

Auckland Council Comments on Melia Place

Melia Place is a Referred Project under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020

Application name	Melia Place
EPA reference	FTC000046
Applicant/s	Melia Development Limited
Comments due by	28 February 2022
Accessing the application	https://www.epa.govt.nz/fast-track-consenting/referred-projects/melia-place/the-application/

All sections of this form with an asterisk (*) are mandatory.

1. Contact Details

Please ensure that you have authority to comment on the application on behalf of those named on this form.

Organisation name (if relevant)	Auckland Council		
*First name	Tony		
*Last name	Bullard		
Postal address	PO Box 92300, Auckland 1142		
*Home phone / Mobile phone	0272 545 127	*Work phone	0272 545 127
*Email (a valid email address enables us to communicate efficiently with you)	tony.bullard@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz		

2. *We will email you draft conditions of consent for your comment

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I can receive emails and my email address is correct	<input type="checkbox"/>	I cannot receive emails and my postal address is correct
-------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	--

3. Please provide your comments on this application

In preparing this response, the following experts have been engaged for the Council to review of the project. This includes Urban Design, Development Engineering, Watercare Services Limited, Auckland Transport, and Healthy Waters. It is noted here that this is not an exhaustive list of experts required to review the application in full, and it is recommended to the Expert Consenting Panel that relevant expert areas identified in the planning comments are independently reviewed.

The proposal is considered to be inconsistent with the high-level policy framework promoted by the Auckland Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan. The Auckland Unitary Plan zoning of Residential – Single House Zone does not anticipate a level of development that is multi-unit in nature and the creation of small freehold sites. The zone anticipates one to two storey high buildings consistent with a suburban character within spacious sites. All types of development (including non-residential activities) should be in keeping with the scale and intensity of development anticipated by the zone so as to contribute to the amenity of the neighbourhood. The proposal does not respond well to either the existing established suburban character or the planned character of the zone. Many of the proposed dwellings are either terrace houses or duplexes with a good proportion of them being three-storey in height on very small sites. These types of development are not envisaged in this zone.

Nonetheless there are some merits to the proposal that relate to its topography which slopes downwards and reduces its visual impact, it has a large amount of green space and reasonably low overall coverage, and it is a rear site which minimises its public street visual impact. Further detailed comments are provided by the Urban Design Specialist – see comments attached.

Council accepts the proposal is an integrated residential development but it also is a proposal that contains more than one dwelling. Council considers the overall activity status to be non-complying. This is due to the proposal triggering the need for consent under H3.4.1(A6) as an activity with more than one dwelling in the Single House Zone (which has a non-complying activity status) as well as under H3.4.1(A9) as an Integrated Residential Development (which has a discretionary activity status). The most restrictive activity status must apply and therefore the overall activity status is non-complying. This approach is considered consistent with Council's assessment requirements following the decisions of the Environment Court in the Auckland Council v Budden ([Auckland Council v London Pacific Family Trust NZEnvC 030 \[2018\]](#)) declaration proceedings.

Note that there appears to be missing information relating to the flood assessment (see Healthy Waters comments attached). Hence more information relating to this should be provided as part of the application.

If consent was granted, conditions along the lines provided by the applicant should be incorporated into consent with the wording being modified in some places so that it is consistent with council's current standard condition wording. A copy of council's standard **Conditions Manual** is attached. In addition, the following additional conditions should be included.

- Vehicle access and restrictions as per Auckland Transport's proposed conditions attached.
- Pedestrian safety conditions as per Auckland Transport's proposed conditions attached
- New water hydrant and watermain extension as per Watercare's proposed conditions attached.
- Stormwater conditions as per Healthy Waters comments attached.

- Condition/s governing the use of shared community facilities to manage nuisance type effects.
- Condition/s managing any potential reverse sensitivity effects associated with the operation of the adjacent RSA.
- That the bike store areas be provided with e-charge facilities for e-bikes.

Further details on conditions relating to infrastructure can be found in the Auckland Transport, Healthy Waters, Development Engineering and Watercare's comments attached.

Urban Design Specialist Response

Date: 22.02.22

Urban Design Review and Overall Summary:

From: Andrew Henderson, Principal Urban Design, Urban Design Unit, Auckland Council

Overview:

- I note little substantial change from the last pre-application to address remaining urban design concerns.
- Natural Environment / Site Conditions
 - I note the site has some difficult geographical contours which the proposed layout is designed to work around. This also helps hide the development from the public road, and in combination with existing tree planting, somewhat from the adjacent development. Notwithstanding, the proposal can and will still be seen from a number of adjacent receptors and therefore the character of the SHZ is still important and should not be weakened or undermined.
 - I would recommend further info to be able to confirm level differences and thus any impacts between Blocks F and D, J and T.
 - For example please note Arch Plan RC05.03, Elevation 2 (LHS of block F and significant retaining walls).
 - Also note Arch Plan RC05.04A, Elevation 2 (LHS of Block I and significant retaining and fencing).
- Context/ Site Layout
 - The proposed site layout is generally logical and flows well from both public roads. I note that access is intended to be restricted and should be speed controlled to ensure a safe environment. The use of rear lanes is understandable and in this case does help to minimise cars/garaging from the more public internal roads.
 - While I have reservations about the character of the proposed higher density built form terraces, I do note their strategic siting within the central part of the bowl shaped topography. This in my opinion is a well-conceived site design to reduce their overall impact. As they are framed on their north and south sides by tall trees and the remaining RSA building on the east. The new duplexes on the western flank help soften and integrate higher density within the middle location. Views of the development are this restricted and setback from adjacent single house zone neighbours. This is a benefit and positive of the site/proposal.
- Density / Intensity / Character
 - I'm generally supportive of a proposal for slightly higher density within this site covered by the single house zone.
 - **However the intrinsic qualities for the single house zone character should be better provided. I have concerns with the overall density proposed in this scheme.**
 - An IRD in my opinion requires to follow the AUP zone expectations in terms of density and character and it does not intrinsically mean higher density is acceptable.
 - I consider that despite the opportunity for a small pocket of higher density to be potentially acceptable and largely hidden due to topographical changes, this proposal with the currently designed dominant three storey bulky and long terraces has the potential to undermine SHZ expectations and future larger subdivisions in same.
 - This small pocket of higher density may be better reduced and confined to the location where blocks D, R, S, T and U are currently located.

