

Decision following the hearing of an application for resource consent under the Resource Management Act 1991

Proposal

For a combined Land Use and Subdivision for a 20-unit Integrated Residential Development and villa relocation. These residential units will be contained within three (3) buildings, identified as the “Surrey Building”, “Courtyard Building”, and “Villa”. Two vehicle crossings will be constructed along Browning Street and Firth Road.

Pursuant to s133A of the RMA 1991 minor correction has been made in the decision to include one submitter (paragraph 41) and a correction to the name of the submitter, Charmaine Pountney

This resource consent is **GRANTED**. The reasons are set out below.

Application number:	BUN60317193
Site address:	11 Surrey Crescent, Grey Lynn
Applicant:	Cohaus Group
Hearing commenced:	Wednesday 26 and Thursday 27 September, and Monday 29 October 2018
Hearing panel:	Dr Lee Beattie (Chairperson) Heike Lutz Pamela Peters
Appearances:	<p><u>For the Applicant:</u> Douglas Allan, Counsel Marianne Riley, Cohaus Concept David Welch, Consultation/Engagement Thom Gill, Architecture Brendon Verhoeff, Engineering Bronwyn Coomer-Smit, Transport John Parlane, Transport Graham Burgess, Architect Jeremy Salmond, Architect Rebecca Skidmore, Urban Design Gerard Thompson, Planner</p> <p><u>For the Submitters:</u> Tanya Cumberland and Charmaine Pountney Mike Brooker and Sue Gower William Muir on behalf of Dr Laretta Alessi and Graham Muir Toby Hilles Alison Munro</p>

	Penny Buckley and David Wren on behalf of David and Penny Buckley <u>For Council:</u> Matthew Wright, Team Leader Margot Thomson, Planner Sam Shumane, Traffic Engineer John Mackay, Urban Designer Priyanka Misra, Specialist Built Heritage Kate Brill, Auckland Transport Paulette Kenihan, Senior Hearings Advisor
Hearing adjourned	27 September and 29 October 2018
Commissioners' site visits	Wednesday, 20 September and Monday 8 October 2018
Hearing Closed:	12 November 2018

Introduction

1. This decision is made on behalf of Auckland Council (**'the Council'**) by Independent Hearing Commissioners Dr Lee Beattie (Chairperson), Heike Lutz and Pamela Peters, appointed and acting under delegated authority under sections 34 and 34A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**'the RMA'**).
2. This decision contains the findings from our deliberations on the application for resource consent and has been prepared in accordance with section 113 of the RMA.
3. The applications were publicly notified on 25 June 2018. A total of 16 submissions were received, with five in support and 11 in opposition. Their locations and basis of these submissions have been summarised in Section 5 of Mr Wright's s.42A report. We would like to thank the submitters for access to their properties during our second site visit.
4. In reaching our decision we have considered:
 - The application, its AEE and all its supporting documents and plans;
 - The Council officer's s.42A report, and amendment, with supporting reports attached to his s.42A report;
 - The pre-circulated Evidence in Chief from the applicant;
 - The written submissions from the submitters to the application, including Mr Wren's planning evidence;
 - The submissions from the applicant's Legal Counsel and evidence provided at the hearing;
 - The responses to our questions to all the parties during the hearing process;

- The Applicant's right of reply and further evidence;
- Relevant sections of the Auckland Unitary Plan: Operative in Part (AUP: OP); and
- Undertaken two site visits, including from a number of the submitters properties.

Summary of proposal and activity status

5. The proposal and the required resource consents are set out in detail within Section 3 of Mr Wright's s.42A report. There was no disagreement between the parties or the planners present at the hearing (Mr Wright, Mr Thompson and Mr Wren) regarding the consents required and as a result these are adopted for our decision. In essence, the applicant sought combined Land Use and Subdivision consent for a 20-unit Integrated Residential Development and villa relocation at 11 Surrey Crescent, Grey Lynn as a Discretionary Activity.
6. We would like to note at this stage that while the application and associated AEE and supporting reports referred to a co-housing concept as the basis for their proposal, their application was formally framed as an Integrated Residential Development.¹ Which is defined as in the AUP: OP as:

A residential development on sites greater than 2,000m² which includes supporting communal facilities such as recreation and leisure facilities, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (inclusive of hospital care), and other non-residential activities accessory to the primary residential use. For the avoidance of doubt this would include a retirement village.²

7. This is a point we shall return to in more detail later on in this decision, save to say at this point that we considered the application in this light, and this was asked of us by Mr Allan in his closing submission and in response to our questions.
8. Overall the proposal has been considered as a discretionary activity. Again, there was no disagreement between the parties over the activity status and this has been adopted for our decision.
9. In terms of the site and its context, while there was disagreement over the potential and actual effects the proposal could generate on the local environment, there was no disagreement over the site description set out in the applicant's AEE and Mr Wright's s.42A report. As a result, we adopt this site description for our decision.

Procedural matters

10. Initially there was a suggestion in Mr Wright's s.42A report that Ms Adrienne Wong's submission was not received within the statutory timeframes. However, this was clarified at the hearing as being incorrect. As a result, we were not required to make

¹ Section 6.1 of Mr Thompson's AEE dated 21 March 2018

² Section J (Definitions AUP: OP)

a determination on whether or not to accept this submission. However, we note for completeness that Mr Allan would not have opposed a “late” submission from Ms Wong in any event.

11. While potentially technically not a procedural matter Mr Allan brought to our attention, in light of the 2017 RMA amendment, which this application was subject to, the inability of any of the parties to appeal our decision to the Environment Court. In light of this he asked us to issue an interim decision should we have any concerns, which would then give the applicant the ability to address these concerns before we make our final determination on the application. While we acknowledge this approach is available to us, as will become apparent through the rest of this decision we did not think this approach was required and we had sufficiently reliable comprehensive information to make our decision, which was tested during the hearing process.
12. We sought clarification from the applicant over the actual age of the villa on site, as it was suggested that it was post 1900’s (1913). However, we were, following advice from the applicant (Mr Allan) advised that if it could be pre-1900’s and potentially requiring consent for its relocation under other pieces of legislation. However, this is not within our jurisdiction and would be an issue for the applicant to address should we be of a view to grant consent.
13. Finally, we received an Addendum s.42A report from Mr Wright dated 21 September 2018 before the hearing. In this short Addendum Mr Wright amended his recommendation to us, from refusal to approval of consent. Indeed, this is not uncommon or inappropriate for experts to do and they can, and will change their views based on new information and facts coming to light. In this situation Mr Wrights initial recommendation was “*very finely balanced*” and his view changed in receipt of further traffic engineering evidence addressing his concerns over these matters.³

Relevant statutory provisions considered

14. In accordance with section 104 of the RMA, we have had regard to the relevant statutory provisions including the relevant sections of Part 2 and section(s) 104 and 104B, 105, 106, 107 and (for conditions) 108.

Relevant standards, policy statements and plan provisions considered

15. In accordance with section 104(1)(b)(i)-(vi) of the RMA, we have had regard to the relevant policy statements and plan provisions of the following documents.
 - Regional Policy Statement (Auckland Unitary Plan: Operative in Part) (AUP: OP))

³ Section 2 of Mr Wrights s.42A report dated 2 September 2018

- District Plan (AUP: OP)
 - Regional Plan (AUP: OP)
16. There are no other national environmental standards, policy statements, regulations, plans or legislation relevant to this application. There are also no other matters we have been referred to that may apply under s104(1)(c).

Local Board comments

17. As set out in Mr Wright's s.42A report (Section 2) and the applicant's AEE we were advised that the applicants had presented their scheme at an ordinary meeting of the Waitemata Local Board under the 'public forum'. We understand that they received a positive response in that forum from the Chairperson. The Local Board did not provide a written response.
18. However, of relevance to us, we were advised that the Waitemata Local Board members comments on the proposed application were sought on 19 April 2018 and that no formal comment had been received for us to take into account as part of this hearing process.

Summary of evidence heard

19. The Council planning officer's (Mr Wright) s.42A report was circulated prior to the hearing and taken as read, noting that an amended s.42A report was also received just before the hearing, as we have discussed above. Mr Wright recommended approval, subject to the appropriate conditions of consent.
20. The Evidence in Chief from the applicant's experts and Mr Wren (planner) on behalf of Mr and Mrs Buckley (submitter, 8 Firth Road) were circulated prior to the hearing and was taken as read. The further evidence presented by and on behalf of the applicant and the submitters at the hearing is summarised below.
21. In doing so, we note that the following is a summary of the key issues raised and must be read in conjunction with the actual legal submissions, pre-circulated evidence in chief, submission from the submitters, and evidence and statements presented at or after the hearing. To reduce repetition, we concentrate on matters relating to the areas of contention between the parties.

