



Development potential screening

PROPERTY POTENTIAL REPORT

Buyer Risk Report

23 Waller Avenue, Bucklands Beach, Auckland, 2012

Land area 1,312 m²
Zone Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone
Legal NA1639/39
Report date 11 May 2026

Issued by SECTIONSCAN LIMITED · [sectionscan.co.nz](https://www.sectionscan.co.nz)
bobzhangmba@gmail.com · 021 0835 8860

Disclaimer. This report is general information only and does not constitute financial advice under the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013 (FMCA). Findings are based on Auckland Council GIS screening and publicly available data at the date shown, and are subject to confirmation via Record of Title, Auckland Council property file, Watercare pre-development enquiry, and chartered-professional design.

23 Waller Avenue, Bucklands Beach, Auckland, 2012

🎯 1. Executive Dashboard

23 Waller Avenue, Bucklands Beach, Auckland, 2012 1,312 m² · LOT 16 DP 46045 · Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone (code 18)

Assessment: 🟡 Viable with conditions Development pathway is available in Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone, but site-specific items require engineering, title, or consent resolution before committing — principally: public infrastructure mapped within property boundary.

Yield

- Up to 3 dwellings — dwelling-count activity status Permitted (AUP H5.4.1 (A1))
- 4+ dwellings — Restricted Discretionary (AUP H5.4.1 (A2))
- Max height: 8m + 1m for pitched roof (AUP H5.6.4); 2 storeys typical, 3 storeys marginal
- Vacant-site subdivision size screen: each proposed vacant site must meet 400 m² net site area for MHS under AUP E38 / H5.6.10 in the MHS zone (this is a sizing screen only, not approval or yield confirmation; planner to confirm against E38 tables and any precinct controls)


Clean profile

- ✓ **Flood:** Not within 1% AEP flood plain or flood-prone area
- ✓ **Liquefaction:** Very Low Liquefaction Vulnerability
- ✓ **Landslide:** Low susceptibility
- ✓ **Planning overlays:** None mapped on property
- ✓ **Notable trees:** None within property / 20m buffer
- ⚠️ **Overland flow path:** Mapped path crosses property boundary — see Section 5
- ⚠️ **Infrastructure:** Public pipe(s) cross the property boundary — see Section 5

“All findings above are GIS screening results using property boundary intersection and a 20m buffer. Confirm via the Auckland Council AUP viewer before finalising design.”

Critical due-diligence items

Due-diligence item	GIS finding	Deal impact	Resolution	Status
Wastewater pipe on property	Public wastewater pipe(s) cross or run through the property	May sterilise part of platform or force diversion cost	Record of Title + Watercare pre-dev enquiry	● Open
Stormwater asset on property	Public stormwater pipe(s) cross or run through the property	Easement may restrict building platform	Record of Title + Council review	● Open
Earthworks volume (E11 trigger)	Indicative cut+fill ≈ 1312 m ³ level / 437 m ³ stepped, fall ~4m	Level platform trips E11 RD; stepped design may stay permitted	Survey + engineer cut/fill takeoff	● Open
HAIL / NES-CS contamination	Not yet screened	If HAIL-eligible: PSI/DSI required, adds 2–4 months + \$8–20k	Property file + HAIL register + historic aerials	● Open
HIRB on uphill boundary	4m fall; uphill side = opposite-of-north-west	3-storey yield unverified; recession plane may cap height	Concept envelope against surveyed contour	● Open
Overland flow path on property	Mapped path appears to cross property boundary	May affect building platform, earthworks, stormwater	Drainage engineer boundary/intersection review	● Open

Due-diligence item	GIS finding	Deal impact	Resolution	Status
		routing and consent design		
Title easements / covenants	Not confirmed by GIS	May restrict yield or building platform	Order and review Record of Title + instruments (LINZ)	 Open

