

Delmore

88, 130, 132 Upper Ōrewa Road and 53A, 53B and 55 Russell Road,
Upper Ōrewa / Wainui

Urban Design Assessment

19 December 2025

B&A

Urban & Environmental

Prepared for:
Vineway Limited

B&A Reference:

25108

Status:

Final

Date:

19 December 2025

Prepared by:



[REDACTED], Registered Urban Designer (UDIA)

Partner, Barker & Associates Limited



Contents

1.0	Introduction	4
1.1	Purpose	4
1.2	Scope and Involvement in Project	4
2.0	Site Context	4
2.1	Neighbouring Sites	6
2.2	Notice of Requirement 6	8
2.3	Wider Site Context	9
3.0	Planning Context	10
3.1	National Policy Statement on Urban Development	10
3.2	Regional Policy Statement	11
3.3	Auckland Unitary Plan	11
3.4	Reasons for Consent	12
4.0	Design Response	13
4.1	Site Opportunities and Constraints	13
4.2	Key Design Details	13
4.3	Response to consultation	15
5.0	Assessment	17
5.1	Strategic Urban Form	18
5.2	Future Urban Zone (Subdivision)	20
5.3	Street Network and Block Structure	20
5.4	Open Space Provision and Response to Natural Features	24
5.5	Architecture and On-site Amenity	25
5.6	Streetscape Safety and Amenity	34
5.7	Fencing and Retaining	38
6.0	Conclusion	40

Appendices

Appendix 1 Upper Orewa Strategic Context Plan

Appendix 2 Accessibility Analysis

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This report provides an urban design assessment to support the fast-track consent application for the Delmore project by Vineway Limited ('**the Applicant**'). The project is located across multiple properties on Upper Ōrewa and Russell Road, in the Ōrewa / Wainui area of Auckland ('**the Site**' or '**application Site**') and requires resource consent as a non-complying activity for the development of up to 1,213 dwellings, a commercial superlot, one unserviced residential superlot, two neighbourhood parks, areas of open space, areas of protected vegetation, roads including the NoR 6 road, supporting infrastructure and other associated works ('**the project**' or '**the proposal**').

The report assesses the urban design merits of the proposal in terms of its consistency with sound urban design principles. These principles are set out in the report and are primarily derived from the Auckland Unitary Plan – Operative in Part ('**AUP**') and good urban design practice based on the unique characteristics and context of the Site.

1.2 Scope and Involvement in Project

My involvement in development of the proposal has been:

- Ongoing review and comments on various iterations of the detailed architectural, civils and landscaping plans;
- Attendance at pre-application meetings with Auckland Council; and
- Preparation of an Urban Design Assessment to support the fast track application.

2.0 Site Context

The Site encompasses approximately 110 hectares and is currently used for pastoral and agricultural purposes, with homes to support that use. There are a number of mature and exotic specimen trees of varying quality scattered across the Site in the form of shelterbelts, boundary planting, stream planting, pine plantations and individual specimen trees.

A series of existing water courses / streams also dissect the Site with a number of these bounded by vegetation protected by consent notice (see **Figure 1** for example). The topography of the Site rises and falls between a series of ridgelines and gullies, with steeper areas concentrated closer to waterbodies and the northern portion of the Site. Much of the Site in between the waterbodies features is land which could be described as rolling with a general fall to the east towards the Ōrewa River (refer to **Figure 1**).



Figure 1 - Looking east from the centre of the site



Figure 2 - Looking south-east towards Millwater and Ōrewa from the western portion of the site




Figure 3 -Landform and Key Natural Site Features

2.1 Neighbouring Sites

Neighbouring sites to the east and south share similar characteristics as the application Site – rolling farmland in use for pasture with intermittent pockets of natural and exotic vegetation. In addition, there are a handful of rural lifestyle properties accessed via Russell Road.

Most of the western and north-western boundary of the application Site features dense native vegetation which is identified as a Significant Ecological Area and / or falls within the Nukumea Scenic Reserve. Much of this land is itself elevated above the application Site.

2.1.1 Ara Hills

The neighbouring site to the north / north-east is currently being developed to create a residential subdivision referred to as Ara Hills as shown in Figure 4 and 5 below. The broader Ara Hills development is set over 84 hectares and currently has approval for 575 residential lots with plans to increase this to 900 lots over time. Private Plan Change 119 (PC119) and accompanying resource consents are currently being sought to enable further development of this Site which also currently falls within the Future Urban Zone ('FUZ').



Figure 4 - Early phases of development at Ara Hills (source: Google StreetView)




Figure 5 – Plan Change 119 Proposed Zoning and Precinct Plan 1 (source: AV Jennings)

As shown in Figure 5 above, PC119 includes provision for THAB and MHU zoning, a neighbourhood centre) along Grand Drive, areas of formal and informal open space with recreational functions, an extension of Grand Drive and a separated pedestrian / cycling connection over State Highway 1. Much of this is reflective of the development and early stages of subdivision which has occurred to date. Lots which have already been subdivided to form the neighbourhood centre sits approximately 50m east of the Site. This distance extends to approximately 1.3km (Euclidean distance) to the western portion of the Site. The development of the PC119 provisions was

informed by a revised Masterplan for the site which includes a number of changes to the consented subdivision layout – especially adjacent to the application site.



Figure 6 - Ara Hills Illustrative Masterplan (source: Boffa Miskell)

2.2 Notice of Requirement 6

Notice of Requirement 6 (**NOR6**) provides for a new urban arterial corridor with active mode facilities between Wainui Road in Milldale and Grand Drive in Upper Ōrewa. A decision to confirm the NOR was made on 23 January 2025.

Significantly for the proposal itself, NOR6 establishes two tie-ins / levels at the intersections of Upper Ōrewa Road and Grand Drive, with a requirement to accommodate a maximum 8% grade between these two points. As such, future development must tie into the levels established for this arterial network.

The Urban Design Assessment submitted as part of the designation process identified a number of outcomes and opportunities associated with the development of this connection (refer to Figure 6 below). Of particular relevance to this application, the Urban Design Assessment identified the need to:

- Establish land use integration / interface that enables buildings and spaces to positively address and integrate with the corridor; and

- Minimise earthworks and level changes at corridor boundaries & Interfaces with future development areas to enable integration with adjoining future land use. Use retaining structures in areas where space is insufficient to deploy earthworks batters or where earthworks negatively impact the efficiency of adjacent land uses.




Figure 7 - Urban Design Opportunities Assessment of NOR6 (Source: Supporting Growth Alliance)

2.3 Wider Site Context

The Site is currently located in an area which can best be characterised as peri-urban with both urban and rural features fragmented throughout. Significant urbanisation of the wider area south and east of the application Site (including the areas of Millwater, Milldale, Ōrewa West and Ara

Hills) has been progressively undertaken since 2010. In addition, the remaining live-zoned areas of the Milldale development (Stages 4C, 10 -13) received approval under the FTAA in October 2025. This provides for a further 1,100 new homes south of Wainui Road (approximately 1.5km from the Site) and serviced by a temporary Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) until additional capacity at the Army Bay WWTP comes online.

The Site is located approximately 3.2km west of the Ōrewa Town Centre and 2.3km north-east of the emerging Milldale Local Centre with access via Howard Road and Upper Ōrewa Road (via Wainui Road). The Site is also located within proximity to State Highway 1 and the Ōrewa and Wainui interchanges which provides direct access to the Albany Metropolitan Centre 16km south of the Site.

The Site is also located in close proximity to a number of existing or proposed amenities including schools, open spaces and commercial centres. The later includes two proposed neighbourhood centres, one directly adjacent to the Site in the Ara Hills development that is consented, and one approximately 800m south of the Site within the Milldale North Private Plan Change area, which was lodged with Auckland Council in early-2024. The Site is also located in proximity (ca. 600m) of a proposed education campus intended to feature a primary, intermediate and secondary school on Upper Ōrewa Road which has been identified in the Wainui Future Urban Structure Plan and will be subject to a future Ministry of Education designation process. Sub-regional sports and recreation facilities are currently provided in two locations near the Site at Metro Park (Millwater) and Victor Eaves Park (Ōrewa) 2km and 2.5km away from the Site respectively.

The main employment areas in proximity to the Site are located in Ōrewa Town Centre, the Highgate Industrial area (1.6km south of the Site) and Silverdale Town Centre / Industrial area (3km south of the Site). The proposed Milldale Rapid Transit Station lies adjacent to the Highgate Industrial Area. A major new industrial employment area, Silverdale West, is also proposed and is subject to a lodged Private Plan Change application (PC103), south of Diary Flat Highway approximately 3.2km south of the Site.

