

From: Carly Hinde
To: Euan Williams; Rachel Morgan
Cc: Emma Howie; DEWE, Gregory; Dylan Pope; Magdalena Regnault
Subject: RE: BUN60446761 / FTAA-2503-1038 - Milldale FT - Meeting Minutes
Date: Wednesday, 30 July 2025 12:15:09 pm
Attachments: [image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)

This message was sent from outside the company by someone with a display name matching a user in your organisation. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Hi Euan / Rachel,

Apologies for the delay responding to this email and thanks again for issuing these minutes and picking-up the requested changes to the Geotech and planning notes – I have reviewed these and the other minutes and can confirm that these are all acceptable.

Many thanks.

Kind regards,

Carly Hinde | Principal Project Lead
Planning & Resource Consents - Premium Unit
Mob. 027 238 1132
Auckland Council, Level 6, 135 Albert Street, Auckland
Visit our website: aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

From: Euan Williams <Euan.Williams@woods.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, 21 July 2025 4:30 pm
To: Carly Hinde <carly.hinde@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Cc: Rachel Morgan <RachelM@barker.co.nz>; Emma Howie <emma.howie@woods.co.nz>; DEWE, Gregory <gregory.dewe@fultonhogan.com>; Dylan Pope <dylan@dcs.gen.nz>; Magdalena Regnault <magdalenar@barker.co.nz>
Subject: BUN60446761 / FTAA-2503-1038 - Milldale FT - Meeting Minutes

Hi Carly,

We have generated final PDF meeting minutes for Planning, Healthy Waters – Stream Geomorphology. Geotechnical and the Main Workshop. They can be found here:



Final Minutes from Council Meetings

https://barkernz-my.sharepoint.com/:f/g/personal/rachelm_barker_co_nz/EqhgUwLde8BFnhpz31jzOzoBOdeBPgXSxH0SwszO9B0NwQ?e=PyD3XN

We are still waiting on your comments on the minutes from the AT/HW/HW, Ecology and WWTP meetings.

Regards,
Euan



woods.co.nz



Euan Williams
Principal Planner
BA, MSc (Res. Mngt.) (Hons), MNZPI
Euan.Williams@woods.co.nz
[+64 21 757 975](tel:+6421757975)

This email is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, notify the sender and/or Woods immediately. Woods (Wood and Partners Consultants Ltd) accepts no liability for the content of this email, or for the consequences of any actions taken on the basis of the information provided unless that information is subsequently confirmed by a duly signed letter.

From: Carly Hinde <carly.hinde@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Sent: 15 July 2025 10:11 am
To: Rachel Morgan <RachelM@barker.co.nz>; Euan Williams <Euan.Williams@woods.co.nz>; Emma Howie <emma.howie@woods.co.nz>
Cc: DEWE, Gregory [REDACTED] Tim Rickards [REDACTED] Magdalena Regnault <[REDACTED]> Jamie Whyte [REDACTED] Griffin Benton-Lynne [REDACTED] Dylan Pope [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BUN60446761 / FTAA-2503-1038 - Milldale FT - Stream Geomorphology & Bridges Update

Morning everyone,

Apologies form the delay from my side, but please find attached our comments to the RDOC - I have also uploaded these to the OneDrive. Hopefully all the requests / comments are clear, but if you need any clarification please just let Dylan and I know. Do you have any updates re. the building coverage assessment?

In terms of the other meeting minutes, please find attached our amendments to the planning and geotech notes – I have saved within the 'Final Minutes from Council Meetings' folder and then tried to delete and added them instead to the 'Draft minutes' folder, but I do not think I have permission to delete files, so would be grateful if you could please review and confirm your acceptance to the amendments. I hope to provide the remaining minute comments from our specialists in the next few days.

Many thanks.

Minutes

Project: Milldale Stages 4C, 10 – 13

Date: 27 May 2025

Time: 10:30 – 12pm & 2pm – 4pm

Location: Auckland Council, 135 Albert Street

Attendees:

