It is not clear how these figures were calculated, but it appears that they may be short of what could be created if the qualifying standards were met.
- It is noted that the Te Kawerau ā Maki submission on the PAUP did previously propose that development of the southern area of the Riverhead Forest would be part of a package that would require protection of all the SEAs (62ha) across the wider landholding. It is suggested this type of mitigation/offset is reviewed by the applicant (either protecting existing SEA or revegetation planting).

Reference has been made to the relevance of lot boundaries and sizes to the south. If this is to be relied upon in any assessment we would recommend that the substantive application be supported with a detailed consideration of the subdivision pattern to the south of the subject site, and how this was established through the relevant planning framework (i.e.: was this through TRSS processes, previous/historic plan provisions, etc?).

As discussed, the application also requires controls and robust mechanisms to be put in place regarding the provision of future land use development on each vacant lot. This is necessary to support the link put forward in relation to the consideration that should be given to dwelling land use activities and also to deliver on the envisaged aesthetic and design quality of the proposed dwellings.

An assessment of potential precedence effects and plan integrity outcomes should also be included in the substantive application. It is expected that the applicant will reference the amended criteria for the decision making of the Consenting Panel on this application under the Fast Track Act (weighting and gateway test) as part of this assessment.

Matters which have not been discussed in the pre-app to date but are noted for completeness include:

- The consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects for the surrounding rural production zoned land; and
- The extent of any subdivision proposed to rural production zoned land (on the basis of disparities between the lot boundaries and the zoning boundaries).

Noting the applicants stated intention to lodge the application shortly these matters are highlighted as needing assessment and for review during any invitation to comment received by Council.

RETIREMENT VILLAGE

It is understood that the retirement village aspect of this development will be a discretionary activity pursuant to C1.7, as this is not provided for within the Countryside Living Zone, nor within the Treaty Settlement Chapter. Likewise, the public retail activities are not provided for and therefore will be a discretionary activity pursuant to C1.7.

Whilst we note that there are some unique characteristics to the site and the location of the retirement village particularly in relation to the containment of some effects from the wider receiving environment, at this stage we have concerns with the establishment of a retirement village within the Countryside

¹ Campbell Brown memo, dated 3 March 2025

Living zone and the consistency of this activity as presented with the associated relevant objectives and policies of the AUP: OP which have not been addressed to date:

- A retirement village of the scale and intensity proposed has a fundamentally urban form and character, which Policy H19.7.3 (1) seeks to avoid. The retirement village as currently proposed involves relatively substantial landform modifications (excavations of up to 12m), and as such doesn't appear to be consistent with H19.7.3(1)(a) and (b), and raises concerns with respect to the consistency of the proposal with the Regional Policy Statement of the AUP: OP (objectives and policies B2.2.1(1) and (4), B2.2.2(4), and B9.2.1(4).
- Plan Change 20 responded to early caselaw (*Kumeu Property Limited v. Auckland Council* ENV-2017-AKL-44) to "close the loophole" in Chapter H19 that enabled a broader range of residential activities within the Countryside Living Zone than was intended. The commissioners on PC20 stated:

*"Amending the term 'residential' to 'dwellings' provides better alignment with the RPS objectives and policies in respect of, elite and prime soils, urban growth and form, residential growth and intensification, commercial and industrial growth, rural lifestyle development, rural production and rural character and amenity."*²

*"We find that there is a primacy given to rural production activities within the rural zones, within the rural general objectives and policies and within the RPS objectives and policies enabling rural production. That primacy does not appear to apply to the Rural – Countryside Living zone, which has a focus on rural lifestyle living rather than rural production, albeit with some low-level rural productivity. The Rural – Countryside Living zone would be particularly vulnerable to conversion to more intensive residential and commercial land uses, if the zone description and policy structure were not sufficiently clear as to the zone purpose."*³

Discussion

To date, no significant policy assessment has been provided in relation to the retirement village activity, with the policy assessment submitted having been restricted to the vacant lot subdivision aspects of the development. We encourage a more comprehensive assessment of the application against the relevant provisions of Chapter H19 and E21 of the AUP: OP to be provided with the substantive application for our further consideration of this aspect of the development.

