

Date Raised	Issue Raised - Urban Design	Comments
18-Mar	Greater clarity and design detail is needed around the delineation of pedestrian and vehicular access and circulation at the Carrick Place entry, and separation from basement and loading dock. This will need to address safety and security considerations as well as wayfinding for visitors from Carrick Place.	Noted, interface with Carrick Place remains under design review, with a revised proposal that addresses these matters anticipated to form part of UDP2 package.
18-Mar	At the Carrick Place interface there are opportunities for strengthening the boundary planting and landscape treatment that would benefit the amenity of the apartments at lower levels as well as the interface with adjoining neighbours.	Agreed, revised design response will address this opportunity.
18-Mar	A multi-core strategy would result in shorter corridors and smaller cohorts of apartments per floor that fosters a stronger sense of community and safety.	Addressed with design changes since UDP1 have adopted a multi-core strategy for both Dominion Road building and Valley Road building, which is now split into two separate buildings above integrated basement.
18-Mar	A multi-core strategy would enable a greater proportion of dual aspect apartments, with cross ventilation and enhanced solar access.	Addressed, as noted in item 4 above.
18-Mar	Further development of the courtyard space requires careful consideration of the communal versus unit interface, and spatial design to support communal activity versus just pedestrian desire lines to and from building cores and entries.	Addressed as part of landscape concept development drawings now completed in working draft and shared with Council.
18-Mar	Levels and buildups to achieve planting to manage privacy at the interfaces will require careful consideration in relation to courtyard-level apartments.	Addressed as part of landscape concept development drawings now completed in working draft and shared with Council.
18-Mar	The panel supports the way in which the Valley Road building provides for high quality café / retail tenancy spaces at the street front to either side of the apartment lobby entry.	Noted, these positive elements have been retained with subsequent design revisions.
18-Mar	The question of shopfront height, including ability to increase floor to floor height as well as devices such as parapets, warrants greater consideration in determining an optimal design response on Valley Road that more strongly relates to the scale, articulation and frontage character of the adjacent special character buildings that define the corner with Dominion Road.	This has been looked at as part of the further design development of Valley Road building frontage and façade design, that now has a 3 level building across the Valley Road frontage to relate to the scale of special character, noting heritage specialists are in agreement that Valley Road warrants a differentiated response that need not so strongly relate to that of the adjacent special character buildings as on Dominion Road.
18-Mar	Easement – aligning to the frontage line of the special character buildings through to the Valley Road corner has benefits in more readily relating new to old in a way that relates to the character, including the position of the Universal Buildings on the subject site.	Given the status of the AT road widening designation, the proposal cannot at this stage seek to utilise this wedge of the site's street frontage. Design and all drawings are being revised to consistently show the building frontage to the set-back designation line, which will provide a clearer basis to evaluate how the proposal relates to the adjacent character buildings and the streetscape.
18-Mar	Typology – the scheme could go further with apartment typologies that support a different lifestyle and occupant, such as to remove occupiable balconies and consider dual aspect which provides not only cross ventilation but also relief for residents from Dominion Road.	Since UDP1, the adoption of multi-core strategy, splitting of Valley Road building into two, and revised massing of upper levels including terraces and balcony spaces, have diversified the typologies.
18-Mar	Main entry – further consideration of the location, scale (width) and positioning of the lobby entry to Dominion Road, noting that its current scale and qualities seems out of keeping with the character of Dominion Road and reads overly commercial.	Design amended since UDP1 to address this feedback, with narrower, more recessive apartment entry that is both more residential in character as well as responsive to the special character.
18-Mar	Vertical circulation – consider the merits of switching the lift and stairwell to the internal courtyard side of the building, this would have the benefit of all of the occupants of the Dominion Road building feeling strongly connected to the central and the circulation activity would be a further contributor to enlivening the central open space to build community.	This option was tested post-UDP1 but was found to have knock-on consequences that negatively impacted the courtyard space and outlook for units facing the courtyard. The revised lobby design in combination with the other façade changes is considered sufficient to improve the overall composition.
18-Mar	A reduction in building height for the southern end of the Dominion Road building, in response to its relationship with the adjoining special character buildings needs to be considered.	Southern end of Dominion Road building has been reduced by one level and top level recessed back from street boundary. Southern end building reduced to 3 levels to relate to extg building heights
18-Mar	The matter of scale along the Dominion Road frontage, needs to be more carefully addressed alongside the architectural qualities of the street-facing facades and responses to the special character context	As noted in heritage feedback, this matter has been the subject of extensive testing and design development since UDP1 to develop a design direction for a more considered contextual and special character response to the street-facing facades and recessive massing and treatment to upper levels.