For the Applicant

22. **Mr Douglas Allan:** Barrister, set out the proposal, the site context and the relevant legal framework for us to consider as a Discretionary Activity. As discussed above, he advised of his desire for an interim decision should we have any concerns about the proposal. He considered the site's history, highlighted the key aspects of the local environment and the areas in contention between the parties, including:
- Carparking issues and traffic;
 - The impact of the proposal on the Single House Zone; and

- The implications of the proposal on the Special Character Overlay (Overlay).
23. In light of the evidence he recommended that we approve the application, subject to the appropriate conditions of consent. We asked Mr Allan as to how we should address Part 2 of the RMA and he advised us that given the up-to-date nature of the AUP: OP we need not go back to Part 2 in this case.
 24. **Ms Marianne Riley:** future resident, spoke to her evidence in chief (which was taken as read) and she produced a limited piece of supplementary evidence with a draft version of the Resident's Travel Plan. She was then asked a range of questions about how this plan would work in practice. She highlighted that the future residents were commitment to reducing travel demand as proposed, through their use of shared vehicle's and cycles. This would be reinforced through the future body corporate rules and the use of an on-site travel manager. However she did note that there were some private vehicles for use of future residents. She was asked about how parking was managed at Earth Song, however she was not aware of the details.
 25. **Mr David Welch:** future resident, spoke to his evidence in chief (which was taken as read) and he produced a limited piece of supplementary evidence outlining the level of consultation the applicant has undertaken with the local Grey Lynn community. Attached to his supplementary evidence was a letter of support from Generation Zero and the written approval of owners of 3 Browning Street. To which we have had to regard to as part of this decision.
 26. **Mr Thomas Gill,** Architect and future resident, spoke to his evidence in chief (which was taken as read) and he produced a limited piece of supplementary evidence seeking to highlight the impact of the proposal on the submitters property at 8 Firth Road (Mr and Mrs Buckley). In doing so he acknowledged that he had not taken this from their property himself and relied on the photos provided in Mr Wren's planning evidence.
 27. Mr Gill took us through the plans with a helpful presentation and then was asked questions about the design approach to the development and the site. This included his rationale for the heights of the buildings, ceiling heights, orientation of bedrooms, outlooks and location of car parking areas and car stackers. We asked him about the impacts on the neighbouring properties, especially with regard to outlook and the finer grain detail of where TV aerials and heat pumps etc would go and what their impact would be. He advised that this level of detail had not been resolved, but would be covered in the condition of consent requiring the Council's urban designers final sign off. He suggested that the carparking areas could not be provided under the building due to costs.
 28. We also asked his opinion on the impact of the proposal on the long views when coming along Surrey Crescent from the Grey Lynn shops. We all initially had concerns as to the appearance of the building and car stackers in this view. This is a point we return to in the applicant's right of reply where we received amended plans seeking to address this issue.

29. **Mr Brendon Verhoeff:** Civil and structural engineer of Maven Associates Limited evidence in chief was taken as read and we had no questions for him. At this stage we would like acknowledge that engineering issues were not a matter of contention between the parties and we accept Mr Verhoeff's advice in regard to this matter.
30. **Ms Bronwyn Coomer-Smit and Mr John Parlane,** both traffic engineers, evidence in chief were taken as read and Mr Allan asked that we consider their evidence together, to which we agreed and asked questions of both of them together regarding their evidence in chief. They were asked a range of questions regarding the impact of the car stackers, actual car parking demand and the impact of the proposed vehicle entrance next to the Surrey Crescent and Firth Road intersection. They were of the view that the proposal was appropriate to its context and that reducing car parking would not adversely affect the existing street network. They acknowledged that a future AT resident's car parking permit system would also assist with removing commuter parking from the local area.
31. They suggested that vehicles should not be able to reverse manoeuvre off site and that the use of signage and a travel management plan would prevent this. They supported the reduction in car parking numbers given the high level of public transport options available in the area and the applicant's desire to encourage cycling options. Finally, they were asked about how effective car stackers were as an option. They supported this approach. They maintained their collective view that the proposal was appropriate in traffic engineering terms.
32. **Mr Graeme Burgess:** architect's evidence in chief was taken as read. It was his view that the proposal in its amended form, as it was presented to us during the hearing, responds appropriately to the requirements in the Special Character Area Overlay (SCAO). In his view the site is atypical of its overlay with varying streetscape character distinctly shifting towards Surrey Crescent. The new buildings on site are, in his view, complementing the character of the area and present a connection with the existing SCAO as well as the neighbouring character of Surrey Crescent. He considers the roof forms and materials proposed are appropriate to this context.
33. He was of the view that the relocation and renovation of the villa would result in a positive effect and the proposed changes are in keeping with the character of the SCAO. He contests that the building was not within a Historic Heritage Area and does not consist of a restoration project and therefore disagrees with Ms Misra (Council's Heritage Officer) that the proposed changes to the villa are inappropriate.
34. **Mr Jeremy Salmond:** heritage architect's evidence in chief was taken as read. Then he provided us with background as to his understanding of the origin of the SCAO combined with Single House Zoning for this site, referring back to the legacy Residential 1 (Auckland City Council's Isthmus Plan) areas that have been used as the basis for inclusion of the SCAO. He confirmed his view that the development provides an appropriate transition, mediating between the more intact overlay area that is apparent in Browning Street and Firth Road, and the vastly different mixed-use area apparent in Surrey Crescent. We questioned the age of the existing villa due to contradicting this in his evidence in chief. He confirmed that in his expert

opinion the building was built before the turn of the 20th century. We found both Mr Burgess and Mr Salmond's evidence very helpful.

35. **Ms Rebecca Skidmore:** Urban Designer's evidence in chief was taken as read. She maintained her view that the proposal was appropriate in urban design terms. We asked questions regarding the impact in the short and medium views of the building and car stackers next to the Surrey Crescent and Firth Road intersection. She suggested that the impact of this would reduce in time as the landscaping grew and mitigated the impacts on these views.
36. **Mr Gerard Thompson:** Planner's evidence in chief was taken as read. He produced a limited piece of supplementary evidence providing further information to the wider context he considers relevant when assessing the character of an area. He also provided further evidence on his understanding of the contribution of the rear yards of the properties in the SCAO to the character of the area in response to Mr Wren's evidence. In his view the unity of the back yards, as proposed by Mr Wren, is not perceptible from the individual properties.
37. With regards to site coverage, Mr Thompson was asked to clarify varying amounts stated in various documents. He explained the two different rules applying to this area (SCAO and Single House Zone) and their differing requirements. As will be considered below, Mr Thompson provided us with further information on this matter as part of the applicant's right of reply.
38. He stressed the unusual nature of the site, given its size in this part of the city within the Single House Zone and how this provided an opportunity to use the AUO: OP's Integrated Residential Development provisions, which only applied to site over 2,000m². Finally, he was asked about the satellite dishes etc and he supported Mr Gill's view that this would be addressed in the detail design stage to ensure these did not adversely impact on the adjacent properties.

For the Submitters

39. **Ms Tanya Cumberland and Ms Charmaine Pountney's** submission was taken as read and they read a short submission in support of the proposal. We did not have any questions of them, but thanked them (as we did all the submitters) for making the time to present to us at the hearing.
40. **Mr Mike Brooker and Sue Gower's** submission was taken as read and they read a statement outlining their concerns regarding the proposal. In essence, this outlined a number of areas relating to compliance with the zoning standards, car parking, pedestrian safety (children going to school) and traffic effects; the impact on their amenity, especially in terms of their back yard from the dominance of the proposed building form. They were concerned that the zoning provisions could be undermined in this way, as they, and others in the area have relied on the zone provision as an expectation of what could be developed on that site. When asked what would be acceptable Mr Brooker suggested that 5 residential dwellings would be acceptable in line with the intended zoning outcomes for the site. However, they were open to

considering a redesigned proposal if it reduced the impact on them and the wider environment.

41. **Mr Graham Muir's** (on behalf of himself and Dr Laretta Alessi) submission was taken as read and Mr Muir talked to their submission. In essence Mr Muir questioned the whole rationale for the proposal including its ability to achieve the 'co-house form of living' and sustainable outcomes sought and believed this was nothing more than a traditional form of multi-unit housing in the SHZ. He was of the view that the application was distorting the town planning rules to enable this form of development, which he considered would create adverse impacts on the local environment including on the level of on-street car parking available in the area. He questioned the level of public transport available and whether this was a viable option for the site. He answered a number of our questions regarding his submission
42. **Mr Toby Hilless** spoke to his submission which was taken as read. His main concerns related to the height of the proposal and the impact this would have. He was also concerned about the level of cycles provided and the potential noise effects.
43. **Ms Alison Munro's** submission was taken as read and she read a statement outlining her concerns regarding the proposal. In doing so she outlined her concerns about the traffic and parking effects, public transport was not as good as suggested, especially if travelling to places other than the CBD and also had concerns as to how it would be ensured the development remains as "co-housing" as proposed. She also expressed concerns about the safety of children walking to Grey Lynn Primary School and the impact of vehicles reversing out of the site.
44. **Ms Penny Buckley's** submission was taken as read and she read a statement outlining her concerns regarding the proposal including adverse effects upon her property (dominance, overlooking and noise), traffic and car parking issues, construction effects and the precedent it could set within the zone. She questioned the choice of the site by the applicant and why they had chosen this site. She believed that the AUP; OP Single House zone ('SHZ') and SCAO would provide her with the necessary protection from inappropriate development on this site.
45. **Mr David Wren:** Planner for Mr and Mrs Buckley spoke to his evidence in chief (which was taken as read) and he produced a summary of his evidence, which he read to us. In this he addressed a number of issues that had arisen through the applicant's evidence and questioning for us. He also addressed Mr Allan's comment that he had inferred that the Council should have 'spot zoned' the site. This was not his view and he was highlighting the AUP: OP logical zoning pattern, with the different densities it provided for. He reinforced his view that the proposal would result in a change in character for the local environment, which would bear little resemblance to the wider residential neighbourhood and that the proposal was contrary to the AUP:OP for the SHZ.
46. We asked him what his view of neighbourhood meant, given the references to this within the SHZ. It was his view that this was linked to the zone, but could be

considered in a wider context. He talked about the AUP: OP transitional use of zones such as along nearby Garnet Road, where the densities/heights etc changed with the change in zoning. He stated that the Mixed Use was historical and it did not set a frame of reference for the residential zones on the other side of Surrey Crescent. Finally, he stressed that he supported the co-housing concept, it was just that in his opinion the proposal was in the wrong place.

The Council

47. Mr Wright (Planning Team Leader for the Council) had concluded in his amended s.42A report that the proposal was appropriate in planning terms and was not contrary to the objectives and policies of the AUP: OP. After listening to the applicant's case and the submissions, he was asked by us if he maintained the same opinion expressed in his amended s.42A report. He reaffirmed this view and recommended, subject to the appropriate conditions of consent, that the application should be granted consent. His conclusions were informed by his own professional judgement, responses to our questions, and the Council experts and/or external consultant's views.
48. We asked him to explain the rationale behind the amendment of his s.42A report. He explained that in light of the amended traffic engineering advice from Auckland Transport and Council's consultant, his concerns about traffic and parking effects had been addressed.
49. We then asked questions of Mr Sam Shumane (consultant traffic engineer to the Council) including the rationale for amending his initial position on the potential traffic effects which he said was based on the further evidence provided by the applicant's traffic engineers and Auckland Transport. He did express concerns about the potential effects of cars reversing onto Firth Road and if this did happen it could become an issue.
50. We then asked questions of Ms Priyanka Misra around issues raised in her heritage assessment and her rationale for her report.