Name	Role/Organisation
Carly Hinde	Principle Project Lead, Auckland Council
Dylan Pope	Planner, DCS on behalf of Auckland Council
Mustafa Demiralp	Urban Designer, Auckland Council
Cas Hannink	Parks Planner, Auckland Council
Antoinette Bootsma	Ecologist, Auckland Council
Dylan Walton	Wastewater Engineer, GWE on behalf of Auckland Council
Martin Meyer	Stormwater Engineer, Auckland Council
Hilary Johnston	Environmental Specialist, Tektus on behalf of Healthy Waters
Sameul Homes	Development Engineer, Auckland Council
Philips Augustine	Transport Engineer, Auckland Council
Richard Simonds	Geologist, Auckland Council
Shahriar Tehrani	Transport Engineer, Auckland Transport
Gregory Dewe	Applicant, Fulton Hogan Land Development
Sean Connolly	Applicant, Fulton Hogan Land Development
Rachel Morgan	Planner, Barker & Associates
Magdalena Regnault	Planner, Barker & Associates
Euan Williams	Planner, Woods
Sean Wu	Urban Designer, Woods
Jamie Whyte	Project Coordinator and Engineer, Woods
Juan Alvarez Du Lugo	Stormwater Engineer, Woods
Tim Rickards	Land Development Engineer, Woods
Trevor Lee-Joe	Transport Engineer, Stantec
Mark Delaney	Ecologist, Viridis
Brittany Pearce	Ecologist, Viridis
Jon Williamson	Hydrologist, WWLA

Jack Taylor	Wastewater Engineer, Apex Water
Matt Savage	Wastewater Engineer, Apex Water

Item	Detail	Action
1	<p>Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carly / Dylan requested a single comprehensive response including maintaining a tracking table of responses. • FHLD advised that the intention was to provide a response to Councils feedback prior to the comments period. • Carly / Dylan advise they are happy for us to ask for further clarification on any of the above matters / discuss with the specialist prior to our response. • Dylan raised follow up meetings / informal workshops to keep the line of communication open through the process and continue to iron out issues. • Further feedback (policy and strategy, stormwater, waste management, subdivision) will be passed on to the applicant team in due course. <p>Minute 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel membership: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It was noted that there were no conflicts of interest in relation to FH or Woods / B&A's involvement with Russell McVeagh in the surrounding area. However, RmcV are involved in other projects with B&A. ○ Carly / Dylan advised that they believe the panel skills / knowledge required would include development engineering urban design, landscape and planning and ecology. ○ Carly advised that they are seeking the appointment of three panel members. General agreement with the applicant team that this would be appropriate. • Timing: commencement recommended in 3 weeks. General agreement that the commencement date will be at the discretion of the Panel. <p>Conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carly / Dylan suggested to reviewing the conditions in a way that a s127 process can occur smoothly. Euan advised the strategy is to reference condition 1 all the way through so any variations will only need to vary condition 1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further discussion regarding format of response to be held post judicial conference; • Any further meetings / workshops to be organised via Carly.
2	<p>Parks / Land Advisory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions and feedback general as per feedback tracker: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans will be updated showing 1.5m max high retaining wall.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Woods clarified that the berm widths are acceptable and the correct width for tree and parking bays. These further details will be provided at EPA. ○ Woods noted that all walls fronting reserves will be no higher than 1.5m and include a permeable style pool fence. The structures are not anticipated to have adverse shading effects noting their height and the permeable fencing proposed. ○ General agreement to lower Wall 14 to 1.5m. It was noted that the walls will be screened by vegetation. ○ General agreement for typical dry basin / drainage detail to be provided at EPA. ○ Cas advised they were unable to locate the drainage reserve species list. Woods confirmed that this would be provided or drawing reference provided. • Cas advised that the concerns regarding the number of bridge proposed is being further discussed between themselves and the operations team. Cas noted that bridges will generally require local board approval. • B&A raised HW water concerns regarding the activation of drainage reserve. Cas noted that the proposed reserves were appropriately activated and that this matter would be further discussed with HW. B&A advised that if required, an activation study could be prepared similar to what was provided for the FHLD's Drury application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage reserve species list to be provided or, point Council to the plan provided. • Cas to provide further comment on the appropriateness of bridges and the outcomes of the discussion with HW around the activation of the drainage reserves.
3	<p>Urban Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mustafa noted that the design is logical, sensible and functional and the density is appropriate for the context. • Queried future retaining walls and net buildable area. Dylan requested future lot testing of these allotments. FHLD advised that the same standards as previously approved have been utilised. • Road lowering to be discussed with AT. • Dylan requested that the design guidelines were reviewed in detail. He noted that the guidelines referenced too many varying zone standard. Dylan agreed to provide detailed feedback / mark up of the design guidelines following the design guidelines being updated by the applicant. • Dylan raised concerns with the blanket coverage requests and differential between coverages and zones. B&A suggested the preparation of a coverage study to demonstrate site coverage patterns for developed areas subject to these blanket consents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FHLD team to prepare coverage study. • FHLD to elaborate on connectivity to the south of Stage 13. • FHLD to undertake a review of the design guidelines and report back with track change version.