3.0 Planning Context

This report is not a planning assessment and is not intended as such. However, an understanding of the AUP provisions, and the wider strategic direction that applies to the Site, are relevant to this urban design assessment to:

- Contextualise the built form and design outcomes that the AUP expects for the site and wider area.
- Focus my assessment on matters for which consent is required under the AUP and provide relevant urban design input to inform the planning assessment.

3.1 National Policy Statement on Urban Development

The National Policy Statement on Urban Development ('NPS-UD') came into effect in August 2020 and requires councils to amend their plans to provide adequately for housing. Areas over which local authorities have jurisdiction are classed as Tier 1, 2 or 3 urban environments. Auckland is classed as a Tier 1 urban environment.

The objectives of the NPS-UD that are of particular relevance to this urban design assessment include:

- Objective 1: New Zealand has well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.
- Objective 3: Regional policy statements and district plans enable more people to live in, and more businesses and community services to be located in, areas of an urban environment in which one or more of the following apply:
 - (a) the area is in or near a centre zone or other area with many employment opportunities
 - (b) the area is well-serviced by existing or planned public transport
 - (c) there is high demand for housing or for business land in the area, relative to other areas within the urban environment.
- Objective 4: New Zealand’s urban environments, including their amenity values, develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities, and future generations.

3.2 Regional Policy Statement

Chapter B2 of the AUP sets out the Regional Policy Statement ('RPS') as it relates to urban growth and form. It establishes a strategic goal for a "quality compact urban form" in Auckland. Implicit within this goal is the need to support residential and commercial intensification.

The policies in the RPS, particularly those policies contained in Section B2.3, include the following issues relevant to this assessment:

- Providing for the re-zoning of Future Urban zoned land to urban zoned land where it supports a quality compact urban form and a range of housing typologies;
- Enabling higher levels of intensification and growth along public transport corridors and near open space;
- Subdivision and development respond to the physical characteristics and intrinsic qualities of the site;
- Ensuring that infrastructure is in place or can be provided to support new development; and
- Promotes the efficient use of land and enables a range of built forms to support choice for a diverse and growing population.

3.3 Auckland Unitary Plan

3.3.1 Zoning

3.3.1.1 Future Urban Zone

The FUZ is applied to land that has been identified as suitable for some level of urbanisation in the future. It effectively functions as a "holding zone" in advance of any rezoning or urban development of the land that seeks to avoid fragmentation of land through rural residential development that could undermine future urbanisation processes. As this application seeks to

enable urbanisation of the land, the FUZ does not provide any particularly useful policy direction with regard to understanding or assessing any urban design effects of the proposal.

3.3.1.2 Residential - Mixed Housing Suburban Zone

The MHS zone is the most widespread residential zone across Auckland and enables development generally to be two-storey detached and attached housing in a variety of types and sizes. Based on a consideration of the site characteristics and the nature of the MHS zone, it is proposed to utilise the MHS zone provisions as a basis for informing an urban design assessment of the application. The rationale for this is set out further in Section 5.1 of this assessment.

Key urban design outcomes associated with MHS zone includes:

- Development is in keeping with the neighbourhood's planned suburban built character of predominantly two storey buildings, in a variety of forms;
- Development provides quality on-site residential amenity for residents and adjoining sites and the street; and
- Development support attractive and safe streets through appropriate landscaping, provision of passive surveillance and the minimisation of garage doors.

3.3.2 Subdivision

As the Site falls within the FUZ, the Subdivision – Rural Chapter ('E39') of the AUP applies. However, as stated in 3.3.1.1 above, the nature of the proposal (involving subdivision of up to 1,213 lots) and the provisions of E39 themselves do not provide a useful reference point for assessing the urban design merits or effects of the application. It is therefore considered more relevant / useful to this urban design assessment to consider the provisions of the Subdivision – Urban Chapter ('E38') of the AUP. Key urban design outcomes associated with E38 include:

- Subdivision provides for the long-term needs of the community and minimises adverse effects of future development on the environment.
- Subdivision has a layout which is safe, efficient, convenient and accessible.
- Subdivision maintains or enhances the natural features and landscapes that contribute to the character and amenity values of the area.
- Subdivision manages adverse effects on historic heritage or Māori cultural heritage.
- Subdivision protects indigenous vegetation or wetlands.

3.4 Reasons for Consent

The proposal requires resource consent for a number of regional and district level activities under the AUP. Overall, as the application is for a residential development on land zoned FUZ, resource consent as a **non-complying activity** is required.

Whilst its status as a non-complying activity means assessment of the application is not restricted to any particular matters, relevant provisions as identified in Section 3.3 above have been used to help inform this urban design assessment.

4.0 Design Response

4.1 Site Opportunities and Constraints

Based on a high-level site analysis in the context of the policy direction provided by the AUP as it relates to matters of urban design, the high-level urban design opportunities and constraints that the Site presents to development are:

- High amenity is afforded over parts of the Site via an elevated, easterly outlook towards the coast and surrounding residential areas as well as northerly outlook over established native forests;
- Several streams, wetlands and overland flow paths run through the site which require development to be setback from their margins;
- There are several large areas of vegetation protected by consent notice and Significant Ecological Areas which need to be protected from future development;
- The riparian margins associated with the above-mentioned features will help to provide for upfront and ongoing amenity and biodiversity values that could be appreciated by future residents;
- Auckland Transport has designated for an arterial road through the centre of the Site which will provide good access to nearby centres including Ōrewa and Milldale (as well as at the Ara Hills development). This road is also intended to act as the main public transport route connecting the Site with the wider areas;
- The underlying topography of the Site and its proximity with existing / future employment areas at Ōrewa, Milldale, Highgate and Silverdale means it is unlikely to be suitable for intensive commercial or industrial development;
- Development will need to tie-into the levels required to deliver the proposed arterial road connection, reduce street connections on to this road and avoid vehicle crossings so as not to undermine its core functions;
- Development should provide for future connections to neighbouring developable land (e.g. FUZ land) to enable the integrated development of these sites to occur;
- Opportunities for passive recreation (e.g. walking) should be supported in areas not suitable for development;
- Blocks and streets should be orientated to maximise solar orientation whilst also responding to the underlying topography and general south-eastern orientation of the land; and
- Lot sizes and roading alignments will need to be cognisant of the underlying topography and seek to minimise any large areas of retaining. Where possible planted batter slopes should be preferred to support on-site and street amenity.

4.2 Key Design Details

Figure 7 below sets out the overall masterplan that is subject to this assessment. Broadly speaking, the masterplan provides for up to 1,213 dwellings, a commercial superlot, one unserviced residential superlot, two neighbourhood parks, other open space areas, areas of protected

vegetation, roads including the NoR 6 road and several private JOALs, and supporting infrastructure (e.g. stormwater management devices). Development is to be delivered over two main stages. Those components of the masterplan which are of relevance to this urban design assessment are discussed further overleaf.




Figure 8 - Proposed Delmore Masterplan (source: Terra Studio)

4.2.1 Streets and JOALS

A total of 26 roads are proposed to be constructed and vested with Auckland Council. The proposed roads comprise one arterial road (the NOR6 road), two minor collector roads and 23 local roads. These roads have, for the most part, been designed to the relevant Auckland Transport standards. Where vehicle crossings are proposed directly onto local roads, the masterplan has adopted an approach of combining these to minimise crossing points and maximise crossing separation.

In addition to the public street network, the masterplan includes provision for a total of 32 private JOALs with varying formed and legal widths (ranging from 4m up to 12m) depending on their location, and the number of lots they service. A number of these JOALs are required to limit vehicle access onto the NOR6 road as well as respond to the awkward site geometry when factoring in fixed development constraints (e.g. covenanted bush). The use of JOALs also helps to maximise the provision of streetscape landscaping and visitor car parking of publicly vested roads.

4.2.2 Proposed Dwellings

Up to 1,213 residential lots and dwellings and one super lot will be provided. It is proposed to construct one dwelling per residential lot. The dwellings will comprise of combination of detached and zero-lot dwellings.

A total of 77 different unit types are proposed. Of these, 22 are standard typologies and encompass most dwellings proposed. A further 55 are bespoke typologies which are typically located on larger and / or irregularly shaped lots. The dwellings will range from three to five bedrooms in size and will vary in height between one and two storeys (approximately 1/3 are one storey and 2/3 are two storeys).

A variety of materials and colours are proposed throughout the development, albeit in a considered manner to establish a consistent “look and feel” across the development. The design of all dwellings (and associated lots) has been based on the MHS zone provisions within the AUP.