Confidence by topic

Topic	Confidence	Reason
Zoning	High	AUP GIS layer returned
Flood / liquefaction / landslide	Medium	GIS screening — not a geotech or flood model
Wastewater	Medium	Asset visible; legal/easement status unknown
Stormwater	Medium	Nearby network identified; capacity unconfirmed
Earthworks	Low-Medium	LiDAR screen — not a surveyed contour
HIRB / envelope	Low-Medium	Needs concept design + surveyed contour
HAIL / NES-CS contamination	Low	Not yet screened against register / aerials
Yield	Medium	Planning rules support baseline; layout untested

Immediate next steps (~\$8–15k due diligence)

1. Order Record of Title and all registered instruments from LINZ

2. Auckland Council property file + HAIL register check + historic aerial review (1940s–1980s) for contamination history
3. Submit Watercare pre-development enquiry (free) to confirm capacity and invert levels
4. Commission survey-grade contour plan + drainage engineer pre-feasibility (to confirm earthworks volume and run overland flow property-boundary intersection on actual geometry)

3. Site & Planning



Site orientation. Selected property boundary is highlighted in cyan with Auckland Council Landbase property boundaries rendered for context. Address point: -36.864899, 174.905532. Source: Auckland Council GIS / Auckland Council aerial basemap / Auckland Council LiDAR (Contours2024, 0.25m interval, NZVD2016). Retrieved 2026-05-08.

Zone: Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone (MHS, code 18) — enables up to three dwellings per site as a permitted activity at suburban density and a 2-storey scale.

Intensification: NPS-UD / PC78 increased intensification has limited application in MHS where qualifying matters apply; no overlays were mapped on this property by the GIS screen, but the planner must confirm against the operative AUP and any Bucklands Beach character/coastal qualifying-matter application.

Baseline planning activity status

- Up to 3 dwellings: Permitted (AUP H5.4.1 (A1))
- 4+ dwellings: Restricted Discretionary (AUP H5.4.1 (A2))
- Subdivision: Restricted Discretionary (AUP E38 / E39)

This is dwelling-count / subdivision activity status only; separate resource consent or approvals may still be triggered by development standards, earthworks, stormwater, wastewater, access, contamination, overlays, title/easements, Watercare/Council/AT requirements, and building consent.





Development standards

Parameter	Standard	AUP Rule Ref
Maximum height	8m + 1m for roof pitch $\geq 15^\circ$	H5.6.4
Height in relation to boundary	3m + 45° recession plane from side/rear boundaries	H5.6.5
Maximum site coverage	40%	H5.6.8
Minimum landscaped area	40% (must include permeable surfaces)	H5.6.9
Minimum unit size	Studio 30 m ² / 1-bed 45 m ² / 2-bed 70 m ² / 3-bed 90 m ²	H5.6.13 / Table H5.6.13
Minimum outlook space	Principal living 4m × 4m; bedrooms 1m × 1m	H5.6.14
Minimum setbacks	Front 3m / Side 1m / Rear 1m	H5.6.6
Parking requirement	No minimum (AUP-wide removal)	E27
Vacant-site subdivision size screen	400 m ² net site area per lot (parent <1 ha)	E38 / H5.6.10

4. Development Scenarios

This section is technical feasibility only. It does not recommend a scenario. Build cost, sale price, IRR target, and the buyer's risk appetite and capital position determine which scenario is the right financial choice — none of those inputs are in this report.

Scenario comparison

Scenario	Yield	Planning / approval pathway	Feasibility
A — Retain existing + add up to 2 rear/side dwelling(s)	Up to 3 (1 retained + 2 added)	Dwelling activity may be permitted under H5.4.1 (A1); other consents/approvals likely apply	
B — Demolish + baseline 3 dwellings	Up to 3 dwellings	Dwelling activity may be permitted under H5.4.1 (A1); standards/earthworks/stormwater consents likely	
C — 4+ dwelling intensification test fit	4+ dwellings, yield unconfirmed	Restricted Discretionary under H5.4.1 (A2) + bundled standards/earthworks/SW/access	
D — Hold / land bank	—	—	

Feasibility is a technical signal only: consent path × critical due-diligence items × envelope fit. It is not a financial recommendation.