- Mustafa did not raise density concerns around the periphery of the site and acknowledge things have moved since the zoning / precinct plans were prepared.
- Mustafa queried connectivity to the south of Stage 13. Woods explained design rational and FHLD explained there are several existing roading connections to the eastern side of Milldale. General agreement to provide a response / elaborate on connections provided.
- Mustafa advised that they will review the landscaping plans in relation to the Stage 4C JOALs.
- Mustafa / Dylan suggested more could be done to improve the amenity / screening of the WWTP in relation to the adjoining residential area. It was noted anything further could make it stand out and the preference is for the plant to be recessed. General agreement to review landscaping buffer. In addition, the plans need to be updated to correctly identify the landscape planting as these identify planting within the road berm.
- Dylan advised that concept lighting plans are required as part of the RC application, particularly for those shared driveway areas/ COALs that serve more than 10 dwellings/ lots. Whilst previous Milldale applications have deferred this to consent conditions, PC79 required lighting plans to be provided as part of the application. Rachel noted that PC79 is subject to appeal and the lighting provisions are subject to change – it remains open to the applicant to apply to infringe the information requirement standards in PC79 with appropriate assessment and justification.

4	<p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Auckland Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussions and feedback general as per feedback tracker. ○ General agreement that the details requested can be supplied at EPA stage as per other applications. • Auckland Transport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussions and feedback general as per feedback tracker. ○ General agreement that the details requested can be supplied at EPA stage as per other applications. ○ AT advised that the proposed layout will result in conflicts with bus stops. Woods noted that the proposed arrangement complies with AT's required setbacks. Woods to undertake review of bus stop locations. ○ AT advised that their suggestion to eliminate accesses onto Collector Roads was a preference only, not a concern. Nothing further is required. ○ AT advised further advice is being sought in respect of bioretention (rain gardens). Advice to be circulated post meeting. ○ Euan advised concerns about fish passage would be resolved between the project and Councils ecologists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Philips to review speed management plan. • General comments / concepts on lighting of the JOALs to be provided. • Woods to undertake assessment of intersection at Waiwai Drive in relation to sightlines to confirm bus stop locations. Findings to be addressed in the updated Infrastructure Report. • AT to circulate further advice regarding rain gardens within the road reserve.
5	<p>Groundwater and dewatering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jon confirmed agreement with Councils assessment. Agreement to update reporting accordingly. • It was noted that effects in relation to the reduction of the wetland at 147 Argent Lane have been addressed in detail within the applicants AEE. 147 Argent Lane have been identified as an affected party. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater report to update reporting accordingly • Additional reasons for consent to be included in AEE.
6	<p>Streams / Wetlands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General agreement to prepare an integrated wetland plans that incorporates all information requested by Antoinette (refer to feedback tracker) for discussion at a future workshop. • Antoniette noted the culvert wing walls may result in progressive encasement. Detailed comments on culvert wing walls and progressive incasement for Viridis / Woods review. • General agreement to provide SEV data sheets for Councils review. • In respect of wetland hydrology it was noted that the new wetlands established at Milldale were performing well. It was suggested that the next meeting is held at Milldale to visit these wetlands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viridis to prepare integrated wetland plan and provide SEV data sheets • Antoniette to provide detailed comments on culvert wing walls. • Wetland workshop to be held at FHLD offices at Milldale.

7	<p>Development Engineering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions and feedback generally as per feedback tracker: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FHLD confirmed the standard vehicle crossing departures apply to the application; Samuel noted maintenance issues with SW drainage being located at rear of Stage 4C properties. General agreement this matter can be resolved at EA as any changes will not have a consequential effects on lot design. Samuel noted the private SW network within Stage 4C would require a body corp, operation and maintenance plans and 221 consent notices to the titles. Woods noted that FHLD are looking to avoid a body corp arrangement. HW noted this would be a maintenance issue from their perspective. Woods advised that further information on how the arrangement would operate would be provided. Woods noted the OLFP would not meet the AUP(OP) definition. Carly advised further comments on waste collection will be provided. It was acknowledged that there was considerable pre-app discussion on this matter. Samuel suggested splitting the operations and maintenance condition into two; one for public and another for private devices. General agreement this was acceptable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carly to circulate waste comments once received. Draft conditions to be updated.
8	<p>Healthy Waters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions and feedback generally as per feedback tracker. General agreement that a number of matters raised could be resolved as EA stage. It was noted that there was conflicting advice / requirements between AT and HW in respect of the stream edge rain garden arrangement. AT and HW to coordinate and provide a response. In respect of flood modelling, HW noted that 3.8 degree climate change is required to be applied when looking at risk to people and property. In respect of land to vesting local purpose reserve, it was noted that post conversation with parks and reserves an activation study would be prepared to demonstrate the active edging. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HW and AT to develop a consist opinion regarding the stream edge rain garden arrangement and advise
9	<p>Wastewater</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dylan Walton noted the proposed arrangement is of a very high quality. Discussions and feedback general as per feedback tracker. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft conditions to be reviewed in line with Dylans feedback. Report to be updated to address Dylan's comments.