4.2.3 Open Spaces

Several different open spaces are proposed across this project. This includes two neighbourhood parks, one each located centrally within the main stages of the development. The Stage 1 Neighbourhood Park encompasses an area of 3,050m² while the Stage 2 Neighbourhood Park encompasses an area of 3,200m² Neighbourhood Park and adjoins the commercial superlot. Vineway Limited are in on-going discussions with Auckland Council regarding the potential acquisition of these parks. Should an agreement be reached, these can be subsequently vested to the Council. In addition to the neighbourhood park, 23 open space ‘drainage reserve’ areas are proposed to be vested to Council along with walking tracks and lookout points within proximity to the neighbouring Nukumea Scenic Reserve. It is currently proposed that the later be retained in private ownership and managed by a residents’ society. However, this part of the development is subject to ongoing conversations with Auckland Council and the Department of Conservation about potential future ownership. Further, extensive restoration and enhancement planting is proposed across the development and around identified watercourses and natural wetlands.

4.3 Response to consultation

The submitted scheme has been influenced and amended in response to comments received from a number of parties, including Auckland Council. Of note to this urban design assessment, the following changes in response to matters raised by Auckland Council’s urban design specialist are set out in the table below.

Auckland Council Comment	Design Response / Comments
<p>The proposal involves a significant re-zoning of the land in the Future Urban Zone (FUZ). This is not considered consistent with the objectives and policies of the zone. Together with the lack of structure planning and private plan change processes, the Planning Framework makes it challenging to assess the application. It is important to understand what has informed the key design decisions with a structure plan study in order to assess</p>	<p>In urban design terms it is considered acceptable to assess the proposal against the MHS zone provisions and Chapter E38 of the AUP.</p> <p>The Site’s relationship with other amenities is set out in Section 2 and Appendix 1 of this assessment. This relationship has helped to inform the proposed residential land-uses and density. Further discussion is provided in Section 5.2 below.</p>

<p>the proposal's suitability of the proposed locations. The arrangement and sizes of urban blocks, proposed density, connectivity within the site and the greater area, locations and hierarchy of open spaces, proximity to centres, potential need for a local centre within the proposal area, and walkability are some of these aspects.</p>	
<p>Lack of connectivity is a concern, acknowledging there are site constraints in respect to SEA's, covenants, streams, topography etc.</p>	<p>The extension of Grand Drive through the Site will provide for good levels of connectivity with the wider urban environment including Ōrewa Town Centre and Milldale Local Centre (as well as other local destinations including schools and open spaces). Connectivity within the site is supported by the adoption of gridded street networks (where practicable) whilst acknowledging the need to respond to the intrinsic qualities and physical characteristics of the site as required by B2.3.1(1)(a) of the RPS. Further analysis is contained in Section 5.3 below.</p>
<p>Future proofing connections should be provided/ safeguarded. These will need to be detailed in the application.</p>	<p>Future roading connections have been provided for through to Russell Road and neighbouring sites to the south of Stage 1 and east of Stage 2. There are additional opportunities to utilise existing paper roads through to the Ara Hills development. However, given the nature of the topography these are likely to be limited to recreational pedestrian connections.</p>
<p>Proposal appears reasonably fragmented. Significant number of cul-de-sac's is a fundamental issue.</p> <p>The proposal is car orientated which is also an issue.</p>	<p>Cul-de-sacs have been largely limited to the periphery of the development (and Rural Urban Boundary) or smaller finger of developable land within the Site. The development of a fully connected street network would require the development of extensive bridge structures which would provide limited connectivity benefits when considering likely usage.</p> <p>As the Site is located at the periphery of the Rural Urban Boundary any development of the Site would likely be car orientated to an extent. Measures to reduce car dominance have been incorporated into the design including the extensive use of JOALs / rear access and the pairing of driveways to provide for streetscape amenity for future pedestrians, inclusion of raised speed tables at key intersections and speed cushions more generally along road alignments to slow vehicle movements. The proposal is also</p>

	seeking to deliver part of the NOR6 road which is intended to function as a key bus and cycling route to the wider area. Further analysis on walking connectivity is contained in Section 5.3 below.
Details of distances (walking distances) to other commercial/ neighbourhood centres should be considered and provided.	This are covered broadly in Section 2 and Appendix 1 of this assessment. Section 5.3 also provides an assessment of future walking distances following implementation of the proposal.
Other services such as recreation areas need to be considered and included in the site analysis.	This are covered broadly in Section 2 and Appendix 1 of this assessment.
Proposal is difficult to support from an Urban Design perspective given the underlying zoning.	This is noted but considered more relevant to an overall planning assessment of the proposal.
Retaining wall design needs to be considered in the design including adjacent street and stream interfaces.	<p>Details of retaining walls are provided within the Civil Drawing Set and Landscape architecture set included within the application.</p> <p>In general, the approach for the development has been to minimise the extent of retaining required through the use of planted batter slopes.</p> <p>The majority of interlot retaining has been kept to heights of less than 1m and has also facilitated the adopted of paired driveway crossing at street level. Additionally, some large retaining has been incorporated into split level dwelling typologies or will also include a stepped profile with landscaping bed. Where retaining fronts streets it is proposed to utilise key stone or masonry types walls to provide a positive interface.</p>

5.0 Assessment

In consideration of the above, this section assesses the proposal against the various provisions associated with the 'MHS zone' and 'E38 Subdivision – Urban' relevant to urban design matters which is considered to provide an appropriate basis for the assessment of this fast-track consent application.

For ease of reference, I have consolidated the key urban design matters identified within Section 3 into the following thematic headings:

- Strategic urban form;
- Future Urban Zone (subdivision);
- Street network and block structure;

- Open space provision and response to the natural features of the site;
- Architecture and on-site amenity;
- Streetscape safety and amenity; and
- Fencing and retaining.

5.1 Strategic Urban Form

It has been noted that the FUZ land around Upper Ōrewa / Wainui has not been specifically identified in any Structure Plans prepared by Auckland Council. To address this, a Concept Structure Plan covering the Upper Orewa area has been developed based on the technical reporting undertaken for this application as well as PC119 to assist both the Panel and Auckland Council in understanding how development of this area can be undertaken in an integrated manner and support a well-functioning urban environment (WFUE). This is included as Appendix 14 to the Substantive Application.

In urban design terms, I do not consider the lack of a Auckland Council prepared or endorsed Structure Plan to be problematic given a suite of investigations and technical documents have been prepared to understand the feasibility of development of the Site (which are a much finer grain of detail than would be undertaken as part of a structure planning process). In addition, a review of the nature of existing and proposed development in wider Ōrewa / Silverdale sub-region (refer to **Figure 9** and **Appendix 1**), combined with the topography of the Site makes it clear that residential uses on the Site would be the most appropriate urban outcome (as opposed to commercial or industrial uses).




Figure 9 - Strategic context of the Site (refer also to Appendix 1)

The location at the periphery means that the catchment for any retail centre would be limited and encompass large areas of rural land, while its urban catchment is already served by a network of

neighbourhood, local and town centres (both existing or proposed). In addition to the larger centres of Milldale and Ōrewa there are a number of existing or proposed smaller neighbourhood centres in close proximity to the Site to help provide for local convenience needs. This includes at the neighbouring Ara Hills and proposed Milldale North development, along with several other neighbourhood centres within 2.4km of the site at Waterloo Reserve, Millwater, Highgate, and Arran Drive. Nevertheless, a small neighbourhood centre is proposed to support local convenience needs of future residents should demand arise.

In terms of industrial activities, Auckland Council has long signalled further expansion in and around Silverdale and Dairy Flat. Agglomeration of industrial activities is considered beneficial as it can support a more productive employment environment and provide for efficiencies in servicing (especially related to transport). Further, typical lot sizes and building dimensions of industrial activities are considered unsuitable for the topography of the Site and would require significant earthworks and retaining structures (several meters high).

Based on the above, predominantly residential uses across the Site (as well as FUZ areas to the south) are considered most appropriate. This residential use would be supported by a number of existing or proposed amenities located in close proximity to the Site including primary, intermediate and secondary schools as well as open spaces. In terms of the detailed application of densities across the Site, the Ara Hills development provides a useful precedent given similar topographical constraints exist (refer to **Figure 10**). Development at Ara Hills (which also falls within the FUZ) is predominantly one to two storeys in detached and attached configurations which is the type of development sought to be enabled through the provisions of the MHS zone. Future stages are also intended to include detached dwellings on larger sites.



Figure 10 - Development consistent with the MHS zone standards at Ara Hills on a sloping road (source: Google Streetview).

