Delmore Fast Track Application

Appendix 8: A28 (Urban Design) to Response to Comments letter

From: Cam Wallace – Barker & Associates

Date: 2 June 2026

Re: Response to Annexure 28 to Auckland Council Response – Urban Design

1.1 Introduction

This memorandum responds to the Technical Specialist Memo prepared by Auckland Council (Urban Design) in relation to the above fast-track application (as lodged). This response addresses:

- Further information requests / technical queries; and
- Recommended amendments to consent conditions.

Comments that are now considered resolved are identified in green in the table below. Comments where further information has been provided are identified in blue. Comments which are noted as a point of disagreement between the Applicant and Council are included within yellow.

1.2 Response to Further Information Requests / Technical Comments

Information Request from Council	Applicant Response	Information Request / Technical Comment from Council under section 53 FTAA	Applicant Response under Section 55 FTAA
Retaining walls and street interface While some retaining wall details are provided on Appendix 11 – PG. 2535/18 Typical Retaining Sections, including examples exceeding 1.5m,	It is understood that the concerns regarding retaining walls have now been resolved (as per email from Auckland Council on 2 April).	This matter is largely resolved. It is acknowledged that retaining outcomes along street interfaces have improved relative to the previous scheme, and that higher retaining walls along street frontages are now less common. The	Resolved.

these do not fully demonstrate typical or worst-case conditions where retaining heights are approximately 3m or greater.		earlier request for additional information relating to worst-case retaining wall scenarios has been withdrawn. Some concerns remain regarding battered frontage conditions and their implementation and maintenance, but retaining wall design is no longer considered a key outstanding issue in itself.	
Elevations – street and internal interfaces The application primarily provides street elevations. Elevations demonstrating the relationship between development and adjacent lots, as well as elevations within JOAL environments, are not provided.	Additional drawings have been provided highlighting the treatment of the proposed development along external site boundaries in the document titled *'260402 – DELMORE – UD SECTION RFI.'* All JOAL's have been updated in the civil road drawings to show accurate footpath locations and widths.	Additional interface material has been provided, and no further significant concerns arise from this material at a high level. This matter is no longer considered an outstanding issue.	Resolved.
JOAL Design • Review JOAL design to ensure these environments function appropriately as primary access where they serve a large number of dwellings. • Provide improved pedestrian priority, grade separation between pedestrian and vehicle movement. • Allocate adequate space and provide lighting design to support safety and CPTED outcomes	• JOAL designs include provision for a grade separate footpath on at least on side. Larger JOALs have incorporated grade separated footpaths on either side of the JOAL. A condition has also been proposed requiring implementation of speed calming measures for longer JOALs to further support a	• This remains the principal outstanding urban design issue. • While it is acknowledged that the updated roading drawings (Appendix 26a) now incorporate grade-separated pedestrian paths in some JOAL profiles, this approach is not applied consistently across the development. There remain	Further design changes have been made to all JOALs of concern identified by Mr Demiralp (JOALs 1, 3, 4a, 5b, 9 and 40). These are included in the updated roading cross-sections. Inconsistencies in landscaping plans with regard to the JOAL environments have also been corrected.

