

No	Comment	Response	Author
1	No justification for development the site ahead of the 2050 development date.	The applicant does not agree with this statement for the reasons set out in the legal memorandum provided with the applicant's response to comments.	B&A
2	Concerned that urban development within the site will compromise ability to undertake rural activities within their property (e.g. machinery noise).	The property will still be subject to rural zoning which means that rural activities retain permitted activity status. Any consent application for a rural activity will be assessed against the existing environment in which your property is in the rural zone, with a related expectation that rural activities can occur.	B&A
3	Houses too close to property boundary.	See response to point 19 below.	Terra Studio
4	Requests a predator proof fence along the boundary of their property, designed to prevent people and domestic animals out. This should be in place before any works begin.	A predator proof fence is impractical. Predator proof fences are expensive to purchase, construct and maintain. A predator-proof fence is not necessary to exclude dogs or people and is generally considered excessive for this type of purpose. Domestic cats can roam up to 1.2 km while feral cats can roam up to 6.3 km, so any cat would simply walk around the fence if the fence was situated just along the property boundary. The shared property boundary represents approximately 25% of the total boundary 180 Upper Ōrewa Rd. Installing a predator-proof fence along the shared property boundary would be ineffective at preventing roaming animals, as the surrounding land would continue to provide access for both pest species and domestic animals.	Viridis Consultants
	Extent of earthworks (e.g. 10m cuts).	<p>The extent of earthworks reflects what is required to develop the site. The final cut/fill figures are changed slightly as a result of amendments to the master-plan since lodging the substantive application, however, the same design approach, focused on minimising the extent of earthworks (set out in 5.2 of the earthworks report as lodged with the substantive application (Appendix 16)) still applies. This includes:</p> <p>(a) aligning road geometries with the existing landform;</p> <p>(b) balancing cut and fill;</p> <p>(c) use of flat building lots;</p> <p>(d) re-profiling the existing ground primarily along the spines of the proposed sub-catchments; and</p> <p>(e) incorporating batter slopes along streams and gullies to reduce the earthworks footprint while maintaining stability.</p>	

5		In addition, the assessment undertaken by Riley Consultants confirms that the site is suitable for comprehensive development. Specific recommendations are made for stability enhancement measures to be used across the site, which are adopted through the conditions of consent. Refer to the geotechnical report submitted with the substantive application (Appendix 8). Riley Consultant's continues to support these conclusions after undertaking further work in response to the questions raised by Auckland Council.	
6	Inadequate plans for dealing with wastewater and concerns about information provided include: ability to connect to Army Bay ahead of Stage 1 upgrade; level of treatment of treated water; on-site treatment produces no solid waste; no trucking of waste.	This is addressed in detail in the applicant's response to comments. Refer to the documents in Appendices 45 and 46 to the AEE.	B&A
7	Considers representation of engagement with Vineway Ltd inaccurate.	The engagement record provided a summary. There was no intention to cause concern due to the way in which engagement was recorded.	B&A
	Concerns about effects of in-stream fauna within the waterway that also runs through their property. Including, relocating specimens resulting in death; it will "strip our property upstream, of its rich freshwater life. (Longfin eels, freshwater mussels, native crayfish, small fish)".	The only streamworks proposed as part of this development involve the removal of existing culverts and the installation of new culverts. A total of 17 existing culverts are proposed for removal. Several of these culverts currently act as full or partial barriers to fish movement. Their removal is therefore expected to improve fish passage and is likely to enhance both the abundance and potential diversity of freshwater fauna within and upstream of the site.	
		A total of 13 new culverts are proposed to be installed. These have been designed generally in accordance with the National Environmental Standards for Freshwater permitted activity requirements and will enable fish passage. The few that do not have been carefully assessed and are still designed to achieve this outcome. The combined length of all new culverts represents just 3.5% of the total stream length within the development site.	

