Comments on Beachlands South – Sub-precinct F

Oct 25, 2026

Details

To: Beachlands South Expert Panel, c/- Environmental Protection Authority — substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz

Application: Beachlands South [FTAA-2606-1256], Beachlands South Limited Partnership

From: Michelle Preston, owner and occupier of [redacted]

Contact: [redacted]

I was invited to comment as the owner and occupier of adjacent land under section 53 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, in accordance with Minute 2 of the Expert Panel dated 28 September 2026. My comments relate to Sub-precinct F (Employment), which is directly opposite my home.

Summary

I understood the land opposite my home would be light industrial with planting along the road, and I could have accepted that. I oppose the changes in this application, which replace that with terraced housing, a single access and no buffer, and I ask the Panel to impose the conditions set out at the end of these comments.

The application departs from what the precinct provides for and what neighbours were shown, in four ways that directly affect my property:

1. All traffic from a light industrial area that has nearly doubled in size would use a single give-way intersection on Jack Lachlan Drive, about two sections from my driveway, with no second access secured.
2. Sixteen ground-floor terraced houses are proposed on the Jack Lachlan Drive frontage, although the precinct provides for housing in this sub-precinct only above the ground floor.
3. The applicant's landscape assessment relies on a planted buffer along Jack Lachlan Drive that the plans do not show.
4. These changes are not identified in the applicant's summary of departures from the precinct provided to the Panel.

1. Traffic and safety on Jack Lachlan Drive

The single access to Sub-precinct F has not been assessed for its effects on Jack Lachlan Drive or the homes opposite it.

One give-way intersection for the whole sub-precinct. The Planning Assessment (section 6.2.6) confirms that all vehicle access to Sub-precinct F will be from one new road off Jack Lachlan Drive. The Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) describes this "Road 24" intersection as a give-way priority intersection with a right-turn bay (ITA section 7.4, Updated Figure 7-24). That figure shows the intersection about two sections east of my property, with the Road 24 and Karo Road right-turn bays and painted median directly in front of my driveway.

The industrial area has nearly doubled. The ITA (section 8.2) states that light industrial floor space has increased from about 16,000 m² assessed at Plan Change 88 to about 29,100 m². It estimates 219 vehicle trips in the morning peak from light industrial activity alone (ITA Table 8-8). The industrial roads and turning heads are designed for 17.9 m semi-trailers (ITA section 7.3). All of these vehicles, plus the 57 dwellings, would use Road 24.

The intersection has not been modelled. The ITA's modelling addresses distant intersections such as Whitford and Trig Road. I could not find any capacity, queuing or safety analysis of the Road 24 / Jack Lachlan Drive intersection, or of its interaction with Karo Road and the driveways opposite. This matters because the precinct (I458.6, E27 modification) specifically defines Jack Lachlan Drive as the transport network against which traffic from non-residential activities is to be assessed.

Effect on my property. I tow a caravan and must reverse it into my driveway from Jack Lachlan Drive. With a turn bay and median in front of my driveway, an intersection two sections away, and regular heavy vehicles, this manoeuvre would become significantly more difficult and less safe. The same applies to other residents opposite who reverse trailers or boats.

A second access is already contemplated but not secured. The Planning Assessment (section 6.1) states that 758 and 770 Whitford-Maraetai Road are proposed for a "future accessway" to the industrial and live/work units in Sub-precinct F. No proposed condition requires that access to be built, or links it to occupation of the industrial lots. Without it, Jack Lachlan Drive carries the full load indefinitely.

2. Terraced housing in the employment sub-precinct

The 16 terraced houses on the Jack Lachlan Drive frontage are inconsistent with the operative precinct provisions for Sub-precinct F.

The Sub-precinct F objective in I458.2 seeks local employment in a quality-built environment, with residential accommodation provided above the ground floor in the Mixed Use Zone. The matching policy in I458.3 enables residential activity above the ground floor only where it does not compromise employment activities. The proposed terraced houses (lots 1029–1044, typologies T-3b and T-3c) are standard ground-floor dwellings with no employment component.

The precinct description says Sub-precinct F will provide a local employment source. Replacing the employment frontage to Jack Lachlan Drive with ordinary housing undermines that purpose and puts the most residential part of the sub-precinct right beside its only vehicle access.

The application has also dropped the indicative neighbourhood park shown for Sub-precinct F. When the Council asked about it, the applicant replied that the existing Kahawairahi Drive playground is sufficient (Studio Pacific response to Council's request for information, September 2026).

3. Landscape edge to Jack Lachlan Drive

The applicant's landscape conclusions for this corner rest on a planted buffer along Jack Lachlan Drive that the Sub-precinct F plans do not provide.

The Landscape and Visual Assessment (updated 14 September 2026, Viewpoint 5) states that development in this area would be progressively screened by a 15 m deep strip of buffer planting along both Whitford-Maraetai Road and Jack Lachlan Drive, and that the Project would not change this. However, the precinct standard (I458.6.2) requires the 15 m buffer only along Whitford-Maraetai Road, and the Sub-precinct F drawings (RC_4.3 to RC_4.7) show the terraced and live/work lots extending to the Jack Lachlan Drive boundary, with only a narrow pedestrian strip between them.

None of the assessment's viewpoints is on Jack Lachlan Drive opposite Sub-precinct F, so the effect on the homes facing it has not been assessed. The drawings also do not show how the Jack Lachlan Drive frontage will be treated, such as fence heights, planting or whether front doors face the street. Without that, the Panel cannot be satisfied of consistency with the Sub-precinct F assessment criteria (I458.8.2(6)), which seek building and landscape design that frames and defines road edges, with 'front' activities facing the street.

The applicant cannot rely on a 15 m buffer along Jack Lachlan Drive to conclude that landscape effects are acceptable, and then propose a layout that does not provide it. I ask the Panel to hold the applicant to its own evidence: a 15 m planted buffer along the full

Jack Lachlan Drive frontage of Sub-precinct F, secured by condition. If that buffer is not required, the Landscape and Visual Assessment's conclusion for this corner is unsupported and the effects on the homes opposite remain unassessed.

4. Other matters

Construction traffic. The draft Construction Traffic Management Plan in the ITA estimates about 80 to 144 heavy vehicle movements per day at peak, routed via Whitford-Maraetai Road and Jack Lachlan Drive past my home. The conditions should limit construction truck hours, protect access to existing driveways, and require the contractor to keep affected residents informed.

