

Delmore Fast-Track

04/05/2026– Auckland Council Response

Annexure 3:

Strategic Planning

1.0 APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

Application and property details

Fast-Track project name: Delmore Fast-Track

Fast-Track application number: FTAA-2512-1164

2.0 Technical Specialist Memo – Strategic Planning

To: Dylan Pope – Lead Planner & Carly Hinde - PPL

From: Rosie Stoney, Senior Advisor Growth and Spatial Strategy

Qualifications & Relevant Experience: I hold the qualification(s) of: Master of Urban Planning (Professional) from the University of Auckland. I have 12 years' experience in strategic land use planning. I am an intermediate member of New Zealand Planning Institute. I have prepared supporting commentary for use in evidence and technical assessments for plan changes for Auckland Council.

Preparation in Accordance with the Code of Conduct: I confirm that I have read the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 – Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses ([Code](#)), and have complied with it in the preparation of this memorandum. I also agree to follow the Code when participating in any subsequent processes, such as expert conferencing, directed by the Panel. I confirm that the opinions I have expressed are within my area of expertise and are my own, except where I have stated that I am relying on the work or evidence of others, which I have specified.

Signature: 

Date: 26/03/2026

3.0 Executive Summary / Principal Issues

Strategic planning matters related to this application are covered in the attached memorandum.

4.0 Documents Reviewed

The following documents have been reviewed in preparing this memorandum:

- Delmore Assessment of Environmental Effects Report
- Appendix 3 - Schedule Application
- Appendix 14 – Concept Structure Plan
- Appendix 15 - Economics Assessment- NZIER. 2025. Economic impacts of the Delmore development. A report for Vineway Limited.

5.0 Additional Reasons for Consent Not included in AEE / Incorrect Reasons for Consent

N/A

6.0 Specialist Assessment

See attached memo

7.0 Section 67 Information Gap

N/A

8.0 Recommendation

In my opinion, the proposal is contract to the sequencing and timing outlined in FDS and does not align with the FDS principles for growth. Bringing this development forward has wide-ranging local and subregional implications in terms of infrastructure investment and costs

The development proposal and the supporting infrastructure do not suggest that this development is of regional significance, rather it is more locally significant within the Upper Ōrewa future urban area.

Several deficiencies remain which would be best addressed through a structure planning and plan change process.

9.0 Proposed Conditions

N/A

10.0 Supporting Documents

N/A

Memo

27/03/2026

To: Carly Hinde, Principal Project Lead, Resource Consents

From: Rosie Stoney, Senior Advisor Growth and Spatial Strategy

cc: Claire Gray, Manager Growth and Spatial Strategy, David Hawkey, Head of Transport, Growth & Infrastructure Strategy

Subject: Strategic Planning comments – Delmore Fast-track Approval Application

Proposal

1. The Delmore fast-track application proposes development of 109Ha of Future Urban Zoned (FUZ) land into a residential community in Ōrewa, including approximately 1,250 dwellings, one super lot, supporting infrastructure, and associated works. The land is currently zoned Future Urban in the Auckland Unitary Plan 2016 (Operative in Part) and is sequenced from 2050+ in the Future Development Strategy (FDS).
2. This application has been lodged under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 ('FTAA'). The purpose of the FTAA is to *'facilitate the delivery of infrastructure and development projects with significant regional or national benefits'* (s3 FTAA 2024).
3. The comments in this memo build on the strategic planning comments on the initial Delmore Fast Track Application. These comments relate to strategic alignment, consistency with the FDS and out-of-sequence development.

Strategic alignment

4. The proposed development is located within the Upper Ōrewa future urban area and the FDS timing for this area is 2050+. The applicant proposes development in this area would commence 24 years before, and be completed 16 years before, the sequencing identified in the FDS.
5. The applicant comments on the discretion to which decision makers must have regard to the FDS under Section 104(1)(c) of the RMA as "any other matter...relevant and reasonably necessary to determine the application". The NPS-UD makes clear that the purpose of an FDS is to assist the integration of RMA planning decisions with infrastructure planning and funding. The FDS is also one of the documents local authorities must have regard to when preparing or changing RMA planning instruments. Clause 3.17 of the NPS-UD clarifies that RMA planning documents must have regard to the FDS, and local authorities are strongly encouraged to use the FDS to inform other plans and strategies. In addition, the decision of the Expert Panel dated 17 September 2025 states that the FDS is a relevant consideration under Schedule 5, clause 17 FTAA. It is therefore an appropriate document to have regard to in this process.
6. The FDS states that future urban capacity must be used well, and, as such, that comprehensive and integrated planning should be applied and ad-hoc planning based on ownership boundaries avoided. Significant development capacity is currently available across the region and significant future urban capacity is sequenced between 2026 and 2050+. The proposal to bring development in this area forward by two decades means that the required bulk infrastructure is not prioritised, funded or designed at a detailed level at this time.

