

# E

## Appendix E

### Engagement with KCDC Urban Design experts - Boffa Miskel



The following table is a record of the engagement with KCDC urban design and landscape peer reviewers Boffa Miskel undertaken in the lead up to lodgement of the substantive application. The table outlines initial comments or requests from Boffa Miskel, with follow up clarification and discussion. The final column highlights the action taken and design changes that have been implemented in the final application documentation.

The key changes that have been undertaken are:

- Alteration of the rural interface property lots.
- To the northern side of the development the lot layout has been altered to reduce the number of properties with a shared boundary to the existing rural zone. These lots have also been altered to introduce a greater lot size and variability of lot width to visually break down what could otherwise have been perceived as a harsh residential interface.
- To the southern boundary, refinement of the planting and setback requirements have been undertaken to ensure that this interface is appropriately treated given the topographical context
- Internally pedestrian access and crossing points, as well as off-road paths have been considered to ensure pedestrian and active mode connections are adequately catered for. In most cases the comments from Boffa Miskel have been adopted, other than pedestrianisation of a portion of the primary connector road (see comment re: traffic impacts and centre viability)

The design team has valued the input from the peer reviewers and have addressed the commentary where appropriate.



Topic/ Theme	KCDC c/o BoffaMiskell Query (Memorandum 24.11.2025)	Initial Applicant Response
	<i>Additional questions in red text are per email from M.Moore dated 01.12.2025</i>	
Connectivity	<i>Is there an adequate number of pedestrian paths linking the site to shared path (expressway CWB). More than one should be provided along this boundary.</i>	We understand from NZTA that only one main CWB connection is desired. However three points of access are shown to be possible on the masterplan. This matter needs to be closed out with NZTA. Note: We support formalising these connections, subject to agreement with NZTA.
	<i>Is the road hierarchy reflected in the layout? Could pedestrian-only connections be used to close some streets to thoroughfare to amplify the road hierarchy and increase neighbourhood walkability?</i>	Yes the road hierarchy is reflected in the development layout. A road hierarchy is proposed that relates to connection points beyond the Site and efficient connections across the plan. The local centre is positioned with optimal direct frontage onto to primary and secondary Collector roads. All Collector roads form loops and cul-de-sacs are avoided wherever possible. All streets have been designed to support multi-modal access with pedestrian paths and some (Primary Collectors) with dedicated cycle paths. Neighbourhood walkability is considered to be very high due to block dimensions, location of the centre, distribution of open space amenities and street design (high amenity for peds). The development has been designed with input from Stantec to ensure permeability and to disperse vehicular traffic in the most appropriate manner.
	<i>Is there an option to close the north-south road to vehicles for the extent of the Mixed-Use frontage (Figure 1)? Car park entry to mixed use development and medium density housing is provided at rear, vehicular connection is not needed. This would reduce unpredictable vehicle movement at the centre; create north-west outdoor dining/café options as well as additional open space for residents in the medium density area. It helps to define a road hierarchy in the centre.</i>	We don't support closure of the identified section of this Collector road. It is part of an important Secondary Collector forming a loop connection back to the Peka Peka access (Primary Collector) and linking residential areas immediately north of the centre. It is a fundamental part of the movement system. Good practice seeks increased permeability at the centre rather than reduced. Local centre streets will be designed with raised tables and/or surface material changes at intersections and thresholds to slow traffic and enhance the pedestrian environment. This can be confirmed as a condition.