We understand that the proposal would involve the subdivision of the site to encompass the retirement village on much smaller site to enable future further countryside living subdivision on the remainder of Lot 2. This limits the ability of the wider site to accommodate and mitigate the intensity of use and urban form of this development and balance the outcomes. We would encourage the applicant to consider offering additional or extensive protection of the wider Lot 2 area as a consideration to the more intensive urban form proposed for the retirement village.

It is understood that the applicant has other Case Law examples of retirement villages being approved within the Countryside Living zone that would assist in a further assessment of this, and we would encourage these being provided in the substantive application when lodged to assist our further review of this matter. Please, however, take into account the implications of Plan Change 20 when determining if the case law you have available is relevant and/or useful.

Critical further information that would be useful to enable a more substantive assessment of the retirement village aspect of the site includes:

² Paragraph 92 of the PC20 Decision

³ Paragraph 94 of the PC20 Decision

- The caselaw documentation referenced above;
- A “density” calculation for the retirement village activity, based on the extent of the retirement village site and proposed number of units;
- A comprehensive policy assessment of the retirement village activity against the relevant obs & pols, noting the one provided to date focusses on the vacant-lot subdivision activity;
- A complete Landscape Visual Assessment & Architectural plan set that provides a clear understanding of the relationship of the retirement village site with the surrounding environment and its visibility; and
- A complete Transport Impact Assessment.

OTHER MATTERS

In other correspondence the following matters have been highlighted:

- Need for survey evidence to confirm stream width.
- Need for the applicant to review and assess the proposal in relation to any instruments and interests on the ROT.
- The Council has been consistent regarding this land including through the PAUP hearings that large scale development should go through a plan change process. The Independent Hearings Panel (IHP) referenced a plan change approach in their recommendations on the Riverhead 2 precinct:

“The Panel acknowledges that the area is Treaty Settlement Land and considers that a future plan change should be pursued to develop specific provisions that are consistent with the enabling provisions in Chapter B6 Mana Whenua of the regional policy statement.”⁴

Council’s Policy team is still of the view that a plan change is a more appropriate process for development of this scale on this site. They acknowledge this is a listed project in the Fast Track Approvals Act but wish to reiterate their comments in this regard and in the interests of openness you should be aware that this is an overarching point the Council may wish to make when asked for written comments following any substantive lodgement.

SUMMARY

Overall, while we acknowledge the site and proposal accommodates a range of positive overall outcomes, we retain concerns at this stage of the consistency of the proposal with the relevant provisions of the AUP: OP.

We hope that this letter is useful to the applicant with respect to the aspects of the proposal summarised in the memo above to assist with understanding positions, the development of the scheme and the further assessment of the proposal against these provisions to be undertaken when the substantive application has been lodged.

⁴ Report to Auckland Council by Independent Hearings Panel. Hearing topics 016, 017 Changes to the Rural Urban Boundary; 080, 081 Rezoning and precincts. Annexure 4 Precincts North (July 2016)

Yours sincerely,



Emma Chandler
Associate
Sentinel Planning Limited



Joe Wilson
Principal Project Lead
Auckland Council Premium Resource Consents

Appendix – Specialist Pre-Application Notes

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – Peter Kensington

I write in response to your request for specialist input brief dated 19 February 2025 and my attendance at the pre-application meeting on 18 March 2025. This email provides my specialist landscape architectural review comments, as part of the pre-application engagement process, for the proposals at Rangitooopuni in Riverhead – noting that an opportunity for further formal comments on the lodged application will be available in due course.