Per-scenario technical card

Scenario A — Retain existing + add up to 2 rear/side dwellings

- *What could be built* — The customer is not limited to one added unit. The MHS permitted-activity ceiling is 3 dwellings; the existing house counts as one, so up to 2 additional standalone or attached units may be added at the rear or side, subject to envelope and access. Rear/side unit position and access depend on measured driveway clear width, pinch points beside the retained dwelling, manoeuvring, vehicle crossing and any legal right-of-way; access width is not measured in this report and is an open constraint.
- *Site coverage check* — $1,312 \text{ m}^2 \times 40\% = 525 \text{ m}^2$ total building cap. Scenario A retention screen was not auto-generated (existing footprint not retrieved); the screened side-access estimate suggests material site space remains, but the existing dwelling

footprint must be deducted from the 525 m² cap before sizing 2 added units.

Landscape requirement at 40% = minimum 525 m² permeable/landscaped — this is the binding constraint alongside coverage.

- *HIRB outcome* — Site falls ~4m to the north-west, so the south-east boundary is the uphill side. Applying H5.6.5 (3m + 45°) at a 1m side setback gives an envelope rising at 45° from 3m above ground level on the boundary — for a unit set back 3m from the uphill boundary, vertical clearance to the recession plane is approximately 3m + 3m = 6m, comfortably allowing 2 storeys. A third storey is marginal and depends on actual ground level at the boundary, not the rolled-average elevation.
- *Earthworks trigger* — Indicative balanced cut+fill ≈ 1,312 m³ for a single level platform — well over the AUP E11 250 m³ residential threshold, so a level-platform design trips Restricted Discretionary earthworks consent. A 3-step stepped platform reduces this to ≈ 437 m³ — still over the 250 m³ threshold. Survey-grade cut/fill takeoff required to confirm.
- *Planning / approval pathway & notification risk* — The dwelling-count activity may be permitted under H5.4.1 (A1) for up to 3 dwellings, but the project still needs checks for: earthworks (>250 m³, RD under E11); stormwater detention/treatment under E1 plus the overland flow path crossing the boundary; wastewater works given the in-property lateral and the public mains crossing the property; vehicle crossing/AT approval; NES-CS contamination if HAIL-eligible; title/easement constraints on mapped pipes; Watercare connection approvals; and building consent. Non-notified is plausible only after the pipe corridor and overland flow path are resolved and adjacency effects (shading, privacy, outlook from rear units) are addressed.
- *Technical blockers* —
- **Wastewater pipe on property** — added unit must sit clear of the pipe protection/easement corridor of WW-P1, WW-P2 and WW-P3, or the layout must design around the corridor by shifting the building footprint outside it.
- **Stormwater asset on property** — same corridor logic applies to SW-P1, SW-P2, SW-P3 and the manholes annotated as inside the property.
- **Earthworks volume (E11 trigger)** — RD earthworks consent likely; staging or stepped design may reduce volume but does not avoid the threshold here.
- **HIRB on uphill boundary** — caps a 3-storey rear unit unless a wider setback is adopted.

- **Overland flow path on property** — building platform must not block, divert or dam the path; drainage engineer required.
- **HAIL / NES-CS contamination** — not screened; could trigger PSI/DSI before earthworks consent.
- **Title easements / covenants** — pipe corridors and any access right-of-way must be confirmed before locking the rear-unit footprint.
- **Vehicle access** — open constraint until clear width, gradient and crossing are confirmed; rear access beside the retained dwelling is the practical risk for a 3-unit retain-and-add.

