

To: Delmore Expert Panel C/O Environmental Protection Agency
From: Charlotte MacDonald – Barker & Associates Limited
Date: 15 July 2026
Re: Applicant Response to RFI 3

1.0 Introduction

This memorandum responds to the Request for Further Information 3 (“RFI 3”), dated 7 July 2026 issued by the Environmental Protection Authority (“EPA”) on behalf of the Delmore Expert Panel (“panel”) pursuant to section 67 of the Fast-Track Approvals Act 2024 (“FTAA”).

The following attachments are included within this memorandum:

- **Attachment 1:** Insight Economics Memorandum

Each of the panel’s information requests are set out below in italics with the applicant’s response provided underneath.

2.0 Response

1.a. Capacity of local services, including (but not limited to):

- i. Schools*
- ii. Hospitals*
- iii. Doctors*
- iv. Other emergency services (fire, ambulance, police)*

Applicant Response:

A memorandum prepared by Insight Economics responding to this request is included as **Attachment 1**.

1b. Concern about the transportation of waste off-site.

Applicant Response:

The commenter has raised a concern regarding the potential effects associated with transporting wastewater off-site. The applicant considers that these effects have been comprehensively assessed and can be appropriately managed through the proposed design and consent conditions.

Transporting wastewater off-site is not the applicant's preferred servicing solution and will not occur if the development is able to connect to the public wastewater network. If required, it is anticipated to be only a temporary measure until a public wastewater connection becomes available.

Nevertheless, the substantive application has assessed wastewater transportation as a potential long-term servicing scenario to ensure that any associated effects are fully understood and can be appropriately managed.

The AEE includes an assessment of the potential effects associated with transporting both treated and untreated wastewater, including traffic, air quality, noise and hazardous substances. These assessments are supported by detailed technical reports prepared by the relevant specialists, all of which were lodged with the substantive application. In response, the applicant has proposed a comprehensive package of conditions, including:

- Preparation of a Wastewater Management Plan to be certified by Council, to manage hazardous substances and minimise the risk of spills;
- Installation of an acoustic fence adjacent to the dwelling at Lot 203 to ensure compliance from the wastewater filling station with the applicable noise standards under the Auckland Unitary Plan;
- Dust management measures relating to the use of wastewater trucks along Russell Road;
- Widening of Russell Road to accommodate wastewater trucks;
- Preparation of an Off-site Wastewater Disposal Management Plan to be certified by Council, including identification of receiving facilities, contingency measures, and maximum daily volumes;
- A requirement that wastewater is transported only to facilities identified in the certified Off-site Disposal Management Plan;
- A requirement that wastewater is transported only by operators holding all necessary approvals and licences;
- Record keeping and reporting requirements for all tanker movements;
- Contingency storage to ensure wastewater can be retained on-site should an approved receiving facility become temporarily unavailable;
- A review condition under section 128 of the RMA enabling Auckland Council to review the consent and require amendments to the Off-site Wastewater Disposal Management Plan if necessary;
- Preparation and implementation of an Odour Management Plan to be certified by Council, as well as monitoring and reporting obligations; and
- Installation of odour control systems for the wastewater infrastructure, including a post-commissioning odour assessment to ensure odour is acceptable, and if not, remediation to be required.

These conditions have been reviewed by Auckland Council's technical specialists and refined through the RFI process. As demonstrated through the agreed conditions arising from RFI 1 and RFI 2, Auckland Council is satisfied that the proposed management framework appropriately addresses the potential effects associated with wastewater transportation.

1.c. Increased fire risk of the area.

Applicant Response:

The applicant acknowledges that urban development has the potential to increase the risk of fire from residential sources. However, the existing rural land use also presents a fire risk, including from agricultural machinery, controlled burn-offs and other farming activities.

The proposal has been designed to minimise the potential for fire to spread into adjoining indigenous vegetation, including the SEA, as follows:

- The species proposed for ecological restoration and enhancement planting were reviewed and amended in response to comments from the Department of Conservation to reduce fire risk. In particular, the planting methodology was revised to avoid establishing large contiguous areas of vegetation and instead utilise smaller planting blocks separated by breaks. These changes are summarised in Appendix A to the applicant's response to the Department's comments on the substantive application (refer PDF page 2).