Construction effects on neighbouring homes. Earthworks, compaction and building work opposite my property could cause ground movement and vibration, leading to cracking of my house, damage to my swimming pool, and dust settling on my roof. My household relies on roof-collected rainwater tanks, so dust on the roof would contaminate my water supply. I ask that the consent holder be required to survey, monitor and put right any such damage at its own cost, as set out below.

Departures not identified to the Panel. The applicant's memorandum of counsel dated 24 September 2026 summarises the key departures from the precinct as building height, transport staging and the Ecological Protected Area Network. It does not mention the Sub-precinct F changes described above: the single access, ground-floor housing on the employment frontage and the removal of the neighbourhood park. I ask the Panel to assess these changes specifically against the Sub-precinct F objectives, policies and assessment criteria.

Outcomes I ask the Panel to secure

If the Panel grants consent, I ask that it impose conditions to the following effect:

1. **Second access before industrial occupation.** The second access to Sub-precinct F via 758 or 770 Whitford-Maraetai Road must be constructed and operational before any light industrial lot in superlot E2 (lots 1526–1529) is occupied.
2. **Heavy vehicle routing.** Until that access is operational, heavy vehicles serving the light industrial lots must not use the Road 24 / Jack Lachlan Drive intersection, other than for construction.
3. **Intersection safety audit.** Before engineering plan approval, an independent road safety audit and vehicle tracking of the Road 24 / Jack Lachlan Drive intersection, including the Karo Road intersection and the existing driveways opposite (53 to [redacted]

[redacted] and 1 Karo Road), must be completed. It must specifically test residents reversing trailers and caravans into those driveways, and affected owners must be consulted on the design.

4. **Employment frontage.** The Jack Lachlan Drive frontage of superlot E1 should be used for employment or live/work buildings with ground-floor workspace, consistent with the Sub-precinct F objective and policy, rather than standard terraced houses.
5. **Planted edge.** A 15 m deep strip of native planting must be provided along the full Jack Lachlan Drive frontage of Sub-precinct F, matching the buffer the Landscape and Visual Assessment relies on. No dwellings, other buildings, fences or parking may be located within it, whether or not housing remains in superlot E1. The planting must be established before any dwelling or building in E1 is occupied, and maintained in perpetuity, as I458.6.2 requires for the Whitford-Maraetai Road buffer.
6. **Construction traffic.** Construction heavy vehicles on Jack Lachlan Drive should be limited to weekday daytime hours, with access to existing driveways maintained at all times and a named contact for residents.
7. **Protection of neighbouring properties.** Before any earthworks or construction in Sub-precinct F begins:
   - The consent holder must offer owners of properties on Jack Lachlan Drive and Karo Road opposite the site, including [redacted] an independent pre-construction condition survey of their house, pool, driveway, fences and water tanks, at the consent holder's cost, with a copy given to the owner.
   - Vibration must be monitored at the nearest dwellings during earthworks, compaction and piling, and kept within the limits in the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan.
   - A Dust Management Plan must be certified by Council, including water suppression, monitoring and stopping work in high winds.
   - Where dust affects roof-collected water supplies, the consent holder must clean affected roofs and gutters, clean or flush water tanks, and supply replacement drinking water while this is done, at its cost.
   - A post-construction condition survey must be offered, and any damage attributable to the works, including cracking, pool damage or soiling of houses, must be repaired or the owner compensated by the consent holder.
   - A named contact and complaints process must be provided, with complaints responded to within a set timeframe.
8. **Future industrial buildings.** The light industrial lots in superlot E2 are being created as vacant lots, and the Light Industry zone allows buildings up to 20 m high. Any future building on lot 1529, which fronts Jack Lachlan Drive, should require its own resource consent with the owners and occupiers opposite treated as affected parties. The 15 m planted buffer in item 5 should apply to the E2 frontage as well as E1.

9. **Industrial noise, lighting and hours.** Heavy vehicle movements and deliveries serving the light industrial lots should be limited to 7am to 7pm Monday to Saturday, with none on Sundays or public holidays. Outdoor, security and car park lighting in Sub-precinct F must be designed and shielded so it does not spill across Jack Lachlan Drive into homes.
10. **No stopping on Jack Lachlan Drive.** No-stopping-at-all-times restrictions should be installed on both sides of Jack Lachlan Drive between Karo Road and Road 24, so that parked vehicles from the new development do not block visibility for residents using their driveways, particularly when reversing trailers and caravans.
11. **Speed limit.** The ITA says the applicant intends to reduce the Jack Lachlan Drive speed limit from 60 km/h to 50 km/h. The Road 24 intersection should not open to traffic until that reduction is in place, and the consent holder should be required to seek it from Auckland Transport.
12. **Construction access and hours.** Construction traffic for Sub-precinct F should not use the Road 24 entrance opposite existing homes until that road is formed and sealed. Noisy construction work should be limited to 7:30am to 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am to 1pm on Saturdays, with no work on Sundays or public holidays.
13. **Consultation on detailed design.** The owners of properties opposite Sub-precinct F should be consulted, with their feedback provided to Council, before Council certifies the landscape plan for the Jack Lachlan Drive buffer and before engineering approval of the Road 24 intersection.
14. **Cap on industrial floor space.** Light industrial floor space in Sub-precinct F should be capped at the approximately 29,100 m² modelled in the ITA. Any proposal to exceed that should require a new traffic assessment of the Road 24 / Jack Lachlan Drive intersection and its effects on Jack Lachlan Drive, with the owners and occupiers opposite treated as affected parties. This ties future growth to the evidence the Panel is relying on now, since the precinct sets minimum, not maximum, amounts of light industrial floor space.

Closing

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I would welcome the Panel visiting Jack Lachlan Drive opposite Sub-precinct F, and I am happy to provide photographs of my driveway and the current outlook if that would assist.

