RFI Response to Auckland Parks 25/06/2025 250, 256 West Hoe Heights –

Date: 01/07/2025

Prepared for: Vineway Ltd.

Site Location: 53A, 53B & 55 Russell Road (Stage 1) / 88, 130 & 132 Upper Ōrewa Road (Stage 2), Wainui, Auckland

The purpose of this RFI response is to provide a response to landscape specific matters following feedback received from Auckland Council's Parks Planner, Cas Hanniink on 25/06/2025 (**Response** below RFI in **bold**);

Unclear interfaces and boundary treatments

4.9 – The proposal includes design elements that support accessibility, safety, activation along reserve interfaces. Most retaining walls are under 1 metre in height, aligning with parks Planning requirements for open space lots proposed to vest. Lot 5020, the proposed Stage 2 neighbourhood park, is fronted by roads on two sides, while remaining edge interfaces with residential lots to support passive surveillance. However, no interface details have been provided for the Stage 1 Park.

Response: Refer to page 2180/23 Rev B Park 2 on the Updated Landscape Plan. . The park has been illustrated within the Landscape Plan more clearly than previous revisions. The park has been labelled 'Stage 1 Park'. Native bush revegetation defines the eastern edge of Stage 1 Park. A 1.2m visually permeable fence is proposed along the southern boundary of lot 358 which fronts the Stage 1 park. A landscape strip is also proposed to the south of lot 358 to create a soft vegetative buffer between the park and residential property. The park is also located along a public road which is relatively free of vehicle crossings and provides for ample on-street parking.

4.10 – High retaining walls along park boundaries must be avoided, and any future grading must align with council acquisition metrics. The applicant has accepted 1.2m high and 50% permeable fencing adjacent to any neighbourhood park location as per the Applicant's response (Terra Studio, Rev B.

Response: Confirmed and implemented

4.11 – For other interfaces, 1.8m fencing may be supported if recessive design and visually permeable (50%). All retaining walls should integrate with the landscape through stepped or landscape designs and be attractively finished, especially where visible from public spaces. Although the AEE indicates minimal retaining wall heights, some appear to reach 2.5 – 3m. Confirmation is required that no walls adjacent to neighbourhood parks or drainage reserves exceed 1m.

Response: Retaining walls adjacent to public parks are below 1m in height and are screened by planting. Retaining walls which exceed 2.0m in height which front the road reserve will be stepped to reduce the visual impact of the wall.

4.12 – The provision of designed interfaces that enhanced CPTED and passive surveillance over neighbourhood park locations and drainage reserves is important for the wider community to connect, enjoy, treasure and utilise space.

Response: Low fencing is proposed along the interfaces with public parks to ensure passive surveillance towards the reserve can be observed by residents. Low planting is proposed alongside neighbouring interfaces to both create a vegetative buffer and to further delineate private and public areas.

4.14 – While the application of standard parks planning conditions would typically support positive CPTED outcomes and enable effective passive surveillance, the current proposal lacks sufficient clarity to inform this.

Response: Additional detail has been provided within the Updated Landscape Plan to ensure that positive CPTED outcomes are illustrated and achieved. Analysis of the outcomes have been provided in the sections above.

Encumbered street tree locations

4.15 – The appendix 12-1 stormwater layout drawings indicate stormwater locations directly under the front berm. These service line locations create conflicting points between infrastructure provision and tree growth. Where insufficient separation (Depth and distance) is provided, maintenance of service lines may be affected as a result of root penetration. To address the above and as part of the RFI process, the applicant has outlined the provision of a 10-metre length root barrier to be installed directly above stormwater pipes where they pass beneath street trees.

Response: Agree with the provision of root barrier in situations as described above. A note with words to this effect is provided on the Updated Landscape Plan.

4.16 – It is noted that for pipes less than 1m deep and directly beneath trees, a

horizontal barrier above the pipe may be need; if pipes are offset, a vertical barrier may be more appropriate. Where roots grow deeper (1.5 – 2m), barriers may not be necessary, but if used, they should be placed close to the pipe, not the root ball, and only where the pipe is under or beside the tree.

Response: Agree with the provision of root barrier in situations as described above. A note with words to this effect is provided on the Updated Landscape Plan.

4.17 – 4.22: (Various sections outlining berm widths and Urban Ngahere Strategy)

Response: As addressed in the most the Updated Landscape Plan a check has been run on the landscape plans clarifying that 2/3 of the proposed street trees meet the 10cu.m soil requirement, with a separate detail utilising structural soil beneath adjacent pathways provided for those not meeting the 10cu.m standard.

Soil requirements within berms can be found on page 2180/40 Part 4 of the Updated Landscape Plan. Detail has been provided for a tree pit within a berm to achieve a 10 cu.m area of planting soil. Where this length is constrained by various infrastructure (predominantly driveways) an alternative detail has been provided which allows for structural soil beneath pathways to allow roots to extend out, thus achieving a 10 cu.m soil volume.

Canopy cover percentages can be found on page 2180/41 part 4 which illustrate the smallest and largest proposed tree coverages which the proposed development. This demonstrates a wide canopy tree and a medium canopy tree and demonstrates how they work in conjunction with proposed private lot trees to provide canopy closure.

Disconnected open space network and fragmented route legibility

4.23 – 4.29:

Response: Refer to Terra Studio Response Memorandum.