10	<p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The applicant team agreed to review the feedback provided and note that the process for updates would be discussed in the coming week, including at the judicial conference.• The meeting was closed.	
----	--	--

Minutes

Project: Milldale Stages 10 – 13, 4C, WWTP

Date: 19 June 2025

Time: 9.00am – 10.00am

Location: Online

Topic: Geotech

Attendees:

Name	Role/Organisation
Euan Williams (EW)	Planner, Woods
Chris Ritchie (CR)	Geotechnical Engineer, CMW
Melissa Campbell (MC)	Geotechnical Engineer, CMW
Jamie Whyte (JW)	Engineer, Woods
Luke Xu (LX)	Geotechnical Engineer, Auckland Council

Item	Detail
1	<p>Stage 10 – 13</p> <p>Settlement Monitoring and Timeframes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council raised concern that time to achieve estimated t90 settlement was not stated in the application material. Council supports a Settlement Monitoring Plan (SMP) but noted the plan in the Geotech Report does not align with Milldale plans (P24-128-00-1202-EW and -1203-EW). • CMW confirmed settlement timeframes are based on data from the last 7 years and typically observed within 9–12 months. • CMW to update the Settlement Memo and ensure alignment with current plans. <p>Groundwater Table, Cross Sections, and Remedial Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council requested groundwater tables, lot boundaries and remedial works shown on geological cross sections. • CMW responded: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ RU values are used for modelling rather than GWT due to geological appropriateness. • Groundwater levels excluded to avoid conflict with WWLA data. However, additional explanation on the reasoning will be provided. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lot boundaries will be added. ○ Light hatching of remediation will be added for Council information only. <p>Boundary Stability and Retaining Wall Connections</p>

- Council queried how stability will be achieved near Stage 13 boundary.
- CMW confirmed earthworks/retaining are generally constructed across boundaries to avoid temporary works.
- Temporary stability measures to be noted in design reports if cross-boundary construction is not possible.

Discrepancy in Retaining Wall Extents

- Council noted inconsistency between Woods' plans and CMW's modelling.
- CMW confirmed this will be addressed via drawing updates.

Overland Flow Path and Stockpile Areas

- Council have highlighted that considerations should be made to the potential migration of streams over the 100-year period for assessment under E36.9(2). Noting that streams can meander and therefore encroach on building platforms/access ways. Councils understanding for the matter is that Healthy Waters has raised similar comments and CMW will provide update in geotechnical comments once those are addressed.
- Council requested slope stability analyses near softened alluvium and stockpile areas.
- CMW discussed extent of palisade wall design and committed to provide additional cross sections and sensitivity assessment regarding the depth of the soft alluvium material.
- Annotation re: topsoil stockpile area to be added to plans.

Earthworks Specification Coverage

- Clarification that reinforced slope earthworks are referenced in earthworks specification, with additional design requirements included in structural reports.

Soil Testing Deviations from NZS4431:2022

- Council requested justification for deviations.
- CMW response:
 - Density testing not reliable in natural soils.
 - Shear strength of 140kPa exceeds NZS3604 minimum bearing capacity requirements. Additional justification to address the deviation to be provided.

Missing Borehole (TP04-24)

- CMW confirmed this was not excavated due to stockpiles.

Pending Lab Results

- CMW confirmed these results will be added when available.

Softened Base Contacts

- Council noted omission in slope stability inputs.
- CMW to update stability assessment and re-run models if required.

Slope Stability Output Annotations

- Council noted missing remediation data on some sections.
- CMW will add pile parameters and reissue outputs for Sections A and K.