The MHS zone is the most widespread zone used throughout Auckland and is applied to both existing neighbourhoods and greenfield sites. The MHS zone is intended to enable intensification, while retaining a suburban built character of one to two storeys in detached and attached typologies. Use of the MHS as the basis of informing development of the Site allows for an efficient use of this land to support the viability on enabling infrastructure while also providing for the amenity values associated with a more suburban environment. The MHS zone also provides for a greater degree of housing choice through more varied (and smaller) sites sizes consistent with the requirements of a well-functioning urban environment and B2.2.1 of the RPS. Consideration of the applying the Single House Zone ('SHZ') was also not considered appropriate or necessary noting that detached housing on larger sites can still be delivered through the framework of the MHS zone. In contrast, the SHZ requires large minimum site sizes and prevents the use of attached typologies. This would serve to limit housing choice and variety, inconsistent with the requirements of a well-functioning urban environment.

Overall, I consider that development consistent with the MHS zone provisions is appropriate in urban design terms given the context of the Site and its surrounds.

5.2 Future Urban Zone (Subdivision)

The FUZ is applied to greenfield land identified as suitable for urbanisation and can best be described as a "holding zone" to prevent use or development of that land in a manner which could undermine eventual urbanisation. From my reading of the AUP, there are two key aspects of the FUZ. Firstly, maintaining larger-scale rural uses and secondly, preventing subdivision of land for the reason just noted.

From an urban design perspective, I would not consider the proposal to be inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the FUZ as they relate to subdivision (the second aspect). As I understand it, these objectives and policies are seeking to prevent fragmentation of the land which has the potential to increase the number of landowners and therefore motivations and abilities to enable future urbanisation. This increase in different landowners and parcels is invariably likely to lead to more piecemeal development and compromise the ability to deliver a comprehensive and well-functioning urban environment.

In this instance, the proposal would result in a subdivision pattern and density of development of the type that could be reasonably expected to occur on the Site given its underlying intended urban use. As I will discuss further in the remaining sections below, the proposal does not raise any adverse urban design effects in relation to the policy framework of the FUZ.

5.3 Street Network and Block Structure

The layout proposed is the logical response to the site based on its size and shape and identified constraints. A Key influence which has informed the development of the street network and overall block structure is the presence of a number of streams, natural wetlands, SEA's and protected bush areas along with the designated NOR6 road alignment. These are effectively "hard constraints" within which future development must be configured and is consistent with the objectives and policies of the AUP. As can be seen in **Figures 11 and 12** the proposal has been arranged such that key connecting roads (and developable land) follows ridgelines through the Site while development has been avoided in gullies resulting in relatively thin ribbons of development across the Site.

The landform of the Site ultimately impacts on the ability for the proposal to connect in with the surrounding environment. Provision has been made for vehicle connections to the south across the stream via the NOR6 road along with roads 1, 10 and 17. Onward connections to the east and west on neighbouring site from the NOR6 road are also probably given the size of them. In addition to these road connections, two pedestrian connections through to Ara Hills have been signalled via Roads 5 and 9. These are identified on **Figure 11**. Connectivity immediately to the north through to Ara Hills would be challenging to achieve given this area has already obtained consent and would require the removal of previously approved development lots.

The blocks themselves have largely adopted consistent depths and regular (rectangular) shapes to help in the development of an efficient and connected network of streets. Deeper blocks and lots have been used strategically to aid in the transition of heights across the Site by facilitating the use of revegetated batter slopes as opposed to very tall retaining. These are particularly noticeable alongside riparian margins.




Figure 11 - Responding to landform: roads follow ridgelines (red) while development is avoided in gullies (blue). Connections with neighbouring sites also shown (black)



Figure 12 - Birds eye view of the development looking north-west (source: Terra Studio)

Overall, based on the context of the Site relative to its existing landform I consider that the street and block structure proposed is acceptable in urban design terms and consistent with the requirements of the RPS and Chapter E38 within the AUP.

5.3.1 Connectivity and Accessibility

Related to the proposed street network and block structure is the wider implications of inter-site connectivity and accessibility to amenities (parks, shops, the future FTN, and schools) for future residents. To understand this, an accessibility analysis was undertaken and is included in Appendix 3.

5.3.1.3 Parks

Regarding **parks**, the analysis demonstrates that 100% of lots proposed are located within an 800m / 10-minute walking catchment of at least one neighbourhood park. Of this, 54% will be located within a 400m / 5-minute walking catchment. In addition, a number of lots will have proximate access to other open spaces in the north-western portion of the site as well as Ara Hills which will support recreational / leisure uses through the provision of walking tracks through these open space areas. This also includes a number of sites which will be located within a 10-minute walk of the already established Ara Hills Playground (off Ara Hills Drive).

5.3.1.4 Shops

Regarding **shops**, the development will also be served by consented commercial lots within the Ara Hills development. The analysis demonstrates that 98% of lots proposed will be located within an 800m / 10-minute walking catchment of local shops. Generally speaking, access to some commercial uses within a 10-minute walking catchment is considered desirable – albeit this aspiration is focussed towards more intensive residential development typologies such as terraced housing and apartments. In this regard, the proposal is more than sufficiently served by commercial services, with more specialised / larger services such as supermarkets available in larger centres such as Milldale (2.3km south-west of the Site) and Orewa (3.2km east of the Site).

5.3.1.5 Public Transport

Regarding the **FTN**, a total of 51% of proposed lots across Delmore will be within an approximate 500m / 6-minute walking catchment of the proposed FTN route which may utilise the NoR6 corridor. A further 33% of lots fall within a 10-minute walking catchment.

A 500m catchment has been adopted as the principal measure to align with targets set out within the Regional Public Transport Plan 2023-2031 (RPTP) whilst a distance of up to 800m / 10-minutes is also identified as appropriate in Auckland Transport's own guidance.¹ Importantly, the RPTP highlights an aspirational target of having 42% of the population of north Auckland living within 500m of the FTN.

Considering the site context at the edge of Auckland's urban area, having 84% of lots located within an approximate 10-minute walking catchment of the FTN is considered to be appropriate. The potential for the future expansion of local bus routes via the minor collector roads through the Site has the potential to enhance this accessibility further. However, these services would require extensive duplication of the FTN route and may not be viable. In this regard it is noted that Auckland Transport has established a programme of on-demand services to extend the reach of public transport services where conventional fixed route services are not suitable. As such, there also remains potential for the further expansion of public transport coverage (via on-demand services) across the development.

5.3.1.6 Schools

Regarding **schools**, a total of 85% of proposed lots across the Site will be within an approximately 1600m / 20-minute walking catchment of MoE proposed primary / secondary school campus located off Upper Orewa Road following completion of the NoR6 Road and the school itself. The most distant lot within Delmore is located approximately 2000m / 25-minutes' walk from the campus.

Extensive research undertaken across New Zealand² has established that a threshold of around 2.25km represents a reasonable walking distance for secondary school students. A shorter distance for primary age students is generally considered desirable (due to the ability of younger children) with a distance of within 1.3km correlated with the highest levels of active travel.³ The prevalence of children travelling to school via active modes decays with increased distance towards 2.3km; past which the chance of students travelling via active modes is reduced to near zero. Detailed analysis of Journey to Education data from the 2018 Census undertaken for Auckland Council⁴ highlights that the average distance to schools for primary aged children was 3.2km, rising to 5.6km for secondary aged children.

Based on these figures, it is considered that the Site will be well served by educational opportunities upon completion of the proposed primary / secondary campus off Upper Orewa Road. In the short-term, primary aged students would likely need to be driven to either Atuhoehoe or Nukumea primary schools and Orewa College, although an existing school bus route to Orewa College is available via Upper Orewa Road. It is noted that this is not an uncommon characteristic of new greenfield areas as the Ministry of Education generally responds to increased demand (from new housing growth) rather than establishing new school capacity in advance of development occurring.

¹ *Urban Street and Road Design Guide*, pg. 51

² Mandic et al., (2023) *Examining the transport to school patterns of New Zealand adolescents by home-to-school distance and settlement types*, Journal of Transport & Health vol. 30

³ Ikeda et al., (2018) *Built environment associates of active school travel in New Zealand children and youth: A systematic meta-analysis using individual participant data*, Journal of Transport & Health vol. 9

⁴ Paling, R. (2020) *Analysis of the 2018 Census Results – Travel to work and Travel to Education in Auckland*.

5.4 Open Space Provision and Response to Natural Features

As discussed in Section 5.3 above, the proposal has been heavily influenced by the physical constraints imposed by the topography of the Site (include streams and gully networks), protected areas of native vegetation and natural wetlands.