Right of Reply

51. Mr Allan provided us with answers to some of the questions we raised during the hearing, including:
 - The approximate age of the villa, being pre-1990's and potentially subject to the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014;
 - Further details of the elevation of the buildings and screening of the car stacker area on the corner with Surrey Crescent and Firth Road; and
 - The site coverage figures for the surrounding site.
52. As considered above, Mr Allan, Legal Counsel, also emphasised that the proposal was a discretionary activity and should be considered as an 'integrated residential

development' in a SHZ and should be considered on its merits, as Table H3.4.1 does not require integrated residential developments to comply with any of the Single House Zone standards⁴. It is expected this applies to the rules associated with traffic and transportation effects also.

53. He then outlined a number of responses to the issues raised by the individual submitters and Mr Wren's planning evidence. He asked Mr Gill and Mr Thompson to provide secondary supplementary pieces of evidence addressing the issues raised in his right of reply. We note for completeness that these pieces of evidence did not raise any further issues beyond what we had sought information on and we were of the view that this did not constitute further or new evidence which required further comment from the other parties.
54. **Mr Thomas Gill** presented a second piece of supplementary evidence which provided us with new amended plans for the landscape treatment for the corner of Surrey Crescent and Firth Road. He also provided us with further details on the proposed car stackers.
55. **Mr Thompson** presented a second supplementary evidence which provided a desktop survey of site coverage for the properties in the SHZ areas surrounding the application site. The result of this was that he considers a high proportion of these properties have site coverage in excess of the permitted standard (35%), with coverage of 40-45% being not uncommon in the area.
56. We then sought an agreed set of conditions from the parties and asked if Mr Allan would contact both the Council officers and Mr Wren over this matter. He did this and we acknowledge that we received these and comment as appropriate as to the rationale for the conditions we favour below.

Principal issues in contention

57. After analysis of the application and evidence (including proposed mitigation measures offered by the applicant), undertaking a site visit, reviewing the Council planning officer's s.42A report and supporting documents, reviewing the submissions and concluding the hearing process, the proposed activity raises a number of issues for consideration. As a result, we found that the principal issues in contention are:
 - The proposal's impact on the Special Character Area Overlay;
 - Whether the proposal was appropriate to its surrounding context and any potential adverse impact on the surrounding area's character values. This includes the relevant urban design considerations;

⁴ Legal Submission in Reply p7 pp20

- The impact of removal of parts of, and the relocation of the villa to its new location;
- The impact of proposed form of the Courtyard Building roof;
- Materiality of new buildings;
- The proposed building form and its impact on the amenity of the adjacent properties;
- Site Coverage issues and whether this would impact the amenity of the area;
- Traffic and car parking effects;
- The vehicle access arrangements;
- Construction traffic effects
- The screening of the car stackers;
- The use of the site for co-housing; and
- Whether the proposal is contrary to the AUP: OP objectives and policies.

58. We note for completeness that matters relating to construction effects, earthworks (related effects of land stability, runoff, dust, etc), were not in particular contention between the parties. We agree with this, and find that these issues can be addressed through the appropriate use of conditions of consent.

59. As we noted above, Mr Allan asked us to consider the application as an Integrated Residential Development proposal. We agree and find the proposal meets the AUP: OP: definition for an Integrated Residential Development and as a result we have considered the application on this basis. In doing so, we also accept Mr Thompson's view over the unusual nature of the site, given its size within the SHZ in Greg Lynn and location adjacent to the building and uses within Terrace and Apartment Building and Mixed Use Zones.

Main findings on the principal issues in contention

60. Our main findings on the principal issues that were in contention are.

The proposal's impact on the Special Character Area Overlay

61. The relevant AUP: OP matters of discretion for the SCAO were set out in the Mr Wright' s.42A report and Ms Misra's specialist report. While this is a discretionary activity and we can consider all the relevant effects, this provides us with a good guide as to the matters we should be considering. As a result we address these issues in turn below as part of our overall assessment of the proposal:

- D18.4.1 (A4) External alteration and additions to building (Villa)

- D18.4.1 (A5) Construction of new buildings (Surrey and Courtyard Buildings)
 - D18.6.1.1 Building height (Surrey Building)
 - D18.6.1.4 Building coverage
62. The application site sits on the edge of a SHZ and has a SCAO. To the north and north east of the site, the character of the area is that of older style villas and bungalows, single and two storey in height. To the south and south west the area consists of multi storey commercial and residential apartment buildings located within the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building and Mixed Zones. In our view there is no 'gradation' of zones as suggested by Mr Wren between the SHZ and the multi-use zone⁵ which may be the case in other parts of the surrounding Grey Lynn/Westmere area. In our view there is an abrupt change of scale and character in this location, which is reflected in the range of land use uses, building heights, scale and massing and topologies along Surrey Crescent.
63. As considered above, we agree and find that the application site is unusual and differs greatly from the characteristics of the other sites within the SHZ with a SCAO which provide a more coherent character.
64. We agree with the applicant's architectural experts, Mr Salmond⁶ and Mr Burgess and planner Mr Thompson⁷, that a wider view needs to be taken regarding the character of this area. While the edges of a zone may in some cases be well defined and provide for coherence, this site requires a consideration in its wider context due to the site's atypical character, as well as the very different character created by the nearby multi-storey commercial, school buildings (Greg Lynn Primary School) and residential apartment buildings location within the Terrace Housing and Apartment Building and Mixed Zones.
65. We note that the objectives of the SCAO do not merely require retention of special character values but also requires these character issues to be managed in an appropriate way. In our view it would not be appropriate not take into account this context and how any proposed design fits with this context and character. In our view to do so would be contrary to the policy intention of the SHZ and SCAO. We note to this effect that the AUP: OP describes at A1.6.2.Overlays, that: "*Overlays also manage specific planning issues such as addressing reverse sensitivity effects between different land uses.*"
66. In this respect we find that it is necessary to apply a wider view to the context of the site and we agree with the applicant's planner Mr Thompson that the development forms a transition between the two zones that is well within the underlying purpose of the AUP:OP. We also find that the character of the proposed design in urban

⁵ Summary of Evidence of Edward David Wren, 26-27 September 2018, 2.5 images

⁶ Statement of Evidence of Jeremy Salmond, 23 August 2018, paragraph 20

⁷ Supplementary Statement of Evidence of Gerard Francis Thompson, paragraph 2.2

design terms is appropriate on this site and not contrary to the requirements of SCAO, as discussed by Mr Salmond⁸ and Ms Skidmore.

67. We note that Ms Misra raised the issue of the differences in height between the existing buildings on Browning Street and that the relocation the villa could adverse impact upon this, especially as it relates to the Surrey building in the streetscene. We do not agree, and support the position taken by the applicant's planning (Mr Thompson), urban design (Ms Skidmore) and heritage experts (Mr Salmond). In our view, based on our site visit the Browning Street topography falls to the north and there are mature trees lining both sides of the relatively narrow street. The houses in this area are single and two story in height. Also the immediate neighbouring building at 3 Browning Street is currently adding a second storey to their building. The established character therefore is up to two storeys high in this part of the streetscene. The proposed Surrey Building would be three storeys high and in our view, given the nature of the existing environment would be appropriate in this context.
68. To support this approach Mr Burgess provided us with examples in SCAO areas⁹, where differences in height of neighbouring buildings in close proximity form part of the character, rather than detracting from it. Mr Salmond agrees with and supports that view. We note that 3 Browning Street is lawfully adding another storey to their building and the increase in height of the buildings towards Surrey Crescent follows the contours of the street, but is hidden behind the trees and provides in our view an acceptable 'bookend' at the margins of the zone.
69. Finally we find based on the applicant's evidence (planning, Mr Thompson) and urban design (Ms Skidmore)) and the Council's planner (Mr Wright) and urban designer (Mr Mackay) that the height, bulk and massing and design of the proposed building forms would be appropriate in this section of Surrey Crescent. The three storey nature of the built form would not be out of character with the surrounding built character of Surrey Crescent, which we note, again for completeness includes a range of building heights and typologies.
70. As a result we find that the proposed Integrated Residential Development will not adversely impact on the residential character of the SCAO nor the SHZ.

The impact of removal of parts of, and the relocation of the villa to its new location

71. We note that the existing villa has been altered repeatedly over time and the majority of the building fabric has changed. The building is not individually scheduled nor is there a Historic Heritage Overlay in place for this part of the existing building. All parties agree that the villa could be relocated on site.
72. The council heritage (Ms Misra) expert considers the proposed changes to the side veranda and its roof, and the side gabled bays of the villa to have adverse effects on the architectural values of the villa. Her rationale for this assessment is that the

⁸ Statement of Evidence of Jeremy Salmond, 23 August 2018, paragraph 34

⁹ Statement of Evidence of Graeme Burgess, 11 September 2018, paragraphs 8.7-8.9

elements are original to the building. The removal of all other non-original elements is seen as having a positive effect in her view and should be encouraged.

73. Mr Burgess referred us ¹⁰ to the objective of the SCAO which seeks to maintain and enhance the special character of the streetscene, not to protect the authenticity of individual buildings. In addition, Mr Salmond explains¹¹ to us that the return veranda is an element of a corner villa not one within the body of the street. He suggested that due to the relocation of the villa to a single street front site, the loss of the return will not diminish the integrity of the villa in this location. We agree with this view.
74. It is noted for completeness that the applicant has reviewed the design and they are now proposing to retain the side gables for the villa. We find that the proposal relocation of the villa is acceptable and appropriate in planning terms.