- The proposal in my opinion should achieve a provision of built form design and landscaped spaciousness closer to that expected within the SHZ and reflective of surrounding character, through the majority of the application site. At present it is the minority of the site being designed with SHZ character. I feel a reduction should be considered.
- As an example, along the norther edge (blocks K, L, M and N) creates 14 dwellings resulting in doubling the number of houses along the same boundary edge (Nos. 27-39 Vipond Road). The proposed dwellings along the western edge of the site creates 13 dwellings (Blocks A-D&F-H) resulting in quadrupling the number of existing houses along the same length of boundary (3 dwellings). This proposal results in significant intensification and visible density.
- The proposed building coverage within the SHZ is 35%, the proposal provides an average of 20.8% BC but character is more than just a numerical average of extent of building coverage. It is the combination of lot sizes, housing numbers/types/designs, presence of spaciousness through yards, landscaping and set backs to name but a few intrinsic qualities. It is noted that the character of spacious development is not fully provided throughout the site as:
 - The dwelling typology mix is 37 units within terrace form and 22 units within duplex form. The majority of units are not in a style which reflects the existing or intended character of the single house zone.
 - Lot sizes are not comparable to those existing surrounding the development.
 - 13 units have less than the minimum landscaped area, 12 of which are more than 5% less, ranging to 12% less.
 - 31 units out of all do not achieve 50% front yard landscaping, with some as low as only providing 12%.
 - 43 units over all are found to exceed building coverage, 35 of which are more than 4% larger, some ranging up to 22% more.
 - The proposal of terrace development itself in terms of its basic built form also counters the general character of single house zone.
- I am of the opinion that more of the site should reflect the expected and proposed lower density SHZ character.
- I note the terraces at 3-9 Melia Place could be used as evidence of a break of standard single house built form character but I discount these as fully informing the character of the area, as they are in and of themselves the only terrace development within the vicinity and quite out of character with the locality.
- Of specific concern with this character are Blocks K, O and P, and with a lesser extent Blocks L, M and R.
- Typology, Building Design and Appearance
 - The proposed building form of typologies for blocks F, G and H are considered good in terms of their design. They provide an overall balance of being a duplex but with a downsized design to reduce its visual appearance and bulk similar to a single house at a glance and yet still identifies them visually as two separate dwellings with more scrutiny.
 - The proposed building form and design of the duplex typologies for blocks A-D are similarly adequate but less successful in identifying individual dwellings. I consider this could be brought out more strongly to improve this visual distinction through the use of materials and colour.
 - Overall, the architectural mechanism of stepping the building plates to follow the land contours, to mitigate visual bulk and height from outside the site is clever and can be successful. The majority of duplexes achieve this. I feel this is let down in the proposal by the length and bulky roof of the terraces.

- The built form typology and design for Blocks K, O and P are significantly out of character with the SHZ and will have an adverse effect both when viewed from the front and rear (both within and outside the site). The latter may be lessened somewhat if substantial existing planting is retained, but as mentioned below, this appears unlikely and views will exist.
The proposed continuous cat-slide dormer roof extensions are bulky and dominant within the roof space. This coupled with the excessive long length of the terraces creates a dominant uncharacteristic building form not reflective of the single house zone and are more reflective of the MHU zone. The use of different material colour and slight modulated elevation does not create visual breaks which are successful to mitigate its length. The unmodulated roof plane further emphasizes these bulk, massing and dominance aspects. The overall built form and its aspects are not recessive or minimised to help to visually reduce the bulk and massing of the terrace. In my opinion they have the opposite effect. This built form is not sensitive to the SHZ character in my opinion and will have an appearance similar to walk up apartments.
 - I disagree with the architectural statement in that I consider the three storey terraces will not appear as two storey from the street level and advocate that the dormers will be prominently noticeable from this vantage point.
 - The built form typology and design for Blocks L, M and R are more acceptable, being shorter in length and the individual pitched roof dormers creating some visual interest. However, they still appear top heavy, repetitive in form and colour and from the southern direction dominant when viewed from a SHZ perspective. It may be that removing the dormers in favour of large vertical emphasis rooflights might be more appropriate and reduce bulk and massing effects.
The gable wall projections in the centre of the wall are unusual and in my view unbalance the building visually. The fact that long views of this feature are limited due to being built out each side by another building is a saving grace. Ideally this wall projection should run from the ground and could incorporate a different colour or material to help break the façade up visually.
 - The three storey height effects from these terraces and the resolution of down scaling this height and multi-unit built form through clever architectural mechanisms has not been achieved successfully in my opinion. I consider this needs to be refined more strongly to see if it can acceptably accommodate 2/3 storey in this location/site.
 - The building design of Blocks U and T are acceptable.
 - All building designs present well considered ground floor elevations with adequate levels of glazing to the street frontages. They provide active elevations and allow passive surveillance opportunities.
 - Ground floor front facing bedrooms should not have ranch sliders as they will loose privacy and increase the risk of having shut curtains minimising activity and passive surveillance at street level. It is recommended that normal sill height windows are provided instead.
 - The community building has a simple non-descript design. It will appear as a standard utility sports type building. This design could have been improved to be more iconic as a focal point of the application site and corner site. Notwithstanding this, the brick rounded front corner is a nice architectural feature and the tall wide glazed sections help to connect and add interest with the street.
 - Unfortunately I find that the urban design statement does not provide sufficient detailed explanation of the resolution of design matters or mechanisms used to address concerns raised at pre-application.
- Individual lot concerns