8		<p>As a condition of consent, a fish management plan will be prepared and implemented prior to any streamworks. Fish management is standard practice and involves safely relocating freshwater species (including kākahi and kōura) from the temporarily affected stream sections. These species are relocated within the same stream system to ensure local population structures are maintained. In addition, the proposed extensive riparian planting will enhance stream ecological values by improving instream habitat conditions, which is expected to support increased abundance and diversity of freshwater species over time.</p> <p>Consequently, the development will not have the impacts referred to in the comment to the panel.</p>	Viridis Consultants
9	Concerns about traffic generated by the development. In particular on Upper Orewa Road given marings subject to "continual sinking and have repeatedly needed remedial work", and exiting Wainui Rd "bottle neck". Questions what applicant will be required to do on Upper Orewa Road to remedy "likely damage".	The Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix 28 to the AEE) has reviewed the specific Delmore site, and concludes that the site and surrounding areas can operate safely both during development and post-development, without requiring further upgrades of the surrounding road network. This comment is also specifically addressed in the response memo prepared by Commute Ltd provided in Appendix 51.2 to the AEE.	B&A
10	Impacts on pine tree stand on their property.	Any tree removal will be undertaken on the subject site only, and will be in accordance with the Tree Management Plan as outlined in the Peers-Brown Miller Arboricultural Report.	B&A
11	Concerns about who will be responsibility for ensuring compliance in perpetuity with various aspects of the development. Was advised by Auckland Council that it would be the developer. Not clear who the developer is because: "Both Vineway Limited and Myland Partners (NZ) Ltd are ultimately owned by Safe Haven Corporate Trustee Limited, a corporate trustee company with a single director / shareholder, but with unknown (at least to the public) beneficial owners."	Each stage of the development will have a resident's society which has the job of managing areas of native vegetation on the site. These societies are also charged with managing the on-site wastewater infrastructure.	B&A
12	Do not support ability for the developer to increase up from 1250 lots. Concerns about differing numbers of lots being presented.	This condition of consent is no longer included.	B&A
13	Unsure where water supply will come from.	The capacity analysis prepared by McKenzie & Co confirms that there is capacity in the public network to supply Delmore. Refer to Appendix 45 to the AEE.	B&A

14	Concerned that water supply approach, or development generally, will affect "semi-artesian bore" up which their property is dependent.	Connection to the public network means this will not occur.	B&A
15	Concerned about how rainfall has been factored into civil and geotechnical engineering assessments. States: "I have personal experience of how often a "100-	The geotechnical assessments have been carried out assuming a high degree of ground saturation during extreme rainfall events, as is normal practice. Further, the civil designs give appropriate consideration to the required rainfall event intensities prescribed by the design standards.	Riley Geotechnical Consultants
	year rainfall event" can occur on the back of Lot 2 DP 153477; on occasion we had 2-3 a year. I well remember having to look for two 24 inch x 6 foot concrete culvert pipes which had been		McKenzie & Co
	excavated by the stormwater from a farm crossing and carried a considerable distance downstream. My observation would be that storms coming in from the west dump the bulk of their rain there, and before they reach Orewa. So I hope Orewa rainfall figures were not used. I	Rather than relying on regional Orewa figures, we've used the site-specific depth-duration curves from Auckland Council's TP108 standard, specific to the Delmore site. We then applied the a climate-change factor of 32.7% to account for a 3.8 degree climate change increase, in line with the latest best practice.	
	also know high the creek can run off our current property, which again I hope the engineers have taken into consideration"	Using those TP108 rainfall inputs, we ran a dynamic 2-dimensional stormwater model to simulate runoff and creek flows at the peak of a '1-in-100-year plus' climate-change event. The model predicts water depths, velocities, and flow routes across your property boundary to the Delmore site, and downstream.	
		From this, we determine the maximum flood levels along your boundary with the Delmore site, ensuring our design fully accounts for the extreme flows you've likely observed during past storms. We also calculate flow velocities around each proposed culvert and specify targeted erosion-protection measures to safeguard those structures under peak conditions.	
16	Concerned that geotechnical assessment prepared with "limited on-site observation". Contends that developers are actually pursuing acknowledged mineral interests in tandem with the development.	It is not possible to test a high % of all the soil beneath the site. Nevertheless, we consider that the investigations carried out to date are appropriate to inform our assessments and conclusions. None of our inputs to date have been carried out for the purpose of mineral or resource extraction. Further, the site geology is not known for its minerology.	Riley Geotechnical Consultants