The proposed form of the Courtyard Building roof

75. Ms Misra expressed concern within her report that the proposed Courtyard Building's asymmetrical roof form would diminish the character of the area. However, Mr Salmond was of a different view¹² that symmetry in gables towards the street would contribute to the character of this area, however, the courtyard Building is not facing the street and therefore its asymmetrical roof does not weaken the character in that respect. In our view very little of that roof will be seen from Browning Street where it would have the most impact, as we could ascertain during our site visit, and we agree with Mr Salmond's view in this regard.

Proposed material choices of the new buildings

76. The proposal includes the use of stained vertical timber cladding and standing seam metal roofing. In Ms Misra's view these building materials are inappropriate in the SCAO and detract from the character of the area. The applicant's architectural experts are of the opinion that the materials proposed are appropriate for new buildings in this area. To this end Mr Burgess makes the point¹³ that the materials are required to be 'compatible' with existing materials which does not limit the use of materials that are in keeping, yet not identical with the ones used for other buildings in the area. The characteristics identified are timber cladding and metal roofing. In his view, both those building materials fit with these characteristics.
77. Mr Salmond is also of the view¹⁴ that "...*replicating the architectural grain...*", and we understand the materiality to be part of the architectural grain, would be "...*historically inauthentic, and thus would challenge the integrity of the Special Character Area.*" We agree with Mr Burgess and Mr Salmond and find that the

¹⁰ Statement of Evidence of Graeme Burgess, 11 September 2018, paragraph 8.14

¹¹ Statement of Evidence of Jeremy Salmond, 23 August 2018, paragraph 45

¹² Statement of Evidence of Jeremy Salmond, 23 August 2018, paragraph 44

¹³ Statement of Evidence of Graeme Burgess, 11 September 2018, paragraphs 7.1-7.3

¹⁴ Statement of Evidence of Jeremy Salmond, 23 August 2018, paragraph 35

materials require compatibility with the existing, not replication, therefore timber cladding and metal roofing as proposed are appropriate in this case.

78. However, we do note that the issue of material was an issue of concern, we believe it's appropriate to ensure this level of materiality is achieved through the use of conditions of consent. To this end we are imposing a condition which requires strict accordance with the plans and building materiality proposed.

The proposed building form and its impact on the amenity of the adjacent properties.

79. The majority of the submitters in opposition to the proposal highlighted the potential adverse effects the buildings height, bulk and massing; and overlooking could have on their properties. This view was supported by Mr Wren in relation to 8 Firth Road (Mr and Mrs Buckley's property). This view was not supported by Mr Wright (council's planner), Mr Mackay (Council's urban designer), Mr Thompson (applicant's planner) and Ms Skidmore (applicant's urban design) who all believe these effects were acceptable in this context.

80. While we understand the submitters concerns, based upon our own site visit and the evidence of the Council's and applicant's experts we favour their professional views and are of the view that these level of effects potential adverse effects are acceptable in this context. However, we do acknowledge and support their concerns about the fine grain detail of the location of any future heat pumps and TV aerials etc. To address this issue we agree that a condition should be imposed to ensure this is addressed at the detailed design stage.

81. For completeness we find that the proposal will not adversely dominate the adjoining residential properties.

Site Coverage issues and whether this would impact the amenity of the area

82. We acknowledge that this issue is in many ways interrelated to the issues of building bulk and massing considered above, as extra site coverage enables further bulk and massing to be achieved. To this end as set out above, we had questions of the planning experts regarding the varying amounts of site coverage that have been stated in their evidence and what the implications of this level of site coverage would be. During the hearing Mr Thompson clarified that the differing amounts are related to the two different zone requirements for this area. In SCAO zones the maximum building coverage on sites over 1000sqm is 25%, whereas in SHZ the maximum building coverage is 35%. Mr Wright agreed with this with as did Mr Wren.

83. Several submitters opposed the proposed site coverage of 43%, which exceeds the permitted amount for both, SCAO and SHZ considered above. Mr Wren stated that that the site in his view is overused¹⁵ compared to the 25% building coverage that is permitted in the SCAO.

¹⁵ Summary of Evidence of Edward David Wren, 26-27 September 2018, 2.8

84. Mr Thompson provided, in this secondary Supplementary Statement of Evidence¹⁶ a survey to illustrate the site coverage of the surrounding properties in this area. He found that the site has currently 31% coverage. This falls within the 35% of the SHZ, yet it exceeds the 25% permitted in the SCAO. He states that coverages of the site considered in survey of the local area range from 27% to 56%. This showed to us that the permitted 25% set out in the SCAO are not adhered to in any of the existing dwellings in this area. He further concludes that a high proportion of the properties were within the range of 40%-45% building coverage.
85. In our view, the character of an area is typically defined by the existing characteristics, not district plan rules. As Mr Thompson's survey showed, the area does not exhibit a compliance with the desired maximum 25% of the SCAO. All of the properties exceed this coverage. This may be the result of historical zoning and previous planning requirements, we do not know. However, we acknowledge the site coverage proposed is 8% greater than even the higher 35% permitted under the SHZ.
86. While we understand the submitters concerns, we are of the view that the wider context needs to be considered for this particular site to achieve the objectives and policies set out in the AUP: OP. In this regard we favour Mr Thompson and Mr Wright's view and find that this increase in site coverage is appropriate in this context

Traffic and car parking effects

87. A critical tenet to the application is less reliance on private vehicle use for resident's daily activities and to discourage individual car ownership¹⁷. The application sought to provide housing and a way of living in a manner that the applicant stated would support 'sustainable transport' options such as cycling, walking and public transport¹⁸. We were told by Ms Riley (future resident) in her evidence that the residents of the development are expected to use cycling, walking and public transport with less reliance on private motor cars. Accordingly, the applicant has limited their onsite car parking spaces. Noting some will be privately owned and some shared. The applicant proposes ten car parks on their site, nine near the corner of Firth Road and Surrey Crescent and one, off Browning Street serving the villa. We note that the AUP: OP requirement is for one space per unit, or twenty in total¹⁹.
88. The traffic effects and particularly parking requirements are a key concern by those submitters against the proposal. Many submitters expressed their concern for their neighbourhood amenity, implications for on-street parking availability, safety of pedestrians and children on the Surrey Crescent and Firth Road Corner and the effects of construction traffic.

¹⁶ Second Supplementary Statement of Evidence of Gerard Francis Thompson, 29 October 2018

¹⁷ Supplementary Statement of Evidence Marianne Riley pp2

¹⁸ Supplementary Statement of Evidence Marianne Riley Appendix A Cohaus Travel Plan pg 1

¹⁹ Statement of Evidence – John Parlane p4 pp4.1

89. In terms of the off-site car parking effects the proposal could generate it was Mrs Coomer-Smit's (applicant's traffic engineer) view that:

*'the level of traffic anticipated to be generated by the proposal can be integrated within the existing adjacent road network with no adverse effects to the function, capacity and safety of the transport network.'*²⁰

90. Mrs Coomer-Smit undertook an on-street parking survey of the parking provision and demand for use of parking spaces in the vicinity of the development Site on the 5th and 6th August 2018. The results indicated within a 200m walk of the site there were at least 62 vacant parking spaces on the Sunday and at least 17 vacant parking spaces on the Monday²¹. She stated, after her assessment the proposed parking shortfall will not generate any noticeable adverse effects on the streets with 200m of the Site, due to the actual demand for parking associated with the proposal²². She and Ms Riley have estimated the actual shortfall based on the likely demand, will be in the region of one to six spaces²³.
91. Mr Parlane drew our attention to the policy changes set out in the AUP:OP and the assessment required under the plan for SHZ. He suggested where a proposal provides less parking than the rules require, the application needs to be assessed according to AUP: OP criteria (E 27.8.2 (5))²⁴. He and Mr Thompson advised us of the new AUP:OP introduced parking as a policy instrument to reduce travel demand in intensified areas, while still requiring parking in outer areas of the Auckland or when lack of parking could outweigh any positive transportation effects. He states the Council's parking policy fits into a wider goal of providing intensification and alternatives to private car use, which falls within the direction of the AUP:OP RPS policy approaches.²⁵ He stated the Auckland Plan (and we would suggest refresh Auckland 2050 as well) was very clear that transformation was required. Practical illustration of this shift he stated were the THAB zoning and Mixed-Use zones, where parking in these areas has been made optional, other than in the CBD. As we have considered above, there are examples of these, nearby on Surrey Crescent.
92. In our view, while being a discretionary activity the assessment criteria at E 27.8.2 (5)²⁶ provided us with a good guide to the issues we need to address, including:
- a) *Is the parking sufficient for the proposal - having regard to operation, the availability and accessibility of public transport, the measures and commitment outlined in a travel plan and whether activities on the site have complementary parking demands?*
 - (b) *Actual effect of any vehicles parking on the street.*