18-Mar	The extent of design investigation of street facing elevation has been very limited and somewhat superficial to date, and as such is a fundamental issue requiring significantly further attention and design development	Addressed since UDP1 through revised strategy and further design development of facades and materiality for street facing elevations to Dominion Road and Valley Road, working closely with appointed heritage consultant John Brown and Council's heritage specialist.
18-Mar	Dominion Road frontage should engage more deeply with the existing and historic grain of the site's building frontage including the width of existing buildings and their subdivision of street-facing tenancies	As per item 16 above.
18-Mar	Explore the merits of an alternative elevational strategy that results in a more horizontal emphasis on the Dominion Road frontage, as the current treatment is contributing to the building mass appearing taller and bulkier than it is.	As per item 16 above.
18-Mar	Architects must engage more deeply with the particulars of the special character of this part of Dominion Road in articulating the facades. Current features such as the large-scale arches do not resonate and feel out of place.	As per item 16 above.

18-Mar	Articulation and use of materiality, needs to achieve a greater level of overall cohesiveness with the architectural language and materiality strategy for the building as a whole. The materiality of upper levels bears no or little relationship to the lower levels addressing Dominion Road and this is not supporting the ability to achieve a building stepping up to this height.	As per response to heritage feedback, revised façade design for Dominion Road building since UDP1 has simplified and consolidated the grain in terms of number of modules and elements which is resulting in a more cohesive design. Within this, there is a conscious decision to differentiate the setback upper 4th and 5th level of the Dominion Road building with materiality that relates more to the Valley and Carrick Road buildings in behind, as per direction from Council's heritage specialist.
18-Mar	Provide the panel with aerial oblique views from above each corner of the site, taken to include the immediate context of adjoining buildings and street frontage / corners, to inform an understanding of how the building massing, architecture and boundary interface conditions relate to both the public realm and adjoining properties.	4 oblique drawings added to drawing set.
18-Mar	Site sections that depict heights relative to the AUP 11+2m heights and relevant height in relation to boundary controls, and shading studies, as provided in the pack for Panel 1, should continue to be provided and updated as the scheme evolves.	Addressed, with sections included and shadow studies updated for drawing package 02/07 issue.
11-Apr	Undertake a more in depth context analysis - including but not limited to: streetscape, the entrances, the building fabric, what are the aspects of the character buildings and what could they lend to the proposal, the grain and rhythm of shop fronts, fascia heights, building forms etc.	Design direction on these matters has been taken from the appointed heritage specialist in conjunction with Council's heritage specialist
11-Apr	Address the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol's 7c's of design quality	An evaluation against these matters can be undertaken as part of the urban design assessment as required, but typically we would frame out such assessment against the more specific urban design related provisions and assessment criteria of the AUP.
11-Apr	Recommend the proposal should aspire for a higher Homestar standard (7+)	Noted.
11-Apr	The design response/strategy needs to be developed further in more depth, particularly in relation to identified sensitive receptors (streetscape interface, internal courtyard, heritage buildings, adjacent residential buildings etc).	Noted - further to the overall site layout and building core and typology changes, the programme of further design development of integrated architecture and landscape design has developed areas of focus to Dominion Road, Valley Road, the central courtyard, and the Carrick Place / eastern boundary interface, to ensure the proposal develops well considered design responses to each of these important receptors / parts of the scheme.
11-Apr	Courtyard design requires further design consideration to work. This feels more of a movement orientated space and designed as left over space rather than an integral element in the design.	Addressed as part of landscape concept development drawings now completed in working draft and shared with Council.
11-Apr	Consideration of dual aspect typologies and multi cores is needed and has true benefits. However if done, this will make blocks narrower and potentially affect yield.	As per item 4 above, Addressed with design changes since UDP1 have adopted a multi-core strategy for both Dominion Road building and Valley Road building, which is now split into two separate buildings above integrated basement.
11-Apr	Further consideration of block numbers to yield to site layout to separation to height may be required. A balance will be needed.	The revised design has altered the balance of these factors.
11-Apr	The entry at Carrick Place requires more work as described by the Panel.	As per UD item 1, interface with Carrick Place remains under design review, with a revised proposal that addresses these matters anticipated to form part of UDP2 package.