- Concerns with overshadowing, overlooking, privacy and dominance effects generated from Block J (units 19 and 20) toward Block Q (unit 43). The step in land level is significant and raised/retained decks/gardens with low or tall fencing may incur issues. Clearer examination through sections is recommended.
- Similar issues may exist between unit 11 towards the lower outdoor space of units 7 and 8.
- Overlooking and privacy effects from lots 35 to 40 towards the outdoor space of lots 43 to 52 is overlooked but the intensity is less due to the larger separation distances. Landscaping within the rear outdoor space is critical to maintaining a modicum of privacy and amenity.
- Public Realm Interface
 - The entrance to the site from the public road off Melia place is relatively non-descript – given the proposals nature and intent on being semi private, a gateway feature would be of merit to help signify the sites importance and difference from public land.
- Relationship to Neighbours
 - I consider the proposed development and its more dense and intense character will be noticeable from a number of boundary adjacent neighbouring properties, specifically along the western and northern boundaries, especially if existing tree belts are being removed.
 - Side views from 23A will be of a dominant Block K.
 - Views from 23 and 23A over the rest of the development is considered to be acceptable as the development is set back and adequately spacious, somewhat reflecting the surrounding SHZ character.
- Amenity / Liveability
 - I note from the shading diagrams that a number of proposed dwellings will be unlikely to achieve 4 hours of direct sunlight to their outdoor space during the equinox. This is due to the orientation of dwellings but also due to typology design. Less than 4 hours is considered poor amenity for residents.
- Landscape Treatment
 - Its considered that if the significant existing tree belt along the northern edge of the site is removed as shown on the plans it opens the site up significantly and while dwelling height is managed from that perspective via a stepped floor plate the length of the terrace dwellings will become highly apparent. Replanting the news tree which will take at least 5 years to grow to a scale sufficient for mitigation will not satisfactorily mitigate this effect in my view.
 - Similar issues exist with the western boundary.
 - The landscape plan shows the retention of these existing trees but as they are predominantly on the proposed site and not the neighbouring site are potentially likely to be cleared thus losing the natural buffer between sites. I would recommend that further clarity is provided on this by the applicant.
 - The street edge to Blocks K, I, M and N is car dominated and particularly poor in terms of streetscape amenity. The proposed large specimen trees and rear yard treatments on the dwellings opposite will help add interest and soften built form but will take years and will need to be conditioned to remain.
 - Other than the above concerns, the general planting plan in terms of its provision is good. Orange fencing heights need updated on the fencing plan as they are not identified on the key.
- Semi - Public Open Space
 - The proposed open space areas are well provisioned and designed. The extension of a footpath towards the reserve through native bush is supported.
 - The provision of community facilities is welcomed.
- Street Design

- The rear lanes are well landscaped given their restrictions.
- Pedestrian movement through the site is good overall.
- Traffic calming measures and crossings could be implemented along the main road sections to improve pedestrian movement and safety more.
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)
 - Generally good overall. The site could do with some additional lighting along lanes and some road pole lighting appears spaced out too far and dark areas could exist. I also don't note any lighting through the open space area and path to the reserve. Potential for crime is higher as residents may use this shortcut home/out.

Conclusion Summary

The proposal is a well polished design which has a number of positives, however I still have design concerns. These concerns relate to density, intensity, bulky building design of terraces and from not providing/retaining single house zone character. In my opinion it is at odds with the AUP's expectations in this regard, specifically Policies 1 and 2. I also consider the proposal is going to be at odds with Policy 4 in terms of shading and also with visual dominance from long bulky terraces and intensity of dwellings if existing tree belts are to be removed/substantially thinned. There remains concerns that this proposal will be noticeable from adjacent neighbours if trees are substantially removed and its proposed character. While some increased density and intensity of housing with an appropriate design could be supported on this site, I consider this needs to be reduced and refined from the current proposal. There is a concern that this could potentially undermine the Plan and set examples for other large more intense subdivisions within the SHZ across Auckland.