Scenario B — Demolish + baseline 3 dwellings

- *What could be built* — Three standalone or attached dwellings on a clean site with a master-planned layout. Demolition unlocks the full 525 m² coverage budget for new construction and removes the existing footprint constraint.
- *Site coverage check* — 1,312 m² × 40% = 525 m² total building footprint cap. At three 2-storey dwellings of ~120–150 m² footprint each = 360–450 m², well within the cap. Landscape/permeable surface minimum 40% = 525 m².
- *HIRB outcome* — Same as Scenario A: H5.6.5 (3m + 45°) gives a 2-storey envelope clear at typical setbacks. A 3-storey form is marginal on the uphill (south-east) boundary and would need either greater setback or precise surveyed ground-level testing.
- *Earthworks trigger* — Same as Scenario A: 1,312 m³ level / 437 m³ stepped — both trip E11. RD earthworks consent expected; stepped design reduces but does not avoid the threshold.
- *Planning / approval pathway & notification risk* — Dwelling-count activity may be permitted under H5.4.1 (A1), but the project still needs checks for: E11 earthworks RD; E1 stormwater (detention + overland flow design); pipe corridor resolution before fixing the platform; wastewater connection capacity; AT vehicle crossing; HAIL contamination screen; Watercare; and building consent. Non-notified is plausible if pipes are diverted/protected and the overland flow path is engineered through the site without adversely affecting neighbours.
- *Technical blockers* —

- **Wastewater pipe on property** — WW-P1 (100mm PVC-U lateral), WW-P2 (150mm AC main), WW-P3 (150mm AC main) — full design freedom requires either diverting the public main, pile-bridging, or designing the building platform outside the corridor.
- **Stormwater asset on property** — SW-P1 (150mm earthenware), SW-P2 (150mm PVC), SW-P3 (225mm concrete) inside the property — same four resolution options.
- **Earthworks volume (E11 trigger)** — RD earthworks consent.
- **HIRB on uphill boundary** — caps 3-storey form without wider setback.
- **Overland flow path on property** — must be retained, daylight or piped through the site to engineering standard.
- **HAIL / NES-CS contamination** — open until property file and historic aerials are reviewed.
- **Title easements / covenants** — pipe corridor easements must be confirmed; demolition does not extinguish them.

Scenario C — 4+ dwelling intensification test fit

- *What could be built* — A denser attached-townhouse or small multi-unit scheme of 4+ dwellings may be possible on 1,312 m². This automated report does not confirm the maximum count; the next step is an architect/planner test fit against coverage, landscape, outlook, HIRB, access, and the in-property pipe/overland flow constraints.
- *Site coverage check* — 525 m² building cap unchanged. Four 2-storey terraced units at ~100–110 m² footprint each = 400–440 m², within cap. Five units at ~95 m² footprint = 475 m², still within cap. Landscape 525 m² and outlook spaces (H5.6.14) are the typical practical constraints, not raw coverage.
- *HIRB outcome* — H5.6.5 (3m + 45°) applies on every boundary; on the uphill (south-east) side this constrains 3-storey forms unless setback is increased. Two storeys is the safe envelope for terraced units against side boundaries at 1m setback.
- *Earthworks trigger* — Same as A/B: tripped under E11. RD earthworks consent included with the multi-dwelling RD bundle.
- *Planning / approval pathway & notification risk* — 4+ dwellings is RD under H5.4.1 (A2) and would be bundled with E11 earthworks RD, E1 stormwater, vehicle crossing, NES-CS (if HAIL-eligible), and any standards infringements. Notification risk rises with dwelling count and adjacency effects (shading, privacy, outlook), particularly on the uphill boundary; limited notification is realistic until adverse effects on adjoining owners are designed out and the pipe corridor is resolved.

- *Technical blockers* —
- **Wastewater pipe on property** — same WW-P1/P2/P3 corridor; with 4+ units the practical answer is usually divert the public main into road reserve or design around the corridor by shifting the building footprint outside it. Pile-bridging is possible but rarely cost-effective at this density.
- **Stormwater asset on property** — SW-P1/P2/P3 corridor; on-site detention under E1 will compete for site area with units.
- **Earthworks volume (E11 trigger)** — RD bundled.
- **HIRB on uphill boundary** — practical 2-storey cap at 1m setback unless setback is widened.
- **Overland flow path on property** — engineered routing required across a denser layout.
- **Vehicle access** — shared driveway design must comply with H5.6.13 and FENZ access; for 4+ units this is a first-order constraint.
- **HAIL / NES-CS contamination** — earthworks volume increases NES-CS exposure if HAIL-eligible.
- **Title easements / covenants** — corridor easements particularly limiting at this density.