²⁰ Statement of Evidence Bronwyn Coomer-Smit p2 pp 2.1

²¹ Statement of Evidence Bronwyn Coomer-Smit p10-11 pp 7.2 pp 7.4

²² Statement of Evidence Bronwyn Coomer-Smit p 2, pp 2.3

²³ Statement of Evidence Gerard Thompson p33 pp7.66

²⁴ Statement of Evidence John Parlane p 5 pp 4.10

²⁵ Statement of Evidence John Parlane p 2 pp3.1-3.2

²⁶ Statement of Evidence John Parlane p 5 pp 4.2-4.8

93. In Mr Parlane's view the proposal meets both of these assessment criteria (a) and (b)²⁷; by the nature of the applicant's operation, availability of public transport, a travel management plan and potentially complementary parking demands. Mr Parlane also confirms there is ample opportunities to park on the streets around the site. He considers a small number of extra cars on these streets is unlikely to have any noticeable effect on other activities.
94. On the contrary view, submitters against the application considered the parking is under provisioned. They record the area is currently very challenged in terms of parking. They point out the peak time at school opening and closing hours exceeds the normal demand, combined with increasing commuter parking. Several submitters refuted the assessments or the methodology by the applicant's experts²⁸.
95. Mrs Buckley for instance, stated on numerous occasions people park on the yellow lines, close to corners and over garage entrances. Mrs Buckley and Mrs Munro spoke of the many school children and foot traffic in this vicinity and who use the current pedestrian refuge on the corner of Firth Road and Surrey Crescent. They alerted us to potential difficulty for these pedestrians (often children) with cars turning and manoeuvring from the site onto the Firth Road/Surrey Crescent intersection.
96. While not part of this process we heard via the submitters that Auckland Transport have signalled their intention to implement Residential Parking Zone for the Grey Lynn and Arch Hill zone (Grey Lynn RPZ) in early 2019, which is an area close to the subject site. Mrs Coomer- Smit considers some commuter parkers will attempt to park on the streets where there will be unrestricted parking, potentially near this neighbourhood²⁹.
97. We understand when and if the streets in this neighbourhood are subject to a Residential Parking Zone, residents in the area will be able to apply for residents parking permits to allow them to park for longer periods. Ms Coomer-Smit advised AT's website outlines eligibility that states '*new developments and homes built after notification of the AUP (30th September 2013) are not eligible for parking permits.*'³⁰
98. Mr David Wren for Mr and Mrs Buckley raised the fact, the site was large enough to accommodate the required car parking and did not consider the co-housing model should be relied on for a reduction in car parking spaces³¹. He cautioned there was nothing in the proposed conditions of consent, that required the development to remain a co-housing development and potentially the site could be subdivided or unit titled in the future. He said any body-corporate rules can be changed over time³². This could have implications for on street parking. Mr Wren also raised the concern of cars reversing out of the site and on street manoeuvring for large vehicles³³. He

²⁷ Statement of Evidence John Parlane p 5 pp 4.10

²⁸ Submission by Mrs Penny Buckley p2 pp1

²⁹ Statement of Evidence Bronwyn Coomer-Smit p15 pp7.14

³⁰ Statement of Evidence Bronwyn Coomer-Smit p16 pp 7.8

³¹ Summary of Evidence Edward David Wren p5 pp2.10

³² Statement of Evidence Edward David Wren p11 pp 6.16

³³ Statement of Evidence Edward David Wren p11 pp 6.18-6.20

also supported Mr Shumane's original conclusions that the parking shortfall would create adverse effects, noting that Mr Shumane had changed his view on the application.

99. The AUO: OP policy approach and rules framework according to Mr Parlane, never stipulated all parking demand should be provided within each site, nor do they ensure parking is available for all car users on local streets. The SHZ he suggested follows a pattern of quality of residential development including areas where homes may not be close to public transport or there is little opportunity for on-street parking. He points out this property is adjacent to or alongside more intensive zones and strong transit options.
100. Finally, on this matter Mr Thompson also referred us to Environment Court decision in *Food & Fun Ltd and Others v Auckland City Council (Decision A125/2008) (Benson Road Deli)* where the Environment Court also affirmed this broader approach to parking in the policy approach.
101. We accept and favour the expert traffic evidence (Coomer-Smit, Parlane and Shumane) and the planning evidence by Mr Gerard Thompson³⁴, but on the submitters concerns we also aim to secure traffic arrangements ahead for this 'integrated residential development' and their commitment to minimise any on-street parking. We signal then, requirements in the conditions using the Operational Management Plan, Travel Management Plan and a condition of consent to require monitoring and report on the on-street parking situation in the future.
102. While we have been asked to prefer and rely on the traffic and transportation experts by the applicant and Council, we have also understood the submissions of the residents and local community many of whom who have lived and worked in this environment for many years. This also recognises Mr Wren's concerns for protecting the existing on-street parking, from a future change of operation on the site. However, this is way we have decided to include a s.128 review condition to ensure the on-site car parking needs are being meet.

The vehicle access arrangement

103. Ms Coomer-Smit concludes the access arrangements into the site are appropriate and will not create any adverse safety effects. Mr Thomson also stated any access effects will be less than minor³⁵. We queried access to and from the site, in peak times or when one or more vehicle were leaving and entering, in response to submissions read and heard. The traffic engineers, both for the applicant and the Council, were comfortable with safety matters and ease of access to the site.
104. Ms Coomer-Smit and Mr Thompson state there are significant positive effects that the entire 20 unit development can be serviced by two, 3 m wide vehicle crossings, both onto smaller local roads. This configuration accessing local rather than the

³⁴ Statement of Evidence Gerard Thompson p17 pp 6.46-6.49 p 31 pp 7.59- 7.73)

³⁵ Statement of Evidence Gerard Thompson p17 pp 6.46-6.47

arterial road, means that if Auckland Transport plans go ahead to put a cycleway along Surrey Crescent, Ms Coomer-Smit states the development will significantly reduce potential for conflict with cyclists and vehicles.

Construction traffic effects

105. Concern for management of construction traffic was expressed both for the amenity of local neighbours and recognising the school environment nearby with peak traffic times. However, we are of the view that the imposed condition limiting the times of construction traffic will address this matter.

The screening of the car stackers

106. As considered above this was initially a serious concern of ours, especially the impact this could have on the Surrey Crescent streetscene. However, we believe this issue has now been appropriately addressed by the amended design supplied to us by Mr Gill as part of his secondary supplementary evidence. However, we wish to reinforce our desire to ensure this intention is achieved through the appropriate use of conditions of consent.

The use of the site for co-housing

107. A number of the submitters raised the issue of whether the site was appropriate for a co-housing development of this nature. As discussed above, the application sought consent as an Integrated Residential Development on this site, not as co-housing development. While there was some discussion during the hearing process over what this could be and the need for new and innovative housing models for New Zealand (this is also supported by us) this was not sought for and we have assessed this application as an Integrated Residential Development based on the likely and potential effects it could generate.
108. As it is apparent from our consideration above, we find that an Integrated Residential Development of this type is appropriate in effects terms for the site. We find that the proposed range of building heights, bulk and massing is appropriate to its context and it will not adversely dominate the adjoining residential properties. Nor, will it adversely impact on the character of this part of the SHZ or the SCAO.

Whether the proposal is contrary to the AUP: OP objectives and policies

109. Both Mr Wright (Council's planner) and Mr Thompson (applicant's planner) were of the view that the proposal was not contrary to the objectives and policies of the AUP: OP, where Mr Wren (for 8 Firth Road) was of a different view. As we will consider below we favour both Mr Wright's and Mr Thompson view on this matter. This is not to be seen as a criticism of Mr Wren.
110. It is clear to us that the proposal, as set out in Mr Wright's s.42A report and Mr Thompson's evidence that the proposal meet this policy intention of section B2 of the AUP: OP Regional Policy Statement. This simplicity seeks to promote a compact urban form with a range of housing choice predominately in existing areas, close to

centres and transit opportunities which provides for residents' needs. We find that this form of Integrated Residential Development meets these strategic policy outcomes. We also find that the proposal is not contrary to the policy outcomes sought in parts B3 and B5.

111. Turning to the policy approach in SHZ we note that the zone description seeks to:

The purpose of the Residential – Single House Zone is to maintain and enhance the amenity values of established residential neighbourhoods in number of locations. The particular amenity values of a neighbourhood may be based on special character informed by the past, spacious sites with some large trees, a coastal setting or other factors such as established neighbourhood character

112. As we found above we are of the view that the local environment, especially along Surrey Crescent, is characterised by a range of residential typologies and building sizes and does not show the 'traditional' values associated with the SHZ in a SCAO in other parts of the local Grey Lynn/ Westmere neighbourhood. We agree that the site is unusual in terms of size and location and forms part of the transition between the SHZ and other higher intensity zones. We also note that the SHZ provides for Integrated Residential Development H3.3(8), which we are of the view the proposal meets. It is clear to us, based on the evidence of Mr Wright and Mr Thompson that an Integrated Residential Developments can only occur on larger sites (over 2,000m²) which do not adversely affect the amenity of the adjacent residential properties and the character values. As we have considered in detail above, we are of the view that this proposal is appropriate to its context and will not adversely affect the amenity of the adjacent residential properties.

113. Turning to the Special Character Areas Overlay, again for the reason we have considered above, we are of the view that the proposal will not be contrary to the AUP: OP policy approach (objectives and policies) for the Special Character Areas Overlay based on the evidence of Mr Burgess and Mr Salmond.

114. Finally, in terms of the rules for traffic and parking we favour evidence of Mr Wright and Mr Thompson and find that the proposal will not be contrary to these objectives and policies. In our view any potential and actual adverse effects that could be generated by traffic and parking issues can also be addressed by the appropriate use of conditions of consent, which we intend to impose.

Overall findings

115. We find that the proposal is appropriate to its location in planning terms and consent should be granted subject to the appropriate conditions of consent. We would also like to note the positive benefits this will provide including providing for further housing in Auckland and seeking to establish alternative views of housing choice in close location to a range of local services and transit options.

Decision

116. In exercising our delegation under sections 34 and 34A of the RMA and having regard to the foregoing matters, sections 104, 104B, 106, 107 and 108 and Part 2

of the RMA, we determine that resource consent (both land use and subdivision) for a combined Land Use and Subdivision for a 20-unit Integrated Residential Development (cohousing development) and villa relocation is granted consent subject to the conditions set out below.

117. The reasons for our decision have been set out in the sections above.

Conditions

General conditions

These conditions apply to all resource consents.

1. The activity shall be carried out in strict accordance with the plans and all information submitted with the application, detailed below, and all referenced by the council as consent number LUC60317194
 - Application Form, and Assessment of Environmental Effects prepared by Gerard Thompson and Raheel Khan of Barker & Associates, dated 21 March 2018.