11-Apr	Further consideration of the Dominion Road proposed building line and its relation to the character building line and easement is strongly recommended. Closer synergy with adjacent building lines would be optimal.	As per UD item 10.
11-Apr	Building separation for internal amenity could be increased slightly more, potentially by 2m or more if the building is slimmed down or realigned using the easement area	The revised building separation and multi-core changes to building layout and and development of initial landscape design concepts for the courtyard have addressed the internal site amenity matters.
11-Apr	Building dominance would be felt in the central area of the courtyard and would need to be alleviated.	Evaluation of 3D model of revised massing and architectural development alongside landscape proposals demonstrates there is not a dominance issue to be alleviated central to the courtyard.
11-Apr	Communal space requires strong consideration of interface/buffers and set backs to ground floor residential. The 3m sets backs may not be sufficient and level changes may be required.	These matters have been addressed as part of the revised layout and landscape concept development.
11-Apr	UD are not supportive of the narrow single entrance on the left hand side of Dominion Road frontage. Specifically CPTED, design appearance and functionality concerns make this unacceptable.	This entrance is under design revision, as part of addressing the universal access issue raised for Dominion Road building.
11-Apr	UD are not generally supportive of long corridors and not having external connection/daylight via glazing.	These matters have been addressed as part of the adopted multi-core strategy and split of Valley Road building into two.
11-Apr	Service areas for retail units are not provided – given both internal and public street parking/loading/waste constraints, not providing a service access area or movement space to the rear of retail units appears short sighted, specifically on Dominion Valley Road.	Noted.
11-Apr	Basement design – concerns with waste areas, size, travel distance, waste collection being non-functional.	Noted.
11-Apr	Storage lockers – concerns with access behind parked cars.	Noted.
11-Apr	Sufficient space is required between bike parks and car parks.	Noted.
11-Apr	The design at present doesn't lend itself to breaching height restrictions and needs further consideration/tailoring	This has been addressed through the further design development.
11-Apr	Concerns with increased 5 storey height, specifically in closer relation to residential properties (north and east)	Addressed through further design development and drawing documentation to understand residential boundary interface conditions proposed.
11-Apr	Concerns with increased 5 storey height, in relation to the character buildings	Revised massing and architectural treatment has addressed the relationship of 5 storey element to character building, as noted in other responses to heritage and UD feedback.

11-Apr	Concerns with increased 5 storey height, in relation to the impact on courtyard sunlight/shade.	Sun/shade studies are provided.
11-Apr	In relation to Valley Road building UD disagree with panels comments that “...the direction that this building is going in as a massed form up to five storeys in height above car parking level”. At present, the Council UD considers this requires stronger refinement.	Noted, and that since UDP1 there have been t further changes to height and massing in eastern half of site from Valley Road frontage through to Carrick Place including reduction to 3 storeys at Valley Road.
11-Apr	There are concerns with 5 storey height of the Valley Road building and its closer relationship to the eastern residential properties from an urban design perspective – both shading and massing leading to potential dominance.	As per item 42.
11-Apr	There is strong concern with overlooking from open balconies to the northern retirement village. Building height, proximity and deck design needs further consideration.	These have been reduced and louvres added to address overlooking from the balconies.
11-Apr	We strongly suggest that detailed bulk and massing studies are needed, and are not convinced by current designs to alleviate effects. Different sides of the site need different approaches as there are different audiences.	Differentiated responses to the different context have been developed and continue to be refined. Comparitative drawing set now produced to aid understanding.
11-Apr	Any future design statement should provide an analysis and explain breakdown of form, and façade strategy – We are currently not convinced the Valley Road building is successful on its long sides.	Noted.
11-Apr	There are four key Valley Road interfaces of importance to be addressed – South, North, East and internal west, possibly in this order.	All sides of building mass to this side of site are addressed, with differentiated responses where appropriate, in revised design proposals.
11-Apr	Agree with Panel and Heritage specialist on closer scrutiny of design details on heights and relation to adjacent character buildings.	Noted
11-Apr	The pedestrian and car park entries both relate poorly to the street and lack legibility.	All entries have been revised to address these matters.
11-Apr	The pedestrian and car park entries are under-articulated and non-legible – a clearer presence and legibility is recommended.	As per 52 above.
11-Apr	The vehicle entrance appears as a gap site and service space, allowing views straight up to the 5 storeys, including blank walls and vehicle space to the street, therefore creating dominance and visibility concerns.	As per heritage feedback on this issue, this feedback has informed further refinement of the 3 storey Valley Road building massing and façade design, with a greater vertical emphasis and alignment between ground floor and upper level façade elements, as well as structure to ground that treats the parking entrance with the same grain and framing strucutre as if it is a missing retail module void.