The Site itself contains a range of landscape character areas that will contribute to its overall visual quality, amenity, and recreational opportunities. These include existing watercourses, SEAs, native bush revegetation, upper and lower riparian zones, revegetation within private lots, pond edge planting, stormwater ponds, and open recreation spaces (refer Figure 12). The landscape design responds to site-specific conditions, ensuring an integrated and cohesive public and private realm that enhances amenity, outlook, and the overall spatial quality of the site.




Figure 13 – Example of the proposed landscape approach to respond to different site characteristics and existing natural features (source: Greenwoods)

The design prioritises a structured and resilient landscape approach, particularly in riparian and stormwater areas, where planting plays a functional and aesthetic role. Along watercourses, stormwater ponds, and wetland edges, species have been carefully selected to stabilise banks, filter runoff, and support ecological function, ensuring these features are seamlessly integrated into the wider landscape.

The proposal provides for two neighbourhood parks. The Stage 1 park provides for 3,050m² of land that meets all provision metrics set by Auckland Council. Most of the park is flat with some gently sloping land and is integrated with the stream network. The Stage 2 park provides for 3,200m² of land directly adjoining the proposed commercial centre. It is centrally co-located with a large area of bush protected by consent notices and features two road frontages. Most of the proposed park features flat or gently sloping land, although there are areas of steeper sloping land towards the adjacent residential lots. Further discussion on specific design metrics is contained within the Parks Memorandum prepared by Terra Studio.

The proposed parks have been located such that all dwelling lots within the proposal are located within an 800m walk, whilst the majority of lots will be within a 600m walk consistent with Auckland Council's open space provision targets. Areas outside of this 600m will generally also have the benefit of close access to the proposed creational areas and trails close to Noukmea Scenic Reserve as well as neighbourhood parks that have been established within Ara Hills.

Overall, the proposal delivers a high level of visual and recreational amenity, balancing open spaces for community use with more enclosed, immersive bush settings. Canopy trees provide visual interest, shade, and definition of spaces, while underplanting contributes to a rich and textured ground plane that enhances the overall landscape quality. This layered planting approach strengthens wayfinding and site legibility, reinforcing key arrival points, movement corridors, and edges. Over time, the maturing landscape will enhance outlooks for residents, create a sense of enclosure where appropriate, and contribute to a well-defined and enduring public realm.

5.5 Architecture and On-site Amenity

A total of 64 different unit types are proposed. Of these, 22 are standard typologies and 55 are bespoke typologies. The 22 standard typologies can be grouped together into five key groups:

- Three-bedroom, single level;
- Four-bedroom, double level;
- Three-bedroom, two levels;
- Four-bedroom, two levels; and
- Five-bedroom, two levels.

Each of these groups is assessed broadly below in terms of the proposed architectural response and the provision of on-site amenity.

In terms of their positioning within the Site, the approach has been to distribute the different typologies across the development (refer to **Figure 15**). This will ensure some degree of variation in built form outcomes associated with differing building heights, fenestration on street facing façades, roof lines, and materiality. Some typologies have also been intentionally designed to respond to the specific site context over different parts of the development – For example Typology 4G.2-D has been developed as a split-level typology that internalises retaining within a site away from lot boundaries to help manage transitions in ground levels from public roads. Overall, this approach will provide for visual interest across the development. Each of the proposed typologies have also been developed to ensure they appropriately address their street (or JOAL) frontages to provide for engagement and activation of the streetscape (refer **Figure 14** for example).



Figure 14 - Example Street Frontages along Road 1 Looking north-west (source: Terra Studio)




Figure 15 - Proposed distribution of typologies (source: Terra Studio)

5.5.1 3G.1 Three Bedroom with Garage – Single Level

There are seven variations of this typology (3G.1-A to 3G.1-G), with variations 3G.1-A and 3G.1-B offering zero-lot options. The differences between the variations range from subtle changes, such as building widths and depths, to more significant variations, including the building footprint shape and the internal programming of indoor and outdoor spaces.

This typology features a dedicated front door oriented towards the public or communal realm, with footpaths providing direct and legible access. This arrangement enhances wayfinding and activates the streetscape, contributing to a safer and more engaging public environment. Additionally, the typology includes a single garage, which in some variations accommodates a laundry with space for a washing machine and dryer. The internal garage provided in all variations

offers sufficient space for additional shelving or storage to meet the potential needs of future occupants.

The design incorporates a generous outdoor living space that exceeds the standard 20m² required under the AUP for residential zones at ground level. These outdoor spaces are co-located with an internal active habitable room, such as the kitchen, dining, or living area, and align with the required 6m x 4m primary outlook within residential zones of the AUP. This configuration facilitates positive indoor-outdoor flow, enhances amenity for future occupants, and ensures functional use of space.

The internal programming follows a conventional design approach. All variations, except 3G.1-E, include a bedroom oriented towards either the road or the JOAL, depending on which serves as the primary vehicle access for the dwelling. This orientation ensures glazed panels face the public or communal realm, enhancing passive surveillance and contributing to the safety of these areas. Variation 3G.1-E positions the primary living room towards the primary vehicle access, ensuring a high degree of passive surveillance and activation of this space due to the aligned primary outlook. The kitchen, living, and dining areas are arranged in an open-plan configuration, allowing for efficient movement and maximising the use of available space for occupants.

Each bedroom features dedicated wardrobes to enhance amenity and functionality for day-to-day living. Additionally, variations 3G.1-A, 3G.1-B, 3G.1-C, 3G.1-D, 3G.1-E, and 3G.1-G include dedicated storage spaces designed to accommodate typical household items such as linen, mops, buckets, and vacuum cleaners. These provisions contribute to the overall functionality and amenity for future residents.

This typology has been designed to establish a strong and active frontage to the public or communal realm, incorporating sufficient glazing on façades to ensure a high level of passive surveillance over the street or JOAL, in accordance with established Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design ('CPTED') principles. The front yard landscaping includes low-level fencing with gated pedestrian access, complemented by layered soft landscaping such as hedges, low-level amenity planting, and specimen trees, contributing to the quality and amenity of the public or communal realm.

The material palette, which includes timber vertical weatherboards, grooved sheet products, horizontal weatherboards, brick, steel tray roofing, and aluminium joinery, enhances the building's modulation and articulation. This diverse mix of materials, combined with varied roof profiles and architectural features such as gable picture frames and window shrouds across the typologies, adds visual interest and amenity when viewed from the public realm. These design elements collectively contribute to a positive built form outcome, aligning with the anticipated suburban character of the neighbourhood.

This typology has been clustered in evenly distributed pockets across Stages 1 and 2, creating a cohesive yet varied arrangement of building forms throughout the development. This distribution enhances visual interest and reduces monotony within the streetscape. These clusters have been interspersed with other housing types, contributing to a diverse range of housing options that cater to a broad demographic. This approach fosters a socially inclusive and balanced community while supporting a variety of affordability levels and promoting socio-economic diversity.

5.5.2 3.2 Three Bedroom with Garage – Two Level

This typology offers both a zero-lot design and a standard side yard option. It features a dedicated front door carefully oriented towards the public or communal realm, with footpaths providing direct and legible access. This arrangement enhances wayfinding and activates the streetscape, contributing to a safer and more engaging public environment.

A single car pad is located outside the kitchen window, allowing for passive surveillance over the public or communal realm while maintaining privacy within the internal living areas. This ensures a balance between visibility and privacy for future occupants.

The design incorporates a generous outdoor living space that exceeds the standard 20m² required under the AUP for residential zones at ground level. These outdoor spaces are co-located with the internal living area and align with the required 6m x 4m primary outlook under the AUP. This configuration facilitates positive indoor-outdoor flow, enhances amenity for future occupants, and ensures functional use of space.

The internal programming consolidates communal living areas on the ground floor, with the kitchen, living, and dining areas arranged in an open-plan configuration to promote efficient movement and maximise the use of available space. The first floor accommodates three bedrooms, ensuring a high level of amenity and privacy for future occupants. An integrated external storage facility has been incorporated into the dwelling design, providing space for garden maintenance equipment and other household items as an alternative to garage storage.

Each bedroom includes dedicated wardrobes, enhancing functionality for day-to-day living. Additionally, a dedicated internal storage space has been incorporated on the first floor to accommodate household items such as linen, mops, buckets, and vacuum cleaners. These provisions collectively contribute to the overall functionality and amenity for future residents.

This typology has been designed to establish a strong and active frontage to the public or communal realm, incorporating sufficient glazing on façades to ensure a high level of passive surveillance over the street or JOAL, in accordance with CPTED principles. The front yard landscaping includes low-level fencing with gated pedestrian access, complemented by layered soft landscaping such as hedges, low-level amenity planting, and specimen trees, contributing to the overall quality and amenity of the public or communal realm.

