



**Melia Place Project  
Fast Track Consent Application FTC46  
Reply to RFI 1**

RFI 1 paragraph	Response
<p>1. Provide elevation sections showing the relationships between block F and D, J and Q.</p>	<p><b>Berry Simons:</b></p> <p>Please see updated resource consent architectural drawing set prepared by Paterson Cullen Archaus, April 2022. In particular, please see <b>Sheet RC05.03 Rev D</b> dated 19 April 2022 and <b>Sheet RC05.04 Rev C</b> dated 19 April 2022.</p>
<p>2. Provide comment on the Council’s urban designer comments in respect of Blocks K, O and P and L, M and R and if considered necessary make amendments to the plans. Amendments may include breaking up some of the larger blocks and revising roof forms.</p>	<p><b>Berry Simons:</b></p> <p>Please see updated resource consent architectural drawing set prepared by Paterson Cullen Archaus, April 2022. In particular, please see <b>Sheet RC05.05 Rev B</b> dated 5 April 2022 and <b>Sheet RC05.05a Rev A</b> dated 5 April 2022, which depict the amendment of Block K into Block K1 and Block K2, to break up this larger block. <b>Sheet RC04.05 Rev B</b> dated 5 April 2022 show the amended floor plans for the amended Blocks K1 and K2.</p> <p><b>Sheets RC02.05 Rev C and RC02.06 Rev C</b> dated 05 April 2022 showing an enlarged site plan which depicts the new Blocks K1 and K2 in the context of the entire development.</p> <p>With respect to comments on the Council’s urban designer comments, Mr Jason Evans has addressed this in the tabulated response to comments at Line 15 particularly in response to Blocks K, O and P (as Mr Henderson raises the same concerns with Blocks L, M and R “to a lesser extent”).</p>

RFI 1 paragraph	Response
	<p>This is also addressed by the peer review prepared by Dr Lee Beattie, dated 22 April 2022. To briefly summarise, Dr Beattie considers that the proposed density, site layout, building bulk and mass are appropriate to this site context, and that the amendment to Block K appropriately addresses adverse effects and are now appropriate.</p> <p><b>Civix:</b></p> <p>It is noted that due to the changes to Block K, when subdivision occurs and new boundaries are established between the two blocks, this will result in a small side yard infringement, where the eaves of the building have a setback of only 0.75m. This will have no adverse effects, as overall the separation of the blocks results in increased visual amenity, by breaking up the built form, and as the infringement is limited to the eaves, there is still suitable setback at ground level to provide planting and undertake building maintenance. As such the proposal remains consistent with the intention of the zone standards and will not result in adverse effects.</p> <p>As this is a technical infringement only, and of a small scale, all previous assessment in the AEE remains relevant, as such this has not been updated. However, an updated version of the AEE can be provided to the panel at their request.</p>
<p>3. Clarify to what extent the existing hedge/ planting along the western boundary is to be retained.</p>	<p><b>Berry Simons:</b></p> <p>This is addressed more comprehensively in response to the second RFI. By way of summary, Mr Barrell of Tree3 Limited has reviewed the cut and fill plans in the approved earthworks consent (LUC60386828) and confirmed that effectively none of the existing planting along the western boundary will be able to be retained. However, Mr Barrell has confirmed this can be resolved with re-planting along that boundary, and that this will result in a more positive environmental outcome than if the existing planting was to be retained. This is also addressed in the updated Landscape and Visual Assessment Report prepared by Mr Campbell of Greenwood &amp; Associates, who refers to Mr Barrell's assessment and confirms that replanting can be undertaken and that visual and amenity effects with the removal of planting on this boundary can still result in effects that are no more than minor.</p>

RFI 1 paragraph	Response
<p>4. Provide comment on the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design and lighting commentary from the Council's Urban Designer.</p>	<p><b>Jason Evans:</b></p> <p>The proposed layout and housing typologies are designed to meet the essential purposes of CPTED principles whilst also presenting an attractive residential environment. I have listed below the relevant CPTED principles and indicated how in my opinion the proposal meets these.</p> <p><u>Safe movement and connections</u>  The proposal represents a 'street based' design approach where buildings are positioned to provide a consistent relationship to the footpath and roading connections. The roads are designed to provide for safe movement of vehicles with footpaths located to provide for a separate pedestrian route that is overlooked and provides for connectivity throughout the site.</p> <p><u>Surveillance and sightlines</u>  The layout and position of the differing housing typologies allows for a good degree of overlooking of pedestrian and vehicle routes throughout the site including views to the Olive Grove with Blocks T and U providing overlooking opportunities. The location and design of the MUGA and community building will also provide for further levels of activity and passive surveillance of this area.</p> <p><u>Layout - Clear and Logical Orientation</u>  The layout provides for a curvilinear principle route through the site with spurs off this route to service sub groupings of units. This approach in my view establishes a clear primary and secondary hierarchy that will be readily understood by visitors to the development. The architectural design combined with landscaping elements will provide for varying character elements throughout the site and therefore serve as 'memory markers' for visitors i.e. there are specific design elements that distinguish various parts of the development and therefore support legibility and avoid the development looking 'all the same'.</p>

