

Dear Fast Track panel,

In the matter of Vineway's Delmore development, Upper Orewa Rd, Wainui Auckland

Rereading **Appendix 9** of the applicant's response to neighbours' and others' comments, including our own, and Barnaby Wallace's comments on the current infrastructure (including local schooling situation for his daughter), it strikes me how easy it has been for Vineway to dismiss or avoid responding clearly to objections my brother and I, as well as others, have raised. I was not going to respond, but decided that certain things need to be stated so that the Panel are under no illusion as to the manner in which Vineway seem to attempt to distract from the detail within our joint objections.

My experience of this process has been that Vineway are being dismissive and avoiding a straight answer to awkward objections that we or other neighbours or interested parties have raised. May I ask whether the Panel have the capacity to compare the substance and the details of our objections to what Vineway has responded with, to ensure that the detail within the objection is not being lost in Vineway's verbiage?

1. The first example, is in how Vineway have dealt with a neighbour's objections. I will quote Barnaby Wallace in part, but this is available on your website as [Barnaby Wallace \(PDF, 168 KB\)](#):

"While we have no objection to sub-divisions in general and have made no comment on the Millwater, Milldale, Ara Hills or Strathmill developments we do feel it is time to say something. Not all the above developments are complete, **with thousands of houses yet to build**. I understand there is also consent for another subdivision in Dairy Flat that has not yet started. **This will add thousands more houses. The current, and growing, problem is that the local services are already completely overwhelmed:** -

- Transport (both road and bus parking)
- Schools (our daughter is already using an office as a classroom in the wrong part of the school)
- Doctors (the wait for an appointment is two weeks plus and rising)
- Hospital/Emergency (long waits at all local clinics)
- Fire / Police / Ambulance (all sized for a small rural community and not getting the investment required)

While I understand the council is not responsible for the majority of the above investment, **the planning department does have an implicit responsibility to ensure that houses approved can access the required services. This is already a challenge** and I am sure you are receiving many complaints from both old and new residents. It is well past time to drive the required investment in services before making the problem any worse. **I request this submission be put on hold until at least some of these issues have been addressed."**

Vineway have presented their development as one that will provide what they perceive as much needed housing. Yet they haven't been able to demonstrate that more housing is required **in this part of Auckland**, given (as Barnaby points out) that there are possibly a thousand plus houses already planned in developments that are already underway. Such levels of housing only make sense if there are jobs easily accessible, and services and infrastructure that can support that growth in population.

Vineway responded to Barnaby's comments as follows:

"Regarding concerns about capacity within other public services, **these matters are largely outside of the Applicant's control** and reflect broader growth pressures being experienced across Auckland and New Zealand. The Applicant notes that the need for additional housing must be balanced against the challenges associated with accommodating population growth. The proposal will contribute to the funding of public infrastructure and services through development contributions, infrastructure growth charges (if connected to the public network), and rates, which are intended to assist service providers and public agencies in responding to growth **over time**. It will also result in significant upgrades to the existing road network undertaken by the consent holder in accordance with proposed consent conditions. The Applicant therefore does not consider that the concerns raised identify any adverse effects that are unique to, or would be caused by, the Delmore development. In relation to schooling specifically, the information available indicates that **there is capacity at recently established Nukumea School and that further school options are being investigated by the Minister of Education.**"

2 points in particular are worth noting here:

- Vineway rejects any potential responsibility for adding to the current shortages of GPs, hospital capacity, or school capacity in the area. This is completely disingenuous, given that in other parts of Auckland where large developments have been created, there has been little ability for GPs and schools to take up the slack. The Delmore development would in fact be compounding an already existing problem, as other large developments have before them. Their unwillingness to accept any responsibility doesn't bode well for their longterm planning for the community they are proposing.
- Vineway demonstrate throughout their responses to objections a superficiality that presumably hopes to distract. Do they actually know how old Barnaby Wallace's children are? If not, then why suppose that Nukumea **primary school** would be an adequate solution for other children such as his? And is Vineway's team aware that, despite the Government's best intentions, the Nukumea primary school that was first announced in the 2018 budget, designed to open in 2021, did not in fact open (and only in temporary classrooms) until 2023. <https://www.nukumea.school.nz/about> It wasn't until a year later that the school finally could move into permanent buildings. Is this really the quality of education provision that new home owners would wish their children to experience? In the case of Nukumea, it was 6 years until children were in permanent classrooms, and the school took 5 years to launch. To say that "further school options are being investigated by the Minister of Education" brings no certainty to any potential homeowner, and seems to be simply another case where Vineway's directors would not feel any sense of responsibility for provisioning of key services to the community they propose, including – most importantly – the provision of schooling to cover all ages.

2. In the matter of my brother's and my comments, I will give several examples to highlight how Vineway have treated our objections:

a.

The record of my conversation with Mr Allsop-Smith is plainly inaccurate in several respects.

B&A:

No record of conversations between Mr Mason and Mr Allsopp-Smith was provided with application materials. It is understood that the comments provided by Mr Mason relate to the application documents for Delmore's previous application which was withdrawn, and that there was a difference in understanding at that time about what had been discussed.

This information, that Vineway states was not provided with our objections, can be found in the document labelled by FastTrack this time round as [Jonathan Mason and Janet Mathewson Part 1 \(PDF, 33 KB\)](#), and my brother's comments regarding his conversation with Mr Allsopp-Smith are clearly outlined there under **Objections, point 4 onwards**. Our experience of the scoping process carried out by Mr Allsopp-Smith on behalf of Vineway was that he was unwilling to meet in person, and did not accurately record what was discussed over the phone with my brother. In fact his later account of the conversation was factually untrue. If this is Vineway's representative, and how they undertake engagement with the community, this looks concerning for those who might buy into this community.

b.

A predator and people-proof fence on the boundary to be erected and maintained in perpetuity at the developers expense, and designed so that animals and people cannot walk around the end of the fence to access our property. The predator and people proof fence needs to be in place before any works take place on the Delmore site, to prevent employees and contractors using our property either as a convenient toilet or break-room. Concerns also raised with residents entering commenters property in the long-term.

B&A:

The commenters property is located to the west of the Delmore site. This means that it adjoins the Delmore stage 2 area. This area is proposed to be subject to a condition of consent preventing cats and similar pets, thus with respect to cats, the issue raised should not arise. A fence for dogs is impractical and unnecessary. Each residential home is designed to be its own, separate area with landscaping, retaining and fencing which provides an in-built measure of control. Further control is the responsibility of owners in the normal way across the region.

We note that Vineway have completely neglected to refer to a key point that we raised in our objection, namely:

“We note that the impact on our property (property AA) is dramatically under represented. The document states: “The rest of the site consists of dense vegetation.” **No mention whatsoever has been made of the SNA** awarded the property by Auckland council, due to the extremely rich diversity of indigenous aquatic, avian and land-based wildlife.

■ Our strongest possible objections to the permitting of residential cats, and dogs off the leash, in ANY part of the development, still stand. Given that our family has worked for over 50 years to restore the native forest on our property, and thus the bird and wildlife, including through assiduous pest management (including trapping and baiting), it is completely unacceptable to permit homeowners who might understandably be oblivious to the damage one cat can do in a night, to let cats or dogs roam freely within the development or off leash. I offer this link, noting that in this respect a feral cat is not entirely different from a domesticated one, when it comes to killing for sport https://predatorfreenz.org/research/predators/brutal-truths-7-feral-cat-facts/?gad_source=1&gad_campaignid=1685339179&gbraid=0AAAAAC61BcGxgAhCNIHjvaGBBO1Eh1msa&gclid=CjwKCAjwIfPBhAzEiwAv9RTJredq94iiUCp_IDps4kEGNHGVQI7RHHW6C8yxBaTZ1HZ4GxQZcs-EhoCzYoQAvD_BwE

- https://www.fasttrack.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0030/19758/Appendix-7_Consultation-Overview-Report_Redacted.pdf On page 20, point 7 of this document, we note the following:

- Council would like to see restrictions on domestic cats as part of the consent conditions. Noting this is consistent with the approach at Ara Hills.