7. Appendix C of the FDS Monitoring Report for 2024/25¹, identifies updated infrastructure requirements for each future urban area. As noted in the Infrastructure Funding and Financing commentary, significant infrastructure within the proposed development site and the wider area is required to support development.
8. While the applicant is correct in that the timing in the FDS is indicative, it is the basis upon which Watercare, Auckland Transport and other infrastructure providers plan their investment programmes. The indicative nature of the timing does not mean that development can occur significantly ahead of the delivery of bulk infrastructure required to support development in the area.

Infrastructure

9. While the applicant has outlined infrastructure they intend to deliver, this does not factor in the costs borne by the Auckland Council group. Out of sequence development increases costs, undermines the strategic and phased approach to planning and creates inefficiencies in infrastructure delivery by diverting funding from live zoned and priority areas.
10. As noted in the Infrastructure Funding and Financing commentary, there is a substantial risk that providing infrastructure for this development would displace planned investment in other areas of Auckland.
11. As noted in Watercare's comments, wastewater infrastructure to support development is scheduled for 2038+ and 2050+ for bulk water. Commentary by Watercare details their concerns around the applicant's proposals to provide solutions in the absence of this bulk infrastructure delivery and the subsequent vestment back to the council.
12. In addition, enabling bulk transport infrastructure has not been prioritised for funding for delivery by AT in the RLTP 2024-2034 or the LTP 2024-2034. The timing for delivery of these projects in the detailed business case for route protection is late 2040. While some of the transport infrastructure is proposed to be provided by the applicant, Auckland Transport's commentary details their concerns around the lack of funding available to provide remaining infrastructure to support development of this area.
13. The site remains poorly connected to the strategic transport network and is not served by public transport. The applicant's assessment focuses primarily on internal connectivity and therefore overlooks the wider network effects. Public transport and active mode connections are not funded and are required to connect the proposed development area with surrounding areas. As a result, there is a risk that the development will remain inherently car-dependent, which is inconsistent with FDS principle 1 and well-functioning urban environment requirements. Auckland Transport's commentary has further discussion of constraints on public transport and active modes.
14. Bringing development forward ahead of further development of the Silverdale business and industrial land will also increase emissions and car-dependency as people travel further to work. These patterns are likely to be reinforced and difficult to change even once more employment capacity is delivered across the catchment. This is further supported by the applicant's comments about connections between Albany and the city centre.

¹ [Future Development Strategy 2023-2053 Monitoring Report 2024/2025](#)

Quality compact growth and well-functioning urban environment

15. Auckland's long-standing spatial strategy is based on a quality compact approach to growth. The FDS reiterates this, noting that growth should be prioritised within existing urban areas and that greenfield expansion should be limited and carefully sequenced to avoid inefficient, car dependent patterns of development.
16. As noted in the council's economics commentary, the applicant's argument that more housing is better does not consider the trade-offs of enabling development in this area ahead of bulk infrastructure delivery. Enabling development here not only leads to poor outcomes for new and existing communities due to inconsistent timing with supporting infrastructure provision, it also has the potential to draw growth away from other catchments which better align with existing infrastructure (FDS principle 5).
17. Some consideration is given to how aspects of the development will relate to the neighbouring Ara Hills development, however there is little consideration in the plans about how the proposed development can or will integrate with other areas of FUZ to the south and southeast of the site. Collectively, these raise concerns around urban form density and scale and that future rezoning options may be compromised or 'locked in' by the current development proposals.
18. In the substantive application, the applicant's statement that the FDS anticipates "280 dwellings per annum in the north" is not accurate. The FDS does not allocate annual dwelling targets to sub-regions. The applicant argues that more development capacity is required for the Hibiscus coast area and points to capacity constraints within the Hibiscus Coast catchment. It is my view that this is a localised issue based on a narrow catchment definition and does not represent a regionally significant development proposal.

Development in the Future Urban Zone:

19. The FUZ is a holding zone that applies only until structure planning and bulk infrastructure planning have been completed. As noted in the council's policy commentary, while the applicant has provided a structure plan (Application Appendix 14), it neither meets the guidance in Appendix 1 of the AUP, nor does it apply the catchment wide, integrated approach outlined in the FDS.
20. Permitting development to occur without a structure plan and a plan change process is problematic. Development in the FUZ without a plan change bypasses processes set out in the RPS and principles of the FDS to ensure coordinated, efficient, and sustainable urban growth. As such, a plan change process is the more appropriate mechanism for enabling development in this area.

Conclusion

21. This development proposal is out of sequence with timings outlined in FDS and does not align with the FDS principles for growth and its requirements for a well-functioning urban environment. Bringing this development forward has wide-ranging local and subregional implications in terms of infrastructure investment and costs
22. The development proposal and the supporting infrastructure do not suggest that this development is of regional significance, rather it is more locally significant within the Upper Ōrewa future urban area.
23. My view therefore is that this proposal should not be approved. Several deficiencies remain which would be best addressed through a structure planning and plan change process.