• Incorporate landscaping, including tree planting, within JOAL environments. • Clearly resolve waste management, including bin storage and collection locations, ensuring pedestrian paths are not compromised.	reduction in vehicle speeds on support pedestrian priority. • It is proposed to undertake detailed lighting designs at EPA stage and a condition is proposed to address this. • In terms of landscaping, all JOALs proposed benefit from in-lot landscaping (including low-level ground cover, hedges and specimen trees) which directly adjoins theses spaces as set out in the landscape plans. Whilst not within the defined JOAL boundary, experientially these areas of landscaping will form part of the JOALscape for any visitors arriving by foot. Additionally, some JOALs will also benefit from the proposed slope revegetation area which, in time will form a dense area of landscaping adjoining them. Given the narrow extent of most JOALs, additional landscaping within the JOALS themselves is not considered necessary. • As above, the Mckenzie road drawings have been updated to	several JOALs that function as primary access streets serving a significant number of dwellings, where grade separation and pedestrian priority are not clearly demonstrated. Examples include JOAL 1 (serving approximately 20 units) and JOAL 4A (serving approximately 23 units). • Similarly, while some JOAL profiles introduce landscape strips of approximately 0.5m to 1m in width, this is not consistent across all JOALs. For example, JOAL 40 (serving approximately 25 units) does not appear to provide additional landscape amenity space. In addition, these landscape elements are not clearly coordinated with Appendix 11 Landscape Plans, and the quality and implementation of these spaces remain unclear. • The applicant has also indicated that JOAL environments will benefit from adjoining lot landscaping. However, in many	Physical separation (in the form of a 1m wide landscaping strip) is now provided between the main JOAL footpath (i.e. the footpath serving the most number of units) and vehicle carriageway along JOALs 1, 3, 4a, 5b, 9 and 40 which complies with the recent amendments to E27 introduced through PC79. This 1m wide landscaping strip also provides space to store bins during collection day enabling unobstructed pedestrian access through these JOALs. With regard to landscaping within JOAL environments, fencing proposed is typically limited to 1.2m in height and are visually permeable. Landscaping proposed includes low-level groundcover, hedging, and some specimen tree planting all of which is visible through or over the proposed fencing. It is also observed that no fencing is proposed over vehicle crossings / pedestrian

	include newly proposed loading bays, footpaths and rubbish truck turning heads.	instances, front yard spaces are fenced directly along the boundary, which limits the extent to which private planting contributes positively to the JOAL environment. This reduces the potential for these spaces to function as high-quality pedestrian environments. Some examples of this condition are JOAL 40 and JOAL 03. • Furthermore, landscape plans indicate that waste bins are to be located within pedestrian paths on collection days, which has the potential to obstruct pedestrian movement and reduce safety, particularly in JOALs that operate as primary access routes. • While the proposed speed calming measures and the approach to address lighting design at a later stage are supported, the response does not clearly demonstrate how the JOAL design as a whole aligns with the intent of PC79 transport provisions, particularly in	accessways, whilst a number of proposed typologies feature no fencing fronting the JOAL meaning the total extent of fencing along is limited relative to their overall length. Finally, I would observe that this approach is consistent with residential zone provisions related to yards and landscaping (e.g. H4.6.10) which have the express purpose / outcome of providing quality living environments and supporting a landscaped character to streetscapes.

		relation to pedestrian priority and the quality of the shared environment. • Given the number of dwellings reliant on these JOALs, a higher level of amenity, spatial definition, and pedestrian prioritisation is expected. On this basis, the concerns previously raised regarding the design and functionality of JOAL environments remain relevant.	
Block structure and connectivity Explore opportunities to introduce additional mid-block connections within longer blocks to improve permeability.	While mid-block pedestrian connections are often promoted to enhance permeability and walkability, their value must be considered in relation to the site's physical context. Broadly speaking the proposal has adopted small blocks with frequent connections across flatter areas of the site. Most of the development features blocks lengths of less than 180m which is considered low when compared with central Auckland suburbs such as Herne Bay, Ponsonby and Grey Lynn which regularly feature block lengths that typically extend between 200-400m. The longest block within the development is in the northern section of Stage 2 and extends	The applicant's explanation is generally accepted. While some longer blocks remain, this matter is not considered a significant standalone concern at a high level.	Resolved.