17	<p>Failure to consider the ecosystem that has been regenerating over the last 100 years (not stated but assuming within the consent notice areas within the site and on their property). Considers that the application ignores the existence and interrelatedness of these areas with the Nukumea Reserve and stream margins within the site.</p>	<p>The analysis prepared by Viridis Consultants shows that these ecosystems have been considered and ecological connections will be increased as a result of the development. Refer to the Appendix 42.2 to the AEE.</p>	B&A
19	<p>Request buffer of 20m or more between boundary of property and occupied buildings, which is planted with a triple row of harakeke down the centre line.</p>	<p>Mr Mason's property is 180 Upper Orewa Road. This backs on to Stages 2C and 2B-3 of the development. Stage 2C backs on to what is essentially the southern half of 180 Upper Orewa Road, and Stage 2B-3 essentially backs onto the northern half. In both stages, private lots adjoin the boundary. In the Stage 2B-3 area all houses are set back by at least 20m with the closest being 23m and the majority approx 41m. The space between the house and boundary will be planted, with vegetation types selected by Greenwood Associates and Viridis based on the goal of helping the WS11 ecosystem to reestablish. In the Stage C area, houses are set back from the boundary by approximately 10m to 12m, with planting on the slope down towards the boundary. An increase in setback distances in this area would have a significant impact on the ability to maximise the housing yield of this site. These setback distances and the housing location on each lot were determined with input from Greenwood Associates and Barker & Associates' urban design experts to confirm that they are appropriate in terms of managing amenity for the neighbouring property and buffering the SEA-T to the northern part of this area. It is also noted that the dwelling at 180 Upper Orewa Road is approximately 300m from the boundary already. As a result of the above, the applicant does not propose to adjust the housing setback distances or the planting proposed.</p>	<p>Terra Studios; B&A UD; Viridis Consultants</p>
20	<p>Request to understand financial recompense from applicant.</p>	<p>The site is earmarked for urban development as a result of its Future Urban zoning. No financial recompense is proposed because the development is simply realising that anticipated future state.</p>	<p>B&A and Applicant</p>
21	<p>Sets out understanding that application says bus routes will prevent excess traffic, and questions the accuracy of this. Asks what guarantee is there in place that a bus route will run and at what frequency.</p>	<p>The traffic report does not rely on bus servicing for it assessment. It notes that bus servicing is expected at Ara Hills soon and will likely extend into the development along the NoR6 road. The relevant documents are Appendix 28 and Appendix 51.2 to the AEE.</p>	<p>B&A</p>

No	Comment	Response	Author
1	Appears to express support for the application.	Noted with thanks.	B&A
2	Water supply and wastewater infrastructure prioritised before development enabled.	The water supply and wastewater capacity analyses prepared by McKenzie & Co demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity in the water supply network for Delmore, and also within the wastewater network possibly before the Army Bay upgrade and definitely after. If there is a period where houses within the site are occupied before the Army Bay upgrade and there is no capacity at Army Bay, wastewater will be managed using an on-site solution. The on-site solutions put forward have been carefully assessed and would be subject to conditions to ensure required standards are met. The capacity assessments are provided in Appendix 45 to the AEE and the on-site treatment methods are addressed in the documents in Appendix 46 to the AEE.	B&A

No	Comment	Response	Author
1	Do not oppose subdivisions in general.	Noted.	B&A
2	Other developments within the area (Millwaer; Milldale; Ara Hills; Strathmill; unnamed development Dairy Flat) mean thousands more houses already expected. This is overwhelming services including transport; schools; doctors; hospital/emergency; police; ambulance; fire. Development should wait until services available.	<p>The technical assessments informing the development confirm there is demand for houses within the Hibiscus Coast, including alongside other developments. They also confirm that the development can be serviced.</p> <p>The economics assessments by Urban Economics have identified that there is demand for housing in the Hibiscus Coast, in excess of demand in other parts of Auckland. There is also demand for the type of housing Delmore will provide, being standalone homes at an affordable price point. The relevant documents are those in Appendix 53 to the AEE.</p> <p>The traffic, civil engineering, and urban design assessments which have informed the development conclude that there are sufficient services to support the development. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commute Ltd concludes that there is sufficient capacity within the road network, subject to the development's design adopting its recommendations, which it does. The relevant reports are Appendices 28 and 51.2 to the AEE. - McKenzie & Co concludes there is sufficient capacity in the water supply network, and at Army Bay wastewater treatment plant after the stage 1 upgrade, to service the development. Prior to the upgrade, any houses that can connect to Army Bay within the current remaining capacity will, and others will be serviced by an on-site treatment plant. The relevant documents are in Appendix 45 to the AEE. - B&A's urban design expert concludes that the development is within range of all necessary services to support day to day life. A commercial area has also been included within the development. The relevant documents are in Appendix 47 to the AEE. 	B&A

