

11 May 2026

Expert Consenting Panel -  
Via Email to Alex Mickelson of EPA

Dear Alex,

**Subject: FTAA-2508-1096 Request for Minor Correction (Waitākere District Court – New Courthouse Project)**

Thank you for your email regarding minor correction comments. I provide this letter for the assistance of the Panel and yourself as a culmination of this correspondence and to provide requested views/comments on the minor corrections proposed in the Alisa Neal's memorandum of the 04.05.26.

**Additional Documents – Schedule 2 (NoR Documents)**

Further to correspondence with the applicant the following document are identified as needing to be added to schedule 2. These are documents provided during the assessment of the application which are considered by Council to be relevant to the 'scope' of the designation. We understand from correspondence with the applicant's agent that they are content with these additions.

*Waitākere Justice Facility – Stormwater Management Plan Memorandum, dated 12.12.25, Holmes Ltd*

*Waitākere District Court, New Courthouse Project: Transport-Related Comments from Panel memorandum dated 29.01.26, prepared by Carriageway Consulting*

*Waitākere District Courthouse – New Courthouse Project Response to Request for Further Information Acoustic memorandum, dated 17.12.25, prepared by SLR.*

**Condition 12**

I have reviewed the applicants suggested amend/correction to condition 12 including the reasoning set out in the memorandum of the 04.05.26. At a high level the differentiation between which parts of the condition require assessment and which parts require assessment or review appears unnecessary.

I would note that these matters and provisions given all are relevant to the final development/site layout would be best to be reviewed collectively and consider that a singular assessment would be best to assist and inform the information lodged under this condition. In the consolidation and grouping of this condition we anticipate that this was the Panels expectation also. To provide the applicant with confidence it is evident and agreed that the level of assessment needed for bike parking would be much more diminished in comparison to vehicle manoeuvring for instance.

In the interests of expediency, we have suggested alternative wording considering the following:

- Retains the requirement for the composite parts of the condition to be subject to an assessment.

- Identifies that this should be proportionate in detail for each matter as response to applicant concerns.
- Agrees underline of part A subheading.
- Agrees part D reference to from rather than on but retains appropriate in the wording.
- Retains wording of part F to an assessment rather than statement, consistent with the Councils view on the first part of condition 12.

## Condition 12 – Corrections

- Proposed changes shown in bold underlined and strikethrough = applicants additions which Council suggest is deleted;
- Proposed changes shown in underline and bold = applicants additions agreed;
- Proposed changes in bold, underline and yellow highlight = Council's additions to respond to applicants' comments; and
- Proposed changes shown in underline = applicants deletions to Panels decision condition reinstated.

The following traffic, parking and access details, supported by an assessment **proportionate to each part/matter which** is undertaken ~~or reviewed~~ by a suitability qualified traffic engineer, shall be submitted to Council as part of the OPW and certified at the time of Building Consent. ~~Where an assessment is required by Conditions 12(A),(D),(E), (F) and (H) below, this shall be undertaken by a suitably qualified traffic engineer.~~

### **A. Public Parking**

Any public parking proposed to be provided on site. The assessment shall confirm that the traffic effects associated with the provision of on-site public parking are acceptable.

*Advice Note: Any proposal for the provision of public parking at ground level (existing or proposed levels) will also require assessment in respect to the requirements of Condition 4 (Flood Modelling) of this designation.*

### **D: Vehicle Manoeuvring**

Provision for all vehicles to enter and exit the site in a forward direction, unless the assessment confirms that reverse manoeuvring is appropriate ~~on~~ **from** the site.

### **F: Vehicle Access on Edmonton Road**

1). The provision of finalised details of all vehicle crossings and their operation. Where right turn movements into or out of the site are proposed, ~~the design shall be supported by a statement by a suitably qualified transport engineer which concludes that~~ the assessment shall confirm whether these movements can be safely accommodated.

2). The provision of no more than two vehicle crossings to the site on Edmonton Road. Where more than two vehicle crossings are proposed the assessment shall confirm that this is appropriate.

3). No vehicle crossing shall be located to the southwest of the Edmonton Road/Takapu Street intersection or on Alderman Drive (other than the existing vehicle crossing serving the Right of Way). Where such crossing is proposed, the assessment shall confirm that the construction of a vehicle crossing in proposed location is appropriate.

## **Condition 22**

In consultation with Healthy Waters, I have reviewed the reasoning and amendment set out in the memorandum of the 04.05.26 to condition 22. In the below and to work with the applicants comments we put forward an alternative wording with the following reasoning:

1. We consider that it is important to reflect and be clear of the role set out in the draft FEMP of weather warnings in flood response protocols, alongside the supplementary role of monitoring measures.
2. Removal of the word existing reflecting that sources of monitoring measures may change over time.
3. Update of the advice note to reflect the commitment in the draft FEMP to engage with these parties regarding 'warning systems' (refer to section 4 of the draft FEMP) rather than more constrained definition provided in the advice note.

#### Condition 22 – Corrections

Prior to the operation of the activity, a finalised Flood Emergency Management Plan (FEMP) detailing measures outlined in the Draft Flood Emergency Management Plan, dated January 2026, shall be updated and provided to Council for certification. The objective of the finalised FEMP shall demonstrate that risks to persons as a result of the flood hazards are appropriately managed in general accordance with the Draft Flood Emergency Management Plan. The finalised FEMP shall include details of the following:

- Staff roles and responsibilities;
- Flood response protocols including activation and monitoring, including **the use of weather warnings and supplementary monitoring of existing upstream flow, level and rainfall gauges (to an appropriate extent) from the NoR site;**
- Flood hazard signage and alert;
- Evacuation protocols including internally and externally within the site;
- Procedures and circumstances for stay-in-place;
- Communication plan;
- Process for annual inspections, certification, reviews and updates;
- Post-flood event recovery protocols; and
- Confirm detail on resilience of critical infrastructure for implementation of FEMP.

The FEMP must be implemented for the duration of the activity. The FEMP is a live document that must be reviewed yearly to evaluate the effectiveness in achieving the above objective. A copy of the latest FEMP shall be provided to Council at their request.

***Advice Note: ~~For clarity, upstream modelling would include review of publicly available flooding information at locations along Oratia Creek upstream of the site. As per the Requiring Authority's commitment in the Draft FEMP to work with Healthy Waters and Auckland Civil Defence, further engagement must include the extent of upstream modelling and available flooding information at locations along the Oratia Creek upstream of the site to inform the extent and locations of monitoring.~~***

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'JWS', with a horizontal line underneath.

Joe Wilson  
Principal Project Lead  
Auckland Council