Terms of reference:

- a. You have specifically sought specialist advice regarding: any fundamental concerns; any amendments requested; and any information required to support the application for resource consent. I have not set out my comments under each of these headings, rather I have provided a general commentary which reflects the discussion we had with the applicant during our meeting.
- b. I confirm that I have reviewed the preliminary application material that was provided (as a link) in your email dated 12 March 2025, noting that the design of the proposal has subsequently changed, particularly for the layout of proposed development on Lot 2 – as communicated to us by the applicant during the pre-application meeting.
- c. I also note that these comments have been provided without the benefit of me visiting the site or having reviewed the applicant's assessment methodology, including in relation to any visualisations (visual simulations) and any assessment of the likely landscape and visual effects which may occur over time, during what is understood to be a staged implementation.
- d. Acknowledging the helpful summary prepared by Emma Chandler focusing on the likely activity status of the subdivision, dwellings and retirement living, as received 19 March 2025, my comments are also made within the context of the relevant objectives (H19.7.2) and policies (H19.7.3) of the Rural – Countryside Living Zone and the wider Rural Zone objectives and policies; along with the rural subdivision provisions within E39. I also acknowledge the unique nature of the site with the E21 (Treaty Settlement Land) provisions having relevance with the applicant being the development arm of Te Kawerau ā Maki. I note the various rule triggers and that the proposal (being a 'bespoke' response) does not necessarily align with the AUP(OP) framework. I understand that the rural-residential subdivision aspect of the proposal (on Lot 1) is likely to be assessed as a non-complying activity; and that the retirement village aspect of the proposal (on Lot 2) is likely to be assessed as a discretionary activity. I also acknowledge that the lot boundaries of the application site do not completely following the zoning boundaries (AUP(OP) and that there may be some overlap of the rural subdivision with the rural production zoning. I will await classification in the applicant's lodgement or other material on how they wish to respond and develop the scheme to respond to this situation to understand its significance for my assessment.
- e. I confirm that I have reviewed and understand the preliminary planning questions that were set out in your 12 March 2025 email; and the terrestrial comments from Rue Stratham dated 18 March 2025.

Specialist comments:

1. It is pleasing to see that the proposal has involved a landscape / ecology led design response.
2. The design of the rural-residential subdivision (Lot 1) appears to respond to the underlying topography of the site in a logical manner, including the location of proposed access and building platforms and through minimising earthworks.
3. On the other hand, it appears that the retirement village (Lot 2) will require reasonably extensive landform modification; acknowledging that the applicant has communicated to us that this area of the site is relatively well contained visually. As discussed, it will be important to check the eastern interface of this activity, which appears may have some visibility from locations in the wider

landscape to the east (i.e. the existing Riverhead village, where the elevated forested hillsides currently provide an enclosing western backdrop to the settlement).

4. I support the proposed revegetation, which is extensive and will significantly enhance (remedy / restore) a previously degraded landscape – replacing the previous monoculture pine forest land use. I also support the vision for the rural-residential land use, which seeks to achieve a future character of ‘dwellings within the bush’, rather than a traditional rural-residential land use which results in a ‘dwellings within pasture’ character. Such an outcome, if successful in the long-term, will enhance the landscape character and amenity values of the site, in my opinion. It will be important to reconcile how this future restored landscape will interface with ongoing production forestry activities – particularly adjacent the proposed retirement village where these two activities appear will have an immediate adjacency.
5. The proposal appears to be proposing appropriately scaled roads and associated infrastructure (in particular lighting – we heard during the meeting that this will be in the form of low bollard type lighting).
6. To assist in achieving an integrated outcome, where future buildings on the proposed rural-residential vacant lots are appropriate in terms of scale and external appearance – this will require consent notices (e.g. to limit building height, coverage and materials – with some relaxation of front-yard setbacks to recognise the unique nature and intent of the lot layouts – within an overall vision/objective to achieve an integrated built/vegetated outcome – i.e. dwellings ‘nestled’ within a bush setting) and reference to a building and vegetation design guideline document. Implementation and control over future buildings will require confirmation at the time of any application for building consent (so that the council retains a level of control over the outcomes), acknowledging that the applicant envisages a body corporation / residents society-association which will also provide an initial design review function. A common ownership model such as this will be a key mechanism for ensuring the project’s vision is achieved over time, including the proposed comprehensive landscape rehabilitation, which is extensive and will require a long-term approach to implementation, establishment and ongoing management (with associated funding considerations).
7. The proposed retirement village (Lot 2) is a relatively intensive urban development, which may require a balance with areas of unbuilt areas of the site being revegetated (as per the earlier scheme presented to us). I have some preliminary concern over the future development potential on the balance of this lot being realised over time (being the area which will be retained for ongoing production forestry activity), with possible adverse cumulative landscape effects arising. It would be helpful for the applicant to include details of the current pine forest harvesting timeframes and their future intention for this land (i.e. this land could also be revegetated in the future, as originally suggested, or a consent notice could be included that requires no further development to occur on this balance land).