Topic	DOC comments 09/02/26	Applicant response 05/03/26	DOC response 11/03/26	Applicant response 02/05/26	Issue Resolved - Yes/No
	and risk management conditions are still applied.				
Improved Species Mix	The applicant has responded by adding miro and matai and increasing kahikatea within the relevant mix. They have also responded to the year-round food supply and frugivory point by adding karaka and kohekohe and increasing taraire to support native bird values and successional dispersal processes. The plant palette includes a WF11-aligned suite of canopy and podocarp species consistent with these changes.	Noted and no further action proposed.	DOC does not seek any further change on this point.		Yes
Fire and Drought Considerations	The applicant has reduced mānuka in the bush mix from 20% to 10% and explicitly links this to concerns regarding flammability and drought vulnerability. They state that soil moisture will be actively managed during establishment via watering. A minor remaining issue is that 15% mānuka is retained in the riparian mix on the rationale that fire spread is less likely in riparian environments. That is reasonable, but I would prefer that the overall design avoids large continuous mānuka-dominant patches that could act as a fuel pathway in extreme fire weather.	The intent of the planting is to integrate the species throughout the area, rather than establishing them in single-species blocks. This would involve distributing each species approximately evenly across the site in proportion to its percentage of the total planting mix. In response to DOC's comment Vineway proposes to include a note on each of the landscape planting plans: <i>"Mānuka plants are to be integrated with other plants throughout each planting area. No mānuka single-species planting blocks are to be established."</i>	DOC appreciates the proposed response. The note requiring mānuka to be integrated throughout planting areas, rather than established in single-species blocks, appears to respond appropriately to the concern about continuous fuel pathways. DOC supports that note being carried through into the relevant planting plans.		Yes

- The 10m zone surrounding each home, either includes no planting, or contains species identified in the Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) guidance of native plants¹ as having very low, low or low-moderate flammability². Hardstand areas, including driveways and pathways, are also constructed from non-combustible materials such as concrete, further reducing the potential for fire spread.
- The specific construction materials for individual dwellings have not yet been determined, as these are addressed through the building consent process rather than resource consent. However, appropriate fire-resistant construction measures can be incorporated into dwellings located adjacent to the Significant Ecological Area (SEA).

Overall, while the proposal introduces residential development adjacent to indigenous vegetation, it also incorporates a range of design and management measures specifically intended to minimise wildfire risk. These measures have been developed in consultation with the Department of Conservation and with reference to FENZ guidance. Accordingly, the applicant considers that the potential effects associated with increased fire risk have been appropriately mitigated.

¹ Refer: <https://checkitsalright.nz/reduce-your-risk/low-flammability-plants>

² The scale is: Very Low, Low, Low-Moderate, Moderate, Moderate-High, High, Very High

1.d. Reliance on the Residential Society to enforce rules.

Applicant Response:

The proposed Residents' Society framework has been prepared with input from specialist property law firm Alexander Dorrington to ensure that it is fit for purpose and can carry out its long-term responsibilities. The Society provides a practical governance and funding mechanism through mandatory membership, compulsory levies and obligations established by its constitution. The constitution will also identify the representative(s) responsible for administering the Society, providing a clear point of contact for Auckland Council and neighbouring landowners should any issues arise.

In relation to ecological management, the obligations to undertake pest plant control, pest animal management and ongoing maintenance are secured through the proposed consent conditions, which remain enforceable by Auckland Council. The role of the Residents' Society is to implement and fund those obligations over the long term, rather than replace Council's regulatory oversight. This provides a practical mechanism to ensure the required management continues in perpetuity.

Similarly, the proposed domestic cat restriction within Stage 2 is secured by a consent notice registered on the title of each affected lot. Responsibility for complying with that restriction therefore rests with each individual property owner, with Auckland Council retaining the ability to take enforcement action where necessary. The Residents' Society provides an additional layer of oversight by educating residents, promoting compliance and administering the obligations assigned to it under the constitution. These responsibilities were included following input from Auckland Council and were considered necessary by the Council's ecological specialists to strengthen the effectiveness of the proposed cat restriction (refer Appendix 8: A24 (Terrestrial Ecology) to the Response to Comments letter, point 21). This approach is consistent with the adjoining Ara Hills development which also adjoins the Nukumea Reserve (identified as a SEA in the AUP).