11-Apr	Valley Road building requires human scale elements to buffer this. This could be achieved by a frame of the gap and landscape buffer the entrance, create a relatable feature of the space, or create a wider through connection.	Further development of scheme provides further detail of how human-scaled elements are achieved to what is now a 3 storey building frontage to Valley Road itself.
11-Apr	A design rational for the entranceway should be provided.	Noted.
11-Apr	Building Height along the Dominion Road frontage and the extent of building height visible from the street is of concern. 5 storeys is noticeably problematic from an particularly thein respect of the proximity to heritage frontages on either side.	Addresses as part of revised massing and further architectural development, in response to UD and heritage feedback on this issue.
11-Apr	There appears to be a dramatic stepped difference between the fascia levels of the proposal and character buildings on Dominion Road which needs adjusting	Levels of proposed building frontage in relation to character have been subject to further development in close consultation with the heritage experts.
11-Apr	The proximity of tall dominant buildings to the retirement village which may have potential effects regarding increased shading, overlooking and intensity of views.	Noted, landscape design responses have also been progressed to create layered planting and partial screening and filtering of views along this boundary interface in addition to refined architectural responses. Effects assessment to be addressed as part of AEE.
11-Apr	Dominion Road main pedestrian entry – the set back weakens its legibility and this should be stepped forward and not recessed.	This feedback runs counter to heritage considerations and the adopted design direction.
11-Apr	It is considered positive how the pedestrian entry reads as a break but could be more subtle visually with synergy to other parts of the building design.	Noted
11-Apr	Surveillance through clear glazing of the street frontage is recommended from the core	Noted
11-Apr	A canopy at the entrance is recommended.	Noted, to be worked through with refined design development of entry.
11-Apr	The Dominion Road façade strategy is very busy and lacks synergy.	As per UD feedback issue 15
11-Apr	Core design – agree with Panels advice on flipping the building design but this needs to ensure a glazed element of sorts with outlook is kept to the street.	As per response to Heritage issue 10, this option was tested post-UDP1 but was found to have knock-on consequences that negatively impacted the courtyard space and outlook for units facing the courtyard. The revised lobby design in combination with the other façade changes is considered sufficient to improve the overall composition.
11-Apr	It is questioned how useable/functional the balconies on frontage are and currently appear constrained. If provided, it is recommended that they are designed to be functional spaces.	Balcony design has been refined through the further development of facades.
11-Apr	In terms of the facade strategy, it is agreed that some horizontal emphasis could be positive however this needs to be carefully balanced. Too much of a horizontal emphasis has the potential to make any building appear squat and heavy, creating adverse bulk and dominance effects.	Façade strategy and design development has developed a more considered grain with clear vertical emphasis over horizontal.
11-Apr	Street elevations shown in situ – this would provide a better understanding of the relationship to existing buildings.	Noted
11-Apr	A detailed urban design and architectural statement should support any application.	Noted
11-Apr	The size and functionality of the central courtyard space is a matter that will likely need revisiting to ensure an appropriate level of amenity value is provided for future residents.	The amenity for future residents has been addressed through the advancement of the landscape concept that provides a better basis for evaluating scale and spatial qualities and how people can access, use and enjoy this space.

11-Apr	A key consideration will be ensuring that planting can be established within the courtyard space and to the boundary of the site with the Carrick Place retirement units above the proposed podium level. This will require technical expertise in terms of structural, arboricultural, servicing (water supply) and landscape design input (as well as other matters).	This has been addressed through the advancement of the landscape concept and planting proposals.
11-Apr	There appears to be the potential for potential visual dominance and privacy effects to arise on the neighbouring retirement units on Carrick Place, given proximity of building bulk.	Response as per UD issues 42 and 59
11-Apr	The opportunity to ‘front’ Carrick Place through the development with activity and well-designed landscape / building frontages is encouraged. Exploring alternative design opportunities for this space is encouraged.	Noted, interface with Carrick Place remains under design review, with a revised proposal that addresses these matters anticipated to form part of UDP2 package.
9-Jul	The three public street sides/external elevations of the buildings (Dominion Road, Valley Road, East/Carrick Place) are pushing above what was originally granted consent.	Noted.