	approximately 260m and any additional mid-block connection in this location would not respond to any obvious future pedestrian desire line and wouldn't meaningfully improve permeability.		
Street interface and vehicle dominance • Review areas with high concentrations of vehicle crossings. • Reduce the concentration of vehicle crossings where practicable.	The current design, as lodged, has been reviewed for vehicle crossings, and all feasible crossings have been paired. Crossings that remain unpaired are constrained by factors such as road gradients and retaining walls. In areas with steeper roading, pairing vehicle crossings across 9m-10m individual lot frontages would result in significantly increased retaining wall heights. For example, on a 1:8 road gradient, side yard retaining walls would increase from approximately 1.2m (unpaired crossings) to around 2.4m if crossings were paired. This would also result in steeper and less practical parking pads. All proposed vehicle crossings comply with Auckland Transport's minimum separation distance requirements. In locations where crossings are not paired, sufficient space has been maintained to accommodate street	The applicant's explanation regarding paired and unpaired vehicle crossings, including the influence of topography and retaining constraints, is generally accepted at a high level. However, the resulting streetscape outcomes in some locations remain vehicle-dominated, such as Lots 1142–1227 and 746–838. Limited on-street parking provision may also place pressure on the front yard landscaping and outdoor living areas to be converted to additional car parking over time, which can adversely affect the streetscape amenity. Similar outcomes observed in other recent developments of similar intensity, such as Cardinal West in Redhills, suggest that such effects can arise in practice.	The majority of typologies proposed across the development, including those areas of specific concern (Lots 1142-1227 and 746-838) feature the provision of two on-site car parking spaces in the form of a single garage and external car parking pad and lots widths in excess of 9m. In contrast, a review of Cardinal West scheme (via Google Street View), indicates that a significant proportion of homes across the development have a single on-site car parking space available and on lots generally less than 7m in width. I also note that the areas of concern identified are located along local roads and there are further opportunities for on-street parking provided over

	trees, lighting, and bin storage, as per Greenwoods landscaping plans.		and above the indented bays shown on the plans. Final details of on-street parking are a matter of detailed design during the EPA stage of a development. For the area around 746-838 the current plans provide for 20 indented parking bays and kerb space for up to an additional 19 spaces. For the area around Lots 1142–1227, a total of 15 indented bays is proposed while there is unconstrained kerb space for a further 11 spaces. I also note that Council retains the ability to refuse future s127 applications to amend / vary front yard designs (including area of paving / hardscape) or alternatively take enforcement action where works are undertaken without consent.

1.3 Response to Recommended / Amended Conditions

Condition Request from Council	Applicant Response	Council Specialist Response	Applicant Response
It is recommended that the relevant JOAL/access conditions (Condition 100–101) be expanded to include design details relating to pedestrian movement, including path widths, separation from vehicle movement, and confirmation that pedestrian paths are not obstructed by service functions such as waste storage.If this cannot be appropriately incorporated within the existing condition, a separate condition addressing JOAL and internal access design should be included.	Further design work has been undertaken to address the concerns regarding the JOALs, and this condition change is no longer necessary.	Request remains – wording below is for new requested condition if conditions are not changed.	As per above, further design changes have been made to respond to the concerns from Council. The Applicant therefore does not consider that a new condition is necessary, however this can be re-assessed once Council has reviewed the above.
		<u>New**</u> - Pedestrian Access and JOAL Design** The design and construction of all Jointly Owned Access Lots (JOALs) and internal accessways shall ensure safe and efficient pedestrian movement, and shall be in general accordance with the approved plans, except as modified by the following: a) Pedestrian paths shall be clearly defined and provided along all accessways, with a	

		minimum unobstructed width of [insert width, e.g. 1.5m], unless otherwise demonstrated as appropriate through detailed design. b) Pedestrian paths shall be designed to be physically separated from vehicle manoeuvring areas where practicable, or otherwise clearly delineated through changes in surface treatment, level, or markings to ensure pedestrian safety. c) All pedestrian paths shall remain unobstructed at all times. Service and operational functions, including but not limited to waste and recycling storage, utility infrastructure, and loading areas, shall not encroach upon or impede pedestrian movement. d) Details of pedestrian path design, including width, surface treatment, separation measures, and interface with vehicle crossings, shall be provided as part of the engineering plan approval and shall be implemented prior to the issue of a Code Compliance Certificate. e) Details shall also be provided demonstrating responsibility for the implementation and ongoing management and maintenance of all common landscaped	

		areas within the JOAL and internal accessways. This shall include identification of the legal mechanism (such as a residents' society, body corporate, or similar arrangement) responsible for ensuring these areas are established, maintained, and kept in good condition for the life of the development. Evidence of these arrangements shall be provided to Council prior to the issue of a Code Compliance Certificate.	