Michelle Preston

[redacted]

25 October 2026

Documents referred to

- Integrated Transport Assessment (Attachment 8)
- Planning Assessment (Attachment 0B)
- Landscape and Visual Assessment, updated 14 September 2026 (Attachment 6)
- Sub-precinct F Employment drawings (Attachment 2.6)
- Studio Pacific response to Council's request for information (Attachment 2.10)
- Memorandum of counsel on key departures, 24 September 2026 (Attachment 0A1)
- I458 Beachlands South Precinct, Auckland Unitary Plan
- Minute 2 of the Expert Panel, 28 September 2026

Outlook

Comments on Beachlands South (FTAA-2606-1256) – Michelle Preston, [redacted] - PDF Attached

From Michelle Preston [redacted]
Date Sun 25/10/2026 2:31 PM
To Substantive <substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz>

1 attachment (165 KB)
20261025 Comments on Beachlands South – Sub-precinct F.pdf;

Comments on Beachlands South – Sub-precinct F

25 Oct 2026

Details

To: Beachlands South Expert Panel, c/- Environmental Protection Authority — substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz

Application: Beachlands South [FTAA-2606-1256], Beachlands South Limited Partnership

From: Michelle Preston, owner and occupier of [redacted]

Contact: [redacted] - I can receive emails going forward

I was invited to comment as the owner and occupier of adjacent land under section 53 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, in accordance with Minute 2 of the Expert Panel dated 28 September 2026. My comments relate to Sub-precinct F (Employment), which is directly opposite my home.

Summary

I understood the land opposite my home would be light industrial with planting along the road, and I could have accepted that. I oppose the changes in this application, which replace that with terraced housing, a single access and no buffer, and I ask the Panel to impose the conditions set out at the end of these comments.

The application departs from what the precinct provides for and what neighbours were shown, in four ways that directly affect my property:

1. All traffic from a light industrial area that has nearly doubled in size would use a single give-way intersection on Jack Lachlan Drive, about two sections from my driveway, with no second access secured.
2. Sixteen ground-floor terraced houses are proposed on the Jack Lachlan Drive frontage, although the precinct provides for housing in this sub-precinct only above the ground floor.
3. The applicant's landscape assessment relies on a planted buffer along Jack Lachlan Drive that the plans do not show.
4. These changes are not identified in the applicant's summary of departures from the precinct provided to the Panel.

1. Traffic and safety on Jack Lachlan Drive

The single access to Sub-precinct F has not been assessed for its effects on Jack Lachlan Drive or the homes opposite it.

One give-way intersection for the whole sub-precinct. The Planning Assessment (section 6.2.6) confirms that all vehicle access to Sub-precinct F will be from one new road off Jack Lachlan Drive. The Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) describes this "Road 24" intersection as a give-way priority intersection with a right-turn bay (ITA section 7.4, Updated Figure 7-24). That figure shows the intersection about two sections east of my property, with the Road 24 and Karo Road right-turn bays and painted median directly in front of my driveway.

The industrial area has nearly doubled. The ITA (section 8.2) states that light industrial floor space has increased from about 16,000 m^2 assessed at Plan Change 88 to about 29,100 m^2. It estimates 219 vehicle trips in the morning peak from light industrial activity alone (ITA Table 8-8). The industrial roads and turning heads are designed for 17.9 m semi-trailers (ITA section 7.3). All of these vehicles, plus the 57 dwellings, would use Road 24.

The intersection has not been modelled. The ITA's modelling addresses distant intersections such as Whitford and Trig Road. I could not find any capacity, queuing or safety analysis of the Road 24 / Jack Lachlan Drive intersection, or of its interaction with Karo Road and the driveways opposite. This matters because the precinct (I458.6, E27 modification) specifically defines Jack Lachlan Drive as the transport network against which traffic from non-residential activities is to be assessed.

Effect on my property. I tow a caravan and must reverse it into my driveway from Jack Lachlan Drive. With a turn bay and median in front of my driveway, an intersection two sections away, and regular heavy vehicles, this manoeuvre would become significantly more difficult and less safe. The same applies to other residents opposite who reverse trailers or boats.

A second access is already contemplated but not secured. The Planning Assessment (section 6.1) states that 758 and 770 Whitford-Maraetai Road are proposed for a "future access way" to the industrial and live/work units in Sub-precinct F. No proposed condition requires that access to be built, or links it to occupation of the industrial lots. Without it, Jack Lachlan Drive carries the full load indefinitely.

2. Terraced housing in the employment sub-precinct

The 16 terraced houses on the Jack Lachlan Drive frontage are inconsistent with the operative precinct provisions for Sub-precinct F.

The Sub-precinct F objective in I458.2 seeks local employment in a quality-built environment, with residential accommodation provided above the ground floor in the Mixed Use Zone. The matching policy in I458.3 enables residential activity above the ground floor only where it does not compromise employment activities. The proposed terraced houses (lots 1029–1044, typologies T-3b and T-3c) are standard ground-floor dwellings with no employment component.

The precinct description says Sub-precinct F will provide a local employment source. Replacing the employment frontage to Jack Lachlan Drive with ordinary housing undermines that purpose and puts the most residential part of the sub-precinct right beside its only vehicle access.

The application has also dropped the indicative neighbourhood park shown for Sub-precinct F. When the Council asked about it, the applicant replied that the existing Kahawairahi Drive playground is sufficient (Studio Pacific response to Council's request for information, September 2026).

3. Landscape edge to Jack Lachlan Drive

The applicant's landscape conclusions for this corner rest on a planted buffer along Jack Lachlan Drive that the Sub-precinct F plans do not provide.

The Landscape and Visual Assessment (updated 14 September 2026, Viewpoint 5) states that development in this area would be progressively screened by a 15 m deep strip of buffer planting along both Whitford-Maraetai Road and Jack Lachlan Drive, and that the Project would not change this. However, the precinct standard (I458.6.2) requires the 15 m buffer only along Whitford-Maraetai Road, and the Sub-precinct F drawings (RC_4.3 to RC_4.7) show the terraced and live/work lots extending to the Jack Lachlan Drive boundary, with only a narrow pedestrian strip between them.

None of the assessment's viewpoints is on Jack Lachlan Drive opposite Sub-precinct F, so the effect on the homes facing it has not been assessed. The drawings also do not show how the Jack Lachlan Drive frontage will be treated, such as fence heights, planting or whether front doors face the street. Without that, the Panel cannot be satisfied of consistency with the Sub-precinct F assessment criteria (I458.8.2(6)), which seek building and landscape design that frames and defines road edges, with 'front' activities facing the street.