9-Jul	The Dominion Road height, bulk and massing at a basic level is still of fundamental concern, specifically how these design aspects are addressed at a fundamental level, before we address architectural detailing. This is coupled with the fact that the 5th floor appears visually heavy compared with the rest of the building/s (noting it has been pushed back). Is the overall 5 storeys and 4 storeys street front height and bulk appropriate? How could this be resolved further. Then secondarily, could these have architectural treatment to address this further.	N/A - established later in minutes that it comes down to treatment.
9-Jul	The Valley Road building has a lot of mass to it now that it extends over the driveway at three storey height. The repeated design and loss of the strong retail bay elements adds to this bulky mass appearance. Further consideration of breaking this down is recommended.	The Valley road building redesign was in response to questions raised on providing a more continuous façade to the street which was more in line with other character buildings in Mt Eden. The proportioning of the openings and articulation was derived by interpreting the design characteristics of some of Mt Eden's larger buildings without reverting to mimicry. The easternmost module has reduced in size to reduce the appearance of bulk.
9-Jul	The Carrick Place building – height and location has significantly changed, it’s now a lot closer to the adjacent neighbouring buildings at a taller height. The top floor form and architectural appearance to address bulk and mass is recommended to be refined further. Need to look closely at what the effects (visual dominance, shading and overlooking) will be on the adjacent properties (north and east).	The fifth floor floorplate has been reduced and is stepped from the northern and western edges. Further, the different cladding treatment from brick to grey vertical metal cladding panels for the top floor penthouse level, and the minimal extent of overhang of the rooftop treatment to the upper floor, that further contributes to reducing the mass and perception of mass at the top of the building.
9-Jul	Heights have been distributed in different proportions/locations. I.e. 5th level has shifted east and north, potentially resulting in adverse effects.	Following this meeting, amendments were made to the 5th floor to decreasing the perception of visual dominance effects as well as mitigating privacy effects. This is further described in the UDLVA and AEE.
9-Jul	Architectural detailing will add an additional layer to how the bulk and massing could be broken down, but the first step is to resolve the fundamental height, bulk and massing.	As per point 75.
9-Jul	Andrew previously raised whether the service core is fixed in location or is there an option to move it such as flipping between Retail Unit 1 & 2?– if moved, does it improve the accessibility issue?	Flipping the entrance and the core with Retail Unit 2 around – would bring the entrance to a more level entry between Retail Units 1 and 2, but would still be a stepped entrance. This is not apparent on the plans. To avoid a ramp it would need to be located at the northern edge of the site preventing centralised access, architectural and internal amenity outcomes
9-Jul	It was also queried whether the placement of Valley/Carrick building cores and the benefits of their visibility on the eastern elevation has been considered (form and appearance)?	The travel distance for residents accessing the Valley/Carrick cores in a more eastern location was considered too far. The façade benefits of such did not outweigh the disbenefits to residents amenity in their opinion.
9-Jul	Andrew noted the AUDP considered designing through-units/ dual aspect units should be explored, potentially resulting in a significant change in building design. However the original building form is retained, but with some through-units provided – does this address the Panel concerns sufficiently?	The panel was satisfied in this regard, provided the internal bedrooms were able to be addressed.
9-Jul	The top floor appears heavy. Could be the dark/ recessive black colour. • Further discussion on fundamental principles did not take place from an urban design perspective.	This has been lightened and is evident in the updated visual simulations prepared by Boffa Miskell. Resulting in a recessive appearance.
9-Jul	Requested confirmation that the 5th storey would not be visible from directly opposite the building on Dominion Road. Visuals from this streetscape perspective should be provided	See drawing RC-050.
9-Jul	The architectural style and facade strategy in its approach to resolving/refining mass and composition is still needed (Dominion Road)	This has considered to have been resolved through design development following this meeting. The mass and composition is discussed within the UDLVA
9-Jul	The entrance and visible break will play an important role in shaping the bulk and massing along this key frontage. (See below accessibility discussion under site layout) (Dominion Road)	Noted.
9-Jul	Andrew queried the design concept of bringing all the pillars on the facade to ground in the same material of the above façade. (Dominion Road)	Noted.