	<p>Development Restriction Zones (DRZs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council requested indicative DRZ plan. • CMW advised this would be addressed in the GCR and agreed by Council. A standard detail of such restriction will be provided. <p>RE Slopes and Consistency Across Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council raised inconsistencies in RE slope representation. • CMW confirmed geogrid inclusion is for face control only and not shown in global models. • DWG 19 to be updated accordingly. <p>Geohazard Characterisation Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geotechnical report to be updated to address settlement monitoring, slope stability, and related E12, E36, and E38 matters.
2	<p>Stage 4C</p> <p>Lack of Investigation Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council noted lack of supporting documents and site investigations. • CMW confirmed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Extensive monitoring undertaken. ○ Cross sections and historical undercut/photos to be included. ○ All investigation/completion reports will be provided. <p>Slope Stability Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council suggested slope analysis due to 2m level differences. • CMW to provide cross section. <p>Retaining Wall Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council requested preliminary construction details. • CMW confirmed temporary stability measures will be included in design reports. <p>Post-Construction Settlement of 50mm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council recommended this be addressed via advice note. • Applicant confirmed this will be noted. <p>Staging and Stability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council requested clarity on staged earthworks/retaining. • CMW response covered in previous items. <p>Preloading Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CMW will provide preloading and settlement monitoring records. • Key Concern: Lack of investigation data. Report to be updated accordingly.
3	<p>WWTP</p> <p>Missing Documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council noted Section 4 referenced GI Report not provided. • CMW confirmed this will be provided. <p>Site Plan Data</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council requested inclusion of previous investigation points and deeper data sources. • CMW confirmed this has now been added. <p>Groundwater and Basin Profile</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that this will be provided on updated cross sections. <p>Stability Analysis of Slopes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council requested stability analysis due to surcharge and Northland Allochthon. • CMW will provide analysis. <p>Advice Notes Recommended on Conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council requested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Structural engineer confirmation of 25mm differential settlement tolerance. ○ Reassessment of settlement if loading changes. • Confirmed this will be addressed by Woods Engineering.
4	<p>Conditions</p> <p>Stage 10–13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition 26: Update reference to Rev3 (24 March 2025) • Condition 43: Agreed to remove – duplicative of Condition 44 • Condition 44: Update to include SOPO and restriction zones as part of the GCR. <p>Stage 4C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition 29: Agree to have restriction zones to form part of the GCR. • Condition 42: There will be specific reports for retaining walls for building consents under standard process. <p>WWTP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council supports the supervision requirement • Agreed that full GCR requirements are not necessary – revise to reflect format similar to Condition 43 for Stage 10 – 13.
5	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CMW continue to prepare a response to the items raised by Auckland Council, and Conditions to be updated as agreed.

Minutes

Project: Milldale Stages 10 – 13, 4C, WWTP

Date: 19 June 2025

Time: 2.00pm – 3.00pm

Location: Woods, 8 Nugent Street, Auckland

Topic: WWTP

Attendees:

Name	Role/Organisation
Grant Fahey (GF)	Development Manager, FHLD
Dylan Walton (DW)	Wastewater Engineer, GWE on behalf of Auckland Council
Euan Williams (EW)	Planner, Woods
Emma Howie (EH)	Planner, Woods
Tim Rickards (TR)	Engineer, Woods
Yang Cui (YC)	Engineer, Woods
Jack Taylor (JT)	Wastewater Engineer, Apex Water
Matt Savage (MS)	Wastewater Engineer, Apex Water
Andrew Paton (AP)	General Manager, Apex Water
Daniel Williams (DaW)	Partner, Alta

Item	Detail
1	<p>Discussion on Dylan's Memo and progression made since the initial workshop</p> <p>JT confirmed Apex is preparing a response to matters raised in DW memo and key items discussed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Water and Watercare Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TR noted ongoing discussions with Watercare and awaiting a formal letter from them confirming acceptance of the flows into their network. GF noted letter has been requested for some time, continue to chase. DW confirmed if Watercare provides letter, no issue. Otherwise, conditions will be needed to manage reject discharge. Dual Reticulation / Reuse of Water <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JT confirmed there is no current proposal for reuse. DW noted reuse would trigger additional management requirements. Not needed unless reuse is introduced. Microbial Health Risk Assessment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DW and JT agreed the assessment is unnecessary due to full pathogen removal. MS confirmed alignment with international process standards. <p>4. Ammonia Effects on Stream</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apex is preparing a response, indicating negligible impact. DW acknowledged that the plant is temporary and this context should be included in the response. <p>5. Contaminants (including Metals)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apex confirmed low concentrations of concern in the discharge. DW acknowledged this but asked for further detail in the response. <p>6. Overflow from Infiltration Basin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JT noted that the location of overflow discharge point will be clarified on plans. DW requested conditions to cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance of the infiltration basin to prevent blockage Management of overflow events during extreme weather TR confirmed agreement to these conditions. TR confirmed overflow impact would reach Army Bay, not via infiltration. EW noted overflow and discharge share the same receiving stream. DW emphasised the need for control and certainty in overflow event management. <p>7. Watercare Short-Term approach on accepting wastewater</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DW asked for evidence that Watercare will not accept wastewater. GF confirmed this is addressed in Watercare's letter submitted with the application. <p>8. UV Dosage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JT confirmed UV is intended to address biofilm growth. DW is comfortable with this approach, noting RO and membranes provide main disinfection. <p>9. Sampling Frequency and Alerts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JT and MS to confirm sampling details; three samples preferred. DW supported early trigger points for notifying Council of elevated levels and inclusion of this in conditions. <p>10. Discharge Trench Maintenance (Infiltration Basin)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DW noted a need for an operational and maintenance manual for discharge beds. MS agreed to include in the plant's operation and maintenance plan. <p>11. Discharge Quality and Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DW said comparisons not required to the proposed national standards but helpful for perception and supporting proposal. MS agreed comparisons could be made to international or proposed standards.
2	<p>Conditions of Consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GF queried whether conditions could allow flexibility.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DW confirmed openness, provided effects are assessed and managed. • TR noted base line is based on two tests relatively close together and the need for conditions that enable discharge adjustments as further baseline monitoring data is collected. • DW agreed conditions should have built-in flexibility to avoid s127 applications. • TR proposed using a kg/day discharge metric. • DW supported this approach if tied to concentration and overall effect. • TR and DW acknowledged need for conditions that reflect staged development, rather than full build-out from day one. • MS raised the importance of on-the-ground effect measurement (e.g. flow rate). • DW agreed, supporting transition-based conditions and an appropriate review clause. • EW confirmed the rationale will be clearly explained in the Panel response. • EW confirmed Woods will prepare an updated set of conditions for DW review.
3	<p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apex to continue preparing response memo. • Draft conditions to be revised to reflect flexibility and staged development. • Woods to provide DW with update WW conditions for review. • DW to review and provide any feedback.