The applicant cannot rely on a 15 m buffer along Jack Lachlan Drive to conclude that landscape effects are acceptable, and then propose a layout that does not provide it. I ask the Panel to hold the applicant to its own evidence: a 15 m planted buffer along the full Jack Lachlan Drive frontage of Sub-precinct F, secured by condition. If that buffer is not required, the Landscape and Visual Assessment's conclusion for this corner is unsupported and the effects on the homes opposite remain unassessed.

4. Other matters

Construction traffic. The draft Construction Traffic Management Plan in the ITA estimates about 80 to 144 heavy vehicle movements per day at peak, routed via Whitford-Maraetai Road and Jack Lachlan Drive past my home. The conditions should limit construction truck hours, protect access to existing driveways, and require the contractor to keep affected residents informed.

Construction effects on neighbouring homes. Earthworks, compaction and building work opposite my property could cause ground movement and vibration, leading to cracking of my house, damage to my swimming pool, and dust settling on my roof. My household relies on roof-collected rainwater

tanks, so dust on the roof would contaminate my water supply. I ask that the consent holder be required to survey, monitor and put right any such damage at its own cost, as set out below.

Departures not identified to the Panel. The applicant's memorandum of counsel dated 24 September 2026 summarises the key departures from the precinct as building height, transport staging and the Ecological Protected Area Network. It does not mention the Sub-precinct F changes described above: the single access, ground-floor housing on the employment frontage and the removal of the neighbourhood park. I ask the Panel to assess these changes specifically against the Sub-precinct F objectives, policies and assessment criteria.

Outcomes I ask the Panel to secure

If the Panel grants consent, I ask that it impose conditions to the following effect:

1. **Second access before industrial occupation.** The second access to Sub-precinct F via 758 or 770 Whitford-Maraetai Road must be constructed and operational before any light industrial lot in superlot E2 (lots 1526–1529) is occupied.
2. **Heavy vehicle routing.** Until that access is operational, heavy vehicles serving the light industrial lots must not use the Road 24 / Jack Lachlan Drive intersection, other than for construction.
3. **Intersection safety audit.** Before engineering plan approval, an independent road safety audit and vehicle tracking of the Road 24 / Jack Lachlan Drive intersection, including the Karo Road intersection and the existing driveways opposite (53 to 61 Jack Lachlan Drive and 1 Karo Road), must be completed. It must specifically test residents reversing trailers and caravans into those driveways, and affected owners must be consulted on the design.
4. **Employment frontage.** The Jack Lachlan Drive frontage of superlot E1 should be used for employment or live/work buildings with ground-floor workspace, consistent with the Sub-precinct F objective and policy, rather than standard terraced houses.
5. **Planted edge.** A 15 m deep strip of native planting must be provided along the full Jack Lachlan Drive frontage of Sub-precinct F, matching the buffer the Landscape and Visual Assessment relies on. No dwellings, other buildings, fences or parking may be located within it, whether or not housing remains in superlot E1. The planting must be established before any dwelling or building in E1 is occupied, and maintained in perpetuity, as I458.6.2 requires for the Whitford-Maraetai Road buffer.
6. **Construction traffic.** Construction heavy vehicles on Jack Lachlan Drive should be limited to weekday daytime hours, with access to existing driveways maintained at all times and a named contact for residents.
7. **Protection of neighbouring properties.** Before any earthworks or construction in Sub-precinct F begins:
    - The consent holder must offer owners of properties on Jack Lachlan Drive and Karo Road opposite the site, including [redacted] an independent pre-construction condition survey of their house, pool, driveway, fences and water tanks, at the consent holder's cost, with a copy given to the owner.
    - Vibration must be monitored at the nearest dwellings during earthworks, compaction and piling, and kept within the limits in the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan.
    - A Dust Management Plan must be certified by Council, including water suppression, monitoring and stopping work in high winds.

- Where dust affects roof-collected water supplies, the consent holder must clean affected roofs and gutters, clean or flush water tanks, and supply replacement drinking water while this is done, at its cost.
- A post-construction condition survey must be offered, and any damage attributable to the works, including cracking, pool damage or soiling of houses, must be repaired or the owner compensated by the consent holder.
- A named contact and complaints process must be provided, with complaints responded to within a set timeframe.

8. **Future industrial buildings.** The light industrial lots in superlot E2 are being created as vacant lots, and the Light Industry zone allows buildings up to 20 m high. Any future building on lot 1529, which fronts Jack Lachlan Drive, should require its own resource consent with the owners and occupiers opposite treated as affected parties. The 15 m planted buffer in item 5 should apply to the E2 frontage as well as E1.
9. **Industrial noise, lighting and hours.** Heavy vehicle movements and deliveries serving the light industrial lots should be limited to 7am to 7pm Monday to Saturday, with none on Sundays or public holidays. Outdoor, security and car park lighting in Sub-precinct F must be designed and shielded so it does not spill across Jack Lachlan Drive into homes.
10. **No stopping on Jack Lachlan Drive.** No-stopping-at-all-times restrictions should be installed on both sides of Jack Lachlan Drive between Karo Road and Road 24, so that parked vehicles from the new development do not block visibility for residents using their driveways, particularly when reversing trailers and caravans.
11. **Speed limit.** The ITA says the applicant intends to reduce the Jack Lachlan Drive speed limit from 60 km/h to 50 km/h. The Road 24 intersection should not open to traffic until that reduction is in place, and the consent holder should be required to seek it from Auckland Transport.
12. **Construction access and hours.** Construction traffic for Sub-precinct F should not use the Road 24 entrance opposite existing homes until that road is formed and sealed. Noisy construction work should be limited to 7:30am to 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am to 1pm on Saturdays, with no work on Sundays or public holidays.
13. **Consultation on detailed design.** The owners of properties opposite Sub-precinct F should be consulted, with their feedback provided to Council, before Council certifies the landscape plan for the Jack Lachlan Drive buffer and before engineering approval of the Road 24 intersection.

14. **Cap on industrial floor space.** Light industrial floor space in Sub-precinct F should be capped at the approximately 29,100 m² modelled in the ITA. Any proposal to exceed that should require a new traffic assessment of the Road 24 / Jack Lachlan Drive intersection and its effects on Jack Lachlan Drive, with the owners and occupiers opposite treated as affected parties. This ties future growth to the evidence the Panel is relying on now, since the precinct sets minimum, not maximum, amounts of light industrial floor space.