9-Jul	Don’t make this too busy with detailed treatments, need a cohesive language across the façade (Dominion Road)	This is considered to be achieved per the discussion in the UDLVA. Care has been taken to provide a façade strategy that provides a cohesive family of buildings that are differentiated from each other. This is achieved through the use of brick, including the proposed variation in brick colours and finishes, and use of detailing such as the contrasting vertical brick courses above windows and balconies and frieze details to the tops of buildings, and window joinery and the traditional stay details to some of the suspended canopies
9-Jul	Andrew advised such a continual canopy approach would need to be designed very carefully to avoid it becoming dominant feature. Overall a unified but individual unit canopy approach may be more appropriate. Again, avoid make this too busy with treatment, a cohesive language on this design element is needed (Dominion Road)	See comment above.

9-Jul	Consideration of the fenestration design across the building and having an overarching theme is required. A progressional design change/difference may be ok, its current appearance is slightly piecemeal. A complete repetition of one window style across the whole frontage is probably not going to be successful either (Dominion Road)	The fenestration design across the building has been addressed, with a more ordered arrangement being applied to the northernmost module.
9-Jul	Need to resolve eastern façade strategy to address massing is required (Valley)	Providing a chamfered edge to the window on the eastern façade has addressed this, making the eastern façade feel less solid.
9-Jul	Wrapping a strategy around the north east corner may help with the above matters raised by Peter further. A 3D views analysis is required given the views afforded. (Valley).	Visual simulations have been prepared demonstrating the view toward the building, looking west down Valley Road.
9-Jul	Both parts of the eastern façade still remain bulky and top heavy. The LHS is more simple and more successful but should be refined further, while the RHS is considered to be too busy and less successful. The use of more black panels and a horizontal emphasis undermines a reduction of mass strategy. (Valley).	Refinements have been made to the eastern façade through the provision of vertical slats and a chamfered edge to the window.
9-Jul	The physical break could be emphasised more by stepping in the top floor on each side. (Valley).	Noted.
9-Jul	Valley Road vehicle entrance is now part of development as a 3-storey mass/element closer to neighbour. Overall, there are no fundamental issues with 3-storey height (subject to shading) but the bulk and massing requires further refinement from an urban design perspective (subject to shading). The vehicle access should frame the entrance but be more of a recessive element rather than extending the 3 storeys across the full façade. A possible step down and back with a different architectural treatment may resolve this. It is strongly recommended that the well-defined retail unit frontages are brought back. This helped to create a strong visual base and defined middle portion to the street front building, which should appear located over the retail unit visually. The one to two third split of the frontage mass, defined by the visual break above the pedestrian entrance, is supported in principle. An increased height appearance of the pedestrian entrance is also supported but it is possibly too high currently given its relative width. The entrance is also recessive and not fully legible and could be more pronounced within the frontage.	The 3-storey massing has been refined and considered resolved, as discussed during the meeting on 12 August and discussed in Point 76 above. A canopy to the entrance has been added to improve legibility.
9-Jul	Consideration of the function of adjacent retirement village outdoor spaces to understand the effects and importance of views from slot windows on the northern elevation towards the neighbour.	A detailed assessment is provided within the UDLVEA and AEE. Screening is provided that will screen views from the lower levels. Further up the buildings, views will be over and above the roofs of these dwellings.
9-Jul	The applicants advised that tree planting will screen overlooking. However will this be sufficient or will treatment of those windows be needed in addition to address overlooking effects. Visuals/sections of views/screen tree planting is required.	See landscape drawings and architectural plans for sections and views.
9-Jul	Shading analysis was interrogated in the Environment Court process (hourly analysis was provided). Don't need to re-analyse the approved development but would be helpful. Need to have the same level of Environment Court scrutiny as the final scheme was on the edge of acceptability.	An hourly shading analysis has been provided within the architectural drawings.
9-Jul	Andrew advised that hourly shading diagrams are needed in sufficient detail to see effects on adjacent properties. A quantification of shaded time should be provided. Provide on the same time period as Environment Court, equinox and winter certainly	As above. The hourly shading analysis is provided on the same period.
9-Jul	Andrew advised that the overall pedestrian connections and movements through the site has improved in his opinion, links are more direct and succinct. A legible surface treatment could be considered to assist with defining a main route between building entrances for wayfinding purposes. Creating a visual hierarchy to the movement network.	See the landscape plans attached for hard materials strategy.
9-Jul	Movement at ground level – how to balance public/private realm/communal. Avoid fenced off spaces. The balance of planting treatment needs to be right for demarcation, openness and privacy of private space	It is considered an appropriate balance has been achieved. To achieve greater privacy at ground floor patios, additional depth to the planting to the western frontage, plus added a 1.2m high fin fence and gate to each patio is provided behind the hedging.