Auckland Transport Comments

From: Tessa Craig, Major Developments Interface Lead, Auckland Transport

Date: Thursday 24th February 2022

Overall Summary:

1. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the Brickfields, Scott Road development. Auckland Transport has reviewed the application documents submitted with the Melia Place Development (the **Project**) which is a referred project under Schedule 28 of the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Referred Projects Order 2020. Auckland Transport previously provided pre-application comments on this development proposal to the Applicant via Auckland Council in April 2021.
2. Auckland Transport has no fundamental concerns with an Integrated Residential Development (**IRD**) at this location noting that the Residential-Single House Zone rules in the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part (**AUP(OIP)**) have anticipated IRD within this zone, subject to suitable siting and design, by its specific inclusion in the zone rules as a discretionary activity, and also via recognition within Policy H3.3(8).
3. Auckland Transport has identified some areas in the Project design where further changes would improve safety and encourage higher use of public transport facilities, and has provided some recommendations on conditions. These recommendations are provided within the context of the objectives and policies of Chapter E27 Transport of the AUP(OIP) (Objectives 1, 2 and 5 and Policies 1, 2 and 20) and Chapter E38 – Subdivision (Objectives 4 and 6).
4. Detailed comments by general topic are set out below.

Parking

5. For dwellings without garages, the Applicant is proposing to provide bicycle parking either in lockable outdoor yards or secure storage lockers. This will meet the AUP(OIP) requirements for bicycle parking and is supported. As no plans were identified that show the locations of visitor bicycle parking or storage lockers for individual properties, a consent condition is recommended to require this bicycle parking, as described in the Transport Assessment Report (**TAR**).
6. In pre-application comments Auckland Transport queried whether there are any shared parking arrangements between the bowling club and Returned Services Association (**RSA**) activities that would be affected by the Project (e.g. if overflow RSA parking relied on any bowling club car parking that is proposed to be removed). The TAR states that there are no shared parking arrangements. On this basis Auckland Transport has no further comments regarding the proposed on-site car parking supply.

Refuse Collection

7. Auckland Transport supports the proposal to use private refuse collection for the new dwellings and is satisfied based on tracking provided by the Applicant that refuse trucks can enter and exit the site in a forward direction. The Waste Management Plan condition (draft Condition 62) proposed by the Applicant will ensure compliance with this requirement.

Vehicle Access

Melia Place Access

8. The existing vehicle access which serves both the bowling club and RSA is immediately adjacent to the vehicle crossing at 11 Melia Place. The TAR states that the vehicle crossing for the Project (at the property boundary) is separated from the crossing at 11 Melia Street by 3.3m, whilst CIVIX Drawing 1207, with the proposed footpath along the eastern side of the accessway, scales at approximately 4.2m. Whichever of these is correct, such a distance will comply with the AUP(OIP) requirements for a 2m separation.
9. Auckland Transport supports the proposal to install a gate at this access to prevent general traffic using this site as a through route and to help prevent 'rat-running'. It is recommended that the requirement for a gate is included as a consent condition.
10. As separately assessed in the Traffic Assessment section below, due to congestion at the Melia Place/Whangaparāoa Road/ Poplar Road intersection, and safety concerns regarding increased traffic trying to execute a right turn out during the morning traffic peak, Auckland Transport considers that this access should be designed and managed as an entry only access to the application site. A consent condition is recommended in this regard.

Vipond Road Access

11. The existing vehicle access to Vipond Road also serves both the bowling club and RSA. This is a private access, but the intersection and accessway are formed and marked as a road, including a STOP limit line and No Stopping At all Times (NSAAT) markings, whilst a right turn bay is marked on Vipond Road. The Project will have legal access to Vipond Road from the existing accessway via an existing easement. Auckland Transport considers the standard of this access to be appropriate for the Project.

Traffic Assessment

12. The Melia Place /Whangaparāoa Road/Poplar Road intersection is a four-armed intersection with Melia Place and Poplar Road being STOP controlled. A right turn bay is provided on Whangaparāoa Road to assist right turns at the intersection. There are marked shoulders on either side of Whangaparāoa Road which allow parking.
13. The TAR states that there is congestion at the intersection but does not describe the actual operation of the intersection in terms of where queuing occurs or the extent of queuing.
14. The TAR reports that Whangaparāoa Road has high traffic volumes (34,000 vehicle per day) with 2,800 to 3,300 vehicle per hour (vph). Based on this, traffic flows along Whangaparāoa Road are likely to be relatively constant providing few gaps for vehicles on the side roads to exit onto the main road. The Vipond Road/Whangaparāoa Road to

the west is a traffic signal controlled. This intersection is likely to create some gaps in the eastbound flow through its normal operation.