<i>Report title and reference</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Rev</i>	<i>Dated</i>
<i>Rules Assessment – 11 Surrey Crescent, Grey Lynn</i>	<i>Barker & Associates</i>	-	-
<i>11 Surrey Crescent Residential Development: Urban Design Assessment</i>	<i>R.A.Skidmore</i>	-	<i>March 2018</i>
<i>Character Assessment</i>	<i>Burgess, Treep & Knight</i>	-	<i>13 March 2018</i>
<i>Grey Lynn Cohaus, 11 Surrey Crescent, Transport Assessment</i>	<i>Flow Transportation Specialists</i>	A	<i>March 2018</i>
<i>Infrastructure Report, Residential Development 11 Surrey Crescent Grey Lynn</i>	<i>Maven Associates</i>	B	<i>05/03/ 18</i>
<i>Arboircultural report for 11 Surrey Crescent, Grey Lynn</i>	<i>Chris Boucher – Consultant Arborist</i>	-	<i>July 2018</i>

<i>Other additional information</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Rev</i>	<i>Dated</i>
<i>11 Surrey Crescent, Grey Lynn (BUN60317193) – s92 response</i>	<i>Barker & Associates</i>	-	<i>16/08/18</i>
<i>Memo – Schedule of Design Changes – s92 Further Information Submission</i>	<i>Studio Nord</i>	-	<i>15/08/18</i>
<i>11 Surrey Crescent, Grey Lynn – Section 92 (BUN60317193)</i>	<i>Maven Associates</i>	-	<i>03/08/18</i>
<i>11 Surrey Crescent Grey Lynn Proposed Cohaus Development, Review of Character Issues</i>	<i>Salmond Reed Architects</i>	-	<i>16/08/18</i>
<i>Design Memo – Cohaus Design Statement – Scheme materiality & Surrey Building composition</i>	<i>Studio Nord</i>	-	<i>15/08/18</i>
<i>Grey Lynn Cohaus, 11 Surrey Crescent: Response to section 92</i>	<i>Flow Transportation Specialists</i>	-	<i>15/08/18</i>

<i>Plan title and reference</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Rev</i>	<i>Dated</i>
1 – Title page	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
2 – Contents page	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
3 – Introduction	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18

4 – “2. Site and context analysis” title page	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
5 – History of site development – 19 th C	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
6 – History of site development – 20 th C	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
7 – Character edge	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
8 – Development other than single housing along Grey Lynn/Ponsonby arterial ring	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
9 – Street character survey – Browning Street	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
10 – Street character survey – Firth Street	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
11 – Street character survey – Surrey Crescent	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
12 – Unusual houses in Isthmus A character overlay	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
13 – Site	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
14 – Existing buildings	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
15 – “3. Design concept” title page	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
16 – Relocation of existing villa	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
17 – Neighbourhood front yards	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18

18 – Design generators	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
19 – Alternative schemes	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
20 – Neighbourhood building volumes	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
20a – Character transition	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
21 – Character precedent – Norfolk St terraces	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
22 – External materials	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
23 – Form of Surrey building	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
24 – “4. The Proposal” title page	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
R-01 – Location Plan	Studio Nord	-	20/08/18
R-02 – Site Plan Existing	Studio Nord	<i>B</i>	28/08/18
R-03 – Site Plan Proposed	Studio Nord	<i>B</i>	28/08/18
R-04 – Plan – Levels	Studio Nord	<i>B</i>	28/08/18
R-05 – Plan – Level 0	Studio Nord	<i>B</i>	28/08/18
R-06 – Plan – Level 1	Studio Nord	<i>B</i>	28/08/18
R-07 – Plan – Level 2	Studio Nord	<i>B</i>	28/08/18
R-08 – Plan – Roof	Studio Nord	<i>B</i>	28/08/18
R-10 – Unit Plans	Studio Nord	<i>B</i>	28/08/18

R-20 – Sections	Studio Nord	<i>B</i>	28/08/18
R-21 – Sections	Studio Nord	<i>B</i>	21/08/18
R-23 – Sections – Courtyard HIRTB	Studio Nord	<i>B</i>	28/08/18
R-24 – Courtyard HIRTB	Studio Nord	-	20/08/18
R-25– Elevations	Studio Nord	<i>C</i>	- 20/10/18
R-26– Elevations	Studio Nord	<i>B</i>	28/08/18
R-27 – Elevations	Studio Nord	<i>A</i>	28/08/18
R-28 – Landscape details	Studio Nord	<i>A</i>	20/10/18
R-29 – Shading Studies – proposal	Studio Nord	<i>A</i>	28/08/18
R-30 – Shading studies – proposal	Studio Nord	<i>A</i>	30/08/18
R-33 – Streetscape Landscape Design	Xanthe White	<i>4</i>	24/10/18
R-34 – Street planting palette for 11 Surrey Cres Grey Lynn	Xanthe White	-	-
R-35 – Street planting palette for 11 Surrey Cres Grey Lynn	Xanthe White	-	24/10/18
R-36 – Entry reference	Xanthe White	-	24/10/18
25 – “5. Visual simulations” Title page	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
26 – Key to views	Studio Nord	-	22/10/18
27 – Proposal – view A – Browning St	Studio Nord		28/08/18

28 – Proposal – view B – Firth Rd	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
29 – Proposal – view C – Surrey Crescent looking west	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
29a – Proposal – view C – enlargement of landscaped corner	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
30 – Proposal – view D – Surrey Crescent looking east	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
31 – Proposal – view E – Surrey Crescent looking east	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
32 – Proposal – view F – Surrey/Browning St corner	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
32a – View G – from 101/54 Surrey Crescent, The Isaac	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
32b – View H – from 15 Surrey Crescent	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
32c – View I – from rear deck 6/8 Firth Rd	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
32d – View J – from rear deck – 2 Firth Rd	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
32e – View K – from backyard 34 Selbourne St	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
32f – View L – from 202/54 Surrey Crescent, The Issac	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
32g – View M – at completion	Studio Nord	-	22/10/18
32h – View M – after 5 years' growth	Studio Nord	-	22/10/18
32i – View N – at completion	Studio Nord	-	23/10/18
32j – View N – after 5 years' growth	Studio Nord	-	22/10/18
32k – Car stacker details	Studio Nord	-	24/10/18
33 – Landscape	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18
34 – Urban landscape	Studio Nord	-	28/08/18

C150 – Proposed Scheme Plan	Maven Associates	B	08/18
C200 – Proposed Earthworks Overview	Maven Associates	B	08/18
C201 Earthworks Sediment Control Plan	Maven Associates	B	08/18
C202 Proposed Sediment Control Details	Maven Associates	A	02/18
C203 Proposed Sediment Control Details	Maven Associates	A	02/18
C204 Earthworks Cut/Fill Plan	Maven Associates	B	08/18
C300 Proposed Roading Plan- Overview	Maven Associates	C	08/18
C301 Proposed Roading Details	Maven Associates	C	08/18
C400 Proposed Public Stormwater Drainage Plan	Maven Associates	D	08/18
C401 Proposed Stormwater Drainage Long section	Maven Associates	D	08/18
C402 Proposed Public Drainage Plan	Maven Associates	C	08/18
C500 Proposed Wastewater/Water Plan	Maven Associates	B	08/18

2. Under section 125 of the RMA, this consent lapses five years after the date it is granted unless:
 - a. The consent is given effect to; or
 - b. The council extends the period after which the consent lapses.
3. The consent holder shall pay the council an initial consent compliance monitoring charge of \$1620 (inclusive of GST), plus any further monitoring charge or charges to recover the actual and reasonable costs incurred to ensure compliance with the conditions attached to this consent/s.

Advice note:

The initial monitoring deposit is to cover the cost of inspecting the site, carrying out tests, reviewing conditions, updating files, etc., all being work to ensure compliance with the resource consent. In order to recover actual and reasonable costs, monitoring of conditions, in excess of those covered by the deposit, shall be charged at the relevant hourly rate applicable at

the time. The consent holder will be advised of the further monitoring charge. Only after all conditions of the resource consent have been met, will the council issue a letter confirming compliance on request of the consent holder.

Trees in roads

4. The consent-holder shall employ at their expense, a suitably qualified and experienced arborist (the Works Arborist) to direct, supervise and monitor all works that are to occur within the root zones of the London Plane trees (*Platanus x acerifolia*) associated with the project at 11 Surrey Crescent, Grey Lynn.
5. At least two (2) weeks prior to any works commencing on site within 10m of the dripline of the generally protected London Plane trees on the road berm, a meeting shall be held to discuss and clarify the conditions of consent relating to their protection. Present at the meetings shall be the consent holder, all contractors working on the project, the author of the arborist report from Chris Boucher Ltd and any other relevant work site personnel.
6. At the meeting described in condition 5 above, the following will be discussed (but not limited to) and decided upon:
 - a. Machinery and equipment required
 - b. Care of and full extent of tree and root zone protection measures
 - c. Site access, silt-control, clean water diversion bunds and wheel wash facilities where appropriate and necessary
 - d. Bulk excavations and construction phases
 - e. Location of portable toilet facilities and proposed storage or stockpiling areas
 - f. Below ground reticulated infrastructure installation.
 - g. Any other measures deemed necessary by the works Arborist or imposed as a condition of Consent from the Council.
7. Prior to construction works associated with vehicle crossing and below- ground infrastructure installation commencing and at the direction of the Works Arborist, high quality temporary protective fencing (incorporating silt control measures where appropriate) shall be installed and maintained to the maximum extent possible around the London Plane trees in Browning Street Road Reserves adjacent to the site. The fencing will be of high visibility wire mesh, with solid immovable ground anchors. The areas inside the protective fencing are to be considered sacrosanct and no work will be carried out within the protected areas without on-site consultation and direction of the Work site Arborist. The fencing measures described will be maintained until all works associated with the project are completed within the Road Reserves.