Further discussion (28.11.2025) and possible outcomes	Final design responses reflected in application
<p>Agree that the WNDL team will pursue a second link to the CWB at the northern corner of the masterplan. This location is considered useful given the relative proximity (c.500m) to bus stops on Peka Peka Link Road near the intersection with Peka Peka Road.</p>	<p>Application will show 2 connections (Through proposed lots 5005 &amp; 5115) to the CWB pending agreement from NZTA.</p>
<p>WNDL is not a development that will generate significant external or through traffic, with the majority of movements being residents of the proposed development. Street design has been undertaken to reinforce hierarchy (see the varied cross-sections and planting character). Some cul-de-sacs are provided where topography dictates (western dunes), but generally not in lower flat eastern or southern areas.</p> <p>Given the fine grain of the street/block network and the fact that the development will not generate significant external or through traffic, we think that closing some residential / local roads to be pedestrian/cycle only is not necessary and would not be beneficial.</p>	<p>No further changes to proposal in application</p>
<p>The Collector roads are critical parts of the overall movement network designed by Stantec to distribute traffic. However, WNDL will open up dialogue with Stantec about the movement implications of closing the identified section of road. The aim is to support good pedestrian amenity at the centre while optimising footfall / through movement.</p> <p>Local (landscape) to further consider surface and crossing treatment and continue dialogue with Miriam Moore on this matter.</p> <p>For the supermarket layout, there is a preference for Option A rather than Option B. Option A would establish better street edge conditions along the Primary Collector and offers better centre-integration overall.</p>	<p>Raised crossing treatments around the centre in addition to pedestrian crossings at key locations are proposed and have been updated following this discussion.</p> <p>The identified section of road is to remain open to vehicular traffic as it would adversely effect movement patterns and viability of the centre as a whole. Sufficient provision for pedestrian amenity has been included in the updated centre streetscape design.</p>

Topic/ Theme	KCDC c/o BoffaMiskell Query (Memorandum 24.11.2025)	Initial Applicant Response
	<i>Additional questions in red text are per email from M.Moore dated 01.12.2025</i>	
Boundary treatments and lot size	<p><i>The design should be reconsidered to provide larger-lot sizes at rural boundary interfaces, which provide a more appropriate transition into the eco-hamlet rural zone, with planting and colour controls used only as a secondary mitigation.</i></p>	<p>One issue to consider here is the current context of intensification. We submit that the general area north of Waikanae towards Peka Peka Road may intensify over time. There are four possible scenarios 'over the boundary': 1) land remains vacant, 2) large rural lots remain; 3) intensified eco hamlet; and 4) more intensive residential patterns per WNDL proposal. While the adjacent properties/neighbours are currently zoned rural (GRUZ), it is anticipated that these sites (particularly 55 End Farm Road and 343 State Highway 1 may be developed to a residential density. Therefore proposed WNDL lot sizes reflect this. Specific controls are proposed at the GRUZ boundary that apply the GRUZ bulk and location standards to these residential lots with additional landscaping requirements. Efficient use of land is a driver for the plan and lot sizes, especially given the very high proportion of land given over to water mgmnt/ recreation/ecology/landscape.</p> <p>Proposed boundary buffer planting is discussed in the column to the right. Boundary planting will help ensure that standard-density lots are well integrated into the surrounding landscape, while mitigating potential adverse effects until such time as the adjacent land use may change.</p>
	<p><i>It is also noted that there is flexibility in the masterplan layout to introduce more density (duplexes) closer to the centre to enable larger-lot sizes at rural interface boundaries.</i></p>	<p>The FTAA consenting process requires subdivision to the ultimate outcome sought due to the underlying rural zone, thus limiting 'flexibility'. We anticipate that in time this area would be re-zoned for residential and therefore would open up the site to KCDC MD residential standards allowing changes to mix and yield. The quantum of MD has been determined based on accessibility to amenities and market analysis by WNDL. We submit that the proposed mixed density of terrace, semi-detached, apartments, mixed-use bldgs and detached dwellings is an appropriate outcome offering choice.</p>

Further discussion (28.11.2025) and possible outcomes	Final design responses reflected in application
<p>Emma McRae (EM): Thinking about the landscape approach at a higher level. What is proposed is not in line with what is planned for this area, which is why the FTAA process applies. The Bulletin Trust site is in the Eco Hamlet zone which anticipated reduced density at the rural interface, but the Bulletin Trust development is at a greater density than expected.</p> <p>EM suggests the proposed 2m buffer planting is inadequate and would be looking for a minimum 5m planting depth. Local (re)visited the Site on 02.12.2025 and agree the landscape buffer should increase to 5m.</p> <p>EM would like more detail including cross-sections to describe the boundary interface condition with neighbours including any earthworks implications. Local will prepare this information and submit to EM.</p> <p>EM Requests an additional drawing showing the proposal in the context of neighbouring land / adjoining properties. McIndoe Urban will provide this additional drawing. A second dwelling exists at 55 End Farm Road and will be shown on the application drawings.</p>	<p>All assessments and drawings now reflect the additional dwelling at 55 End Farm Road Lots at the rural boundary interface bordering 153, 155 Peka Peka Road and LOT 2 DP 56282 have been redesigned to reduce the number of lots with a direct interface with the neighbouring properties. These new lots will be larger and more varied in size to mitigate the visual impact of residential lots along this edge. A drawing has been added as an appendix to the Masterplan Design Report which identifies the proposal in the context of neighbouring land / adjoining properties.</p>
<p>Miriam Moore (MM): Notes that the reference to increasing density only applies if more density is required. No further action required.</p>	<p>No further changes to proposal in application</p>