The material palette, which includes timber vertical weatherboards, grooved sheet products, horizontal weatherboards, brick, steel tray roofing, and aluminium joinery, enhances the building's modulation and articulation. This diverse mix of materials, combined with varied roof profiles, architectural features such as gable picture frames and window shrouds, as well as recessed and protruding elements, adds visual interest and amenity when viewed from the public realm. These design elements collectively contribute to a positive built form outcome, aligning with the anticipated suburban character of the neighbourhood.

This typology is used sparingly in Stage 1. In Stage 2, it is used more frequently but typically in short runs of one to three lots before being interspersed with other typologies. This approach enhances variation within the streetscape and provides a range of housing options to cater to a diverse mix of occupants, fostering a socially inclusive and balanced community.

5.5.3 4G.1 Four Bedroom with Garage – Single Level

This typology has three variations. Variation 4G.1-A offers both a zero-lot configuration and a standard side yard option. Variations 4G.1-A and 4G.1-C are similar, with the primary difference being that 4G.1-C includes a tandem (double) garage, while 4G.1-A has a single garage. As a result of this difference, these variations also have subtle distinctions in bedroom, wardrobe, and bathroom layouts. Variation 4G.1-B features a single garage along with an additional single bedroom or study, enhancing the overall amenity of the dwelling.

This typology features a dedicated front door carefully oriented towards the public or communal realm, with footpaths providing direct and legible access. This arrangement enhances wayfinding and activates the streetscape, contributing to a safer and more engaging public environment. Additionally, the proposed garage associated with this typology accommodates the laundry (washing machine and dryer) along with additional space for shelving or other storage facilities to meet the needs of future occupants.

The design incorporates a generous outdoor living space that exceeds the standard 20m² required under the AUP for residential zones at ground level. These outdoor spaces are co-located with the internal living area and align with the required 6m x 4m primary outlook under the AUP. This configuration facilitates positive indoor-outdoor flow, enhances amenity for future occupants, and ensures functional use of space.

The internal programming follows a conventional design approach, with all variations featuring a bedroom oriented towards either the road or the JOAL, depending on which serves as the primary vehicle access for the dwelling. This orientation ensures glazed panels face the public or communal realm, enhancing passive surveillance and contributing to the safety of these areas. The kitchen, living, and dining areas are arranged in an open-plan layout, promoting efficient movement and maximising the use of available space for occupants.

Each bedroom is equipped with dedicated wardrobes to enhance amenity and functionality for day-to-day living. These typologies also provide ample internal storage, with variation 4G.1-A featuring a single dedicated storage cupboard and variation 4G.1-B incorporating two. These storage spaces are designed to accommodate typical household items such as linen, mops, buckets, and vacuum cleaners, contributing to the overall functionality and amenity for future residents.

This typology has been designed to establish a strong and active frontage to the public or communal realm, incorporating sufficient glazing on façades to ensure a high level of passive surveillance over the street or JOAL, in accordance with CPTED principles. The front yard landscaping includes low-level fencing with gated pedestrian access, complemented by layered soft landscaping such as hedges, low-level amenity planting, and specimen trees, contributing to the overall quality and amenity of the public or communal realm.

The material palette, which includes timber vertical weatherboards, grooved sheet products, horizontal weatherboards, brick, steel tray roofing, and aluminium joinery, enhances the building's modulation and articulation. This diverse mix of materials, combined with varied roof profiles, architectural features such as gable picture frames and window shrouds, as well as recessed and protruding elements, adds visual interest and amenity when viewed from the public realm. These design elements collectively contribute to a positive built form outcome, aligning with the anticipated suburban character of the neighbourhood.

This typology has been used relatively sparingly in Stage 1, appearing in short runs along Road 2 and further south along Roads 1 and 3, interspersed with other typologies. In Stage 2, it is again used selectively but appears in slightly longer runs of between four to nine dwellings adjacent to Roads 16 and 17, where deeper rear yards back onto open space. Additionally, several smaller clusters are located further south in Stage 2, along with a single dwelling near the intersection with Upper Ōrewa Road. This approach contributes to a varied streetscape character and broadens the range of housing options, catering to larger families that require additional space. This, in turn, fosters a socially inclusive and balanced community.

5.5.4 4G.2 Four Bedroom with Garage – Two Level

There are seven variations of this typology (4G.2-A to 4G.2-G). Variations 4G.2-A, B, and F follow a conventional design and are suited to sites with minimal topographical constraints, although 4G.2-F is a wider and shorter typology compared to A and B. All three variations feature a single internal garage, open-plan ground-floor kitchen, dining, and living spaces, with bedrooms located on the first floor.

Variations 4G.2-C and D are designed as split-level typologies, with the primary entrance, front door, double garage, and vehicle access located at the lower level. This level also accommodates two bedrooms, a bathroom, and a staircase leading to the first floor. The first floor includes an additional two bedrooms, an open-plan kitchen, dining, and living area, and access to a decking area that serves as the primary outdoor living space.

Typology 4G.2-E is also a split-level design but is accessed from the upper level, which features a double garage, a single bedroom, and an outdoor living space co-located with the open-plan kitchen, dining, and living area. The design steps down the slope to a lower level, where three additional bedrooms and a laundry are situated. These bedrooms have direct access to a communal decking space, which provides outlook over a battered slope to a stream or open space area.

All variations feature a dedicated front door oriented towards the public or communal realm, with footpaths providing direct and legible access. This arrangement enhances wayfinding and activates the streetscape, contributing to a safer and more engaging public environment. All variations include a garage that can accommodate additional shelving or storage to meet the potential needs of future occupants.

Each variation includes a generous outdoor living space that exceeds the minimum 20m² required under the AUP for residential zones at ground level. These outdoor spaces are co-located with an internal active habitable room, such as the kitchen, dining, or living area, and align with the required 6m x 4m primary outlook under the AUP. This configuration promotes a strong indoor-outdoor connection, enhances amenity for future occupants, and ensures functional use of space. The kitchen, living, and dining areas are arranged in an open-plan layout, facilitating efficient movement and maximising the use of available space.

Each bedroom features dedicated wardrobes to enhance amenity and functionality for day-to-day living. Additionally, variations 4G.2-A, B, C, and F provide dedicated storage spaces designed to accommodate typical household items such as linen, mops, buckets, and vacuum cleaners. Variations 4G.2-D and E do not provide dedicated storage spaces; however, the associated double garages have sufficient space to accommodate additional shelving or storage units if required. These provisions contribute to the overall functionality and amenity for future residents.

These variations have been designed to establish a strong and active frontage to the public or communal realm, incorporating sufficient glazing on façades to ensure a high level of passive surveillance over the street or JOAL, in accordance with CPTED principles. The front yard landscaping typically includes low-level fencing with gated pedestrian access, complemented by layered soft landscaping such as hedges, low-level amenity planting, and specimen trees, contributing to the overall quality and amenity of the public or communal realm.

The material palette, which includes timber vertical weatherboards, grooved sheet products, horizontal weatherboards, brick, steel tray roofing, and aluminium joinery, enhances the building's modulation and articulation. This diverse mix of materials, combined with varied roof profiles and architectural features such as gable picture frames and window shrouds, as well as recessed and protruding elements, adds visual interest and amenity when experienced from the public realm. These design elements collectively contribute to a positive built form outcome, aligning with the anticipated suburban character of the neighbourhood.

These typologies have been strategically positioned within Stage 1 in areas with greater level changes and more pronounced topographical constraints (see Figure 15 for example). For example, variation 4G.2-D has been extensively used along the edge of Road 1, where there is a significant level change westward towards JOAL 3 and the open space beyond. Many of these lots benefit from an enhanced outlook and outdoor living space, which has been integrated with adjoining open space areas. This variation has also been applied extensively along the southern edge of NOR 6, which sits at a higher grade than JOAL 11, located directly to the south, effectively managing slope within the lots rather than at the street interface.



Figure 16 - Axonometric view showing the approach to split level typologies to help address topographical changes (source: Terra Studio)

In areas with more level terrain and fewer topographical constraints, variations 4G.2-A, B, and F have been utilised. These typologies have often been designed with deeper lots that integrate with adjoining open space areas, effectively extending the private outdoor living environment.

This typology has been extensively used in Stage 2, generally arranged in longer clusters. A similar approach has been taken as in Stage 1, with split-level typologies utilised in areas with greater topographical constraints and the more conventional variations (4G.2-A, B, and F) applied in flatter terrain. Many of these lots also adjoin open space areas and feature slightly deeper rear yards, enhancing outlook quality and overall amenity for future occupants.