Scenario D — Hold / land bank — A clean-zone 1,312 m² MHS site with no overlays and good baseline yield is a defensible hold position while the pipe corridor, contamination and earthworks unknowns are resolved at lower cost. Carrying cost is rates, insurance, maintenance, and opportunity cost of capital; upside is improved DD certainty before committing build capital.

“Scenario choice depends on build cost, sale price, IRR target, and risk appetite — none of which this report assesses. Choose the scenario that matches your financial position.”

5. Risks & Constraints

Wastewater pipe on property — Three wastewater assets are mapped intersecting the property: **WW-P1 (100mm PVC-U gravity lateral)**, **WW-P2 (150mm AC gravity main)**, and **WW-P3 (150mm AC gravity main)**. WW-P1 is an in-property lateral — the existing private drain that runs from inside the property out across the boundary to the public main outside the property; new units could potentially drain to this existing pipe inside

the property, subject to CCTV condition assessment and Watercare acceptance of capacity and legal status. WW-P2 and WW-P3 appear to be public mains running through the site, which is unusual without a registered easement. Any building, structure or significant landscaping inside an easement corridor (indicatively 1.5–3m either side of the pipe centreline, final width per registered instrument and Watercare standard) is unbuildable until resolved. Four possible resolution options:



Wastewater context. Satellite base shows the property and neighbouring street pattern for connection access assessment. Selected property boundary is highlighted in cyan; wastewater pipes and manholes are red. Map labels WW-P1/WW-M1 etc match the candidate tables below. 1000 pipe segment(s) and 304 manhole asset(s) returned from Auckland Council GIS. Retrieved 2026-05-08.

1. **Divert the public pipe** into road reserve via a new connection — highest cost, longest timeline (Watercare approval + civil design + works), unlocks full yield.
2. **Pile-bridge over the pipe** with a structural transfer slab or bridging beams — mid cost, embedded in building consent, requires geotechnical + structural design + Watercare protection sign-off, may still sterilise some footprint.

3. **Design around the corridor** by shifting the building footprint outside the pipe protection/easement area — lowest cost, fastest, commonly costs yield (typically one fewer unit on a constrained site).
4. **Easement variation or surrender** via LINZ — only viable if the pipe is also being diverted/decommissioned.

Resolution requires the Record of Title + registered instruments (LINZ), Watercare pre-development enquiry for invert levels and diversion policy, and a civil/drainage engineer for diversion feasibility.

Stormwater asset on property — Three stormwater assets are mapped intersecting the property: **SW-P1 (150mm earthenware)**, **SW-P2 (150mm PVC)**, and **SW-P3 (225mm concrete)**. SW-M1 and SW-M2 (standard chambers, ~2.4m and ~2.3m deep) are also annotated as inside the property. The four-option resolution framework (divert / pile-bridge / design around / easement-vary) applies identically to these stormwater assets — consult the Wastewater pipe on property item above for the option detail. The 225mm concrete main (SW-P3) is the most material; diverting or bridging a 225mm concrete public main is materially more expensive than a 150mm lateral. Resolved by: Record of Title + instruments, Watercare pre-development enquiry, and drainage engineer review.



Stormwater context. Satellite base shows the property and neighbouring street pattern for connection access assessment. Selected property boundary is highlighted in cyan; stormwater pipes and manholes/chambers are green. Map labels SW-P1/SW-M1 etc match the candidate tables below. 622 pipe segment(s) and 365 manhole/chamber asset(s) returned from Auckland Council GIS. Retrieved 2026-05-08.