Topic/ Theme	KCDC c/o BoffaMiskell Query (Memorandum 24.11.2025)	Initial Applicant Response
	<i>Additional questions in red text are per email from M.Moore dated 01.12.2025</i>	
Boundary treatments and lot size	<p><i>Fencing – Rule M - Fencing at any street, public space or reserve boundary, including interface with private lots, to be 1.2m height. The Fencing Plan (sheet LA3.02) indicates areas where consistent fence design is required to avoid fragmentation and lack of cohesion.</i></p> <p><i>Does this account for when a private yard is in the front of the dwelling? Will there be provision for higher fencing between private lots to provide privacy in the primary outdoor living space?</i></p>	<p>The wording of the rule has been changed to "m. Fencing at any street, public space or reserve boundary (including where open space is not vested with Council), to be maximum 1.2m height. The Fencing Plan (sheet LA3.02) indicates areas where consistent fence design is required to avoid fragmentation and lack of cohesion. Reason for standard: To provide for consistency of fencing height in sensitive locations such as at open space interfaces. Providing for visual connection between open spaces and private lots at critical interfaces."</p> <p>1.2m fencing height is considered appropriate when private yards are in the front of the dwelling. Additional privacy screening etc can be achieved through planting and landscape design rather than resorting to higher fencing. As a note we have also added a rule into the medium density section that "Fencing within front yards of medium density area should be a maximum of 1.2m for the length of the site boundary where that boundary is located between the front of a principal building and a road."</p>
Open space	<p><i>Will stormwater reserves form opportunities for informal recreation to serve local community in the Eastern Flats.</i></p>	<p>Yes, the stormwater reserves will provide opportunities for informal recreation as evidenced by the pathways that connect the network of reserves and the dry basins that provide open, unprogrammed space.</p> <p>The development and detailed design of public open spaces will occur by way of a condition of consent, to be undertaken in collaboration with KCDC.</p>
	<p><i>Are there opportunities to better connect dune paths down to the centre if topography allows.</i></p>	<p>The dune pathways are provided where topography allows and with minimal earthworks intervention. There may be more connections to the centre as the design develops, however steep terrain and minimising dune modification limits access points.</p> <p>The development and detailed design of public open spaces will occur by way of a condition of consent, to be undertaken in collaboration with KCDC.</p>

Further discussion (28.11.2025) and possible outcomes	Final design responses reflected in application
	Wording of the proposed fencing provision has been altered to be consistent with the comments from MM.
Recreational walking loops and open spaces will be provided throughout the various stormwater reserves in a manner that respects the hydrological and ecological functions of these spaces.	Reserves and communally owned open spaces have been updated and are detailed in the application set.
Possible connections from the dunes to the surrounding streets have been shown on the illustrative masterplan.	Dune pathway design has been further developed to connect where possible within the overall network of recreational spaces.

Topic/ Theme	KCDC c/o BoffaMiskell Query (Memorandum 24.11.2025)	Initial Applicant Response
	<i>Additional questions in red text are per email from M.Moore dated 01.12.2025</i>	
Lot development constraints	<i>Have lots with additional overlays and slope constraints been tested to ensure 1m retaining will not be exceeded? Figure 2 shows sites tested in the Masterplan Design Report in green, and sites located in areas with significant slope circled in red.</i>	<p>The bulk earthworks are not intended to create individual flat platforms for each lot, but they do moderate the landform so that most lots sit within the 0–5 % slope range. In the steeper pockets — particularly along gully edges and where lots sit between the dune interface and a lower road — the works provide a practical buildable area of around 20 m depth, with transitions back to natural ground resolved using short, steeper batters or low retaining (up to around 1 m).</p> <p>A small number of lots will remain on steeper terrain by design, as these are intended for architecturally designed dwellings that can respond to the existing landform. Localised retaining of up to 1 m is also expected in some road-edge locations to tie road levels back into surrounding ground.</p> <p>Overall, the approach limits earthworks, maintains the dune form, and still provides workable building areas across the development. Only one retaining wall is proposed along the souther eastern edge of the connector road to Peka Peka Road and will be no more than 1m high. Landscape / secondary earthworks for garden areas will be designed to ensure retaining walls are max 1 m high. This may result in terraced garden areas with 1m steps. This avoids the need for fencing (fall from height) and can be readily screened by planting to soften / outcomes.</p> <p>A condition of consent can be applied to restrict future retainign to a 1m maximum height. This will ensure ongoing compliance by future landowners.</p>
Rear parking for multi-unit developments	<i>Are there options to use lanes and consider rear parking access for multi-unit developments to reduce driveway crossings at the street? Many precedent images eg. Hobsonville point show this type of design, but it is not being provided in most options in this layout.</i>	Yes where appropriate these are included on the plan.