The domestic cat restriction applies only within Stage 2 because that area directly adjoins the SEA, whereas Stage 1 is sufficiently removed that domestic cats are less likely to access those ecological areas. This approach is explained in Appendix 8: A24 (Terrestrial Ecology) to the Response to Comments letter (point 21) and was accepted by both Auckland Council and the Department of Conservation's technical specialists.

Accordingly, the applicant considers that the proposal does not rely solely on the Residents' Society to enforce the proposed management measures. Rather, the Society provides an additional governance and funding mechanism that complements enforceable consent conditions, consent notices and Auckland Council's statutory enforcement powers.

1.e. Proximity of a Significant Natural Area identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan and threats to native wildfire and conservation area.

Applicant Response:

The commenter raises concerns regarding the proximity of the proposed development to the SEA on their property, stating that the SEA has not been identified in the application and that the potential effects have been underrepresented. The applicant does not agree.

The SEA on the commenter's property was identified and considered from the outset of the project. The commenter's property is located immediately west of the Delmore site and is identified as property "AA" on the Adjacent Property Map in Appendix 7 to the AEE (refer PDF page 4). The SEA extending across this property and north into Nukumea Reserve informed the design of the proposed

development and is shown on the site plans submitted with the substantive application in Appendix 9 (refer PDF page 6). While these plans have since been superseded by the replacement plans lodged with the applicant's section 55 Response to Comments, the same information is included in the updated plan set.

The design of the proposed development, including the extent and location of ecological restoration planting, has also been informed by the Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA) prepared by Viridis (included as Appendix 16 to the AEE). The EIA specifically considers the interface between the proposed residential development and adjoining indigenous vegetation. It acknowledges that residential development adjacent to indigenous vegetation has the potential to result in edge effects, but concludes that these effects can be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated through the proposed subdivision design and mitigation measures. Those measures have been incorporated into the proposal and are discussed further below.

Construction related effects

Potential construction effects on the SEA will be managed through a comprehensive suite of consent conditions and management plans, including the Fauna Management Plan, Tree Management Plan, Construction Management Plan, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Adaptive Management Plan. Collectively, these plans provide for:

- Protection of retained vegetation through exclusion fencing and clearly defined no-go areas;
- Ecological supervision where required;
- Erosion and sediment controls to protect downstream receiving environments;
- Management of vegetation clearance to avoid unnecessary effects on indigenous vegetation;
- Monitoring throughout the construction period; and
- Adaptive management where monitoring identifies the need for additional mitigation.

Collectively, these measures have been developed to avoid or minimise construction-related effects on the retained SEA within the application site and the SEA on adjoining land.

Operational effects and long-term management

The proposal has also been designed to minimise long-term edge effects associated with residential development adjoining SEA's (both within the site and adjoining the site). This includes:

- No vegetation clearance within any SEA (aside from the removal of pest plants for ecological restoration purposes);
- Lighting controls to minimise light spill into ecological areas as a precautionary measure to minimise potential effects on long-tailed bats³;
- Extensive indigenous restoration planting within the retained SEA on-site and along its margins, as well adjoining the neighbouring SEA. This planting will restore degraded areas, strengthen ecological connectivity, and establish a vegetated transition between residential development and the retained indigenous vegetation, helping to reduce long-

³ No bats were detected during fauna surveys undertaken.

term edge effects. These outcomes are expected to have a positive impact on the neighbouring SEAs;

- Varying setbacks between residential development and the SEA (refer to information contained within Appendix 9 of the Response to Comments letter, PDF page 5);
- Ongoing pest plant and pest animal management;
- Domestic cat restrictions for Stage 2 of the development which adjoins the SEA;
- Fencing is proposed for all residential lots as shown on the landscape plans. This will assist in discouraging uncontrolled access by people and domestic dogs into the retained ecological areas;
- Ongoing ecological monitoring and maintenance in accordance with the Ecological Management Plan.

Again, these conditions have been reviewed by Auckland Council and the Department of Conservation, and amended with their input to ensure that collectively, the technical, ecological specialists involved consider they are fit for purpose and will deliver positive ecological outcomes with a net gain overall (see for example Appendix 8: A24 to the applicant's response to comments at points 4, 31, 34). The proposed consent conditions require these ecological management measures to be implemented in perpetuity. As discussed above, the Residents' Society will provide an additional governance and funding mechanism to support the long-term implementation of these obligations, while the consent conditions remain enforceable by Auckland Council. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal appropriately manages both construction and operational effects on the retained SEA within the application site and the adjoining SEA.