Earthworks volume (E11 trigger) — Indicative balanced cut+fill $\approx 1,312 \text{ m}^3$ for a single level platform across the $1,312 \text{ m}^2$ site with $\sim 4\text{m}$ fall to the north-west. AUP E11.4.1 (residential) sets the permitted earthworks threshold at 250 m^3 , so a level platform trips Restricted Discretionary earthworks consent. A 3-step stepped platform reduces to $\approx 437 \text{ m}^3$ — still over the 250 m^3 threshold. Resolved by: surveyed contour plan + chartered engineer cut/fill takeoff, then either accept the RD pathway (often bundled with the dwelling consent) or redesign to a more aggressive stepped form.

HAIL / NES-CS contamination — Not yet screened. Bucklands Beach has older residential history with potential for filling, market-garden use, or fuel-tank legacy on isolated sites. If the property file or HAIL register returns a HAIL-eligible activity, the NES-CS regulations require a Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) and possibly a Detailed

Site Investigation (DSI) before earthworks consent — adding 2–4 months and \$8–20k to the timeline. Resolved by: Auckland Council property file + HAIL register check + 1940s–1980s historic aerial review (Retrolens) before offer.

HIRB on uphill boundary — Site falls ~4m to the north-west, so the south-east boundary is the uphill side and is the binding boundary for AUP H5.6.5 (3m + 45° recession plane). At a 1m side setback the recession plane reaches ~3m + 1m = 4m above boundary ground level (1-storey clear, 2-storey marginal). At a 3m setback the plane reaches ~6m above boundary ground level (2 storeys clear, 3 storeys marginal). Resolved by: surveyed contour plan and concept envelope test against actual boundary ground levels, not the rolled-average property elevation.

Overland flow path on property — A mapped overland flow path appears to cross the property boundary. AUP E36 requires that development must not block, divert or dam an overland flow path without engineering design and Council approval. This affects building platform location, earthworks, and stormwater routing. Resolved by: drainage engineer review of property-boundary geometry + intersection with proposed building platform + sized swale/piped solution acceptable to Council.

Title & registered instruments — GIS does not confirm easements, covenants, consent notices, encumbrances, or right-of-way terms. Order and review the Record of Title and all registered instruments from LINZ before relying on any yield estimate or fixing a rear-unit / building-platform location. These documents can legally restrict where buildings, driveways, private drains, public-service corridors, and rear units may be placed — and given that 8 public pipes appear to cross this property's boundary, the existence and width of registered drainage easements is the single most important pre-offer disclosure.

7. Infrastructure Feasibility

Contour & drainage context



Contour and drainage context. Auckland Council contours are shown over satellite context with the selected property boundary highlighted in cyan. Retrieved 2026-05-08.

The property is 1,312 m² with mean elevation ~23.39m ASL, ranging ~21.86m to ~25.86m ASL — about 4m total fall, generally to the north-west. This is a usable gravity-drainage gradient for both stormwater and wastewater across the site; it does not by itself confirm gravity connection to any specific public asset because pipe inverts (not surface samples) determine connection feasibility.

LINZ LiDAR / contour data: <https://data.linz.govt.nz/layer/53621> — search by coordinates -36.864899, 174.905532 for surveyed terrain.

Stormwater

Multiple public stormwater pipes cross the property (SW-P1, SW-P2, SW-P3) along with two chambers annotated inside the property (SW-M1, SW-M2). These are referenced in Section 5 — connection from new units into one of the in-property mains is technically straightforward subject to easement resolution and Council acceptance. AUP E1

detention is likely required for any increase in impervious surface; for 4 dwellings at ~110 m² footprint plus ~150 m² hard-surfaced driveway/yards, indicative new impervious area $\approx 590 \text{ m}^2 \times 40 \text{ L/m}^2 \approx 24 \text{ m}^3$ detention tank volume — indicative only; a drainage engineer will size against the actual catchment, soils and Stormwater Management Area controls.