No	Comment	Response	Author
1	Supports the development. In particular the integration with and restoration and enhancement of the natural environment, and connectivity with surrounding development.	Noted with thanks.	B&A

No	Comment	Response	Author
1	Orewa has not demonstrated a critical need for new housing developments at this time. With the on going delivery of Milldale development phases, Strathmill and Ara Hills projects there is more than sufficient housing developments underway. Current infrastructure and community services on the Hibiscus Coast are already under strain, and additional projects may exacerbate these issues without providing proportional benefits. The existing housing capacity should be optimised before embarking on new large-scale developments which could disrupt local ecosystems and community dynamics.	The economics assessments undertaken by Urban Economics shown that there is a need for additional housing in Orewa. In particular, for housing at an affordable price point. Refer to the documents in Appendix 53 to the AEE.	B&A
2	The infrastructure supporting development on the Hibiscus Coast is already stretched with major infrastructure support needed in the area. Refer attached Stuff article regarding insufficient wastewater connections with recent developments such as Milldale requiring effluent to be removed by truck.	The water supply and wastewater capacity analyses prepared by McKenzie & Co demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity in the water supply network for Delmore, and also within the wastewater network possibly before the Army Bay upgrade and definitely after. If there is a period where houses within the site are occupied before the Army Bay upgrade and there is no capacity at Army Bay, wastewater will be managed using an on-site solution. The on-site solutions put forward have been carefully assessed and would be subject to conditions to ensure required standards are met. The capacity assessments are provided in Appendix 45 to the AEE and the on-site treatment methods are addressed in the documents in Appendix 46 to the AEE.	B&A
3	Vineway Limited is currently involved in completing the Strathmill project. It is prudent to ensure that this existing commitment reaches successful completion before initiating another major development. Spreading resources thin across multiple projects could compromise quality and timelines, leading to potential community dissatisfaction and logistical inefficiencies.	Vineway Ltd's parent company is Myland Partners (NZ) Ltd. Myland is an experienced development entity and it is used to managing multiple projects.	Applicant
5	The proposed Delmore project poses potential threats to local ecosystems and biodiversity. The Wainui - Orewa area has freshwater eel and birdlife which could be disrupted by new construction. The development risks damaging natural habitats, contributing to erosion, and affecting water quality through increased runoff. Additionally, such projects might hinder regional sustainability efforts, counteracting progress made towards environmental conservation. The importance of preserving Orewa's natural environment should be prioritised over unnecessary urban expansion, particularly when sustainable development practices are not clearly articulated.	Delmore has been designed to include a total of approximately 55 hectares of native vegetation across the site (existing plus newly planted), which is intended to return vegetated areas back to the original WS11 ecosystem and provide connectivity with surrounding identified SEA-T's and the Nukumea Reserve. It has also been designed to result in a net gain in wetland extent. Within the Auckland region, both the WS11 ecosystem and wetlands are generally degraded and reduced from their original extent. The combination of these factors turns urban development of the Site into a significant win for the natural environment and makes important contribution to addressing the significant environmental issues of indigenous biodiversity loss. A comprehensive suite of measures is in place to minimise any impacts on native vegetation and fauna during construction, including pre-construction surveys, translocation, and ongoing management. Erosion risk has been carefully assessed and erosion and sediment control measures specific to the site and its typography are proposed to be implemented. In the long run, riparian margins and gully slopes are subject to extensive planting which minimises erosion risk and sediment discharge. The documents relevant on this response are found in Appendices 4, 8, 40, 42, 43.2, 49.1, 52.4.	B&A