Closing

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I would welcome the Panel visiting Jack Lachlan Drive opposite Sub-precinct F, and I am happy to provide photographs of my driveway and the current outlook if that would assist.

Michelle Preston

[redacted]

25 October 2026

Documents referred to

- Integrated Transport Assessment (Attachment 8)
- Planning Assessment (Attachment 0B)
- Landscape and Visual Assessment, updated 14 September 2026 (Attachment 6)
- Sub-precinct F Employment drawings (Attachment 2.6)
- Studio Pacific response to Council's request for information (Attachment 2.10)
- Memorandum of counsel on key departures, 24 September 2026 (Attachment 0A1)
- I458 Beachlands South Precinct, Auckland Unitary Plan
- Minute 2 of the Expert Panel, 28 September 2026
-
-
-

Outlook

Additional comments on Beachlands South (FTAA-2606-1256) – Building heights, transport, ferry and wastewater – Michelle Preston, 61 Jack Lachlan Drive - PDF attached

From Michelle Preston [redacted]
Date Sun 25/10/2026 3:05 PM
To Substantive <substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz>

1 attachment (173 KB)
20261025 Comments on Beachlands South – Landmark Tower.pdf;

Additional comments on Beachlands South – Building heights, transport, ferry and wastewater

25 Oct 2026

Details

To: Beachlands South Expert Panel, c/- Environmental Protection Authority — substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz

Application: Beachlands South [FTAA-2606-1256], Beachlands South Limited Partnership

From: Michelle Preston, owner and occupier of [redacted]

Contact: [redacted] am happy to receive further correspondence about this application by email.

I was invited to comment as the owner and occupier of adjacent land under section 53 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (Minute 2 of the Expert Panel, 28 September 2026). These comments are in addition to my earlier comments on Sub-precinct F, which I ask the Panel to consider alongside them.

Summary

I oppose the 12-storey Landmark Tower and the other building height increases, the removal of transport and ferry requirements set by the precinct, and the proposed treated wastewater outfall into the Whitford Embayment. I ask the Panel to decline these parts of the application or impose the conditions set out at the end of these comments.

The tower would be about 42 m tall on land where the precinct limit is 11 m, nearly four times the permitted height. It would sit on the coastal ridgeline and would be visible from my home on Jack Lachlan Drive. It would change Beachlands from a low-rise coastal settlement into one defined by a single tall tower, which is not what the community was told to expect when the precinct was approved.

Beyond the tower, the application removes or delays several of the safeguards that made the plan change acceptable to the existing community: the Whitford Bypass, the Trig Road intersection upgrade, the timing of the Jack Lachlan Drive upgrade and guaranteed ferry capacity. It also introduces a wastewater discharge to the sea that was not part of the proposal when the project was listed for fast-track.

1. Landmark Tower: conflict with the precinct and Beachlands' coastal character

The tower contradicts what the precinct says development in the Coastal sub-precinct should achieve.

It is far beyond the permitted height. The applicant's memorandum of counsel (24 September 2026) confirms the tower is 12 storeys, about 42 m, on land zoned Mixed Housing Urban with an 11 m height limit. The memorandum describes the departures from the precinct as largely technical. That understates a building nearly four times the permitted height.

It works against the Coastal sub-precinct's purpose. The precinct objective for Sub-precinct D is that development responds to the natural topography and landform character of the coastal edge. The precinct description expects densities to step down from high and medium density near the Village Centre to terraced and detached housing, with larger lots along the coastal edge to achieve a spacious landscape character. A single 42 m tower on the ridge does the opposite: it competes with the landform rather than responding to it.

It does not transition in scale. The precinct's built form policy seeks to transition the scale of buildings so they visually integrate with adjoining areas. The surrounding Beachlands township is overwhelmingly one and two storeys, and the precinct itself concentrates its tallest buildings around the Village Centre and ferry. A stand-alone tower on the coastal ridge has no such transition.

The limits were set through a full public process. Plan Change 88 settled these height limits in 2024 after submissions and hearings. Residents, including me, are entitled to rely on that outcome. The fast-track process should not be used to override it for a building of this scale without compelling justification.

2. Landmark Tower: what the applicant's own assessment shows

The applicant's evidence confirms the tower is designed to stand out, but does not assess how it will look from the existing township.

It is intended to dominate. The applicant's memorandum describes the tower as a singular landmark element. That is exactly my concern: a landmark of this height on the coastal ridge will define views of Beachlands from land and sea.

The landscape assessment identifies it as the most significant change. The Landscape and Visual Assessment (updated 14 September 2026) says that, from the Clifton Road Walkway across Waikopua

Bay, the 12-storey Western Apartment Building would add another layer of development to the coastal escarpment and is perhaps the most significant of the changes. From Marina Beach it describes the building as likely to appear one-off and stand-alone.

Views from the existing township are not assessed. None of the assessment's viewpoints is on Jack Lachlan Drive near my home, from where I would see the tower. The effects on existing residents' everyday outlook have therefore not been assessed.

3. Other building height increases

The tower is the largest of a series of height increases that together would make Beachlands South far taller than the precinct allows. The applicant's memorandum of counsel lists them:

Building	Precinct limit	Proposed height
Apartments along the Fairway Reserve, Marina Point	16 m	about 21.8 m
Six apartment buildings, Coastal sub-precinct	16 m	about 21.8 m
Two Mixed Use zone buildings	16 m	about 21.8 m
Hotel, Community sub-precinct	16 m	about 22.7 m
Building in superlot CM3, Community sub-precinct	16 m	about 22 m
Apartment Buildings B and C, Village Centre (VC3)	18 m	20.8 m and 21.2 m
Apartment Buildings RS1 (VC1) and C (VC4), Village Centre	24 m	26.1 m and 25.3 m
North-west building, Marina Point	11 m	over 11 m

Each exceedance may look modest on its own, but together they change the planned character of the whole precinct from what was approved through Plan Change 88. I ask the Panel to require compliance with the precinct height limits unless a specific, compelling reason is shown for an individual building.

4. Removal of transport upgrades

The application drops two road upgrades the precinct requires and delays a third, relying on traffic forecasts with almost no margin for error.