5.5.5 5G.2 Five Bedroom with Garage – Two Level

This larger typology offers both a zero-lot and side yard option. It features a dedicated front door oriented towards the public or communal realm, with a footpath providing direct and legible access. This arrangement enhances wayfinding and activates the streetscape, contributing to a safer and more engaging public environment. The typology includes an internal single garage with an adjacent car pad. A front yard patio, positioned outside the dining room window, provides opportunities for passive surveillance over the public or communal realm, reinforcing CPTED principles.

The design incorporates a generous outdoor living space that exceeds the standard 20m² required under the AUP for residential zones at ground level. These outdoor spaces are co-located with the internal living area and align with the required 6m x 4m primary outlook under the AUP. This configuration facilitates positive indoor-outdoor flow, enhances amenity for future occupants, and ensures functional use of space.

The internal programming consolidates communal living areas on the ground floor, with the kitchen, living, and dining areas arranged in an open-plan configuration to promote efficient movement and maximise the use of available space. The ground floor also includes a bedroom with direct access to the rear ground floor patio, enhancing amenity and outlook for future occupants. The first floor accommodates the remaining four bedrooms, ensuring privacy and a high level of amenity for residents, separated from the kitchen, dining, and living areas downstairs.

Each bedroom includes dedicated wardrobes, with Bedroom 5 utilising storage under the stairs, enhancing functionality for day-to-day living. Additionally, a dedicated internal storage space has been incorporated on the first floor to accommodate household items such as linen, mops, buckets, and vacuum cleaners. These provisions collectively contribute to the overall functionality and amenity for future residents.

This typology has been designed to establish a strong and active frontage to the public or communal realm, incorporating sufficient glazing on the façades to ensure a high level of passive surveillance over the street or JOAL, in accordance with CPTED principles. The front yard landscaping comprises low-level fencing with gated pedestrian access, complemented by layered soft landscaping, including hedges, low-level amenity planting, and specimen trees, contributing to the quality and amenity of the public or communal realm.

The material palette, which includes timber vertical weatherboards, grooved sheet products, horizontal weatherboards, brick, steel tray roofing, and aluminium joinery, enhances the building's modulation and articulation. This diverse mix of materials, combined with varied roof profiles, architectural features such as gable picture frames and window shrouds, as well as recessed and protruding elements, adds visual interest and amenity when viewed from the public realm. These design elements collectively contribute to a positive built form outcome, aligning with the anticipated suburban character of the neighbourhood.

This typology has been extensively used in Stage 1, typically in clusters of four to seven dwellings, interspersed with other typologies. It has also been utilised extensively in Stage 2, with some much longer runs. For example, in the northern portion of Stage 2, a continuous row of 23 dwellings is located just south of Road 17. In this instance, the primary outdoor living space is predominantly oriented to the south; however, the front yard patio offers an alternative outdoor living option, accessible from the open-plan kitchen, dining, and living area, ensuring reasonable sunlight access for future occupants. The variations in architectural form and colour associated with this typology, along with its integration with other typologies, contribute to a varied streetscape and provide a range of housing options and price points, supporting a diverse mix of future occupants and fostering a socially inclusive and balanced community.

5.5.6 Bespoke Designs

A total of 55 bespoke designed dwellings are proposed. These are contained within the Stage 1 portion of the development (refer to **Figure 15**). For the most part these are located on larger (usually at least 300m², but generally much greater) or irregularly shaped lots across the development including several corner lots. They range in floor area between 102m² and 172m² and the same architectural design philosophy applied to the standard typologies has been adopted for the design of the bespoke dwellings. This includes street activation through the placement of windows and habitable rooms, varied yet coherent materiality / colour, and are of a suburban character that integrates well with the wider development. Given their location, many of these lots also benefit from an extended outlook over adjoining open space areas or streets where outdoor living spaces are also co-located. This will help to support good levels of on-site amenity for future residents.



Figure 17 - Bespoke Typology Locations (source: Terra Studio)

5.5.7 On-lot landscaping

The on-lot landscape strategy applies to all typologies and integrates a diverse mix of specimen tree planting, hedging, and groundcover species, reinforcing the visual quality, identity, and character of the development. This approach ensures a well-structured and contextually responsive landscape, enhancing the relationship between built form, private outdoor spaces, and the streetscape.

In front yards, the strategy focuses on softening the visual impact of built form and hardscape materials, contributing to a cohesive and visually appealing streetscape. A selection of small to medium-sized trees is proposed along street and JOAL frontages, helping to define key movement corridors and reinforce the landscape framework. These trees provide visual interest, shade, and a sense of scale, ensuring a positive interface between public and private spaces. The understorey planting includes structured hedging and complementary low-growing species, arranged in layered clusters to introduce depth, texture, and variation while maintaining a low-maintenance and resilient planting palette. This enhances pedestrian amenity, creating a welcoming and well-integrated streetscape environment.

In rear yards, the strategy prioritises privacy, outlook, and amenity, incorporating a mix of specimen trees, mass native planting for steeper areas, and structured hedging. Specimen trees provide canopy cover and visual screening, while hedging defines property boundaries without creating rigid or enclosed spaces. In lots with steeper gradients, mass native planting has been proposed, reducing maintenance demands for residents, improving site stability, and contributing to broader ecological restoration objectives. The native-dominant species palette ensures a seamless integration with the surrounding natural landscape, reinforcing biodiversity values while supporting a coherent and visually balanced development.

5.6 Streetscape Safety and Amenity

5.6.1 Streets

Streetscape amenity will be supported through the provision of a combination of street trees, communal rain gardens and vegetation within riparian margins where stream crossings are required. Additional streetscape amenity will also be provided by proposed front yard landscaping set out within the Landscaping Plans. Further detail is provided within the Landscape Memo prepared by Greenwood Associates, which should be read in conjunction with this assessment.

The proposed street designs include grass berms and indented car parking bays, which I support as it has the effect of visually narrowing the width of the vehicular aisles, and promoting slower vehicle speeds. These also include numerous opportunities for street trees as indicated on the landscape plans and discussed in Section 5.6.2 below. In conjunction with the proposed housing typologies (typically of two-storeys) with consistent set-backs along streets and front yard specimen tree planting, an enclosed and visually engaging streetscape will eventuate as vegetation matures (refer **Figure 16**).



Figure 18 - Artistic Render showing a typical streetscape (source: Terra Studios)

Within any street environment there are a range of, sometimes competing, factors that need to be taken into consideration. These include requirements for street lighting/servicing, stormwater treatment and conveyance, bin placement, car parking and ensuring safe manoeuvring routes for vehicles, in particular emergency vehicles and rubbish trucks. It is considered that the proposal, represents an acceptable compromise between these functions to deliver appropriate levels of streetscape amenity in line with the expectations for greenfield subdivision as set out within the AUP.

5.6.2 Street trees

The proposed street tree strategy has been thoughtfully designed and contextually responsive, enhancing the public realm and reinforcing a cohesive, high-quality streetscape character. The selection and placement of species improve visual legibility, providing a consistent landscape framework that strengthens individual street identity and spatial definition. Strategically positioned trees are provided at regular intervals (generally varying between 10 to 20m) and define key movement corridors, offering shade, enclosure, and wayfinding cues, while also supporting urban biodiversity (refer **Figure 19**). This approach contributes to a well-connected, pedestrian-friendly environment, ensuring a streetscape that is both functional and visually engaging.



Figure 19 - Example of the proposed approach to street tree plantings in Stage 2B-3 (source: Greenwoods)

The proposed species palette includes a wide range of native species with a diverse mix of broadleaf and structural species introduces variation in foliage, texture, and colour, enhancing visual richness and ensuring a dynamic, evolving canopy over time.

The proposal also aligns with Auckland Council's Urban Ngahere Strategy, increasing urban canopy cover and vegetative density. Where possible, vehicle crossings have been paired, allowing for a greater number of street trees and maximising green infrastructure benefits, including shade provision, urban heat mitigation, and improved air quality.

5.6.3 JOALs

JOALs have been utilised to accommodate vehicle access and car parking for all units fronting NOR6 as well as a number of other roads through the Site. This is in preference to accessing car parking directly off these public streets and has also been utilised to help manage the change in levels across the Site due to the underlying topography. I support this approach, and consider it to be a positive outcome of the Proposal and in line with recommendations contained within the Auckland Design Manual ("ADM") and best practice urban design.

