

## **Attachment B - Summary of feedback and the recommendations of the deliberations panel**

### **General issues**

1. Officers received feedback that requested that progress on the implementation of the strategy be reported each quarter. In response, it is proposed that the review section of the strategy be amended to clarify that reporting will be undertaken on an annual basis to align with reporting undertaken for the Auckland Plan. This reporting will include the supply of serviced land and completed dwellings in future urban areas. Analysis of this information will determine how planning and infrastructure delivery is performing against the timeframes outlined in the strategy.
2. Feedback was also received in relation to the structure planning and plan change process including how structure planning will be undertaken for the different areas, how the areas will be staged and how the impacts of growth and development will be addressed. Feedback noted the important role that structure planning plays to ensure areas are planned for holistically rather than in an ad hoc manner. In order to address this feedback, it is proposed that the structure planning section of the strategy be amended to:
  - define what a structure plan and plan change is
  - clarify that the strategy identifies the sequence and timeframes for when future urban areas will be live zoned and will have the necessary bulk infrastructure in place
  - explain that structure planning for an area will generally occur three years prior to the identified timeframe in the strategy however, where a large area is sequenced over varying timeframes in the strategy, (e.g, Warkworth, Drury West/Drury Opaheke) and would benefit from comprehensive planning, a structure plan may be prepared for the whole area earlier than the normal three years prior
  - outline that structure planning will confirm staging of areas and that:
    - staging will be implemented through plan changes
    - staging of areas for plan changes will generally follow the sequence and timeframes identified in the strategy, unless an alternative staging is considered appropriate and agreed through the structure planning process.

### **North**

#### *Warkworth*

3. There were seven requests for Warkworth North East to be brought forward to the second half of decade one (2022-2027). These argued that projects to address existing infrastructure constraints are currently well progressed and that bringing this area forward would complement Warkworth North as both areas will share the same infrastructure. Feedback outlined that not progressing Warkworth does not recognise the interrelationship between infrastructure, employment and residential integration opportunities. Feedback also noted that Warkworth South is located a significant distance from employment and community facilities, water, wastewater and roading infrastructure; but is sequenced before Warkworth North-East. A request was also received to bring Warkworth South forward as the infrastructure constraints were believed to be overstated in the strategy and this would enable Warkworth to be developed as a whole.

4. Two submitters provided feedback that Warkworth be moved back due to concerns that development would add to the congestion in the Warkworth area. It was also requested that the motorway connection be provided before land is released for development. One submitter further requested that existing live zoned areas be better utilised before further rezoning of land occurs.
5. The panel recommends retaining the proposed sequencing for Warkworth. The Puhoi to Warkworth Road of National Significance is expected to be complete in 2021 and a new wastewater treatment plant at Snells Beach, along with an associated new pipeline from Warkworth and upgraded outfall, is currently being consented and is expected to be implemented over the next five to six years. This means that the remaining areas of Warkworth North will be ready for development from 2022. The recommended later sequencing of Warkworth South provides for the efficient staging of wastewater infrastructure and the recommended sequencing of Warkworth North East between 2033 and 2037 provides time to understand transport solutions for this area. A council-led structure plan will be prepared for the whole of Warkworth to address land use and transport interface issues, and further staging will be confirmed at that time.

#### *Wainui East, Silverdale and Dairy Flat*

6. Feedback on Wainui East, Silverdale and Dairy Flat notes that anticipated infrastructure provision for the wider area will be in place or sufficiently committed to service this area and this justifies bringing it forward to the first half of decade one. In particular, it was noted that these areas are already in close proximity to existing transport links, employment and high amenity areas. Requests were also made that the delivery of infrastructure in Wainui should be delivered through a coordinated approach that addresses the whole area.
7. Other feedback outlined that the Dairy Flat business land should be supported by sufficient residential land and, as a result, the Silverdale residential land should be brought forward in parallel with business land.
8. There was a request to extend the Silverdale – Dairy Flat (Business) area to include additional land to the south of this area. Analysis undertaken as part of the Supporting Growth project estimated that the amount of business land identified in the proposed strategy is appropriate in terms of the anticipated dwelling growth in the wider area. Future structure planning processes for the Silverdale – Dairy Flat Business area, as well as for the wider area, will confirm the amount and location of business land needed. The panel therefore does not recommend any amendments to the strategy.
9. There was a request to remove the reference to the Upper Orewa area being subject to a resource consent process and to sequence the area in the 2018 – 2022 timeframe. The panel considers that the early timing of this area is not appropriate ahead of the resource consent decision, and would prefer to include the area in future structure planning with the rest of the future urban areas to the south. The panel therefore recommends reference to the resource consent process be retained in the strategy until the outcome of that process is known and that the structure planning be undertaken for the whole of the remaining Wainui East and Dairy Flat/Silverdale area.