Further discussion (28.11.2025) and possible outcomes	Final design responses reflected in application
<p>MM/EM wishes to see more detail/evidence on how proposed lots within the western dunes will manage the slope conditions. Similar projects have struggled with this, especially where prominent dune forms are retained. WNDL will provide more detailed cross-sections and retaining wall information to show that the masterplan layout 'can work'.</p> <p>EM: Would like to see east-west cross-sections through the entire western area to properly understand what is proposed. WNDL to supply this information.</p>	<p>Proposed lot testing has been included in the Masterplan Design Report that tests sample lots relative to the topography and design controls. A section through the development including across the western dune area has been included in the landscape set (LA7.01-LA7.03) and is reproduced in the Masterplan Design Report (pg 34-35)</p>
<p>MM: Acknowledges that this has been given consideration.</p>	<p>No further changes to proposal in application</p>

Topic/ Theme	KCDC c/o BoffaMiskell Query (Memorandum 24.11.2025)	Initial Applicant Response
	<i>Additional questions in red text are per email from M.Moore dated 01.12.2025</i>	
Path connections	<i>Is the green belt path north of MP 53–61 connected to the centre around the stormwater pond? Appears connected via footpath but it would be preferable to maintain the treatment for a continuous green spine to connect to the centre if possible.</i>	Connection is provided via the footpaths on the Connector A road as well as an off-street connection to link into the reserve to the south of the mixed use lot MD-28. The cross section of the primary connector will alter in this location so will maintain the treatment of path connection until it reaches the local centre.
	<i>Path connection across Primary Connector – How will this path be connected across primary connector? Is it below road (road bridges over?). If not, a pedestrian crossing here would be beneficial and help to slow traffic as a traffic calming measure as northwest traffic enters commercial area.</i>	Yes - pedestrian crossing is currently shown on the centre design for this location and is intended to be delivered to accommodate pedestrian movement. This can be confirmed as a condition of consent
Staging	<i>Is it anticipated that the development is staged to reduce car dependence from conception? Eg. create habits / walkable communities at first instance by building the more denser parts of the community and the commercial area. It is understood feasibility will play into staging, consider how it can be best achieved to support community development.</i>	A staging plan will be prepared as part of the application. This will be developed by Landlink.
Corner treatment	<i>Corner lots of apartments provide dual frontage facing internal roads including primary connector, but will front the arterials (which is appropriate for maximising outlook at rear to the green spaces). Design review needs to consider this interface as it is a key transition into the town centre. Will this type of detail be addressed at the Panel?</i>	Yes, the panel will address this detail in the design of these dwellings. The design guide has assessment matters under the 'Materials and facade articulation' section that will give the panel scope to address this issue. Additionally the general residential standard under GRZ-R33 9. Windows to Street - Any residential unit or retirement unit facing the street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors. Will apply and require a significant level of glazing to all street facing facades.

Further discussion (28.11.2025) and possible outcomes	Final design responses reflected in application
<i>This box intentionally blank</i>	Design of the primary connector cross section will be altered in this location and developed further at detailed design phase.
<i>This box intentionally blank</i>	No further changes to proposal in application
<i>This box intentionally blank</i>	An indicative staging plan is included in the application documentation and is reproduced in the Masterplan Design Report (pg 112-113)
<i>This box intentionally blank</i>	No further changes to proposal in application



local  
McIndoe Urban