The Whitford Bypass. The precinct requires the Whitford Bypass before more than 1,900 dwellings are built (Table I458.6.3.1, row (e)). The applicant does not propose to build it. Its ITA forecasts 2041 morning peak southbound traffic through Whitford of about 1,589 vehicles per hour, against the 1,600 vehicles per hour that Plan Change 88 identified as the point the bypass becomes necessary. That leaves a margin of about 11 vehicles per hour.

The forecast depends on optimistic assumptions. It assumes a 15% reduction in trips from working from home, and that 45% of residents' trips leave the area rather than the 50% assumed at Plan Change 88 (ITA section 8). If either assumption proves wrong, traffic would exceed the bypass threshold, but under this application there would be no requirement to build it. Every household in Beachlands and Maraetai that uses Whitford-Maraetai Road would bear the consequences.

The Trig Road intersection. The precinct requires the Trig Road (south) / Whitford-Maraetai Road intersection to be upgraded before more than 850 dwellings (row (c)). The applicant proposes no upgrade. Its own modelling shows the Trig Road approach already operates at level of service F, the worst rating, in the morning peak, with average delays rising from 55 to 66 seconds with the development and to 75 seconds in Auckland Transport's sensitivity test (ITA Table 8-9).

The Jack Lachlan Drive upgrade. The precinct requires the Jack Lachlan Drive walking and cycling upgrade before any of the first 500 dwellings are occupied (row (a)). The applicant proposes that 68 dwellings be occupied before the full upgrade is complete.

These are non-complying activities under the precinct. They were key safeguards for the existing community when Plan Change 88 was approved, and they should not be removed on the strength of forecasts this finely balanced.

5. Ferry capacity

The precinct requires capacity for at least 1,150 ferry passengers from Pine Harbour in the weekday morning peak (6:20am to 8:20am) before more than 1,900 dwellings are built (Table I458.6.3.2, row (e)). The applicant's memorandum of counsel acknowledges it has not demonstrated this can be achieved and proposes only a condition to assess ferry adequacy once 1,900 dwellings are exceeded.

The whole precinct is premised on being public-transport focused around the Pine Harbour ferry. If capacity is not secured, new residents would compete with existing Beachlands and Maraetai commuters for the same sailings, or drive instead, adding to traffic on Whitford-Maraetai Road at the same time the bypass is being dropped. A condition to assess later is not a substitute for the binding threshold in the precinct.

6. Wastewater discharge to the Whitford Embayment

The application includes a new long-term discharge of treated wastewater into the sea next to Beachlands, which was not part of the proposal when the project was listed for fast-track.

What is proposed. As Stage 2 of its wastewater strategy, the applicant seeks consent for a new treatment plant and an outfall pipe drilled about 2 km beneath the seabed, discharging treated wastewater through a submerged diffuser into the centre of the Whitford Embayment (EPA section 18 report). The embayment is a sheltered body of water fed by the Waikōpua, Tūranga and

Mangemangeroa creeks. The precinct itself recognises the adjacent coastal marine area as a Significant Ecological Area with rich feeding grounds for international migratory and endemic wading birds.

It departs from what was put forward in 2024. The wastewater memo supporting the fast-track listing (GWE, 30 April 2024) identified connection to Watercare's Beachlands treatment plant as the preferred option. Its standalone alternatives were irrigation to land or polishing wetlands discharging to a stream. A sea outfall was not among the options.

Watercare has already rejected a Gulf outfall for Beachlands. In March 2024 Watercare confirmed it would not pursue a pipeline discharging wastewater from Beachlands into the Hauraki Gulf, and chose a discharge to a tributary of Te Puru Stream instead (Times, 11 March 2024). It would be inconsistent to now approve a private outfall into the same coastal waters through a fast-track process with limited public input.

The coast matters to the whole community. The beaches, shellfish beds, boating and estuaries around Beachlands are central to its coastal character. A permanent wastewater discharge, with the risk of plant failures or overflows over decades, is a significant change that deserves full scrutiny.

Outcomes I ask the Panel to secure

1. **Decline the tower.** Decline consent for the 12-storey Landmark Tower, so that buildings in Sub-precinct D comply with the 11 m height limit set by the precinct.
2. **If any additional height is allowed, keep it modest.** Any building on that site should be limited to a height that transitions to the surrounding low-rise development and sits below the coastal ridgeline when viewed from the existing township.
3. **Assess views from the township.** Before any decision on additional height, the applicant should be required to provide visual simulations from Jack Lachlan Drive and other parts of the existing Beachlands township, so the Panel can assess the effects on existing residents.
4. **Building heights.** Require all other buildings to comply with the precinct height limits, unless a specific and compelling reason is shown for an individual building.
5. **Keep the Whitford Bypass requirement.** Retain the precinct requirement that the Whitford Bypass be built before more than 1,900 dwellings. At a minimum, require it to be built automatically if transport monitoring at any 500-dwelling stage shows trip rates, external trips or Whitford traffic above the ITA's assumptions.
6. **Keep the Trig Road upgrade.** Retain the requirement to upgrade the Trig Road (south) / Whitford-Maraetai Road intersection before more than 850 dwellings.
7. **Jack Lachlan Drive upgrade first.** Require the full Jack Lachlan Drive walking and cycling upgrade to be completed before any dwellings are occupied, as the precinct requires.
8. **Binding ferry capacity.** Retain the precinct's ferry capacity thresholds, including 1,150 peak passengers before more than 1,900 dwellings, as binding conditions rather than a later assessment.
9. **No outfall into the Whitford Embayment.** Decline consent for the Stage 2 wastewater outfall and discharge into the coastal marine area. Long-term wastewater servicing should be through connection to Watercare's network or land-based disposal, as proposed when the project was listed. If the Panel does not decline it, the outfall should be left to a separate, publicly notified consent application when it is actually needed, supported by full coastal water quality, shellfish and bathing assessments.

Closing

Thank you for considering these comments alongside my earlier comments on Sub-precinct F. These matters affect the whole Beachlands and Maraetai community, and I ask the Panel to give them full weight.