15. Traffic modelling has been provided through a SIDRA model output for the intersection. The results show that Poplar Road and Melia Place are extremely congested. The traffic assessment has assumed low traffic volumes using Melia Place, with no traffic turning right out of Melia Place due to the congested nature of the intersection.
16. Section 5 of the TAR provides a summary of the crashes in the area, including at the Melia Place/Whangaparāoa Road intersection. The TAR concludes that there is no crash history relating to movements into and out of the site and thus no apparent safety concerns. Examination of the CAS data for the five-year period of 2016 to 2020 plus all available data for 2021 shows that there have been five reported crashes at the Melia Place /Whangaparāoa Road /Poplar Road intersection. Four of these crashes related to vehicles turning at the intersection to or from Poplar Road. One was serious, one minor and the remaining non-injury. A feature of all of these crashes was to do with motorists not appropriately judging gaps in the traffic flow along Whangaparāoa Road.
17. It is likely that the crashes related to Poplar Road rather than Melia Place as Poplar Road currently has a higher volume of traffic as it serves a much higher number of dwellings and a boat builders' yard (152 vehicle movements at Poplar Road compared to 22 vehicle movements at Melia Place in the AM peak hour¹). The residential development is likely to result in additional traffic movements into and out of Melia Place. Whilst it is accepted that residents of the new development may choose to use Vipond Road access in preference to Melia Place when exiting the site and travelling to the west due to congestion at the Melia Place/Whangaparāoa Road intersection, Auckland Transport has concerns over this intersection and its ability to accommodate traffic from the development safely, particularly in regard to right turn out movements.
18. The TAR states that residents are expected to respond to the conditions and, therefore, reroute to use the Vipond Road access. However, residents (or visitors) have a choice of access and thus residents or visitors may still use Melia Place to turn right onto Whangaparāoa Road. Visitors will also not necessarily be familiar with the local traffic conditions.
19. The Melia Place/Whangaparāoa Road/Poplar Road intersection is congested and, as acknowledged in the TAR (Section 14.1), with increasing congestion drivers may attempt to use smaller gaps in the opposing traffic flows in order to exit the side roads. The Safe System ² acknowledges that people make mistakes. If motorists experience delay turning right from Melia Place onto Whangaparāoa Road there is a risk that a driver may select an inappropriate gap which could lead to a crash causing death or serious injury.
20. The existing crash patterns show there have been injury crashes (including a serious injury) associated with the Poplar Road leg of the intersection. The development allows

¹ Traffic volumes for the AM peak hour extracted from Table 2 of the Traffic Assessment Report

² The Safe System was introduced as part of Safer Journeys: New Zealand's Road Safety Strategy 2010-2020 and works on the principle that it is not acceptable for a road user to be killed or seriously injured if they make a mistake.

for increased traffic on Melia Place and whilst the additional volume and thus probability of a crash may be small, it is the potential severity of the crash that is of most concern.

21. Whilst motorists from the bowling club and RSA are able to currently utilise Melia Place to travel to and from Whangaparāoa Road, vehicles movements will likely be at off-peak times when traffic volumes on Whangaparāoa Road are lower (such as evenings). In contrast, movements associated with the proposed development would occur throughout the day, with highest volumes during the AM and PM peaks.
22. Restricting vehicle movements from the site at the Melia Place vehicle access via entry only would address this concern. The Vipond Road access is available as an alternative, as noted in the TAR, if access is restricted to entry only from Melia Place. A condition restricting vehicle access to entry only at Melia Place is recommended. This recommendation is made within the context of Policy E27.3 (20):

Access

(20) Require vehicle crossings and associated access to be designed and located to provide for safe, effective and efficient movement to and from sites and minimise potential conflicts between vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists on the adjacent road network.

23. The site access via 43A Vipond Road is formed as an intersection with kerb and channel and marked right turning bay. This access point, therefore, operates as an intersection. The traffic assessment shows that there are no operational issues with this access onto Vipond Road. This access is considered to be appropriate for the development.
24. As was highlighted in the TAR for the Melia Place/Whangaparāoa Road intersection, Whangaparāoa Road is congested. It would, therefore, be reasonable to expect that the Vipond Road/Whangaparāoa Road intersection would also be congested. The total traffic generated by the development would be a small proportion of the total traffic travelling through the intersection (less than 1%) and thus is unlikely to make a notable difference to the operation and efficiency of the intersection.

Public Transport

25. The TAR describes the public transport in the vicinity of the site. This includes two bus routes, the 982 on Whangaparāoa Road which is a connector service with a frequency of between 5 to 9 buses per hour in the peak periods in the peak direction of flow, and at least 30 minutes during the day in both directions. Route 983 which travels along Vipond Road then Whangaparāoa Road is a local service with a current frequency of hourly except in the peak direction of travel when there are four buses per hour at peak times. These routes are illustrated in Figure 1 below.
26. As can be seen from this figure, bus route 982 is a direct route along Whangaparāoa Road between the site and the Hibiscus Coast Station, whereas bus route 983 serves other suburbs along the route. According to Auckland Transport's journey planner, route 982

has a journey time of 14 minutes, whereas route 983 has a journey time of 23 minutes³. Route 982 is, therefore, significantly quicker with much greater frequency than Route 983.



Figure 1: Bus Routes (Source: Auckland Transport)

27. The TAR states that the development is well-connected to public transport. For residents wanting to use the more frequent and quicker Route 982 buses to reach the Hibiscus Coast Station to connect to city bound buses, however, this requires them to cross the busy arterial road (Whangaparāoa Road). This would be challenging as there are no pedestrian crossing facilities to reach the westbound (city bound) bus stop. This would be a barrier to potential bus users, particularly the young or those less mobile. Similarly, there are no pedestrian crossing facilities on Vipond Road to cross from the eastbound (outbound) bus stop to the development, but this is considered less of a concern given the lower traffic volumes on Vipond Road.
28. The TAR states that bus passengers can avoid crossing Whangaparāoa Road to travel towards Hibiscus Coast Station by using the bus stop on Vipond Road. Whilst that may be the case, these buses are less frequent and less convenient as they do not travel directly to the station. The inconvenience of using the longer and less frequent buses on Vipond Road to avoid crossing Whangaparāoa Road is likely to be reduce the attractiveness of using public transport.
29. Improvements for pedestrians to reach the Whangaparāoa Road city bound bus stop, such as a pedestrian crossing or refuge island on Whangaparāoa Road, would ideally be provided to encourage use of public transport as an alternative to private vehicle travel. This would provide greater consistency with the Objectives and Policies of Chapter E27 - Transport of the AUP(OIP) and in particular Objectives 1, 2 and 5, and Policies 1 and 2, and Chapter E38 – Subdivision Objectives 4 and 6. The Applicant acknowledges the benefits of such a facility but considers that as this is an existing safety issue that would have wider benefits than this specific development and accordingly should not be required