8. Within the root zones of the London Plane trees adjacent to the site at 11 Surrey Crescent, all activities including excavations and construction associated with the project, will be carried out under the direction and supervision of the work site arborist. All activities necessary to implement any of the above works will be undertaken in accordance with good arboricultural practice. The following issues are worthy of specific consideration:
 - a. Excavations associated with new vehicle crossing installation will be undertaken by hand using hand-tools. A mechanical excavator fitted with a smooth-edged bucket may assist excavations, subject to and with appropriate guidance and supervision from the Work site Arborist.
 - b. All tree roots encountered will be clean-cut with sharp hand tools, back to the excavated face in accordance with good practice. Open-cut excavations within root zones will be kept covered to prevent tree-root desiccation and unnecessary drying out, until backfilling can occur. All concrete foundations within tree root zones will be lined with plastic prior to concrete pour.
 - c. The new vehicle crossing will be constructed of a precast concrete slab with permeable inserts, suspended between concrete edge beams and laid above an appropriate geo-tech fabric. Any difference in levels between the adjacent surfacing will be accommodated by placement of good quality topsoil and re-seeding to maintain the existing grass verge environment.
 - d. Underground reticulated stormwater services beneath the pedestrian footpath from the site to outside 5 Browning Street, will be installed by way of directional drilling / thrusting only (trenchless technology), with any opening pits within the root zones of trees excavated by hand using hand tools, with supervision by the Works Arborist. All opening pits will be located clear of tree roots.
 - e. Storm and waste water connections from the Road Reserve to public infrastructure located within the carriageway, may be open-cut by machine excavator with onsite guidance, direction and supervision of the Work site Arborist.
9. All washings from concrete trucks and/or associated machinery will be undertaken to not contaminate any area within the vicinity of the protected street trees or any areas that are required for landscaping and appropriate methods to ensure this will be implemented to the satisfaction of the Team Leader Central Monitoring.
10. The Consent-holder will engage a suitably experienced and qualified arborist approved by the Auckland Council, who will undertake pruning of the London Plane tree growing in Browning Street and overhanging the western boundary of 11 Surrey Crescent, Grey Lynn in accordance with following specifications:
 - a. Natural target pruning techniques shall be employed, cutting all branches and stems back to branch collars and growth points as appropriate, whilst maintaining natural form (habit) of the subject tree.

The work shall be carried out with due regard for the safety of pedestrian and vehicular traffic at the location.

- b. The pruning of the tree shall be limited to procedures undertaken with onsite guidance of the appointed Works Arborist, entailing the removal/reduction of two ascending stems, along with associated sub-lateral branches to reduce the extent of the tree's canopy boundary overhang to approximately one meter. The extent of pruning will be restricted to branches not exceeding 95mm in diameter.
11. A copy of the Tree Protection & Works Methodology Statement will be kept on site at all times and all contractors and sub-contractors will be made aware of and work in accordance with the procedures contained within it.
13. On completion of the works, the applicants appointed arborist shall provide an end of project memo to the Auckland Council Community Facilities Arborist. The memo shall record the dates and times the Arborist was present, the number and size of roots pruned and retained, as well as any other relevant comments.
14. At the time of building consent, all foundations for new buildings on the site shall be engineered and constructed of adequate materials and founded at sufficient depths to accommodate fluctuation and seasonal soil-moisture levels that may be influenced by the presence of mature trees in close proximity.
15. The consent holder shall ensure that the proposed roofing, rainwater and stormwater disposal materials specified satisfactorily cope with leaf and other debris from the trees adjacent to the subject site and demonstrate that effects associated with leaf litter and debris are minimised and managed.

Urban Design

16. One (1) month before construction commences, beyond earthworks and foundations, the detailed floorplans, elevations, materials and colours, and secondary design elements (such as air conditionings, heat pumps and television antennas etc) should be submitted to Council for approval in writing (this will include consultation with the Auckland Design Office), to the satisfaction of Team Leader Central Monitoring. This shall be based on the plan submitted as part of the application to ensure the outcomes by condition 1 are achieved.
17. The landscaping, as detailed on the landscape plans prepared by Xanthe White Design, shall be implemented no later than the first planting season (May to September) following the completion of the works on the site. The landscaping shall be maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Team Leader Central Monitoring.
18. The consent holder shall ensure that the materials and gradient of footpaths continue consistently through vehicle crossings, and the ramping at kerb crossings should not extend further than 700mm from the gutter line to the satisfaction of the Team Leader Central Monitoring.

Transport

19. At least Two (2) weeks prior to the commencement of any construction activities, including demolition work, the consent holder shall provide a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to Council noting that Auckland Transport has Council's delegated authority to review and approve such plans. The CTMP shall include the following restrictions and / or information:
- a. No heavy vehicles (larger than 8.0 m in length) shall enter or exit the site between 6:00 and 9:00 AM and between 3:00 and 6:00 PM on business days. Concrete delivery and pump trucks are to be excluded from the morning restrictions.
 - b. A wheel wash shall be installed at the entrance to the construction area and the wheels of all trucks shall be washed prior to entering the road reserve. If any dirt or mud is tracked onto the road this shall be removed immediately. The CTMP shall ensure provisions are made for such removal works to be undertaken safely.
 - c. No part of any road reserve shall be used for construction purposes unless prior approval is granted by Auckland Transport.

Advice Note:

It is the responsibility of the consent holder to seek approval for the Construction Traffic Management Plan from Auckland Transport. Please contact Auckland Transport on (09) 355 3553 and review www.myworksites.co.nz before you begin works.

The CTMP should contain sufficient detail to address the following matters: measures to ensure the safe and efficient movement of the travelling public (pedestrians, vehicle occupants, local residents etc.), restrictions on hours of vehicle movements to protect amenity of surrounding environment during earthworks phase if required by Auckland Transport

20. Prior to the occupation of any of the units, all access, parking and manoeuvring areas shall be formed, sealed with an all-weather surface, marked out and sign posted in accordance with the approved plans, to the satisfaction of the Team Leader Central Monitoring.

Advice Notes:

Parking areas should be marked out in accordance with the approved site plan to ensure appropriate parking supply, access, signage, directions and vehicle manoeuvring. This includes the allocation of specific parking spaces to individual units.

Design shall take into account the C/AS1 requirements of the Building Code for fire appliances' access.

Vehicle Crossings

21. The new vehicle crossings shall be designed and formed in accordance with the Auckland Transport Code of Practice. The new crossings shall maintain an at-grade (level) pedestrian footpath across the length of the crossing, using the same materials, kerbing, paving, patterns and finish as the footpath on each side of the crossing.

Advice Note:

Works within the road reserve require prior approval from Auckland Transport. The consent holder should contact Auckland Transport as soon as possible to ensure any required approvals are issued prior to construction.

22. Prior to the occupation of any of the units, all redundant vehicle crossings shall be removed and reinstated as kerbing and verge/footpath to Auckland Transport Code of Practice 2013. This shall be undertaken at the consent holder's expense and to the satisfaction of the Team Leader Central Monitoring.

Advice note:

Works within the road reserve require prior approval from Auckland Transport. This includes vehicle crossings, reinstatement of kerbing and temporary occupation of the footpath/verge/berm during construction. The consent holder should contact Auckland Transport as soon as possible to ensure any required approvals are issued prior to construction.

23. The applicant shall erect suitable signage at the entry of the on-site car parking area (visible in both directions) advising that reverse manoeuvring out of the site by any cars is not permitted by this consent. The signage shall be to the satisfaction of the Team Leader Central Monitoring.

Construction management plan

24. Prior to the start of construction activity a finalised Construction Management Plan (CMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the Team Leader Central Monitoring. The CMP must specify the following:
- a. a construction timetable
 - b. a construction methodology
 - c. general site management, including details of:
 - the bunding or containment of fuels and lubricants to prevent the discharge of contaminants
 - maintenance of machinery and plant to minimise the potential for leakage of fuels and lubricants
 - methods to minimise siltation and discolouration of the coastal marine area during works

- methods to maintain public access to and along the coastal marine area while the activities are being carried out
 - methods to ensure compliance with noise standards
 - a spill contingency plan in the event that there is any discharge of contaminants to the coastal marine area
- d. site reinstatement upon completion of the activities
25. All works shall comply with the approved construction management plan at all times. All personnel working on the site shall be made aware of the requirements contained in the construction management plan. A copy of the approved construction management plan shall be held on site at all times while any activity associated with construction is occurring.

Operational Management Plan & Travel Plan

26. Prior to the first occupation of the new buildings the consent holder shall prepare, lodge and have approved by the Team Leader Central Monitoring an Operation Management Plan that address the following matters (but is not limited to):
- a. Details of the point of contact for the “Cohaus Group” and relevant contact information including phone number and email address.
 - b. Means of dealing with complaints from neighbouring properties / uses and provide a point of contact
 - c. Communal use of outdoor amenity areas
 - d. Outline of how rubbish/recycling will be communally dealt with
 - e. How letterboxes/mail will be dealt with for each of the units
 - f. Communal use of storage areas
- 26a Prior to the first occupation of the new buildings the consent holder shall prepare, lodge and have approved by the Team Leader Central Monitoring a Travel Plan that address the following matters (but is not limited to):
- a. Communal use of cycles and cycle parking
 - b. Communal use of the ten (10) s car parks and shared vehicles
 - c. Providing details to guests that there is no off-street parking and that there is limited on-street parking. Where possible, guests should use transport modes that do not require parking.

The objective of this plan is to encourage residents and visitors to use transport modes which do not involve the use of a private motor vehicle.

27. Once approved, at all times thereafter the consent holder shall ensure that the activity is operated in accordance with the approved Operational Management Plan and Travel Plan (and any approved changes as per condition 28).
28. The management plans required by condition 25 of this consent can be altered at any time by the consent holder following the endorsement in writing of the changes by the Team Leader Central Monitoring.