9-Jul	Creating nodes of activity within the communal area is overall positive – will keep this active but also has flexibility. Central hub linking with the community is also positive and will need to be designed well to ensure success.	Noted.
9-Jul	Andrew expressed a slight concern with the design refinement of the Valley Road access route, the former in terms of it being adjacent to tall blank walls and a pocket garden, and the latter being a narrow space between a boundary and the tall scale Carrick building	The solid wingwall has been removed and a slatted treatment has been added to the access route to provide a sense of openness. Windows are to be provided within the retail units on either side of the Valley Road access.
9-Jul	Will the sunken courtyard be overlooked and what will the feeling of this space be? A slight concern that it should not 'feel' like a service entry with a left over enclosed garden. Passive surveillance and adverse sense of enclosure effects should be considered.	The sunken courtyard will be overlooked. The addition of the slatted balustrade instead of the wingwall treatment to the stairs provides a sense of openness while still providing a quieter private garden space.
9-Jul	On the sunken courtyard, consideration of partially opening up the solid wingwall can be looked into to provide views into the garden for enhanced passive surveillance/reduction of enclosure without spoiling the secret garden concept.	As above.
9-Jul	The Valley Road access route will need to be designed to be welcoming and overlooked.	This will be overlooked by windows to the retail and café.
9-Jul	Taking bulk from the Carrick Road building and adding it in a discrete way to the south elevation on Valley Road could be explored further. A reduction of form/bulk on the top floor at the physical mid-break and on the north side may help address form and bulk overall	Noted

9-Jul	The view of the Dominion Road building from the corner and the Valley/Carrick building east elevation with a dark top floor is very noticeable and does not appear recessive	As per above comment. The treatment of the Dominion Road building top has been slighntened to achieve a recessive appearance.
9-Jul	The apparent height of the mid portion of Dominion Road frontage (LHS of core) doesn't step down with the land and is more noticeable in terms of its scale (height) and bulk. Can a physical step down be considered here? If not, consideration of giving the impression in a visual way to make the appearance of stepping down might work. (compare the original scheme)	Consideration has been given to the Dominion Road height and massing. This considered appropriate resolved through the further design development.
9-Jul	Carrick Road pedestrian entry legibility could be enhanced.	The footpath has been widened to 1.5m.
9-Jul	Although a unified appearance but individual canopy approach may be more appropriate, please ensure that weather protection is still considered so that it is a practical outcome and gaps are considered.	The canopies will provide sufficient weather protection.
9-Jul	A closer attention to detail on the north elevation of Carrick Building is needed give the close range views of audience.	Noted and revised for meeting on 12 August.
9-Jul	A facade composition which creates more defined smaller elements within the overall form, slighting greater vertical emphasis and a lighter 'feel' to the top is recommended to be explored.	The top has been refined as per item 77.
31-Jul	the Panel has reservations about the universal access strategy and the dignity of users via an internalized 'service entrance'. Due to the Dominion Road building having two cores, there is an opportunity for them to be separated further and the northern core to move north (with minimal replanning of apartment layouts and corridors at upper levels). This would provide an equitable and generous entrance for universal access and can still be connected internally to the more southern entry, which would remain on axis to the Carrick Block core beyond. This change would also improve and increase the street activation and may result in better-proportioned ground-floor retail to Dominion Road that is more viable.	The fall north to south along the street frontage makes achieving step-free access challenging, particularly in the central and southern portions of the street frontage that most legibly and logically support a principal point of entry that will function not just for the Dominion Road building itself but for the development as a whole in terms of establishing direct access through to the central courtyard which links all the buildings and common spaces and amenities of the scheme. To mitigate the lack of universal access to the principal lobby entrance to Dominion Road, the proposal has created the conditions for an inviting secondary entrance at the far northern end of the street frontage where level access from the street is able to be established. This linkage, which measures 3.5m in width, while smaller in scale than the principal entry, is sufficiently generous in volume to be an inviting secondary entry, that can provide access for all users, including those with prams and bicycles for example. It is anticipated it will provide a useful point of coming and going for all residents who are heading north along Dominion Road, such that it will be well used and together with high quality interior finishes and integration with the adjacent bike store will ensure it will not feel like a second-class route.