Covenant management and residential society conditions: The team is currently working through updates to draft conditions. To discuss with Council key concerns from the previous application.

- Council confirmed that they are happy in principle with the residential society approach.
- Would like to see some more detail in the conditions and more detail within the management plan. Specific requests included:
 - Detailed weed and animal pest control plans.
 - Specific locations for bait stations and track networks.

”

What evidence is there that the Residential Society will actually have both the teeth and the will to enforce the banning of pet cats, ferrets, rats and mice, AND to ensure that no dog is ever let off its lead? Given Vineway’s unwillingness to take responsibility for the impact of this development on infrastructure and public services, how can we as neighbours, whose wildlife and ecological diversity have earned us an **SNA** from Auckland Council, be confident that this

development will not result in cats or other animals getting into our bush and destroying the wildlife our family have spent over 50 years protecting?

- c. In the objections that we provided this year to the Fast Track Panel, uploaded onto your website as [Jonathan Mason and Janet Mathewson Part 2 \(PDF, 2 MB\)](#), **section 6** refers to our concerns about sewerage being trucked offsite.

In Vineway's document uploaded as [Appendix 9 - Response to all Other Comments1 \(PDF, 11 MB\)](#) they have responded to Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara's concerns about the trucking of waste off the site in their usual dismissive manner. Please read our **section 6 referred to above**, should any of the Panel still be unaware as to why no right thinking neighbour would wish waste to be trucked off site.

d.

Concerns about high fire risk due to excessive concentration of housing next to significant levels of highly combustible native forest. Considers several controls required including: • Defensible Space: Enforcing a minimum 40m radius around homes cleared of highly flammable vegetation, and therefore at least 40m away from any native forest on our own or neighbouring properties. • Fire-Resistant Building Materials: Ensuring roofs and walls meet highgrade fire resistance standards. • Stringent BBQ Restrictions: Banning solid-fuel BBQs (charcoal, wood) during prohibited fire seasons and restricting gas BBQ usage during highwind/hot days.	<i>Viridis Consultants:</i> The native plants being used across the Delmore development have been selected with input from DOC to achieve low fire risk. This is reflected in the material provided in DOC's comments.
--	---

Again, Vineway have completely disregarded the very real fire risk in an area of compact native bush such as ours. There is no recognition on their part of the way in which fires can easily spread across highly flammable areas of bush. This fire in neighbouring Milldale demonstrates how quickly fire can spread in a setting with no nearby bush <https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/person-in-shower-as-electrical-fire-breaks-out-spreads-to-three-homes-in-milldale-auckland/IVFSUCTCNFEG5IKAEL7CBOZMBY/> As we pointed out in our 2026 objections, the local fire services are completely inadequate for the level of extra risk this development brings with it.

As a busy professional, I have better things to do with my time than write emails to Fast Track, but these things need to be pointed out. You are not dealing with a developer who is in all honesty engaging openly with neighbours' objections in a way that gives any level of confidence in regards to their integrity. We have yet to see evidence that a Residents' Association would have the will to deal with all the multiple functions that Vineway are happily assigning to it, or the ability to pay damages to any neighbours, should situations occur that negatively impact our properties or our wildlife. Are the panel confident that such an Association would, for example, patrol the neighbourhood, seeking any signs of pets, and forcing residents to dispose of the

family cat? This is highly unlikely, and sadly presumably a sign that Vineway are simply ticking boxes to get their development approved.

Given that the area was not set for future development until 2050, we are unconvinced that the need or the structures are in place to justify this development, and continue to be firmly against it.

We hope that the Panel will have the time to consider these comments, as an indicator of what we consider to be a lack of good faith on the part of Vineway.

Yours,

Janet Mathewson (and on behalf of Jonathan Mason).