29. Pursuant to s.128 of the RMA the applicant will be required to undertake a car parking survey at 2, 5 and 8 year periods from the date of the occupation of 15 units or more of all the residents actual and real car parking needs to ensure that the consented car parking are appropriately being meet without the required for off-site car parking. This survey shall be forwarded to the Council one month after the date for the requirement of the survey. Should the survey show that more on-site car parking is required to meet the actual car-parking needs of the residents the applicant shall install the appropriate level of suitable car parking arrangement on site such as car stackers (such as, but not limited to) to meet this actual car parking need. The survey and implementation of further car parking arrangements on-site, should that be required, shall be to the satisfaction of the Team Leader Central Monitoring. All costs associated with either survey or the further car parking arrangement on site shall be borne solely by the consent holder.
30. Subject to the exemptions provided for in clause E25.6.2(2), the consent holder shall ensure at all times that the noise generated from the activity complies with standard E25.6.2 – Noise in Residential Zones.

Table E25.6.2.1 Noise levels in residential zones

Time	Noise level
Monday to Saturday 7am-10pm	50dB LAeq
Sunday 9am-6pm	
All other times	40dB LAeq 75dB LAfmax

31. All noise generating activities associated with the implementation of this resource consent on, or in the vicinity of, the subject site (which can include (but is not limited to) any demolition, earthworks and construction activities, and ancillary activities (such as deliveries, loading and unloading goods, transferring tools, etc)) shall not exceed the noise limits stipulated within NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics - Construction Noise (or any subsequent revision), and may only be carried out:
- between the hours of 7:30 am and 18:00 pm, Monday to Saturday; and
 - must not be carried out on any Sunday or public holiday (and any following Monday on which that public holiday is observed)

Surveyor Roof Framing Check

32. No building works shall proceed beyond the roof framing stage until a registered surveyor or licensed cadastral surveyor, engaged by the consent holder, has provided written certification to the Team Leader Central Monitoring that the works completed:
- have been completed in accordance with the approved plans as referred to in Condition 1 of this consent, or
 - do not exceed the vertical or horizontal extent of any breach, infringement, or non-compliance approved under this consent.

Advice Note:

The purposes of certification at the roof framing stage of construction are to:

- provide assurance that the building works, to that point, have been undertaken in accordance with the consent
- reduce the risk of non-compliance as the works are completed.

Written certification should include the following:

- the finished ground level is clearly marked on the subject site
- the relevant consent reference number and site address
- levels, calculations, plans and drawings of the structure(s) that are the subject of certification
- the quantification of the extent of any breach, infringement or non-compliance identified at the time of survey, where this has occurred.

Written certification is to be provided directly to the officer specified in this condition

Earthworks

33. Prior to the commencement of the earthworks activity, the consent holder shall hold a pre-start meeting that:
- a. Is located on the subject site;
 - b. Is scheduled not less than five (5) days before the anticipated commencement of earthworks;
 - c. Includes all concerned officer[s] e.g. Monitoring officer, Arborist etc.;
 - d. Includes representation from the contractors who will undertake the works and any suitably qualified professionals if required by other conditions;
 - e. The following information shall be made available at the pre-start meeting:
 - **RESOURCE CONSENT CONDITIONS;**
 - **EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL PLAN;**
 - **CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN.**

Advice note:

To arrange the pre-start meeting please contact the Team Leader Central Monitoring to arrange this meeting or email monitoring@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz. The conditions of consent should be discussed at this meeting. All information required by Council should be provided two (2) days prior to the meeting.

34. The Team Leader Central Monitoring shall be notified at least two (2) working days prior to earthwork activities commencing on the subject site.

Advice note:

In order to comply with this condition, please fill out the “Notice of Works Commencing” form supplied with your Resource Consent pack and forward this to Council as noted on the form to advise the start of works.

35. The consent holder must take all necessary measures to control silt contaminated stormwater at all times during the earthworks and during building development in accordance with Auckland Council's requirements. Prior to earthworks, the consent holder shall provide an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan in accordance with Auckland Council Guideline Document 2016/005 “Auckland Erosion & Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Auckland Region” to the satisfaction of Council's Resource Consent Compliance Monitoring Team Leader.
36. All earthworks shall be managed to ensure that no debris, soil, silt, sediment or sediment-laden water is discharged from the subject site either to land, stormwater drainage systems, watercourses or receiving waters. In the event that a discharge occurs, works shall cease immediately and the discharge shall be mitigated and/or rectified to the satisfaction of the Team Leader Central Monitoring.
37. The site shall be progressively stabilised against erosion at all stages of the earthwork activity.
38. All earthworks activity on the subject site shall comply with the New Zealand Standard 6803:1999 for Acoustics – Construction Noise at all times.
39. The use of noise generating motorised equipment and vehicle movements to and from the site associated with earthworks activity on the subject site shall be restricted to between the following hours:
- a. Monday to Friday: 7:30 am to 6pm.
 - b. Saturday: 7:30 am to 6pm.
- During school terms, heavy vehicle access shall not occur during the following hours:
- c. Monday to Friday: 8 am – 9 am and 3 pm – 4 p.m.
- There is to be no operation of noise-generating, motorised equipment and vehicles associated with earthworks activity on the subject site on Sundays or public holidays.
40. There shall be no obstruction of access to public footpaths, berms, private properties, public services/utilities, or public reserves resulting from the earthworks activity. All materials and equipment shall be stored within the subject site's boundaries.

41. There shall be no airborne or deposited dust beyond the subject site as a result of the earthworks activity that in the opinion of the Team Leader Central Monitoring is noxious, offensive or objectionable.

Advice note:

It is recommended that potential measures as discussed with Council's monitoring officer who will guide you on the most appropriate approach to take. Please contact the Team Leader Central Monitoring on monitoring@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz for more details. Alternatively, please refer to the Ministry for the Environment publication "Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing the Environmental Effects of Dust Emissions".

42. There shall be no damage to public roads, footpaths, berms, kerbs, drains, reserves or other public asset as a result of the earthworks activity. In the event that such damage does occur, the Team Leader Central Monitoring, will be notified within 24 hours of its discovery. The costs of rectifying such damage and restoring the asset to its original condition will be met by the consent holder.

Advice note:

In order to prevent damage occurring during the earthwork activity, the consent holder should consider placing protective plates over footpaths, kerbs, and drains. Where necessary, prior to works commencing, photographing or video recording of roads, paths and drains may be appropriate. If you would like further details or suggestions on how to protect public assets during the earthwork phase, please contact the Team Leader Central Monitoring on monitoring@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz.

43. Notice shall be provided to the Team Leader Central Monitoring, at least two (2) working days prior to the removal of any erosion and sediment control works.

Public Stormwater

44. All the necessary pipes and ancillary equipment are to be supplied and laid to extend the public stormwater system in general accordance with the Maven Associates, 'Proposed Public Stormwater Drainage Plan', C400, revision D, dated 8/2018.

Advice Note:

An Engineering Plan Approval application for this work is required to be submitted to Auckland Council's Development Engineering and approved prior to the works commencing.

Public Wastewater

45. All the necessary pipes and ancillary equipment are to be supplied and laid to construct a new wastewater connection in general accordance with the Maven Associates, 'Proposed Wastewater Plan', C500, revision B, dated 8/2018. Specific requirements:

- a. Abandon and remove or grout-fill the existing wastewater connection.

Advice Note:

An Engineering Plan Approval application for this work is required to be submitted to Auckland Council's Development Engineering and approved prior to the works commencing.

As-builts for Public Infrastructure

46. All as-built documentation is to be provided to Council for all new public assets to be vested in the Council. The documentation is to be in accordance with Auckland Council's Development Engineering As-built Requirements. The as-built information will require approval by Auckland Council's Development Engineering.

Advice Note:

Vesting of public assets to Auckland Council and close off and completion of the related Engineering Plan Approval must be completed.

Private Stormwater

47. All the necessary pipes and ancillary equipment shall be supplied and laid to provide private drainage, including a detention tank, to the extension of the public stormwater system required by condition 42 of this consent. Specific requirements:
 - a. Abandon and remove or grout-fill the existing private stormwater drainage and connection.
 - b. Design, provide and install a private on-site stormwater volume management system (stormwater detention tank) in accordance with Auckland Council standards; from the point of collection to the point of discharge. The system shall militate against adverse effects on the downstream network for the 1 in 10 year storm back to pre-development levels.

Private Wastewater

48. The consent holder shall provide private wastewater drainage to serve the development to the new connection. Specific requirements:
 - a. Abandon and remove or grout-fill the existing private wastewater drainage.

Other Approvals / Advice Notes

1. Watercare Services Ltd have advised that connections to the existing public wastewater system / watermain / fire hydrant shall be carried out by Watercare Services Ltd's contractor. At the time application for a water and/or wastewater connection of (or application for demand increase), a water and wastewater Infrastructure Growth Charge (IGC) per additional

equivalent unit shall apply. Details of the Charges are available on the website www.watercare.co.nz.

Advice notes

1. *Any reference to number of days within this decision refers to working days as defined in s2 of the RMA.*
2. *For the purpose of compliance with the conditions of consent, “the council” refers to the council’s monitoring inspector unless otherwise specified. Please contact monitoring@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz] to identify your allocated officer.*
3. *For more information on the resource consent process with Auckland Council see the council’s website www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz. General information on resource consents, including making an application to vary or cancel consent conditions can be found on the Ministry for the Environment’s website: www.mfe.govt.nz.*
4. *If you disagree with any of the above conditions, or disagree with the additional charges relating to the processing of the application, you have a right of objection pursuant to sections 357A or 357B of the Resource Management Act 1991. Any objection must be made in writing to the council within 15 working days of notification of the decision.*
5. *The consent holder is responsible for obtaining all other necessary consents, permits, and licences, including those under the Building Act 2004, and the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. This consent does not remove the need to comply with all other applicable Acts (including the Property Law Act 2007 and the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015), regulations, relevant Bylaws, and rules of law. This consent does not constitute building consent approval. Please check whether a building consent is required under the Building Act 2004.*



Dr Lee Beattie

Chairperson

Date: 4 December 2018