#### *Wellsford*

10. There were a number of requests to bring Wellsford forward in the sequencing, with some submitters noting that structure planning should progress in conjunction with the Road of National Significance designation in the area. The main reason provided in the feedback was that there was potential for the Road of National Significance to result in displacement and more people residing in Wellsford.

11. The panel is of the view that the proposed sequencing for Wellsford between 2023 – 2027 reflects the existing wastewater constraints, although consent has recently been granted to upgrade the treatment plant. In addition, a new water source needs to be identified. With regards to the Road of National Significance, no funding or timeframe for construction has been set for the Wellsford stage of this project and only an indicative route has been released for consultation. The land is also unstable and requires geotech investigations to determine the extent of the issue. The panel therefore recommends that the area retain its proposed sequencing.

#### *Hatfields Beach*

12. There was feedback requesting that Hatfields Beach be brought forward in the sequencing noting that roading and services can easily be extended to accommodate development. The proposed sequencing reflects planned wastewater upgrades in the early 2020s and a new water supply transmission line from Albany which may take ten years to complete. In addition, there is already an adequate supply of residential land between Orewa, Silverdale and Wainui. There is a need to balance the provision of business land with residential land. The panel therefore recommends that the area retain its proposed sequencing.

#### **North West**

##### *Whenuapai*

13. There were a large number of requests, including a petition with 55 signatories, for sequencing of Whenuapai (Stage 2) to be brought forward to the first half of decade 1 (2018 – 2022). The petition sought to align the sequencing of Whenuapai (Stage 2) with the development of Red Hills (live zoned 2012 - 2017). Feedback advocated that infrastructure is not a fundamental constraint, that existing transport and wastewater infrastructure supports growth and that bringing it forward would align the sequencing with the completion of the Northern Interceptor. Conversely, some other feedback highlighted infrastructure concerns across the whole north-west area particularly as 15,000 homes are proposed to be built in that area over the next 10 years.
14. Bulk infrastructure, including the Northern Interceptor and a motorway connection between SH16 and SH18, is required to service this area and these works are not scheduled to be completed until decade 2 first half (2028 – 2032). Watercare will also need to build or upgrade a number of pump stations to service this area and an arterial road will need to be established through the area. The panel therefore recommends that the proposed sequencing for Whenuapai (Stage 2) be retained.

##### *Kumeu-Huapai and Waimauku*

15. There was one request to put Kumeu-Huapai back in sequencing due a perceived lack of infrastructure, particularly transport, and the ability for current infrastructure to service more growth. There was also a request to move Waimauku back due to the need to have infrastructure, in particular transport, in place before development commences.
16. The panel notes that the proposed sequencing has already put Kumeu-Huapai back to Decade Two first half (2028 – 2032) due to significant infrastructure constraints, particularly transport. The panel therefore recommends the proposed sequencing be retained.

#### **South**

17. There were 36 pieces of feedback relating to future urban areas in the south, mainly requesting that areas be brought forward in sequencing. These requests related to the large future urban areas of Takanini, Opaheke, Drury, Drury West, Puhinui and

Pukekohe and the rural settlement areas of Kingseat, Hingaia and Maraetai and Oruarangi.

