

Sunfield Application – Ardmore Airport

Joint Statement

Attendees (12pm-1pm) Tuesday, 11th November

Applicant: Ian Smallburn; Simon Ash; David Osborne; Leo Hills

NZTA: Liam Winter; Leon Langton

Auckland Transport: Martin Peake

Ardmore Airport: Dave Marcellus; Rachel Morgan

1. Transport (questions from the Panel)

How access will be maintained and issues managed for the airport through the Mill Road Stage 2 NoR and as a result of the NOR location and concept design.

It is noted that there is a live resource consent currently being process in relation to the upgrades to Hamlin Road and details of this matter will need to be included in any agreed solution.

Hamlin Road access:

- Stage 3 amended access design.
- Relationship with Sunfield proposal as an interim measure.
- Ultimate upgrade (to be determined through NoR process).

We all agree that the Sunfield application is not the appropriate forum to debate whether Mill Road Stage 2 will maintain access to the Airport via Hamlin Road. This is a matter for NZTA to address as part of the NOR process, not within the Sunfield application. The focus should remain on the interim solution proposed by Winton, prior to Mill Road Stage 2 being constructed.

All agree that Winton cannot “stop” the eastern end of Hamlin Road themselves, which is located within the Notice of Requirement, and a formal process and approval from Auckland Transport would be required. The Applicant confirms that the proposed ‘interim’ solution for the eastern end of Hamlin Road prior to the construction of Mill Road Stage 2 is for the existing alignment to remain i.e. it is not proposed to ‘stop’ Hamlin Road. All agree that the plans and conditions/advice notes should be updated to reflect this, noting this is not currently shown on the engineering drawings. See drawing MC325-6.

2. Other transport matters (Only Ardmore Airport, Applicant and Auckland Transport present for discussion)

Not specifically raised by the Panel but addressed in Issues in Contention Table

- a) Whether the Sunfield transport modelling accounts for the development enabled by the consented Stage 2 Ardmore Airport development and the proposed Stage 3 and 4 development.

Leo Hills confirmed that growth was accounted for in the transport model that broadly provides for the Ardmore Airport traffic. This involved increasing all traffic by 20% to account for general increases in traffic movements. Mike Nixon will review the modelling outputs for the Airfield/Mill Road intersection in more detail. Mike Nixon/Leo Hills/Martin Peake to meet separately on traffic modelling and implications for Ardmore Stage 3 and the Sunfield applications.

- b) Staging of the Mill Road / Hamlin Road upgrade.

- i) Ardmore Airport's interim roundabout.
- ii) Sunfield's signalised intersection (prior to the occupation of 50 dwellings).
- iii) Airport Stage 3 consent could cross reference the Sunfield resource consent timing – i.e. roundabout not required if signals are under construction.
- iv) Check how this is provided for in Condition 123.

All agree that Ardmore Airport's interim upgrade is not required should Sunfield's signalised intersection be progressed first. All agree that conditions on the Ardmore Stage 3 consent can be implemented that reflect this. The Applicant/Ardmore Airport will work on conditions for the Ardmore Airport Stage 3 consent to reflect this understanding. As for the associated costs of this upgrade– that is a commercial discussion for Ardmore Airport and Winton which is not relevant to this process.

- c) Staging of Hamlin Road upgrade – provision of continued efficient access to the Airport during construction. Potential amendment to Condition 21(i). Work through the conditions about Hamlin Road remaining open until realigned Hamlin Road is constructed and operational.

All agree that the existing Hamlin Road will remain fully open and operational until the alternative Hamlin Road alignment is constructed. All agree to amendments to condition (21) to make this clear. The Applicant/Ardmore Airport will work on this updated condition.

3. Noise and reverse sensitivity (Only Ardmore Airport and Applicant present for discussion)

Not specifically raised by the Panel but addressed in Issues in Contention Table

- a) Is the land-use configuration, combined with the proposed conditions, appropriate to mitigate any potential adverse effects?

Refer to the additional memo from Laurel Smith.

Technical points in contention are clear and do not require further discussion.

Other mitigation measures to discuss:

Need for a no complaints covenant to be registered on titles. Condition 143 amendments. To apply to individuals and groups.

Ardmore Airport also attach a further memo from Laurel Smith of Marshall Day clarifying remaining points of difference with Jon Styles, the acoustic consultant for Winton. This memo is intended to assist the Panel to understand points of difference and is supplied in place of participation of extensive expert conferencing. The Applicant expressed their disagreement with this process, as the information hadn't been requested, nor has it been signalled as a key issue in contention, and the question arises as whether the applicant would get a subsequent right of reply.

Notwithstanding those broader matters in contention, Ardmore Airport and the Applicant will work on amendments to the proposed no-complaints covenant conditions. The changes are intended to improve workability and efficiency.

4. Airport safety (Only Ardmore Airport and Applicant present for discussion)

Not specifically raised by the Panel but addressed in Issues in Contention Table

Planted landscape buffer and wildlife management plan. Wording of condition 31 and 98.
Evidence of consultation with Ardmore Airport.

All agree that amendments to the conditions to require consultation with Ardmore Airport on landscaping is necessary and appropriate. The Applicant/Ardmore Airport will work on updating condition 31.