Stormwater connection options

Option	Candidate asset	Distance	Gravity headroom	Easement risk	Indicative cost / risk
1	SW-P3 (225mm concrete main, inside property)	within property	Strong (4m fall to NW; pipe surface ~22.54m vs site mean 23.39m)	In-property pipe — see Section 5	Low–Med — assuming registered easement permits a tee/connection; corridor restricts platform
2	SW-P1 (150mm earthenware, inside property)	within property	Adequate (pipe surface ~22.54m)	In-property pipe — see Section 5	Med — small diameter; capacity check needed for added impervious
3	SW-M1 (chamber, inside property, 2.4m deep)	~28m from address point, ~2m to nearest property boundary	Strong	In-property asset — see Section 5	Low–Med — typical drop connection if easement permits

SW-M3 sits on a neighbouring private title (LOT 2 DP 205030, NA133B/529) — not a viable connection without registered easement (neighbour consent + survey + lawyer + LINZ registration; budget \$5–15k legal/survey, neighbour refusal possible). Confirm capacity and connection point via Watercare pre-development enquiry — search "Watercare pre-development enquiry" on [watercare.co.nz](https://www.watercare.co.nz).

Wastewater

Wastewater mains and a lateral cross the property (WW-P1, WW-P2, WW-P3) — referenced in Section 5. WW-P1 is the existing in-property lateral that exits across the boundary to the public main; new units could potentially drain to this existing pipe inside the property, subject to CCTV condition assessment and Watercare acceptance of capacity and legal status. Applying the wastewater gravity screen: site mean ~23.39m ASL, and the only manholes within reasonable distance (WW-M1 at ~11m address-point distance, ~4m to nearest property boundary, invert 22.84m, headroom ~0.55m; WW-M2 invert 23.71m, headroom -0.32m; WW-M3 invert 22.94m, headroom ~0.45m) all sit on neighbouring private titles with tight or negative gravity headroom. WW-P1's pipe surface is +0.9m vs site mean (high/uphill side), and WW-P2 at -1.1m is the only surface sample on the downhill side — but pipe surfaces are not pipe inverts. **Gravity wastewater connection is therefore an open/tight constraint** until Watercare confirms invert levels and the legal connection point; a private pump station may be required if the practical route is too shallow or uphill, and a deeper downstream manhole on a public route may need to be identified.

Wastewater connection options

Option	Candidate asset	Distance	Gravity headroom	Easement risk	Indicative cost / risk
1	WW-P1 (100mm PVC-U lateral)	runs within property → exits to main outside	Likely workable subject to CCTV + capacity	In-property pipe — see Section 5	Low–Med — reuse of existing lateral if CCTV passes and Watercare accepts; capacity for 3+ units to be confirmed
2	WW-P2 (150mm AC main, inside property)	runs within property	Adequate (pipe surface -1.1m vs site mean)	In-property pipe — see Section 5	Med — direct tee into public main typically requires Watercare design approval + protection; confirm legal route
3	WW-P3 (150mm AC main, inside property)	runs within property	Tight (pipe surface +0.9m vs site mean — uphill side)	In-property pipe — see Section 5	Med–High — uphill surface; gravity unclear until invert is supplied

WW-M1, WW-M2 and WW-M3 all sit on neighbouring private titles — not viable as connection points without registered easement / legal drainage rights. Confirm via Watercare pre-development enquiry.

Water supply — Watercare connection expected; new connection application per new dwelling; pressure and capacity confirmation needed for multi-unit.

Power & telecoms — Vector (power) + Chorus (fibre); beforeudig.co.nz for underground cable locations; no National Grid Corridor overlay.


Vehicle access / driveway

The property has a single street frontage on Waller Avenue. The vehicle access clear-width screen indicates an estimated side-access clear width of ~69m on the left side of the likely retained dwelling — this is a screening estimate from parcel geometry, not a surveyed driveway width. The retained-dwelling footprint estimate (~196 m²) suggests the lot is wide enough to allow side-access for a rear unit, but pinch points beside the retained dwelling, gradient, vehicle crossing position, sightlines, manoeuvring, fire and rubbish access, and any right-of-way/easement terms are not confirmed. Auckland Transport approval is required for new or modified vehicle crossings; shared driveway/access for multi-unit must be checked against AUP H5.6.13 and FENZ access requirements.