### *Takanini*

18. Feedback was received in relation to the sequencing of the Takanini future urban area. There was one request for the area to be rezoned to Mixed Rural and leave it outside the Rural Urban Boundary with restrictions to prohibit any further development apart from countryside living/mixed rural blocks. The reasons provided for this request were the infrastructure and environmental concerns, including significant stormwater constraints and the impact on the Papakura Stream.
19. Other feedback relating to Takanini requested either that the area be brought forward, or that the sequencing in the current strategy be retained. Reasons provided were largely infrastructure related, specifically that bringing the area forward would provide adequate time to deliver infrastructure improvements and to explore development options to landowners and stakeholders. There were also requests to split the area into two new areas, north and south, to reflect the different soil types.
20. Changing the future urban zone back to a rural zone, and moving the Rural Urban Boundary to exclude this land, would require a change to the Unitary Plan zoning and is outside the remit of this strategy. The panel agrees with the feedback that there are significant environmental constraints in this area and that further investigations are required before the sequencing can be brought forward. In particular, the majority of the Takanini future urban zone is subject to significant flooding hazards, and is located within the large Papakura Stream catchment. In addition, much of the area is subject to geotechnical constraints due to peat soils.
21. The panel does not accept that the area can be split into two new areas, north and south of the Papakura Stream, in order to bring forward the development of the northern area of Takanini. While the land to the north of the Papakura Stream does not have peat soil constraints, it is still subject to localised flooding and development of this area would increase the already existing flood risk in downstream Takanini. It is noted that development of this northern area ahead of the southern area would still require a comprehensive approach to flood mitigation including formalising existing streams and overland flow paths and associated land take to provide conveyance to the main Papakura Stream. In addition, a significant land take would be required around the Papakura Stream itself. This land take would cater for the existing floodplain associated with the stream and to offset an increase in runoff from any new development.
22. Initial cost estimates to provide a comprehensive stormwater solution to the whole area were estimated to be high with a relatively low to moderate dwelling yield. This was considered to make development possible in the medium to longer term. Since the adoption of the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy in 2015, further analysis of recent stormwater project costs in the Takanini area have been undertaken. The results of this analysis indicate that stormwater costs for the future urban zone remain high and further work is required to understand the viability of development in this area in the medium to long term. The Takanini future urban area has therefore been sequenced in the second half of the third decade (2038 – 2042).
23. The panel therefore recommends that the sequencing be moved back to decade three, second half (2043 – 2047) and the following notation added “significant flooding and geotech constraints; further technical investigations required”.

24. There was a request to bring 55 Cosgrave Road future urban area forward. This site is 11 hectares and is situated within a larger area of future urban land totalling 56 hectares. It is noted that this area is not affected by the wider flooding issues that apply to the large future urban area to the north and is able to be serviced by the Takanini Cascades Stormwater channel. This major stormwater channel has been designed by Auckland Council to reduce flooding in the Special Housing Areas approved in this area. It will be formed as a natural stream surrounded by public open space and construction is planned for spring 2017. It would therefore be advantageous for the 56 hectares in the vicinity of Cosgrave Road to be developed earlier to recoup stormwater costs that have already been committed for the Takanini Cascades stormwater channel. Auckland Transport noted that there would be no impediments for the proposed Mill Road realignment if this area were to be developed earlier but there would be a need to negotiate earlier with the property owner to ensure the delivery of an appropriate arterial corridor. The panel therefore recommends this area be brought forward to 2023 – 2027.

#### *Opaheke-Drury*

25. There were six requests to bring Opaheke-Drury forward to the first half of decade one. A petition, with eight signatories, was also received from landowners in Opaheke-Drury requesting that the sequencing of this area be brought forward. Some of this feedback included supporting technical information (e.g, transport, economics, ecology, geotech, water and wastewater, and urban design). The panel acknowledges the significant amount of information provided in support of this feedback.
26. The main reasons provided were that there are no fundamental infrastructure constraints due to the existing transport, water and wastewater infrastructure. Feedback also stated that there is an opportunity to leverage off infrastructure provision being delivered as part of the Drury South industrial park.
27. Other reasons provided to bring the sequencing of Opaheke-Drury forward included the proximity the area has to transport links and the existing Papakura Town Centre and that early development would help support employment areas between Papakura, Opaheke and Drury South.
28. There was a request to bring the Opaheke area forward as it is closer to the CBD compared to areas like Drury, which will allow the community to grow in a planned and managed way.
29. The Opaheke Drury area has wider connections to the Drury West future urban area. The panel's reasons for the recommend sequencing of Opaheke-Drury at 2028 – 2032 are provided in paragraphs 32-38 below.

#### *Drury West*

30. Two pieces of feedback including a petition with 15 signatories from landowners in Drury West (Stage 1) were received requesting that the first stage of Drury West be brought forward in sequencing by or before 2022. Feedback argued that if Drury West was made development ready prior to 2022, the development will be able to recoup earlier infrastructure costs scaled across the larger geography. Other feedback suggested that Drury West could be brought forward if the rail line was electrified and the Drury and Paerata rail stations were built.
31. In contrast, some feedback however noted that Drury West already has major traffic and infrastructure issues that make bringing forward this area not feasible.