³ Journey times based on travel between 7.00am and 7.30am on a Wednesday in February 2022

to be implemented as part of this Proposal.⁴ However, Auckland Transport would point out that the development would generate greater demand for a safe crossing point. This is discussed further in the next section.

Provision for Pedestrians

30. Section 9 of the TAR describes the existing pedestrian provision on Melia Place and Vipond Road. It recommends that the footpath that runs from Vipond Road to the site should be widened to a minimum of 1.5m through the RSA site (for any vested road, a 1.8m wide footpath would be required, but as this is an internal road/link, this width is considered acceptable). This recommendation is supported provided that it does not narrow down the width of the access way which may create operational issues for two-way traffic if the access way is reduced to below 5.5m. This width is the minimum required width of a two-way access way without passing bays in the AUP(OIP).
31. To provide for pedestrians to reach the wider transport network a footpath should be provided from the site to Melia Place to connect to the footpath on the eastern side of the vehicle crossing at 11 Melia Place. The Civix drawing 1207 shows a facility along both sides of the access onto Melia Place that would be available to pedestrians. This is supported by Auckland Transport.
32. As discussed above, a pedestrian crossing facility across Whangaparāoa Road would ideally be provided for accessibility to the city bound bus stop which provides a connector bus route to the Hibiscus Coast Station. Given this development will create demand for the provision of a safe facility to enable residents and visitors to access appropriate public transport services, then Auckland Transport recommends consideration be given to including a condition requiring a facility be provided by the Applicant.
33. Lighting would need to be provided along the walkways and within the right of ways or JOALS within the site. Implementing suitable lighting will support active transport choices such as walking and cycling. Proposed Condition 18(b) requires lighting in all shared driveways, car and bike facilities and footpaths, which is supported by Auckland Transport.

Consent Conditions

34. Proposed Condition 1 requires the development to be constructed in general accordance with the plans and details submitted with the application. Auckland Transport would prefer the following matters proposed in the application to be subject to specific consent conditions:
 - Provision for bicycle parking for visitors and long-term secure bicycle parking for dwellings unable to provide garaged spaces or secure locked yards in accordance with E27 – Transport, Standard E27.6.2(6) and Table E27.6.2.5(T81) of the AUP(OIP).
 - Provision for a gated access for Vehicles at the Melia Place access to prevent general through traffic.

⁴ See Section 14.2 of Traffic Assessment Report

35. Auckland Transport recommends a new condition requiring measures to be implemented to restrict the Melia Place vehicle access to entry into the site only.
36. Auckland Transport supports Condition 18(b) in regard to lighting and Condition 62 requiring a Waste Management Plan.
37. Auckland Transport recommends that the Expert Consenting Panel consider whether a condition can be imposed on the consent for this development requiring a pedestrian crossing facility on Whangaparāoa Road given the demand expected from this development and safety issues in accessing bus services on the far side of that road identified.
38. Auckland Transport looks forward to the opportunity to review the draft consent conditions in due course.

Watercare Response (Water and Wastewater)

From: Amir Karimi, Development Engineer, Watercare

Date: 28 February 2022

Overall Summary:

Watercare has reviewed the provided information for the fast track consenting application in relation to Watercare's ability to provide water and wastewater services to the proposed 59 residential unit development at 20 Melia Place Stanmore Bay development and the proposed upgrade/alteration to our networks set out in the application, in particular to the Infrastructure Report dated 18/11/2021 by Civix.

Subject to the conditions below, we confirm that there is sufficient capacity in the current water and wastewater network to service the proposed development as of today's date.

- All public water supply and wastewater works required to service this subdivision/development shall be designed and constructed by the developer at no cost to Watercare.
- No building is allowed over the existing or proposed wastewater lines. All the current lines must be relocated clear of the proposed buildings' footprint.
- A private hydrant(s) will be required as the distance between the furthest dwelling entrance and the first available hydrant is more than 135m.
- Any connection to the development will need to be an extension off the existing 125mm PE watermain on Melia Place and not made to the smaller rider main.

Healthy Waters Response (Stormwater, flooding)

From: Lakshmi Nair, Senior Stormwater Specialist & Hansol Lee, Senior Stormwater Specialist, Healthy Waters

Date: 17 February 2022

Overall Summary:

The documents submitted with the application include,

- Stormwater Management Plan by Civix dated 22/10/2021
- Infrastructure Report by Civix dated 18/11/2021
- Flood Assessment by Civix dated 11/10/2021

Stormwater Management Plan

The proposed development is classified as a Large Brownfield Development as per schedule 4 of the Regional Network Discharge Consent for stormwater discharge and diversion. The stormwater management plan describes the stormwater management techniques that will be adopted to mitigate the effects of the development on the downstream stormwater properties and stormwater network.

