

Delmore Fast-Track

04/05/2026 – Auckland Council Response

Annexure 28:

Urban Design

Delmore Fast Track Application

To: Auckland Council – Urban Design
From: Cam Wallace – Barker & Associates
Date: 16 April 2026
Re: Urban Design Response Memorandum

1.0 Technical Specialist Memo – Urban Design

From:

Mustafa Demiralp

**Qualifications
& Relevant
Experience:**

I hold a Bachelor of Urban Design and Landscape Architecture and a Master of Urban Design. I have over 17 years of experience in urban design across both the private and public sectors in New Zealand. I have prepared urban design assessments and technical advice for resource consent applications, plan changes, and fast-track applications, and have been involved in a wide range of projects, including structure planning, master planning, and medium to high-density residential developments. I am currently a Principal Urban Designer at Auckland Council, where I provide urban design advice on resource consent and private plan change applications, and contribute to hearings and assessment processes for large-scale residential, mixed-use, and subdivision developments.

**Preparation in
Accordance
with the Code
of Conduct:**

I confirm that I have read the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 – Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses ([Code](#)), and have complied with it in the preparation of this memorandum. I also agree to follow the Code when participating in any subsequent processes, such as expert conferencing, directed by the Panel. I confirm that the opinions I have expressed are within my area of expertise and are my own, except where I have stated that I am relying on the work or evidence of others, which I have specified.

Signature:



Date:

23.04.2026

2.0 Original Specialist Review Memo

The original specialist review identified several urban design concerns arising from the lodged proposal. In summary, these are related to:

- a fragmented overall structure influenced by topography and natural features;
- the extent to which JOALs function as primary access streets serving large numbers of dwellings;

- retaining and street interface effects, including battered frontage conditions and indirect access;
- some vehicle-dominated street environments; and
- a small number of constrained unit typologies.
- The original review also identified JOAL design and functionality as a key matter requiring further refinement, including pedestrian priority, waste management integration, amenity, and alignment with the intent of PC79 transport provisions.

3.0 Updated Response to Applicant's Memo

Following review of the applicant's response material and updated drawings, a number of matters have been satisfactorily clarified or reduced in significance. In particular:

- Retaining outcomes along street interfaces have improved relative to the earlier scheme, and the earlier request relating to worst-case retaining scenarios has been withdrawn. However, some battered landscape frontage conditions still present sub-optimal outcomes.
- Additional interface material has been provided, and no further significant concerns arise from this at a high level.
- The applicant's explanation regarding block lengths and permeability is generally accepted, and this is no longer considered a significant standalone concern.
- 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, some streets remain vehicle-dominated in character.
- While some refinements have been made, concerns remain regarding pedestrian priority, amenity, waste accommodation, consistency of landscape treatment, and the extent to which JOAL design aligns with the intent of PC79. The recommended amendment to the JOAL/access condition is therefore still supported.

4.0 Outstanding Issues

4.1. The principal outstanding issue is the design and functionality of JOAL environments, particularly where they operate as primary access routes, effectively functioning as streets, serving a large number of dwellings. Examples include:

- JOAL 03, serving 25 units, extending over approximately 250m
- JOAL 1, serving approximately 20 units
- JOAL 4A, serving approximately 23 units
- JOAL 40, serving approximately 25 units

- JOAL 9, serving approximately 27 units
- JOAL 56, serving approximately 19 units.

Key matters include:

- Inconsistent provision of grade-separated pedestrian paths. Examples include JOAL 1, which serves approximately 20 units, and JOAL 4A, which serves approximately 23 units.
- Limited amenity within some JOAL environments. While some landscape amenities have been introduced in certain JOAL profiles, this is not consistent across all JOALs. For example, JOAL 40A, which serves approximately 25 units, does not appear to provide any additional landscape amenity space.
- Accommodation of waste and service functions without compromising pedestrian movement. Landscape plans indicate that waste bins are located within pedestrian paths during collection, which may compromise usability and safety.
- Appendix 11 Landscape Plans do not fully reflect the outcomes of JOAL spaces. The quality of the resulting outcome remains unclear.
- Lack of clear demonstration of alignment with the intent of PC79 transport provisions.

4.2 The battered landscaped frontage conditions, where some dwellings are not directly accessible from the street and street engagement is reduced. Some examples include Lots 616–634, 715–730.

4.3 High concentrations of vehicle crossings in certain locations, such as Lots 1142-1227 and Lots 746-838. Limited on-street parking provision may also place pressure on the streetscape amenity.

4.4 The need for clear implementation and maintenance responsibilities to secure approved design outcomes.

Given the scale of the proposal and the likely staged delivery across multiple builders or development packages, there is a need to ensure that approved architectural and landscape outcomes are consistently implemented. Without clearly defined responsibilities and robust implementation mechanisms, there is a risk that consented design outcomes are not fully realised at the construction stage, resulting in reduced overall quality.

Response to Further Information Requests / Technical Comments

- Retaining walls and street interface
- Elevations – street and internal interfaces
- JOAL Design
- Block structure and connectivity
- Street interface and vehicle dominance

These matters are addressed in Table 1.2 below.

Response to Recommended / Amended Conditions

- Condition 109-110 JOAL/access condition

The recommended amendment remains supported. While further design work has been undertaken, the JOAL environment remains the principal outstanding urban design issue. It is therefore appropriate that the relevant JOAL/access condition be expanded to include design details relating to pedestrian movement, path widths, separation from vehicle movement, and confirmation that pedestrian paths are not obstructed by waste or other service functions. The condition should also ensure that JOALs are designed to a quality commensurate with the number of lots they serve, particularly where they function as the primary means of access in place of a public road.

If this cannot be appropriately incorporated within the existing condition, a separate condition addressing JOAL and internal access design should be included.

5 Conclusion

Overall, the proposal has responded positively to a constrained site context, and a number of matters identified in the earlier review are now more positively resolved. The proposal demonstrates a generally positive residential character, with reasonably well-resolved street interfaces in most locations and a coherent architectural response. Overall, while the proposal demonstrates a number of positive attributes, a number of urban design concerns remain, principally in relation to JOAL design and functionality that would benefit from further refinement.

Delmore Fast Track Application

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.

1.2 Response to Further Information Requests / Technical Comments

Information Request from Council	Applicant Response	Council Specialist Response
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, these do not fully demonstrate typical or worst-case conditions where retaining heights are approximately 3m or greater.	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 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	Additional drawings have been provided highlighting the treatment of the proposed development along external site boundaries in the	Additional interface material has been provided, and no further significant concerns arise from this

relationship between development and adjacent lots, as well as elevations within JOAL environments, are not provided.	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.	material at a high level. This matter is no longer considered an outstanding issue.
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 - Incorporate landscaping, including tree planting, within JOAL environments. - Clearly resolve waste management, including bin storage and collection locations, ensuring pedestrian paths are not compromised.	- 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 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	- 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 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

	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 include newly proposed loading bays, footpaths and rubbish truck turning heads.	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 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
--	--	--

Barker & Associates

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Havelock North | Wellington | Christchurch | Wānaka & Queenstown

		whole aligns with the intent of PC79 transport provisions, particularly in 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 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.	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.

Barker & Associates

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Havelock North | Wellington | Christchurch | Wānaka & Queenstown

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 trees, lighting, and bin storage, as per Greenwoods landscaping plans.	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.
--	---	---

1.3 Response to Recommended / Amended Conditions

Condition Request from Council	Applicant Response	Council Specialist 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.
		New - 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

Barker & Associates

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Havelock North | Wellington | Christchurch | Wānaka & Queenstown

		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.
--	--	--