Access risk: **Open constraint** — screen indicates side-access width is likely workable, but no measured driveway width, gradient or pinch-point survey is available; rear-unit access remains an open item until surveyor and traffic adviser confirm.

8. Next Steps & Due Diligence




Before making an offer

- Order Record of Title + all instruments from LINZ — ~\$50 — LINZ self-service (drainage easements are the priority finding here)
- Auckland Council property file summary + HAIL register check + 1940s–1980s historic aerial review (Retrolens) — ~\$100 + a few hours — Tier 1, not optional
- Submit Watercare pre-development enquiry — free — Watercare portal (request invert levels for the pipes inside the property and the nearest public manhole)
- Confirm vehicle access / driveway constraints — measure clear width and pinch points beside any retained dwelling, check gradient, vehicle crossing, sightlines, manoeuvring, rubbish/fire access and right-of-way/easement terms
- Desktop planner / architect test fit for the scenario being tested — indicative \$500–1,500
- Any critical due-diligence item marked  Fail must be addressed here or the deal should not proceed

During the conditional period

- Review the LIM if supplied, or order one if not — Auckland Council
- Survey-grade contour plan — \$4,000–8,000 — licensed surveyor (closes earthworks volume and HIRB uncertainty, and locates the pipes accurately on the boundary)
- Drainage engineer pre-feasibility — \$2,000–4,000 (property-boundary check on overland flow path + indicative detention sizing + pipe-corridor design strategy)
- Geotechnical report — \$5,000–10,000 (required for multi-storey or significant earthworks, and for any pile-bridging detail over the in-property pipes)
- Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) — \$2,000–5,000 — only if HAIL screen returned a hit
- Arborist inspection — \$1,500–3,000 — only if mature trees visible on aerial imagery
- Planner review: activity status, HIRB, bundle strategy, notification risk, pipe-easement implications
- Access concept from planner / architect / traffic adviser if rear development, shared access or driveway widening is material

Before going unconditional

- Every critical due-diligence item must be closed to  Open-but-quantified or  Pass — no unresolved  Fail rows
- Pre-application meeting with Auckland Council planner for the scenario being taken forward
- Builder's report if retaining existing dwelling (Scenario A)
- Concept architectural test fit confirming the recommended yield is buildable given the surveyed envelope and pipe corridor
- Drainage + wastewater strategy accepted by Watercare at pre-dev stage (capacity, legal access, invert levels, in-property pipe protection or diversion)

Source Evidence Notes

- Evidence retrieval date: 2026-05-08.
- Customer report storage: save the final PDF, reviewed markdown, raw GIS snapshot, input notes, and rendered images under the relevant gitignored deal folder in /deals/reports/.

- Stormwater source: Auckland Council Underground Services MapServer layers 109 (pipes) and 20 (manholes/chambers). 622 pipe segment(s) and 365 manhole/chamber asset(s) returned.
- Wastewater source: Auckland Council Underground Services MapServer layers 5 (pipes) and 4 (manholes). 1000 pipe segment(s) and 304 manhole asset(s) returned.
- Address point: -36.864899, 174.905532.
- Land area used: 1,312 m²
- Property boundary polygon: retrieved from Auckland Council GIS
- Notable Trees Overlay evidence: no Auckland Council notable-tree overlay features returned within the property / 20m nearby-property screen
- Negative GIS evidence means "no mapped overlay returned", not "no physical trees exist". Confirm with Auckland Council AUP Viewer, satellite imagery, and site inspection before finalising layout.
- Connection feasibility is still unconfirmed until Watercare confirms capacity, legal access, and invert levels where needed.

DISCLAIMER: This report is for informational purposes only and does not constitute financial advice under the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013. Development feasibility is indicative only — always obtain independent legal, planning, engineering, and financial advice before making any investment or development decision.