Whilst these techniques have mostly met the NDC Schedule 4 requirements, the document itself is lacking in some of the important information such as reticulation plans and calculations. It contains other information such as architectural plans that are not very relevant to stormwater. In short, the SMP needs a major revision before it can be approved by Healthy Waters.

The review summary of the management techniques as given below

- Water Quality

Treatment of the JOAL and parking areas is proposed via Storm Filters prior to discharge into the proposed new public stormwater lines.

Inert roofing for the dwelling units and 5mm of roof runoff is proposed to be reused for non-potable purposes

There is no mention provided on the type of material and water quality for the private yard spaces

- Stream Hydrology

Individual tanks provide reuse for the 5mm and detention for the 95th %ile storm events for the dwelling roofs.

Communal tanks provide detention for the 95th %ile storm events for the JOALs and additional detention to offset the retention component.

Again, the runoff from private yard spaces have not been included in JOAL tanks or individual dwelling tanks

- Flood Management

Post development peak flowrate proposed to be attenuated to pre-development peak-flow rate of 0.413m³/sec during 10%AEP storm event through individual dwelling tanks and the communal tanks provided within the JOAL.

Infrastructure Report

This report provides information on the proposed stormwater servicing for the units, calculations to support the mitigation methods, overland flow assessment. The report however has missed giving any details on the building over the 525mm diameter stormwater pipe and the proximity of the dwelling at lot 20 to a manhole. If this is not addressed now, council may incur costs for repair and realignment of pipes in the future

The infrastructure report also includes flood risk assessment under E36.9 of the AUP. As the flood assessment report (for reasons below) was not able to be reviewed and accepted, the proposed risk mitigation methods can also not be accepted.

Flood Assessment

This report is a summary of the pre and post development flood effects modelled through the software Tuflow. However, there are no details such as calculations or plans to explain how the OLFP is diverted within the development and the flood plain is dispersed (included in the infrastructure report). There are also no details provided on the model schematisation, input data and parameters used in the model, therefore it cannot be determined whether the modelling methodology is appropriate.

Recommendation

The resource consent shall include the condition that prior to the earthworks commencing onsite, the applicant shall provide evidence of SW discharge authorisation from the Network Utility operator, Healthy Waters.

Development Engineer Specialist (Geotechnical, Services, Rubbish, Stormwater, access and roading, hazards,)

From: Vijay Kunaseelan, Team Leader, Regulatory Engineering Orewa.

Date: 25 February 2022

Proposed conditions include:

Works in accordance with approved design

Prior to the commencement of any earthworks, the Council must be provided with written certification from a suitably qualified professional that all permanent earth bunds, retaining walls, and building foundations have been designed in accordance with the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by GeoStudio Ltd, ref: 2282 Date: 15th October 2021. Written certification must be in the form of a report, or any other form acceptable to the council.

Ensure supervision and certification of geotechnical works.

The construction of permanent earth bunds, retaining walls and building foundations and the placement and compaction of fill material must be supervised by a suitably qualified engineering professional. In supervising the works, the suitably qualified engineering professional must ensure that they are constructed and otherwise completed in accordance with the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by GeoStudio Ltd, ref: 2282 Date: 15th October 2021. Certification from a suitably qualified engineering professional responsible for supervising the works must be provided to Council, confirming that the works have been completed in accordance with condition XX [condition reference], within ten (10) working days following completion. Written certification must be in the form of a geotechnical completion report, or any other form acceptable to the council.

Ensure stability of the site/neighbouring sites.

All earthworks must be managed to ensure that they do not lead to any uncontrolled instability or collapse either affecting the site or adversely affecting any neighbouring properties. In the event that such collapse or instability does occur, it must immediately be rectified.

Sediment/erosion control in accordance with plan to be provided

Prior to the commencement of earthworks activity on the subject site, a finalised Erosion and Sediment Control Management Plan (ESCP) must be prepared in accordance with the Guideline Document 2016/005 -Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land

Disturbing Activities in the Auckland Region and submitted to Council for certification No earthworks activity on the subject site must commence until the Council has certified that that the ESCP satisfactorily meets the requirements of:-

The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan required by Condition xx must contain sufficient detail to address the following matters

- specific erosion and sediment control works (location, dimensions, capacity)
- supporting calculations and design drawings
- catchment boundaries and contour information
- details of construction methods

- timing and duration of construction and operation of control works (in relation to the staging and sequencing of earthworks)
- details relating to the management of exposed areas (e.g. grassing, mulching)
- monitoring and maintenance requirements

All the services shall be constructed in accordance with the Infrastructure Report, prepared by CIVIX. Conditions as follows:-

Stormwater Reticulation Networks

Connection to Public Networks

The consent holder must design and construct connection to the public stormwater reticulation network to serve the units in accordance with the requirements of the stormwater utility service provider. Certification from the utility provider that works have been satisfactorily undertaken must be provided when applying for a certificate under section 224(c) of the RMA.

Advice Note:

- *Acceptable forms of evidence include Engineering Approval Completion Certificates.*
- *Stormwater utility provider is Auckland Council Healthy Waters.*
- *Public connections are to be constructed in accordance with the Stormwater Code of Practice.*
- *Alterations to the public stormwater reticulation network require Engineering Plan Approval.*
- *Plans approved under Resource Consent do not constitute an Engineering Plan Approval and **should not be used** for the purposes of constructing public reticulation works in the absence of that approval.*

Connection to Public Network

The consent holder must design and construct connection to the public wastewater reticulation network to serve the units in accordance with the requirements of the wastewater utility provider. Certification from the utility provider that works have been satisfactorily undertaken must be provided when applying for a certificate under section 224(c) of the RMA.