Key Information Gaps

1: Detailed neighbourhood park metrics have not been supplied or met.

Response: Refer to Architectural and Urban Design Memorandums and Updated Landscape Plans, which show updated park areas meeting the Auckland Council Parks metrics.

2: A detailed and updated scheme plan

Response: Refer to Updated Scheme Plan provided by McKenzie & Co. The update Scheme Plan has been coordinated within the landscape plan set.

3: Retaining wall plans

Response: Refer to Terra Studio Retaining Wall Response Memorandum. Retaining wall locations and heights have been coordinated with architectural plans. Retaining walls 2.0m and above along the street frontage and within private lot back yards are to be stepped.

4: Interface details

Response: Native bush revegetation defines the eastern edge of Stage 1 Park. A 1.2m visually permeable fence is proposed along the southern boundary of lot 358 which fronts the Stage 1 park. A landscape strip is also proposed to the south of lot 358 to create a soft vegetative buffer between the park and residential property. The park is also located along a public road which is relatively free of vehicle crossings and provides for ample on street parking.

5: Canopy closure confirmation

Response: Canopy cover percentages can be found on page 2180/41 part 4 which illustrate the smallest and largest proposed tree coverages which the proposed development. This demonstrates a wide canopy tree and a medium canopy tree and demonstrates how they work in conjunction with proposed private lot trees to provide canopy closure.

7: Public access easements

Response: Refer to the Proposed Draft Conditions of Consent prepared by B&A.

9: Updated landscape plans

Response: Refer to Updated Landscape Plan. Additional detail of proposed planting with public parks have been provided. Corynocarpus laevigatus, Cordyline australis, and Rhopalostylis have been removed in the latest landscape plan set. Knightia excelsa / Rewarewa which also comprised of a narrow canopy cover have been removed. The planting species within the Lower and upper riparian zones have been reviewed and tweaked to address the RFI comment received from the council landscape specialist (Helen Melsopp).

Earlier received landscape specific comments from council which have been previously addressed:

1: The proposal does not currently provide for a second neighbourhood park as

recommended in the Pre-application advice (refer to Figure 1 in the memorandum). (Query on 9 May 25)

Response: A second park has been provided. Refer to Terra Studio Response Memorandum provided 12 June. Conditions of consent provided 19th June.

2: Open space not meeting key metrics (Query on 9 May 25)

Response: Refer to Terra Studio response memorandum for stage 1 details

4: Residential interface and CPTED (Query on 9 May 25)

Response: Refer to Terra Studio response memorandum provided on 12 June

5: Berm infrastructure and trees (Query on 9 May 25)

Response: To mitigate potential conflicts between tree roots and underground services, a 10-metre length of root barrier is proposed to be installed directly above the stormwater pipes where they pass beneath street trees. This measure is intended to prevent root intrusion and protect the long-term functionality of the stormwater network while allowing for healthy tree establishment. The root barrier has been noted on the Landscape Plans, provided June 19.

7: Please confirm DOC discussions or agreements (Query on 9 May 25)

Response: DOC will not be acquiring this lot, so it will be owned in equal shares by lot owners and managed by a Residential Society. The final plans will reflect this, which will be provided 19 June. Conditions of consent will reflect this, provided June 17.

10: Unacceptable street trees (Query on 9 May 25)

Response: These tree species have been removed from the plan set, as has Knightia excelsa / rewarewa due to its smaller canopy.

12: Upper riparian mix recommendations (Query on 9 May 25)

Response: Drawings have been updated to reflect comments

13: Lower riparian mix recommendations (Query on 9 May 25)

Response: Drawings have been updated to reflect comments

14: Stormwater pond edge unclear (Query on 9 May 25)

Response: Best addressed at EPA stage. Generally, these ponds do have a path and fence. All that would change in that regard is that some of the planting beds

would narrow slightly to accommodate these elements, and realistically until the detail of the ponds are finalised by civils it is difficult to know the exact extent of planting at these ponds.

15: General site detail is insufficient (Query on 9 May 25)

Response: Updated Landscape Drawings will address bollards and fencing, provided June 12. The Terra Studio Response Memorandum addresses paths and connectivity. The Stage 1 10m setback from waterways is shown in the Terra Studio Drawing A-S1-1-01 (Appendix 15-2). The Stage 2 10m setback from waterways is shown in the Terra Studio Drawing A-S2-1-01 (Appendix 15-13), referred to in the legend as stream/wetland 10m offset.

17: Please indicate how street tree planting will achieve 12 – 15% canopy closure (Query on 16 May 25)

Response: A drawing has been provided showing tree canopy closure across both public and private realms for the best case and medium case scenarios

18: Please confirm berm widths are appropriate to support trees (Query on 16 May 25)

Response: Compliance with this standard would require reduction in the number of street trees lost (approximately 1/3), which is considered a negative landscape outcome. We have conducted an assessment of our proposed street trees and found that approximately 1/3 of them do not achieve a 10c cu.m planting space within the berm - Greenwood Associates have proposed (for acceptance from council) an alternative tree planting detail for these situations, wherein structural soil is used below the footpath to allow the roots of the tree to extend outwards- this structural soil is therefore considered part of the tree pit. This detail was approved by council during the EPA stage of the Kokowai (Stage 2) project in Hobsonville of which greenwood Associates was also the landscape architectural consultant.