32. The current (2015) strategy sequences the whole of Drury West between 2022 and 2026 and Opaheke-Drury between 2032 and 2036. The proposed new sequencing brings the live zoned area at Drury West (Bremner Road) forward to 2017 and Drury West Stage 1 (north of State Highway 22) to 2022. The remaining Drury West (Stage 2) area south of State Highway 22 is proposed to be sequenced between 2028 and 2032. The sequencing of Opaheke-Drury is proposed to be brought forward by five years to align with the Drury West (Stage 2) sequencing between 2028 and 2032.
33. The ability to provide interim wastewater infrastructure to the area of Drury West, north of State Highway 22 and relatively few other infrastructure constraints means that the area can be development ready from 2022. However, the need to undertake a comprehensive approach to structure planning for the whole of Drury West and Opaheke-Drury means that Drury West Stage 1 will not be development ready before 2022.
34. Drury West (Stage 2) along with Opaheke-Drury is dependent on augmentation of the South and Southwestern Interceptors to provide wastewater capacity for the full build-out of the wider area.
35. In addition, complex inter-catchment floodplain interactions require that all four affected stormwater catchments in the Opaheke-Drury area are considered together to ensure that early development in one area does not preclude the remainder of the future urban zone. A comprehensive catchment-wide and potentially cross-catchment solution for the flooding constraints in Opaheke-Drury is required before development can occur in this area.
36. The sequencing of Drury West allows for the provision of a new expressway between Drury, Paerata and Pukekohe. This is required to alleviate capacity and safety concerns on State Highway 22. Confirmation of the Mill Road corridor alignment and timing is also required for Opaheke Drury. The location and design of an interchange at State Highway 1 where these key corridors intersect will also need to be confirmed. This will need to occur in conjunction with land use planning.
37. Completion of a structure plan for the whole of Drury-Opaheke and Drury West is critical prior to the commencement of development. This area has a number of infrastructure and land use complexities and interdependencies that need to be resolved across the whole of the future urban area. The future success of this area requires a detailed understanding of the optimum outcomes for land use and transport across the wider area (including size and location of centres and rail station locations). These issues will be addressed through a comprehensive, council-led structure planning process that involves all affected and interested parties from the wider area. This will be a public process along with subsequent plan changes. Approval will shortly be sought from this Committee to commence structure planning for the whole of the southern future urban areas.
38. For these reasons, the panel recommends the sequencing of Opaheke-Drury and Drury West at 2028 - 2032.

*Pukekohe/Paerata*

39. Seven submitters requested that Pukekohe be brought forward to the first half of decade one. Four of these submitters specifically requested that Grace James Road and Williams Andrew Road be brought forward. Reasons provided by the submitters include

the need to align with the sequencing of Paerata and that infrastructure is already available.

40. The Panel emphasises the importance of comprehensively structure planning the whole of Pukekohe and note that Pukekohe is already sequenced early in the strategy's timeframe which is second half of decade 1 (2023-2027). The proposed sequencing reflects the need for flexibility to plan for an expressway through the eastern side of Pukekohe as well as upgrades required for water, wastewater and stormwater networks across the wider area. The panel therefore recommends that the proposed sequencing for Pukekohe be retained.

#### *Maraetai*

41. There was one request that Maraetai 2 be brought forward from the second half of decade 2 to Decade 1. The feedback noted that this land is in single ownership, there is existing social and community infrastructure and sewage treatment capacity, and there is already a plan to extend the existing infrastructure network. The proposed sequencing reflects the significant infrastructure constraints for both wastewater and transport and bringing this land forward could result in the treatment plant exceeding capacity. It would also put Whitford-Maraetai Road under further pressure. Although designations are in place to four-lane the road, this is not currently budgeted for in Auckland Council's Long-term Plan or Auckland Transport's Integrated Transport Plan. The panel therefore recommends that the area retain its proposed sequencing.

#### *Kingseat*

42. Feedback requested to bring Kingseat forward in sequencing, noting that this would aid the affordability of the proposed Clarks Beach wastewater service. However, Watercare's Asset Management Plan notes that this will not be operational until 2021. The proposed sequencing reflects the operative live zoning. Some development can occur within the existing infrastructure but large scale development cannot proceed until the wastewater service is operational. The panel therefore recommends that the area retain its proposed sequencing.

#### *Clevedon*

43. Feedback on Clevedon noted that the sequencing of Clevedon Village is inconsistent with the Unitary Plan and public understanding of development areas and highlighted that wastewater won't be available until 2019. The feedback also noted that the maps in the strategy appeared to be incorrect. A Clause 20A request (correction of operative policy statement or plan) has been processed to address the mapping error and the Unitary Plan maps have been updated to reflect the correct zoning. The strategy maps have also been amended to reflect the correct zoning and clarify the actual development potential in Clevedon (all live zoned greenfield land).