Minutes

Project: Milldale Stages 10 – 13, 4C, WWTP

Date: 23 June 2025

Time: 11.30am – 12.30pm

Location: Online

Topic: Stormwater / Parks Discussion

Attendees:

Name	Role/Organisation
Carly Hinde	Principal Project Lead, Auckland Council
Dylan Pope	Planner, DCS on behalf of Auckland Council
Cas Hannink	Parks Planner, Auckland Council
Shahriar Tehrani	Transport Engineer, Auckland Transport
Dali Suljic	Auckland Council
Griffin [last name TBC]	Auckland Council
Jamie Whyte	Project Coordinator and Engineer, Woods
Emma Howie (EH)	Planner, Woods
Tim Rickards (TR)	Engineer, Woods

Item	Detail
1	Tree Pits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HW / AT raised suggestions regarding the provision of tree pits. JW noted concerns around cost and practicality, and confirmed that the application seeks to comply with the Wainui SMP. DS noted that curb discharge directly to streams remains an issue. JW confirmed the design has been reviewed and updated. There will be no direct discharge of stormwater from roads into streams. Road runoff will pass through the basins before being discharged into the stream. DS agreed this approach is acceptable, provided there is no direct discharge from roads to streams.
2	Pedestrian Bridges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JW outlined the proposed pedestrian bridges and the rationale for each. Some bridges are paired with infrastructure, and JW emphasised the importance of the urban design and connectivity benefits provided, which will be delivered at FHLD's cost.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CH noted that bridges compliant with the Code of Practice would not require local board sign-off. CH also advised that he would seek internal guidance on which bridges Auckland Council would want vested with them. DP highlighted the need to balance infrastructure requirements with urban design connectivity. <p>Post meeting note: Further feedback provided by Council parks. Council further considering Bridges 4 & 5 in light of feedback from JW.</p>
3	<p>Basin Design Details</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DS requested additional information on basin design, particularly around access for maintenance. TR confirmed further details can be provided and noted that a 3.5 m access track will be provided for trucks, with a 1.8 m path for pedestrian access. This detail can be confirmed at EPA stage.
4	<p>Overland Flow Path Calculations & Climate Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Griffin raised the need to include climate change considerations and system blockage assumptions in the assessment. TR/JW noted that the current RC documentation does not include full pipe sizing details, as this will be addressed at the EPA stage. TR discussed the modelling undertaken at 2.1% and 3.8% blockage scenarios, and noted that an assessment of acceptable risk will be included in the response. Finalised detail will be confirmed at the EPA stage.
5	<p>Scour & Erosion Assessment for Drainage Reserves</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JW requested clarification on the additional assessments Auckland Council requires to address this matter. DS confirmed he will follow up with Hillary and provide further information on the scope and purpose of the requested assessment.
6	<p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CH to provide clarification on which pedestrian bridges Auckland Council may wish to have vested. Further discussion may be required. DS to follow up with Hillary this week to confirm the information required for the scour and erosion assessment and provide this to Woods. Woods to continue preparing a response to the matters raised and will clarify in the response what information will be detailed through EPA stage.