This has ensured that car parking for a large portion of the development has been screened from what will be the more frequently trafficked routes past and through the Site and has also enabled for good provision of on-street parking across the development which is an important amenity for future residents that can help cater to the needs of visitors (e.g. trades, relatives). In addition, this will increase the extent of landscaping (via both front yard and specimen tree planting along the street corridor) that can be viewed along streets in the development as opposed to car parking. This will support high levels of visual amenity throughout the development.

In limited instances, JOALs have been used as a frontage device / semi-street where pedestrian access to a front door is required (for example JOALs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 36, and 39). Where this has occurred, wider JOAL environments have been provided. These are typically either 10m or 12m width has been provided so as to allow at least one publicly usable footpath in addition to some landscaping (refer Figure 20) and varied hardscape surfaces. Further landscaping (including

specimen tree planting) is proposed within the “front yards” of dwellings which directly front onto these JOALs providing further amenity in these spaces which will assist in giving them a character as a “narrow street” rather than a space purely for vehicular access.




Figure 20 - Wider JOAL Cross-sections (source: Mckenzie & Co)

5.6.4 Safety

With regards to safety, the main area with which urban design is concerned relates to the general design and configuration of open space (including streets) and its relationship with adjacent built form. Issues around traffic or pedestrian safety are also an important consideration. However, the design of streets and vehicles access are heavily regulated through a range of engineering standards and codes. As such, no detailed comment is made on these.

I do note that speed cushions are proposed throughout the development to help encourage slower vehicle speeds. In addition, raised speed tables are provided along key intersections (particularly along the NOR6 road) which also encourage slower vehicle speeds and signal a degree of priority to pedestrian movements.

In addition to transport engineering matters, the proposed typologies and landscaping plans demonstrate a consideration to providing for a degree of activation of street edges through the placement of front doors and windows to habitable rooms fronting streets. This will provide opportunities for passive surveillance of the street space which can help increase both perceived and actual levels of safety. In addition, proposed fencing (as discussed further in Section 5.7 below) is proposed to be kept low and visually permeable so as to avoid undermining the architectural response on street facing façades.

5.7 Fencing and Retaining

5.7.1 Retaining

The overall scale of earthworks and retaining proposed is in my opinion appropriate given the practical need for flat building platforms associated with the low-to-medium density housing proposed. The scale of retaining walls is generally low (under 1m) and in a number of instances the building platform has been altered relative to the ground level so as to minimise further landform modifications. It is also understood that many of these retaining structures have been included to help facilitate the introduction of paired driveway crossings onto streets to help accommodate increased levels of street tree planting and roadside carparking. The extent of retaining and their overall height could be reduced further by unpairing driveways however it is considered that this would have overall negative impacts on streetscape amenity. Based on the above, and consistent with the analysis at Section 5.3 it is considered that the proposal generally works with, and is compatible with, the natural landform of the Site, and has minimised unnecessary modifications.

To reduce the requirement for retaining, it is noted that many of the proposed lots incorporate sloping batters within rear yards, generally at 1:3 grades, allowing for planting on slopes to provide erosion control and support long-term revegetation. Where retaining walls are required along street frontages or public spaces, their height has been kept to a minimum to mitigate potential visual effects. It is understood that these walls will be constructed from keystone (or similar) materials, ensuring a cohesive and visually integrated public realm interface (refer to **Figure 21**).



Figure 21 - Example of a typical street incorporating a keystone retaining wall along the street frontage
(source: Terra Studio)

In addition, raised garden walls are proposed to be incorporated into large retaining structures to help reduce any potential visual impact associated with combined retaining fence heights across the development (refer **Figure 22**).




Figure 22 - Typical Interlot Retaining Wall Detail (source: Greenwoods)

In urban design terms the proposal is consistent with the AUP's intended outcomes for how subdivision and development should respond to landform, landscape, and natural features.

5.7.2 Fencing

The fencing strategy incorporates a range of typologies to respond to site-specific conditions, ensuring privacy, security, and positive integration with the streetscape. This approach establishes a well-defined yet open edge condition between public and private realms while maintaining visual and physical permeability where appropriate. The broader strategy includes boundary security fencing, visually permeable fencing, and open security fencing, with tailored treatments for rear yards, street frontages, JOAL frontages, and reserve interfaces.

In rear yards, fencing is supported by specimen tree planting, introducing vertical scale, enhancing canopy cover, and improving visual amenity. Larger shrubs and hedging are incorporated along some rear boundaries to soften the visual impact of retaining walls with fencing above, mitigating the potential dominance of tall, combined structures. Where steep slopes exist, native mass planting is used, reducing maintenance demands while contributing to site revegetation and erosion control.

For lots adjoining reserves, a 1.8m high visually permeable security fence is typically proposed, allowing for passive surveillance while maintaining security and privacy for future residents. In most cases, this fencing is located on sloping areas at a lower level than adjacent outdoor living spaces, enabling clear sightlines over the fence. Over time, the fence will be visually softened or

entirely screened by native revegetation planting, ensuring a naturalised interface while maintaining security and a positive outlook for future occupants.

Along street and JOAL frontages, the strategy balances privacy requirements with a visually open and active edge condition. Outdoor living areas that interface with these spaces incorporate visually permeable 1.8m fencing coupled with hedging, ensuring privacy where primary outdoor living courts are located. In areas with lower privacy requirements, fencing is reduced to 1.2m, maintaining a sense of openness while maintaining definition to property boundaries. This approach supports a quality public realm environment, minimising any potential visual dominance effects associated with taller fences while fostering a positive relationship between dwellings and the street.


6.0 Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposed development:

- Appropriately responds to landform, landscape, and natural features present on the Site;
- Will contribute positively to the continued urbanisation of the Upper Ōrewa / Wainui area;
- Through the street network proposed, and in the context of identified site constraints, will support connectivity with the local area and established networks to key destinations including the local centre, neighbourhood centre, schools and open spaces via the NOR6 road;
- Will contribute to housing variety and choice within the Upper Ōrewa / Wainui area by providing a range of lot sizes across detached, duplex and terraced housing typologies;
- Will deliver appropriate levels of on-site amenity to all dwellings through a range of design measures; and
- Provides a layout that will enable activation and passive surveillance over streets and public open spaces.

Overall, I consider that the proposal is appropriate to its context, will result in a development that responds to the unique characteristics of the site and the proposed subdivision pattern is consistent with the expectations associated with the type of urbanisation that could be reasonably anticipated for the Site. In my opinion, this is consistent with good urban design practice.

Appendix 1 – Upper Orewa Strategic Context Plan



Legend


- Rural Urban Boundary
- Application Site
- Water
- Waterbodies
- State Highways / Interchanges
- Existing Arterial Roads
- Proposed or Upgraded Arterial Roads
- Existing Collector Roads
- Proposed or Upgraded Collector Roads
- Proposed Rapid Transit Route
- Proposed Rapid Transit Stations
- Hibiscus Coast Rapid Transit Station / Park 'n' Ride
- Existing or Proposed Greenway Routes
- Primary School
- Secondary School
- Composite School (Primary & Secondary)
- Key Existing or Proposed Parks
- Key Existing or Proposed Centres
- Existing or Proposed Residential Areas
- Centre Zones
- Employment Areas
- Schools
- Sports Fields
- Other Open Spaces
- Strategic Transport Corridor
- Future Urban Zone
- Probable Future Residential Areas
- Significant Ecological Areas
- Proposed Milldale North Ecological Protection Area Network

Notations


- Proposed Grand Drive Extension Route (N.O.R)
- Ara Hills Residential Development (Consented)
- Strathmill Residential Development (Consented)
- Proposed MoE Campus
- Milldale North (Private Plan Change)
- Milldale (Live Zoned / Under development)
- Milldale Local Centre (Consented)
- Wainui West (Private Plan Change)
- Highgate Industrial Area
- Silverdale West Industrial Area (Private Plan Change)
- Silverdale Town Centre
- Orewa Town Centre

**Upper Orewa
Strategic Context Plan**


Appendix 2 – Accessibility Analysis




- Primary / Secondary School
- Neighbourhood Centre / Shops
- Park
- Road / JOAL
- Open Space
- Centre
- <400m
- 400-800m



- Primary / Secondary School
- Neighbourhood Centre / Shops
- Park
- Road / JOAL
- Open Space
- Centre
- <400m
- 400-800m
- >800m



- Primary / Secondary School
- Neighbourhood Centre / Shops
- Park
- Road / JOAL
- Open Space
- Centre
- <800m
- 800-1600m
- >1600m



- Primary / Secondary School
- Neighbourhood Centre / Shops
- Park
- Road / JOAL
- Open Space
- Centre
- <500m
- 500-800m
- >800m