

MEMORANDUM – RESPONSE TO MINUTE 1 (SCHEDULE 1 AND 2) OF THE PANEL CONVENOR [RANGITOOPUNI] [FTAA-2505-1055]

To: Helen Atkins, Panel Convenor

From: Joe Wilson, Principal Project Lead – Premium Unit, Planning & Resource Consents, Auckland Council
Emma Chandler, Consultant Planner, Acting on behalf of Planning & Resource Consents, Auckland Council

Subject: Fast-Track Approvals Act 2024 (**FTAA**) – FTAA-2505-1055 – Rangitooopuni Fast-track Proposal – Response to the matters set out in Schedules 1 and 2 attached to the Minute issued by the Panel Convenor (4th July 2025)

Date: 14 July 2025

Schedule 1

1. Approvals The number and range of approvals sought.

Auckland Council response:

Overall Council Reference BUN60449727:

- LUC60449772 – Regional & District earthworks, Vegetation removal, Integrated Māori Development, Signage, Infrastructure, Access & Manoeuvring, Activities and Works relating to Natural Hazards, Construction Activities.
- LUC60452434 – Physical Works for Water Bore
- SUB60449775 – Subdivision
- LUS60449776 – Streamworks
- DIS60449777 – Wastewater discharge
- DIS60449778 – Stormwater discharge
- DIS60449779 – NES: FW discharge
- WAT60449800 – Water take
- WAT60449801 – Groundwater diversion & dewatering

Please note: Awaiting specialist input regarding potential Dam classification and response to shared preliminary 'further information' matters which may create additional consent need/consent type/reference.

Overall Activity Status of the application agreed as Non-Complying.

2. Complexity: The level of complexity will have a bearing on the appropriate frame for decision making.

Auckland Council response:

Based on the nature and type of the proposals, the issues of consideration and the preliminary further information and feedback shared with the applicant we would categorise the application as having a moderate classification/level of complexity.

3. Issues: Issues identified by the applicant and other participants: (a) during consultation; and (b) any disputed fact or opinion, or legal issue, that is or is likely to be of consequence to the determination of the application.

Auckland Council response:

Pre-Application

Prior to the lodgement of the substantive application the applicant undertook engagement directly with Auckland Council on proposals developed into the substantive lodgement. As a culmination of this process a written response was provided to the applicant on the 28/03/25 which included appended specialist responses (from the asset owners and specialists that the applicant agreed to engage on the rational basis of areas of particular relevance to the proposals and meaningful

information available to review at that point). The response was issued with the following acknowledgement:

We acknowledge that the proposal is developing at pace and is regularly changing in scope and details. These preliminary planning comments are based on the general understanding of the application summarised above and provide high-level “in principle” comments for the overall proposal. It is not an exhaustive review of all elements of the scheme against relevant matters given the stage of the process with all consent matters and technical reports to be development and the extent of advice being sought.

Councils' advice provided the following overall summary:

Overall, while we acknowledge the site and proposal accommodates a range of positive overall outcomes, we retain concerns at this stage of the consistency of the proposal with the relevant provisions of the AUP: OP.

A series of recommendations and suggested other matters to be reviewed were identified in the pre-application advice letter for further consideration and response.

As a minor point of understanding the retirement village aspect of this development was identified at pre-application stage as discretionary activity pursuant to C1.7, as this is not provided for within the Countryside Living Zone (H19), nor within the Treaty Settlement Chapter (E21_. In the substantive application the applicant has identified this aspect of the scheme falling within the definition of the activity of Integrated Māori Development listed as a Discretionary Activity under Chapter E21 of the AUP(OP).

Engagement Post Substantive Lodgement

Following the acceptance of the application by the EPA Council in the interests of overall progress of the application undertook and provided the following to the applicant (in consultation with both the applicant and the EPA). The below was provided on the understood basis that it is the Panel's role and discretion to request further information (S67).

