



Auckland Prison Capacity Increase Project

From Mitchel Beckett <[REDACTED]>
Date Sat 7/25/2026 1:48 PM
To Substantive <substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz>

Kia ora Fast-Track Team

My details

Mitchel Beckett (Adjacent landowner)
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I note that I have previously provided my email address to the AP Engagement team and asked for correspondence by email rather than post. However, the invitation to comment was sent by post and was not received by me until yesterday, 24 July, leaving limited time to respond to the invitation. I note that it is likely other adjacent landowners may not receive the post before the deadline of 28 July 2026.

Please find my comments on the above Fast-Track application below.

Section 53 of the Fast Track Approvals Act 2024 requires that the Panel invite written comments on a substantive application from adjacent landowners. I have received that invitation but am unable to provide meaningful comments on the substantive application due to the lack of specificity of the changes proposed at the prison site, resulting in a procedural failure of the fast-track process.

Procedural Failure

It is not possible to meaningfully comment on the substantive application as I have not been provided with a comparison of the specifications of what is currently on the prison site and what is proposed i.e. the before and after position. These comparisons have not been provided despite being requested at the first drop-in session on 12 August 2025 at the Paremoremo community hall, and at multiple subsequent meetings onsite at [REDACTED] of good faith to allow adjacent landowners to provide meaningful comments, the before and after specifications must be visible.

The only information provided following my requests was a page titled the "existing site plan". However, that satellite image only shows what is on the site today in terms of building outlines and plantings. There is no detail as to, for example, current lighting placement and specifications, current wall heights, usage of outdoor areas for prisoner activity such as gardening etc. While the existing site plan may be used to compare with the proposal in the substantive application in respect of screen planting proposed, that is the extent of its usefulness.

The information available on the website for the substantive application continues to show only the proposed go-forward position, with no ability to compare how that differs from what is on the prison

site today.

There is a procedural failure of the Fast-Track process whereby the purpose of s 53 of the Act is defeated by inviting comments that cannot be meaningfully provided due to a lack of information given to adjacent landowners despite numerous requests.

Concerns specific to myself as adjacent landowner

As highlighted above, I am unable to determine the impact of the changes proposed compared with what is on site today. However, my main concerns with the proposal continue to be the lighting and the screening plants. Screen planting on the prison site is unlikely to be effective from my property unless there is additional planting and fencing on my property. This has been discussed onsite with Craig Erskine and Boffa Miskell.

In this regard, an agreement was prepared by the Department of Corrections that would involve them taking responsibility for planting beneath my existing pine trees on the boundary. That agreement was unfeasible as it was unclear how the planting would be maintained and pine trees removed using a staged approach over a number of years as the new bushier plantings grew. Because of this I did not sign that agreement. Following that, Craig advised that they have reached out to Aaron's consulting and an arborist whose name I provided - Christian - to discuss options. I have not yet heard the results of those inquiries.

Substantive Application doesn't reflect Resource Management conditions on adjacent land

includes a Consent Notice pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991. The effect of this is that despite being a 3.5636 hectare block, there is a restriction on the title that prevents the further subdivision of the land. The purpose of this is to ensure that the keeping of the neighbourhood is not changed and to prevent the possibility of just **one** further house on the 3.56 hectares as that would be seen to change the . The substantive application for the Prison Capacity increase and related building changes appears to directly contradict the imposition of How is an additional 500+ prisoners acceptable, when the addition of one further dwelling on adjacent land via application for subdivision is prohibited? The environmental impacts of a subdivision resulting in an extra house is significantly less than that of adding 500+ extra prisoners.

Conditions

The procedural failure outlined above results in an ability for me to be able to determine how the proposal will impact the visibility of lighting, and visibility of the prison, from my property. However in my view, these concerns can be addressed by imposing a condition that either:

1. requires the Department of Corrections to construct and maintain a 1.8m boundary fence along the length of the western boundary of my property in the style of the existing electric gate before commencement of operations, and to plant screening on the road facing side of that fence; or
2. requires the Department of Corrections to provide me with adequate compensation such that I can construct and maintain a 1.8m boundary fence along the length of the western boundary of my property before commencement of operations, and to allow me to plant screening on the road facing side of that fence.

Imposing one of these conditions is the only way that I can obtain certainty that the changes will not result in further light and landscape pollution. If such a condition is not possible, the application ought to be declined for the procedural failure detailed above.

As well as ensuring protection from lighting and visibility, appropriate screen planting and fencing on the boundary of my property will also help mitigate other consequences of the prison capacity increase including increased traffic and noise. The proposal is also likely to have a significant impact on the value of my property without screening and fencing being put in place on the boundary.

Without such a condition for planting and fencing on my western boundary, or appropriate compensation for me to be able to carry this out myself, I am unable to support the substantive application.

Regards
Mitchel Beckett