Advice Note:

- *Acceptable forms of Evidence from the Utility Providers include a Certificate of Acceptance.*
- *Alterations to the public wastewater reticulation network require Engineering Plan Approval. Additional approval is required from Watercare/Veolia as part of the Engineering Plan Approval Process.*
- *Public connections are to be constructed in accordance with the Water and Wastewater Code of Practice.*
- *Plans approved under Resource Consent do not constitute an Engineering Plan Approval and should not be used for the purposes of constructing public reticulation works in the absence of that approval.*
- *The site is located within an area serviced via a pressurized wastewater Collection system. Consultation with the utility provider as to the specific design requirements will be required prior to the consent holder undertaking design or Engineering Plan Approval application.*

Water Reticulation Networks

Connections to Public Network

The consent holder must design and construct connections to the public water reticulation network to serve the units in accordance with the requirements of the water utility provider. Certification from the utility provider that works have been satisfactorily undertaken must be provided when applying for a certificate under the section 224(c) of the RMA.

Advice Note:

- *Acceptable forms of evidence from the Utility Providers include a Certificate of Acceptance.*
- *Alterations to the public water reticulation network require Engineering Plan Approval. Additional approval is required from Watercare/ Veolia as part of the Engineering Plan Approval Process.*
- *Public water supply is required to ensure an acceptable water supply for each lot, including for fire-fighting purposes.*
- *Public connections are to be constructed in accordance with the Water and Wastewater Code of Practice.*

*Plans approved under Resource Consent do not constitute an Engineering Plan Approval and **should not be used** for the purposes of constructing public reticulation works in the absence of that approval.*

Utilities

The consent holder must make provision for telecommunications and electricity to the units in accordance with the requirements of the respective utility operators. These utilities must be underground. Certification from the utility providers that works have been satisfactorily undertaken must be provided when applying for a certificate under section 224(c) of the RMA.

Advice Note:

- *The consent holder may also provide gas servicing to the lot(s), but this is not a requirement of the AUP(OP) and no proof is required at time of section 224(c). Any gas lines are required to be installed underground.*

Certification & CCTV

The consent holder must ensure wastewater drainage, stormwater drainage and water supply systems are made fully operative before a section 224(c) Certificate will be issued by Council. CCTV inspection reports shall be presented to the Development Engineer to verify compliance.

Roading and Transportation (Accessways and Vehicle Crossings)

Vehicle Access

The consent holder must design and construct a vehicle accessway to serve the units in accordance with the approved plans noted in Condition 1 and with the requirements of Auckland Council. Certification from a suitably qualified and experienced engineer that works have been satisfactorily undertaken must be provided when applying for a certificate under section 224(c) of the RMA.

Advice Note

The consent holder is advised that the national Addressing Standard (AS/NZS 4819:2011) requires that all new public roads and extensions to existing roads and any private road (rights of way or common access lots) that serve more than five allotments and created through a subdivision consent will require a road name. All road names must be approved by Council. In order to minimise disruption to construction and survey works, the consent holder is advised to obtain any road name prior to applying for a section 223 certificate. For more details refer to <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/building-and-consents/types-resource-consents/subdivision-of-property/Pages/road-naming.aspx>

As-builts for Public Infrastructure

All as-built documentation is to be provided to Council for all new public assets to be vested in the Council. The documentation is to be in accordance with Auckland Council's Development Engineering As-built Requirements. The as-built information will require approval by Auckland Council's Development Engineering.

Vesting of public assets to Auckland Council and close off and completion of related Engineering Approval consent must be completed.

Transportation Assessment Report prepared by Commute Transportation Consultants, ref: J001773 20 Melia Place, Stanmore Bay-finalv3.docx, 17 November 2021

E27.6.3.7. Lighting (1) Lighting is required where there are 10 or more parking spaces which are likely to be used during the hours of darkness. The parking and manoeuvring areas and associated pedestrian routes must be adequately lit during use in a manner that complies with the rules in Section E24 Lighting.

Completion of parking areas

Prior to the occupation of residential units all access, parking and manoeuvring areas must be formed, sealed with an all-weather surface, marked out, sign posted and drained in accordance with the approved plans [insert plan reference if relevant], to the satisfaction of the Council.

Advice note:

Parking areas should be marked out in accordance with the approved site plan to ensure appropriate parking supply, access, signage, directions and vehicle manoeuvring. This includes the allocation of specific parking spaces to each unit/dwelling where relevant.

Road Naming

In terms with the Auckland Council Road Naming Guidelines, the Consent Holder shall suggest to the Council names for the new road, or access for more than five sites, shown on the Scheme Plan. The Council surveyor may be consulted in regard to the appropriateness of the name and road type. Council will obtain clearance from LINZ so that duplication of the name in any other part of the Auckland region is avoided. The applicant shall then consult the local iwi for comment. The suggested names, including background regarding the historical connection, together with correspondence with Iwi should be submitted to Council. When a name has been resolved with Local Board approval, the Consent Holder shall erect nameplates, in accordance with Auckland Council Standards. Confirm Local Board approval has been obtained so addressing can be completed.

Thank you for your comments