- Brief issued to relevant specialists and/or asset owners and/or elected officials relevant to the activity proposed and Auckland Council statutory role within the Act.
- Provision of 'Work in Progress' tracker identifying further information requests from specialists and asset owners on 01/07/25.
- Provision of updated 'Work in Progress' tracker identifying further information requests and preliminary feedback from specialists, asset owners and local board on 01/07/25. There are a range of specialist areas that require further information request responses to assist with feedback. Notably this relates to regional earthworks, streamworks, stormwater and flooding (HW and SW specialists), and arboriculture.

In terms of next steps, we would welcome feedback and discussion at the panel convenor session but plan to issue a final memorandum to the applicant and panel convenor setting out our consolidated preliminary feedback, key issues and further information requests.

Primary issues at this point helpful to signpost/for discussion at the Convenor Meeting include:

- Traffic and Transportation – Including need for upgrades to the SH16 / Coatesville-Riverhead Highway intersection and SH16 east of this junction, limitations of modelling (assumptions and extent), effects on operation of the networks, access and intersection design and safety, Forestry Road (vested asset design), sequencing of works, and internal JOAL design.
- Effects on Operation and Quality on Streams and Natural Hazards – Information gaps in relation to the assessment of potential onsite and downstream flooding effects, in-stream attenuation and management, potential for Stream erosion and effects on Water quality
- Infrastructure – Resilience of the proposed infrastructure supply including details on proposed bore, in particular relating to water supply for Integrated Māori Development and firefighting supply.
- Ecological Specialist Advice – Key further information requests and comments on conditions/management structures ability to achieve ecological outcomes proposed in the medium and long term.
- Countryside Living Subdivision – Balance and consideration of the provisions of AUP(OP) chapters E39, E21 and H19 collectively, role and weighting of revegetation and other wider public benefits in assessment, disagreement on future 'TRSS donor' eligibility.
- Integrated Māori Development (Retirement Village) – Agreed definition, rural/urban character and intensity concerns noting Council pre-application recommendations not followed in respect to protection of the balance of the lot.
- Precedent Effects of limited consideration/weighting of underlying zoning.

4. Panel Membership

Auckland Council response:

Council have responded to the request for nomination from Auckland Council in relation to the Rangitooopuni expert panel on the 30 June 2025. Auckland Council do not consider at this point there are factors that warrant the appointment of more than four panel members.

6. Procedural requirements and Participants Estimated Timeframe (Schedule 2)

Auckland Council response:

Council are very willing to engage directly with the panel and applicant to advance the progress of the application efficiently.

Council in the preliminary information requests and comments have raised a number of areas where provision and review of further information; alongside workshops and meetings are considered required and sensible on these matters.

In addition, in a number of areas there are matters where a site visit with specialists and the applicant team will be required and helpful to the progress of the application and discussion of these matters through July and August 2025 (suggested).

Emma Chandler (consultant planner for Council) who has been involved throughout the pre substantive lodgement will be on leave (overseas in Europe) 30th August – 23rd September. Given Emma's involvement we would respectfully request consideration is given to this period of leave alongside the matters above in setting out the panel commencement date and the invitation to comment and ss53 and 54 comments deadline following from this.

Informed by the above please see below the Council's proposed estimated dates for discussion in response to Schedule 2. Response limited to timeframes where Council input is required.

Task	Working days	Date
Panel commencement	N/A	09/09/2025
Invite comment from relevant parties	10 W/D later	23/09/2025
Comments close (ss 53 & 54)	20 W/D later	21/10/2025
Comments close for applicants (s 55)	5 W/D later	Not for Council Comment
Any other procedural step and evaluation	XXX W/D (say)	N/A

Draft Decision is to Approve		
Draft conditions to participants (s 70)	XXX W/D (say)	More Panel led timeframe
Participant comments on draft conditions (s70(2))	10 W/D later	Informed by Above.