RFI 1 paragraph	Response
	<p><u><i>Eyes on the street</i></u>  The proposed typologies offer a range of housing solutions with each providing for the opportunity to casually overlook public areas and therefore support the concept of eyes on the street. The typologies do this in a number of combined or different ways including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offering habitable rooms such as kitchens and living spaces that overlook the public realm.</li> <li>• Providing dual outdoor living spaces in many cases that allow closer interaction between the household activities and the street.</li> <li>• Providing for elevated views from units to look down into the street environment.</li> <li>• Locating buildings to face onto and address the public realm and therefore clearly define the public and private realm.</li> </ul> <p><u><i>Sense of ownership</i></u>  The location and design of the proposal offers an attractive residential community outcome with a variety of housing choices will be available in an attractively landscaped setting. The feature elements of community building and MUGA area as well as active play areas that elevate the quality of residential design to a high and 'special' level. These are features that will in my mind support the notion of community and civic/neighbourhood pride.</p> <p><u><i>Quality environments - well managed and maintained</i></u>  The unique elements of the neighbourhood such as the extensive areas of open space, play and games areas and community building require an active and locally based management structure. To this end the management and maintenance of facilities will be the responsibility of a residents association and not be subject therefore to the funding problems that frequently lead to insufficient maintenance in publicly adopted residential designs. The fact that the proposal will essentially be private will further reinforce in my opinion social interaction within the community and ensure a collective pride in the maintenance of the area will result.</p> <p><u><i>Physical protection</i></u>  Physical protection measures in the proposal primarily relate at this time to the quality of layout (active frontages) and appropriate specification of fences and boundary definition. To</p>

RFI 1 paragraph	Response
	this end 1.8m fences are only used for rear garden areas where no passive surveillance is needed to the public realm with other areas offering a variety of fence treatments that provide suitable privacy/ security but do not compromise passive surveillance. Other specific 'target hardening' measures will be incorporated into the detailed design of the houses and likely include standard measures such as deadlock doors, locking windows and motion sensor lighting.
5(a). In respect of water quality there is no mention provided on the type of material and water quality for the private yard spaces.	<b>Civix:</b> Refer to Healthy Water Response letter prepared by Civix attached as Appendix A to this table, dated 13 April 2022 and updated Infrastructure Report drawings 1400-1409. In summary, a design change has been made to use permeable pavers for the private yard spaces, and therefore no water quality treatment is required for this area.
5(b). In respect of Stream Hydrology the runoff from private yard spaces have not been included in JOAL tanks or individual dwelling tanks.	<b>Civix:</b> Refer to Healthy Water Response letter prepared by Civix attached as Appendix A to this table, dated 13 April 2022 and updated Infrastructure Report drawings 1400-1409. Again as summarised above, a design change to the private yard spaces has been made to use permeable pavers, and as such no water quality treatment is required for this area.
5(c). The infrastructure report 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.	<b>Civix:</b> Refer to Healthy Water Response letter prepared by Civix attached as Appendix A to this table, dated 13 April 2022. In summary, the stormwater design has been updated to avoid building over the existing 525mm stormwater pipe.
5(d). The flood report contains 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.	<b>Civix:</b> Refer to Healthy Water Response letter prepared by Civix attached as Appendix A to this table, dated 13 April 2022. In summary, the Flood Modelling Methodology has been updated to address these items, including updating accounting for rainflow at the source rather than at the inflow at the top of the site. A 10 year flood modelling scenario has been added in. As was discussed at the meeting with Healthy Waters on 21 March 2022, retaining walls introduce instability in the TuFlow model. To avoid this, Civix used a high mannings value for the retaining walls to stabilize the model, although notes that it shows unrealistically high water depths where flow paths run over or adjacent to walls.

<b>RFI 1 paragraph</b>	<b>Response</b>
	It is noted that Healthy Waters responded to this response letter asking for a table showing retention/detention volumes and attenuation peak discharge required for each lot. This is currently being prepared and will be provided to Healthy Waters promptly. A copy of this additional information will be provided to the Panel.