Healthy Waters

Kedan Li and Mereene Mathew (Catchment Planning)

- Provide overall stormwater management strategy for both Lot 1 and Lot 2.
- Section 3.2 - Has an assessment been conducted to evaluate the need for additional culverts or upgrades to the existing culverts to prevent blockages and mitigate flood risks?
- Section 3.2 - Given the existing, known flooding issues downstream, how will the proposed development mitigate the risk of worsening downstream flooding?
- Section 3.2 - Provide an assessment of stream erosion mitigation. The assessment criteria should include both peak flow rate and discharging volume.
- Section 3.2.2 - How will the proposed increase in impervious areas (from 0% to 80% in Lot 2) effect runoff rates and what mitigation strategies (attenuation, treatment) will be in place?
- Confirm if overland flowpaths will be maintained and integrated into the development/s, especially considering flood risks during extreme weather events. Will the overland flowpaths be kept entirely clear of structures, or are there specific areas where mitigation strategies will be implemented to ensure flood risk management?
- Section 3.5 - Are there spillway or overflow provisions in place for extreme rainfall events where culverts may reach their capacity? In light of existing downstream flooding, it's extremely important to provide further detail in this regard.

- Section 4.2.2 - Water quality treatment required to GD01 or equivalent standard.
- Section 4.3 - It is acknowledged that private roads are expected to have fewer than 5000 vehicle movements. *E1 - Water quality and integrated management* emphasizes the importance of enhancement and maintenance of water quality – confirm whether any treatment measures will be implemented to manage potential stormwater runoff and any associated environmental impacts? In line with the objectives and policies of this chapter, it is recommended that any impermeable area be treated prior to discharge.
- Section 4.3 - Confirm that geotechnical assessments have been conducted to ensure the stability and suitability of the disposal system for each lot and accessway, particularly in areas with steep slopes or unstable soils. Provide infiltration rates for the soil where the overflow from the tanks will be discharged to.
- Section 4.3.1 - Provide more details on how attenuation will be managed on a catchment-wide basis for the countryside living development? How will the stormwater flows be managed to prevent flooding or downstream impacts if attenuation is not being provided within each lot?
- How will the catchment-wide attenuation solution be designed to ensure that peak flows are effectively mitigated for all storm events, including the 2, 5, 10, 20, 50, 100-year rainfall event?
- Section 4.3.2 - For the steeper sections where treatment via swales is not feasible, alternative treatment measures must be considered.
- Please provide detail on the proposed asset ownership and clarify where vesting of assets is intended

Hillary Johnston (Growth and Development – incorporating comments from Waterways Planning Team)