Minutes

Project: Milldale Stages 10 – 13, 4C, WWTP

Date: 27 June 2025

Time: 10.00am – 11.00am

Location: Woods, 8 Nugent Street, Auckland/Online

Topic: Ecology – Wetland Assessment

Attendees:

Name	Role/Organisation
Euan Williams (EW)	Planner, Woods
Mark Delaney (MD)	Ecologist, Viridius
John Williamson (JW)	Groundwater Specialist, WWLA
Dylan Pope (DP)	Planner, DCS on behalf of Auckland Council
Antoinette Bootsma (AB)	Ecologist, Auckland Council

Item	Detail
1	Vegetation Testing Approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AB sought clarification on why Viridis did not undertake specific vegetation testing in areas where only WWLA carried out soil and/or hydrology assessments. MD confirmed that justification will be provided for not assessing these areas, particularly where they were not considered wetlands from an ecological or habitat perspective.
2	Wingwalls <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MD confirmed primary purpose of the wingwall is for scour/erosion control and to stabilise the bank. Does not result in encasement. It was agreed that irrespective of interpretation, the proposed design does not change extent of effects or generate offset requirements.
3	Assessment of Marginal Areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion on the assessment methodology for marginal areas. AB requested vegetation information to accompany soil analysis and reference numbers on plans. It was noted that these areas are typically of low habitat value (e.g. dominated by creeping bent). Even if they are ultimately considered wetlands, which could increase the total reclamation area, the offsetting approach has allowed for sufficient excess area to accommodate very low or negligible ecological value. MD agreed that further comments would be provided in response to these matters particularly on prevalence and plant composition.

4	Offsetting Considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• AB needs to conclude that all wetlands have been appropriately identified, and that offset is adequate to address effects,• It was confirmed that the offsetting approach has been developed to include sufficient excess area to account for any potential inclusion of low-value marginal wetland areas.
5	Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Viridis to provide further wetland assessment in response to Council comments. In particular, further commentary will be given on unassessed areas and the proposed offsetting approach. AB/MD/JW to undertake offset location site visit next week.

Minutes

Project: Milldale Stages 10 – 13, 4C, WWTP

Date: 2 July 2025

Time: 2.00pm – 3.00pm

Location: Online

Topic: Planning

Attendees:

Name	Role/Organisation
Carly Hinde (CH)	Principal Project Lead, Auckland Council
Dylan Pope (DP)	Planner, DCS on behalf of Auckland Council
Euan Williams (EW)	Planner, Woods
Emma Howie (EH)	Planner, Woods
Rachel Morgan (RM)	Planner, B&A

Item	Detail
1	<p>Council Feedback & Applicant Response Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DP noted that Council’s feedback to the Panel will be based on the application as lodged, any additional information received, or in-principal positions that have been documented. DP noted that they needed to confirm their timeframes working backwards from the 29 July when they were required to provide their comments to the Panel. DP shared learnings from other Fast-track projects, highlighting the importance of providing certainty around: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where there are information gaps When additional information will be provided How matters are being resolved and documented RM supported this, noting the risk of the process becoming messy if there was not a clear exchange of information followed. The Applicant process for information exchange is as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes from all specialist meetings are being used to record agreements on resolution to matters raised in the Council Tracker – these would all be issued by 04/07 via the shared OneDrive folder. The meeting minutes, and updated Council Tracker could be used by the Council as part of their response memos to the Panel noting where agreement had been

	<p>made, where there were outstanding issues, or where further information/reporting was expected to be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated Application information, including a response to the matters raised by Council, updated technical reports or response memos, and updated conditions of consent would be provided back to the Panel after the request for comments period concludes and all feedback has been received from parties asked to make comments on the Application. DP noted that Council would request this updated information is reviewed, and if necessary provide updated Memos. • There was general agreement that not all items need to be fully resolved, provided there is a clear record of discussion and agreed next steps. • DP noted that in some cases, the Council will not be able to confirm its position until updated technical information is reviewed. RM acknowledged this position. • CH noted that there were additional reasons for consent that needed to be addressed. EH confirmed that these would be addressed in the expert response memos and also in the Planning Response document with any additional consent conditions addressed in the updated conditions set.
2	<p>Panel Briefing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CH noted that based on other FastTrack applications, the Panel briefing on 10/07 would be relatively information and approximately 40minutes. • DP noted that along with a general overview of the Application the following will likely be discussed at the briefing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A discussion on how engagement has occurred to date between the Applicant and Auckland Council ○ How updated information from the Applicant is shared by the Applicant and other parties ○ Initial questions that the Panel may have on the Application
3	<p>Council Tracker & Outstanding Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RM noted that there had been a series or productive meetings to resolve matters raised in the Council Tracker. • Geomorphology Assessment: Discussion on the request for the geomorphology assessment. RM noted Woods was underway with this assessment, the Engineers are able to meet to discuss initial findings and confirm there is agreement with Council on the approach to the assessment. Meeting date to be confirmed. • Bridges: Discussion on the feedback from the Parks team and their comments relating to proposed Bridges 4 & 5. RM noted that these bridges also had a dual purpose of screening infrastructure so important that they are provided. DP agreed that the Parks feedback needs to be balanced against urban design and connectivity outcomes, and this can be addressed through the planning response. DP also noted that as the bridges