Michelle Preston

[redacted]

25 October 2026

Documents referred to

- Memorandum of counsel on key departures, 24 September 2026 (Attachment 0A1)
- Landscape and Visual Assessment, updated 14 September 2026 (Attachment 6)
- Urban Design Assessment (Attachment 4)
- I458 Beachlands South Precinct, Auckland Unitary Plan
- Minute 2 of the Expert Panel, 28 September 2026

- Integrated Transport Assessment (Attachment 8)
- EPA section 18 report, Beachlands South (FTAA-2606-1256)
- Wastewater ocean outfall construction methodology (Attachment 10A)
- Beachlands South wastewater meeting minutes, 12 May 2026 (Attachment 22-4.7)
- GWE wastewater memo for fast-track listing, 30 April 2024
- Times: Watercare rules out Beachlands wastewater discharge into Hauraki Gulf, 11 March 2024
-

-

Additional comments on Beachlands South – Building heights, transport, ferry and wastewater

Oct 25, 2026

Details

To: Beachlands South Expert Panel, c/- Environmental Protection Authority — substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz

Application: Beachlands South [FTAA-2606-1256], Beachlands South Limited Partnership

From: Michelle Preston, owner and occupier of [redacted]

Contact: [redacted] am happy to receive further correspondence about this application by email.

I was invited to comment as the owner and occupier of adjacent land under section 53 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (Minute 2 of the Expert Panel, 28 September 2026). These comments are in addition to my earlier comments on Sub-precinct F, which I ask the Panel to consider alongside them.

Summary

I oppose the 12-storey Landmark Tower and the other building height increases, the removal of transport and ferry requirements set by the precinct, and the proposed treated wastewater outfall into the Whitford Embayment. I ask the Panel to decline these parts of the application or impose the conditions set out at the end of these comments.

The tower would be about 42 m tall on land where the precinct limit is 11 m, nearly four times the permitted height. It would sit on the coastal ridgeline and would be visible from my home on Jack Lachlan Drive. It would change Beachlands from a low-rise coastal settlement into one defined by a single tall tower, which is not what the community was told to expect when the precinct was approved.

Beyond the tower, the application removes or delays several of the safeguards that made the plan change acceptable to the existing community: the Whitford Bypass, the Trig Road intersection upgrade, the timing of the Jack Lachlan Drive upgrade and guaranteed ferry capacity. It also introduces a wastewater discharge to the sea that was not part of the proposal when the project was listed for fast-track.

1. Landmark Tower: conflict with the precinct and Beachlands' coastal character

The tower contradicts what the precinct says development in the Coastal sub-precinct should achieve.

It is far beyond the permitted height. The applicant's memorandum of counsel (24 September 2026) confirms the tower is 12 storeys, about 42 m, on land zoned Mixed Housing Urban with an 11 m height limit. The memorandum describes the departures from the precinct as largely technical. That understates a building nearly four times the permitted height.

It works against the Coastal sub-precinct's purpose. The precinct objective for Sub-precinct D is that development responds to the natural topography and landform character of the coastal edge. The precinct description expects densities to step down from high and medium density near the Village Centre to terraced and detached housing, with larger lots along the coastal edge to achieve a spacious landscape character. A single 42 m tower on the ridge does the opposite: it competes with the landform rather than responding to it.

It does not transition in scale. The precinct's built form policy seeks to transition the scale of buildings so they visually integrate with adjoining areas. The surrounding Beachlands township is overwhelmingly one and two storeys, and the precinct itself concentrates its tallest buildings around the Village Centre and ferry. A stand-alone tower on the coastal ridge has no such transition.

The limits were set through a full public process. Plan Change 88 settled these height limits in 2024 after submissions and hearings. Residents, including me, are entitled to rely on that outcome. The fast-track process should not be used to override it for a building of this scale without compelling justification.

2. Landmark Tower: what the applicant's own assessment shows

The applicant's evidence confirms the tower is designed to stand out, but does not assess how it will look from the existing township.

It is intended to dominate. The applicant's memorandum describes the tower as a singular landmark element. That is exactly my concern: a landmark of this height on the coastal ridge will define views of Beachlands from land and sea.

The landscape assessment identifies it as the most significant change. The Landscape and Visual Assessment (updated 14 September 2026) says that, from the Clifton Road Walkway across Waikopua Bay, the 12-storey Western Apartment Building would add

another layer of development to the coastal escarpment and is perhaps the most significant of the changes. From Marina Beach it describes the building as likely to appear one-off and stand-alone.

Views from the existing township are not assessed. None of the assessment's viewpoints is on Jack Lachlan Drive near my home, from where I would see the tower. The effects on existing residents' everyday outlook have therefore not been assessed.

3. Other building height increases

The tower is the largest of a series of height increases that together would make Beachlands South far taller than the precinct allows. The applicant's memorandum of counsel lists them:

Building	Precinct limit	Proposed height
Apartments along the Fairway Reserve, Marina Point	16 m	about 21.8 m
Six apartment buildings, Coastal sub-precinct	16 m	about 21.8 m
Two Mixed Use zone buildings	16 m	about 21.8 m
Hotel, Community sub-precinct	16 m	about 22.7 m
Building in superlot CM3, Community sub-precinct	16 m	about 22 m
Apartment Buildings B and C, Village Centre (VC3)	18 m	20.8 m and 21.2 m
Apartment Buildings RS1 (VC1) and C (VC4), Village Centre	24 m	26.1 m and 25.3 m
North-west building, Marina Point	11 m	over 11 m

Each exceedance may look modest on its own, but together they change the planned character of the whole precinct from what was approved through Plan Change 88. I ask the Panel to require compliance with the precinct height limits unless a specific, compelling reason is shown for an individual building.

4. Removal of transport upgrades

The application drops two road upgrades the precinct requires and delays a third, relying on traffic forecasts with almost no margin for error.

The Whitford Bypass. The precinct requires the Whitford Bypass before more than 1,900 dwellings are built (Table I458.6.3.1, row (e)). The applicant does not propose to build it. Its ITA forecasts 2041 morning peak southbound traffic through Whitford of about 1,589 vehicles per hour, against the 1,600 vehicles per hour that Plan Change 88 identified as the point the bypass becomes necessary. That leaves a margin of about 11 vehicles per hour.

The forecast depends on optimistic assumptions. It assumes a 15% reduction in trips from working from home, and that 45% of residents' trips leave the area rather than the 50% assumed at Plan Change 88 (ITA section 8). If either assumption proves wrong, traffic would exceed the bypass threshold, but under this application there would be no requirement to build it. Every household in Beachlands and Maraetai that uses Whitford-Maraetai Road would bear the consequences.