- As the site is rural zoned, authorisation under the Regionwide Network Discharge Consent cannot be sought. Private diversion and discharge consent should be sought under Chapter E8 of the AUP as part of the application.
- There is not yet enough information to assess or comment on the effects of the development on the significant existing downstream flood hazards. It is understood the applicant's agents are working on compiling this information (via modelling) and are cognisant of the proposed development within the PC100 area.
- Detail is light on stormwater management proposed. Water quality treatment is touched on but there is little mention of hydrology mitigation or stormwater volume management of smaller, more frequent events. As the site is outside of the RUB it would not have been assessed at the time of development of the SMAF overlay. The downstream areas are subject to a SMAF overlay therefore this is a good indication that equivalent hydrology mitigation would be of benefit.
- Historic Healthy Waters watercourse assessments for the stream within the site noted it had 40-60% erosion on the banks. The preliminary geotechnical report describes the stream as having incised gullies and describes the stream as having a relatively high deposited sediment load. This may indicate that hydrology mitigation interventions beyond SMAF might be required for this development (geomorphic solutions). It is suggested that this further investigated in combination by stormwater and ecology specialists.
- The existing 100-year floodplain will be exacerbated due to impervious surface increase from development. If there is an attempt to contain these flows within the stream channel, this will cause incision and widening. This matter should be addressed as part of lodged application.
- Aspirations of maintaining low-flow through the culvert/s has been mentioned however there is little detail within the documents reviewed to date on design, including for the provision of fish passage.
- Culverts are proposed to be relied on to throttle flows from the development as a catchment-wide solution. Intended ownership of these structures is unclear and may also need to be discussed with Auckland Transport.

Council Development Engineer – Ray Smith

Infrastructure and Servicing

- If Watercare approval cannot be gained to service Lots 1 and 2 for water supply and wastewater by public infrastructure extension means, it is noted that the Countryside Living application for 210 Lots that is proposed to be constructed on Lot 1 and the 350 unit retirement village proposed on Lot 2, is proposed to be serviced by on site means.
- The onsite means for Lot 1 include that water supply would be through individual dwelling roof collection with wastewater servicing by individual on site effluent disposal solutions to meet TP 108 requirements.
- The Retirement Village proposal for 350 units would likely be similarly serviced for water supply by roof collection and/or subject to consent, a water bore, however it would be anticipated that a community based effluent treatment system would be required for Wastewater disposal. It would appear that the site profile and available area would be suitable for this to occur. Any on site water supply would be required to be treated to meet national standards and sufficient storage volume would be needed to be available and demonstrated to satisfy demand through a range of climatic conditions. While a range of possible community based wastewater treatment plants could be utilised, the design and construction would also be required to meet TP 108 requirements.
- The developments within both Lots could be expected to supply sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes and subject to further detailed design and additional storage, this is expected to be able to be provided.
- Councils Healthy Waters department have commented separately on stormwater servicing and other stormwater matters and it is likely that any networks may be recommended to be private and especially alongside where the planned roading networks are also private.

Overland flow paths and flooding

- For stormwater, any proposed impermeable surfaces are expected to increase runoff to downstream properties and it is noted from Councils GIS, that flooding appears to exist downstream currently.
- To address this aspect, it is proposed that bush planting is carried out with covenanting within the Countryside living area and that stormwater attenuation will be utilised for the Retirement Village site. The site is in a unique situation in that it is situated at the top of two catchments and both of these solutions are considered to be potentially appropriate noting that Healthy Waters will review and request further information on these aspects in detail. If designed adequately, the bush planting is expected to be especially effective for increased runoff mitigation in that changes to ground runoff coefficients can provide a hydrologically neutral solution in matching pre development runoff flow, volume and timing. Being situated at the top of the catchment, discharges controlled by attenuation have the potential to not further exacerbate downstream flooding, provided that appropriate storage and design detailing occurs. It is anticipated that Healthy Waters will request further information on these matters.
- Although bush planting and attenuation are proposed, it is expected that isolated areas (particularly at outfalls) will be subjected to increased flows and therefore erosion protection would be expected to be provided, where this occurs. Extended detention in isolated areas is another measure that may be recommended to address possible erosion and siltation.
- It would appear from the drawings submitted that the building sites proposed within the Countryside Living area and the development for the Retirement Village are on relatively elevated positions and have been in most instances, located close to ridge lines. They would therefore be expected to be clear of flooding and overland flow natural hazard areas as is required by Chapter 36 of the AUP and Section 106 of the RMA. Consideration of the design of any structures such as fencing or other boundary structures in respect to natural hazards and their operation may also need to be included.
- The requirements for stormwater including stormwater treatment which will be required to address GD01 have been covered by other Healthy Waters staff.