	<p>would be vested assets that the applicant should continue to work with Council to resolve any residual issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WWTP: EH noted that there had been proactive discussions on the WWTP and there is further refinement to conditions being progressed following the meeting with Dylan Walton. • RM noted that with all of the matters raised by Council, there is still to opportunity to continue discussions on these, and Council will have the opportunity to comment on any revised conditions of consent.
4	<p>Rodney Local Board Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RM confirmed that the Applicant had reviewed the feedback received from the Rodney Local Board and confirmed that there is no intention to provide a formal response at this stage, but we will include a response in the Planning Response Report as part of the package of updated information provided to the Panel. • DP clarified that it is up to the Applicant how they choose to respond to this feedback.
5	<p>RDOC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The updated RDOC was provided to DP/CH on 01/07 for feedback. • DP confirmed he had reviewed the updated RDOC and would send through detailed comments on the document. However, was generally happy with the changes that had been made and further clarification to the process. A few areas still needed further consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Design controls and their purpose description ○ Some of the visuals do not reflect the scale of development that could be delivered • DP acknowledged that with the proposed updated, the RDOC could be supportable from a planning perspective, however he remained unsupportive of the 50% Building Coverage sought within the RDOC. • There was agreement that the conditions should be reframed to reflect the changes to the RDOC and clarify the certification process at the time of Building Consent. • DP queried the process for non-compliances with the RDOC. EH/EW confirmed that this would be dealt with through a s221 variation to the consent notice, which would be a robust assessment process and would not require the approved FastTrack consent to be varied. • EH provided an update on the Building Coverage study that was being carried out in response to DP's concerns around the proposal for blanket consents for 50% coverage.
6	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting minutes to be issued by 04/07 in the shared OneDrive for review. • Panel Briefing confirmed for 10/07

- Next planning check-in meeting to be arranged for 16/07
- Applicant continuing to prepare material in response to Council comments and to provide as part of the package of information in response to Comments to the Panel.
- The response material will include:
 - Volume 7: Planning Response Report
 - Volume 8: Updated Conditions of Consent
- The expert responses being prepared will be appended to the Planning Response Report and will include the following:

Expert	Response Format
Earthworks – Southern Skies	Report Update
Ecology – Viridis	Expert Response Memo
Economics – Insight Economics	Expert Response Memo
Engineering – Woods	Expert Response Memo / Drawing Updates
Geotech – CMW	Expert Response Memo
Groundwater – WWLA	Expert Response Memo
Stormwater – Woods	Report Updates / Stormwater model to be provided
Urban Design – Woods	Expert Response Memo / RDOC Update
Wastewater Treatment Plant Design Report / Plans	Expert Response Memo

Minutes

Project: Milldale Stages 10 – 13, 4C, WWTP

Date: 15 July 2025

Time: 2.00pm – 3.00pm

Location: Online

Topic: Stream Geomorphology Assessment

Attendees:

Name	Role/Organisation
Carly Hinde (CH)	Principal Project Lead, Auckland Council
Hillary Johnston	Healthy Waters
Ning Ma	Healthy Waters
Euan Williams (EW)	Planner, Woods
Rachel Morgan (RM)	Planner, B&A
Jamie Whyte	Woods
Tim Rickards	Woods
Shakti Singh	Woods
Boniface Kinnear	Woods
Danny Baucke	Woods

Item	Detail
1	Woods Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erosion Screening Tool – used this in the past to assess erosion hotspots. Used this same tool and methodology and adopted a 2D hydraulic model. Assessment will identify erosion potential categories. Assessment will define pre and post development scenarios and undertake a comparative analysis. The need for mitigation measures is TBC and will be detailed in the report.
2	Auckland Council feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approach outlined aligns with Healthy Waters considerations. Would like to see differences once we compare the pre and post scenarios. Regarding mitigation measures, the modelling will show if the riparian setbacks and engineering solutions are appropriate.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modelling to identify erosion hot spots and then consider design of outlet structures. Outfall structures should be designed in accordance with GD08, noting it is currently being reviewed. • Woods clarified that the detailed design of engineered structures will be managed through conditions of consent, Conceptual details to be provided where necessary and appropriate.
3	<p>Post meeting notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Woods team confirm that the post development discharge to Waterloo Creek is already covered by the Wainui East SMP. For this reason, the assessment will not consider downstream effects on Waterloo Creek.