The Trig Road intersection. The precinct requires the Trig Road (south) / Whitford-Maraetai Road intersection to be upgraded before more than 850 dwellings (row (c)). The applicant proposes no upgrade. Its own modelling shows the Trig Road approach already operates at level of service F, the worst rating, in the morning peak, with average delays rising from 55 to 66 seconds with the development and to 75 seconds in Auckland Transport's sensitivity test (ITA Table 8-9).

The Jack Lachlan Drive upgrade. The precinct requires the Jack Lachlan Drive walking and cycling upgrade before any of the first 500 dwellings are occupied (row (a)). The applicant proposes that 68 dwellings be occupied before the full upgrade is complete.

These are non-complying activities under the precinct. They were key safeguards for the existing community when Plan Change 88 was approved, and they should not be removed on the strength of forecasts this finely balanced.

5. Ferry capacity

The precinct requires capacity for at least 1,150 ferry passengers from Pine Harbour in the weekday morning peak (6:20am to 8:20am) before more than 1,900 dwellings are built (Table I458.6.3.2, row (e)). The applicant's memorandum of counsel acknowledges it has not demonstrated this can be achieved and proposes only a condition to assess ferry adequacy once 1,900 dwellings are exceeded.

The whole precinct is premised on being public-transport focused around the Pine Harbour ferry. If capacity is not secured, new residents would compete with existing Beachlands and Maraetai commuters for the same sailings, or drive instead, adding to traffic on Whitford-Maraetai Road at the same time the bypass is being dropped. A condition to assess later is not a substitute for the binding threshold in the precinct.

6. Wastewater discharge to the Whitford Embayment

The application includes a new long-term discharge of treated wastewater into the sea next to Beachlands, which was not part of the proposal when the project was listed for fast-track.

What is proposed. As Stage 2 of its wastewater strategy, the applicant seeks consent for a new treatment plant and an outfall pipe drilled about 2 km beneath the seabed, discharging treated wastewater through a submerged diffuser into the centre of the Whitford Embayment (EPA section 18 report). The embayment is a sheltered body of water fed by the Waikōpua, Tūranga and Mangemangeroa creeks. The precinct itself recognises the adjacent coastal marine area as a Significant Ecological Area with rich feeding grounds for international migratory and endemic wading birds.

It departs from what was put forward in 2024. The wastewater memo supporting the fast-track listing (GWE, 30 April 2024) identified connection to Watercare's Beachlands treatment plant as the preferred option. Its standalone alternatives were irrigation to land or polishing wetlands discharging to a stream. A sea outfall was not among the options.

Watercare has already rejected a Gulf outfall for Beachlands. In March 2024 Watercare confirmed it would not pursue a pipeline discharging wastewater from Beachlands into the Hauraki Gulf, and chose a discharge to a tributary of Te Puru Stream instead (Times, 11 March 2024). It would be inconsistent to now approve a private outfall into the same coastal waters through a fast-track process with limited public input.

The coast matters to the whole community. The beaches, shellfish beds, boating and estuaries around Beachlands are central to its coastal character. A permanent wastewater discharge, with the risk of plant failures or overflows over decades, is a significant change that deserves full scrutiny.

Outcomes I ask the Panel to secure

1. **Decline the tower.** Decline consent for the 12-storey Landmark Tower, so that buildings in Sub-precinct D comply with the 11 m height limit set by the precinct.
2. **If any additional height is allowed, keep it modest.** Any building on that site should be limited to a height that transitions to the surrounding low-rise development and sits below the coastal ridgeline when viewed from the existing township.
3. **Assess views from the township.** Before any decision on additional height, the applicant should be required to provide visual simulations from Jack Lachlan Drive and other parts of the existing Beachlands township, so the Panel can assess the effects on existing residents.
4. **Building heights.** Require all other buildings to comply with the precinct height limits, unless a specific and compelling reason is shown for an individual building.

5. **Keep the Whitford Bypass requirement.** Retain the precinct requirement that the Whitford Bypass be built before more than 1,900 dwellings. At a minimum, require it to be built automatically if transport monitoring at any 500-dwelling stage shows trip rates, external trips or Whitford traffic above the ITA's assumptions.
6. **Keep the Trig Road upgrade.** Retain the requirement to upgrade the Trig Road (south) / Whitford-Maraetai Road intersection before more than 850 dwellings.
7. **Jack Lachlan Drive upgrade first.** Require the full Jack Lachlan Drive walking and cycling upgrade to be completed before any dwellings are occupied, as the precinct requires.
8. **Binding ferry capacity.** Retain the precinct's ferry capacity thresholds, including 1,150 peak passengers before more than 1,900 dwellings, as binding conditions rather than a later assessment.
9. **No outfall into the Whitford Embayment.** Decline consent for the Stage 2 wastewater outfall and discharge into the coastal marine area. Long-term wastewater servicing should be through connection to Watercare's network or land-based disposal, as proposed when the project was listed. If the Panel does not decline it, the outfall should be left to a separate, publicly notified consent application when it is actually needed, supported by full coastal water quality, shellfish and bathing assessments.

Closing

Thank you for considering these comments alongside my earlier comments on Sub-precinct F. These matters affect the whole Beachlands and Maraetai community, and I ask the Panel to give them full weight.

Michelle Preston

[redacted]

25 October 2026

Documents referred to

- Memorandum of counsel on key departures, 24 September 2026 (Attachment 0A1)
- Landscape and Visual Assessment, updated 14 September 2026 (Attachment 6)
- Urban Design Assessment (Attachment 4)
- I458 Beachlands South Precinct, Auckland Unitary Plan
- Minute 2 of the Expert Panel, 28 September 2026
- Integrated Transport Assessment (Attachment 8)
- EPA section 18 report, Beachlands South (FTAA-2606-1256)

- Wastewater ocean outfall construction methodology (Attachment 10A)
- Beachlands South wastewater meeting minutes, 12 May 2026 (Attachment 22-4.7)
- GWE wastewater memo for fast-track listing, 30 April 2024
- Times: Watercare rules out Beachlands wastewater discharge into Hauraki Gulf, 11 March 2024