Earthworks and Geotechnical.

- The draft plans attached to the infrastructure report are helpful to understand the proposal and to explain the area and volumes of earthworks that will be applied for. However, I would also suggest that as part of the geotechnical report that will be provided, that the earthworks plans should be reviewed and confirmed as satisfactory to meet Council standards.
- The draft earthworks plans would be expected to be updated to include erosion and sediment control measures.
- The geotechnical investigation and reporting should also provide sufficient information to confirm that the building sites and access are stable and free of natural hazards, in line with Councils Code of Practice requirements. It should also address suitability for onsite effluent disposal.
- Although the expected ground conditions in being Waitemata Series silts and clays are relatively well understood and therefore predictable, given the sites steepness, it is also suggested (as per the CoP) that a PS 2 process could be included as an option in any future referral to Council.

Internal Rooding Transport

- It is understood that the Countryside Living and Retirement Village applications will be serviced by private roads. Subject to site investigation to address structural integrity, the cross sections provided for the Countryside living areas are expected to be appropriate.
- For a development such as this, to assist with justifying access widths, parking numbers and general access provisions, a traffic report and impact assessment for the application would be expected to be provided.
- It is understood that Auckland Transport have otherwise reviewed the application and provided advice for the effects to the public roading network, the proposed connections and any upgrades that are proposed.

Council Stormwater Specialist – Martin Meyer

E8 Stormwater – Discharge and Diversion

This activity would typically be assessed as 'discretionary' under E8.

The country living area will consist of 1ha lots, which will discharge stormwater (from overflowing tanks) via tee-bar spreaders to prevent any erosion issues from the discharge. The amount of impervious area per lot will be limited to the building platform as the remainder of lots will be planted with native bush. Attenuation is proposed, however not on lots, however via 'low flow culverts' which will be installed in catchment specific locations.

Stormwater quality treatment will occur throughout the development via swales and wetlands for trafficked areas excluding some steep JOALs in the countryside living zone. Roofs will be constructed of inert materials. Typically, under E8 for rural zoned areas not subject to specific precinct rules this would be seen as adequate treatment for stormwater quality. It is noted that Healthy Waters requested treatment of all impervious areas. Internal discussions will take place so that we have a consistent approach.

E9 Stormwater Quality – High Contaminant Generating Carparks

The applicant has stated they will not have over 30 visitor carparks (exposed to rainfall) in the retirement village, therefore E9 is not applicable. I advised that given they will be treating trafficked areas with a wetland that it would be a permitted activity if they chose to have over 30 carparks.

E10 Stormwater Management

The site does not sit within a SMAF area but is located upstream of a SMAF zone. To be consistent with flow management strategies of this catchment, the applicant was advised by Healthy Waters to take this into account (the current zoning of the land means it would not have been assessed for SMAF). The western reaches of the country living zone will discharge via a tributary of the Ararimu river which is not designated as a SMAF area and therefore consideration of E10 would not be considered necessary for this area.

However all current 'residential' zoned areas that currently discharge into the Wautaiti Stream are Zoned as SMAF-Flow 1.

Of note the applicant stated that onsite attenuation was limited/not considered due to issues with capacity requirements for fire-fighting and potable uses (for the country side living area).

Council Wastewater Specialist, Grant Fleming acting on behalf of Council

In general, the design presented for the site is consistent with standard approaches to individual and communal onsite systems.