No	Comment	Response	Author
1	Support the development as below matters addressed.	Noted with thanks. Comments on the two matters raised are below.	B&A
2	Dust needs to be kept down to avoid impacts on rain water collected from house roofing.	<p>In accordance with the recommendations from air quality specialists Air Matters Ltd, dust generated during construction of the WWTP will be managed using standard, best practice dust mitigations.</p> <p>Air Matters has stated that these best practice dust mitigations should be incorporated into the development's wider Construction Air Quality Management Plan (CAQMP) and include measures to be adopted to avoid, as far as practicable, offensive or objectionable dust, arising from construction activities beyond the boundary of the project site.</p> <p>To achieve this, the CAQMP should address the following (as adopted from the Ministry for the Environment's Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing Dust (2016)):</p> <p>(a) Description of the works, anticipated equipment/processes and durations; (b) Periods of time when emissions of dust might arise from construction activities; (c) Identification of sensitive land uses likely to be adversely affected by emissions of dust from construction activities; (d) Methods for mitigating dust that may arise from the construction site, potentially including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Controlling vehicle speeds; the use of vacuum sweeping (hard paved areas); water suppression; rehabilitating ground cover on exposed earth by way of revegetation or geotechnical cloth (or similar); and wheel washes for vehicles at exit points. <p>(e) Methods for undertaking and reporting on the results of daily inspections of construction activities that might give rise to dust. (f) Procedures for maintaining contact with stakeholders, notification of proposed construction activities and handling complaints about dust or other air quality matters. (k) Contact numbers for key construction staff responsible for managing air quality during construction. (g) Identification of contingency measures to address verified effects on neighbouring property in the event of a process malfunction or accidental dust discharge.</p> <p>Further information on appropriate mitigations for dust management from construction activities in the Auckland Region is provided in: Auckland Council (2016): Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Auckland Region.</p> <p><u>Effects on neighbouring dwellings</u></p> <p>The response above recommends matters that should be addressed in a Construction Air Quality Management Plan to control dust levels during the development's construction (including the WWTP construction). Specific measures (in particular c, d, f & g listed above) will ensure that neighbouring properties, sensitive to dust effects, are identified and appropriate controls put in place.</p> <p>The submission raised potential impacts on rain water collected from house roofing. Larger fractions of dust (referred to as deposited dust) are associated with deposition onto roofs with the potential to flush into rain water tanks. The mitigations recommended above should ensure that deposited dust is kept to a practical minimum during construction.</p> <p><u>Cumulative effects</u></p> <p>There is potential for civil works from other neighbouring developments to be occurring simultaneously with Delmore. Cumulative dust effects should be managed to an appropriate level provided each site is employing best practise through their respective CAQMP. Controls such as regular checks (e) should assist in determining the causes of any unacceptable dust.</p>	Air Matters
3	Noise restrictions are on for weekends and public holidays. Ideally no noise on those days.	<p>The proposed conditions of consent expressly restricted construction hours and days as follows:</p> <p>"All earthworks and construction works associated with the implementation of this resource consent shall be carried out: (a) between the hours of 730am and 1800pm, Monday to Saturday; and (b) Shall not occur on Sunday's and public holidays; but The restriction on hours of works shall not apply to low noise generating activities, such as site set-up or staff meetings, which may occur outside these hours."</p> <p>These operating hours and times align with standard practice.</p> <p>Further assessment has also been undertaken to confirm noise at 105A will be within the permitted activity limits in the Auckland Unitary Plan. The model results show that construction noise and vibration levels are predicted to be below the relevant limits at two dwellings by some margin. For context, there is a closer receiver where compliance is expected also, and the receivers at 105 and 105A are situated lower down off the southern side of the road and therefore are somewhat screened by the intervening terrain which has further reduced the predicted noise levels. Noise is therefore not expected to have an adverse impact at this location.</p>	B&A and SLR

No	Comment	Response	Author
1	Support the plan.	Noted with thanks.	B&A