- For the communal/retirement village, this system will be designed needing a discharge consent and as such more details are likely to be provided from that process and does not really need any further discussion at this point. However, the reporting should include details about how the proposed system might be staged and what monitorable trigger will initiate the construction of the next stage.
- For the on-site individual lots which are targeting discharging are permitted activities it is important that the site development and approach is sympathetic to this. Which includes:
 - Taking into consideration site slopes and watercourses and providing appropriate setbacks.
 - Delineating proposed discharge areas early in the process to avoid site works which may affect the future discharge system performance.
 - Ensure any required drainage systems or geotechnical remedial measures are located well clear of any delineated discharge areas to ensure they can be viably used in the future.

Parks Specialist Response, Doug Sadlier, Senior Parks Planner

Provided by separate attachment.

Auckland Transport, Siva Jegadeeswaran

Provided by separate attachment.

Terrestrial Ecologist, Rue Statham, Senior Ecologist

Pre-Meeting Notes/Review (provided for background and guidance)

1. Presumably, the exotic forest harvesting is / will be compliant with NES-CF 2017, notably Schedule 4 and Schedule 6
 1. Both schedules require consideration of threatened fauna species, including regionally threatened species (lizards, birds, and bats).
 2. Would be useful for completeness to submit both those plans for consideration in the application, including the fauna management plans as required by those Environmental Regulations.
 3. Application lacks the harvest cycle plan, as referred to in Section 1.3 of the EclA.
2. The application is based on subjective analysis.
 1. No formal fauna surveys were undertaken (see EclA section 3.3)

2. The EclA can place little weight on effects assessment on fauna; noting that fauna assessments and management is required for NES-CF
3. I suggest that formal fauna surveys are carried out to inform the development, notably on birds and bats.
3. Density and yield
 1. Table E39.6.5.2.1 Rural – Countryside Living Zone areas not identified Minimum: 2ha resulting in a greater density that expected for the zone. The development does not appear to involve TRSS
 2. Applicant proposes 1ha sites, planner has advised that this applicant's approach / reasoning for this is underpinned by activity status of 1 dwelling per 1ha up to 10 dwellings per site as a PA under chapter E21 and discretion to consider the objectives and policies of chapter E21 (and B7.2.1).
 3. Greater density than that provided by Table E21.4.1 (A3) or (A4).
 4. Retirement Villages are not listed as an activity provided for in CSL zones but are considered as a Discretionary activity under the rules of Chapter C – expectation of policy H19.7.3.1(d) for ecological enhancement a relevant discretionary consideration.
4. The application lacks specific management plans; these need to be submitted as part of the application, these include
 1. Detailed planting and maintenance plans (not concepts)
 2. Weed eradication and pest animal control
 3. Fauna mitigation, prior, during and post development (notably birds, bats, and lizards), being appropriate to each staging area.
5. Lot 2 has the potential to create greater ecological outcomes than Lot1 CSL
 1. The consolidation of the development on Lot 2 is helping to prevent the fragmentation of forest restoration.
 2. The linear arrangement of the CSL fragments the site over Lot 1, leading to less viable forest areas and discontinuity of habitats and corridors for fauna.
 3. Noting many lots are set well with in the planting areas, with long accessways / driveways off the local roads.
 4. Should consider more clustering of house sites to reduce edge effects and habitat fragmentation created by the spread-out form.
 5. Noting the above comments regarding CSL zoning and expected density,
6. The wetlands are likely to provide habitat for threatened wetland avifauna (notably bittern).
 1. The proposed walkways are located next to the largest of wetlands which is likely to disturb these birds.
 2. Would suggest relocating walkways away from the most sensitive habitats.
7. The planting concept is incomplete.
 1. Does not include wetland or wetted edge riparian restoration.
 2. Unclear if the planting is ecosystem derived, and contains some species that are not appropriate for the location or are naturally uncommon and not recommended.
 3. The planting plan does not reflect the current and expected site conditions, e.g. ex-forestry which has significant management and access constraints.
 4. 'General revegetation', 'riparian planting' specifications are incomplete and not consistent with Appendix 16 (or Te Haumanu Taiao - not statutory, but best practice guidance)
 5. Low planting concept is not clear if this is for restoration or amenity. If the latter, it should not be considered forest or ecosystem restoration.
 6. Suggested change is to provide for greater setback from development to the forest restoration and remove 'low planting' entirely.
8. Unclear from the application who will be responsible for ongoing management of the forest restoration.
 1. If to be held in a covenant, how is this compatible with public access (e.g. walkways). The covenant owner will be responsible for all aspects of protection including any damage.

2. Is the ongoing protection and management to be held in an incorporated society? Applicant acknowledges this is the likely route but is their expertise to provide for long term maintenance. Applicant should consider how can strengthen this including role of suitably qualified persons to ensure and oversee management.
3. Who funds the ongoing management and legal mechanism to ensure compliance? Noting the above comments regarding ex-forestry and greater management constraints and costs.
4. Would expect Lot 1 and Lot 2 revegetation to be managed holistically across both sites, not independently.

Meeting Discussion/Clarification on points discussed above (linking to Items above)

- Item 1 and 2 – Laura clarified that bay surveys being undertaken, good to hear that you are doing bat surveys, are you doing any targeted fauna surveys for other species referred to in item 1. This should be undertaken and inform proposals.
- Other – Rue queried proposals in respect to mountain trails. Peter Whiting provided clarification regarding the position of these and that would not include walking trails – details on how design measures will provide for this to be provided.
- Item 3 – discussed the provision of draft management plans as outlined under item 3 including animal and weed pest control.
- Item 5 – discussed Rue's comments on habitat fragmentation and clustering. Peter explained that the proposed roading and building platforms have been selected based on the existing topography and minimising earthworks – confirmed that this will need to be demonstrated in the application.
- Other - Light spill - further detail on the design and how this will be managed around building platforms, walkways, revegetated areas. Suggest the use of cross-sections for design considerations (e.g. Hamilton)
- Other – discussed the difference in position between Council and the applicant team of the status of the proposed revegetation, riparian and wetland restoration in the planning assessment.

Freshwater Ecologist and Streamworks - Antoniette Bootsma, Senior Specialist

- I am in general agreement with the classification and delineation of waterbodies including wetlands and streams.
- I note that input regarding replanting in wetlands and riparian areas is provided by the terrestrial ecologist
- Final plans submitted during the application should include pre and post development catchments to confirm that no decrease in water input to wetlands and streams will result.
- Culverts – design drawings should be sufficiently detailed from which to confirm that PA standards are met
- Indicative Streamworks Management Plans should be provided for all streamworks.
- Cut and fill plans should show setbacks from wetlands and streams. I note that some building platforms are located close to wetlands.
- Please provide an assessment of effects of boundary fencing, vegetation removal and creating building structures on wetlands.

Watercare – Amber Taylor, Development Planning Team Lead

Our planning teams have very limited capacity to be assessing servicing options for land that is not earmarked for urbanisation by Council.

They have however reviewed the proposal and provided a high-level response, see below.

Wastewater: This area is not within the planned area of service for wastewater therefore it has not been accommodated within the existing infrastructure servicing Riverhead. Riverhead is serviced via an LPS

system, with system capacity currently constrained by the capacity at Riverhead pumping station. Further capacity at the Riverhead pumping station will become available on completion of future projects, including works associated with the Slaughterhouse pumping station and diversion of the Kumeu/Huapai sewerage scheme. Any provision of future capacity is earmarked to service anticipated growth.

Water: Since the proposed development is located outside the Rural Urban Boundary (RUB) and beyond the water reticulation system in Riverhead, its approval would significantly impact the available capacity for other existing Future Urban Zone (FUZ) areas in Riverhead.