31-Jul	The Panel is generally supportive of the proposed landscape strategy and the creation of a series of distinct character areas; however: The Panel has concerns about the interface of the communal courtyard with the ground-floor single-aspect apartments adjacent. The Panel is not convinced that planting as shown is adequate to delineate public and 'private' space, and ensure positive residential amenity, including privacy in relation to the communal activities. The apartments are very deep in plan, and adequate daylighting is yet to be tested. High planting and / or screening / curtains to mitigate privacy issues could negatively impact daylight penetration to the point of non-compliance. The Panel strongly encourages the applicant to consider a level change (preferable) or greater distance and stronger delineation between private spaces and the paths. It may be that the Western path of the courtyard could also be omitted.	It is considered an appropriate balance has been achieved. To achieve greater privacy at ground floor patios, additional depth to the planting to the western frontage, plus added a 1.2m high fin fence and gate to each patio is provided behind the hedging. This has been reflected within the landscape drawings.
31-Jul	The Panel has concerns over the two-bedroom typologies type 2A & similar, and type 2K, due to the poor amenity provided to the second bedroom. This could be improved with a reduction in unit numbers, and/or some reconfiguration/replanning to provide a wider typology with better proportioned and spatially arranged bedrooms	Type 2A with the offset bedroom is a layout that the developer has built in numerous previous developments and have been received well by the market. The Type 2K units have been removed In the Dominion Road building and three of the 2K (1 bed + multi) units were replaced with 2 x 2 full bedroom apartments thus reducing the number of apartments by one per floor. The one remaining 2k was revised to a type 1D, which sees the second bedroom as a office/ study rather than a bedroom.
31-Jul	The Panel considers that Apartment type 1A & 1B should not be referred to as being a two-bedroom apartment. The panel considers that every habitable room should have a window in an external wall and that daylight and air should not be borrowed from other rooms. Nevertheless, if the applicant persists with them as "office/adaptable spaces" they would benefit from a swapping of the bathroom and the office space location, to enable more long-term adaptability of the floor plate and minimizing relocation of services to make changes	These are referred to as multi-use rooms and this has been reflected within the plans. There are 19 within the development.
31-Jul	Apartment type 3B would benefit from being handed like Apartment 3A so the deck and living is in a north-western corner, also with louvres to the balcony to provide privacy / minimise overlooking to the north.	This was reviewed and felt that the effect on the courtyard of separating the balconies resulted in a too busy façade for the low height.
31-Jul	The Western elevation[of the Valley Building] could be further improved by reconsideration of its articulation and how it turns the corner to reduce the appearance of the otherwise large blank wall - in particular from the high-profile vantage point of the Dominion Road / Valley Road corner.	This has been addressed through providing a feature consistent in scale with the chamfered edge window on the eastern elevation.
31-Jul	This module or the Western third of the [of the Valley Building] may also benefit from being of a different colour or texture, to better respond to the heritage context, differentiate from the larger block behind, and potentially differentiate from the Dominion Road Building.	We investigated options of changing the brick colour, but upon doing renders felt that there was starting to become too many variations of brick tones to this area and felt the additional colour was a diminished outcome.
31-Jul	The Panel suggests the height of the canopy could be lowered to better match the canopy in the pediment of the adjacent character buildings, noting that this may also benefit the size of the clerestory windows over and daylight access (visible sky) into these south-facing tenancies	The canopy has been lowered in the latest drawings

31-Jul	The Panel supports the extension of the block to the Eastern boundary, and the framing of a vehicle entry. Although this is an improvement from the previous arrangement its success will be dependent on the quality of the materiality, finishes of the soffit and sidewalls, and the hiding of all services.	Noted - it is our intention to maintain the quality here as it is a very public visual interface to the complex.
31-Jul	The Panel supports use of brick and the general approach taken in material selection and detailing, which is a key component to the project's success in response to heritage.	Noted.

Date Raised	Issue Raised - Heritage	Comments
11-Apr	The demolition of the character-supporting "Universal Buildings" remains a concern. Its loss will cause adverse effects that can only be adequately mitigated by a high-quality replacement design that is sympathetic to character values.	Noted. Ongoing design development is underway to ensure high-quality replacement design is sympathetic to character, taking on board feedback and directon from Council's heritage specialist.
11-Apr	The Western Elevation on Sheet RC-301 is misleading, as it does not show the full length of the Valley Road Building behind the existing character-defining buildings at the corner of Dominion/Valley Roads. This should be amended to be a more like-for-like comparison (add in the proposed building behind, or remove the background hatching).	Noted
11-Apr	The Dominion Road building has 8 modules where the previous consented development had 6. Combined with the building being taller, the proportion and grain is not reading correctly.	Addressed - the modules and resultant grain of Dominion Road street façade has been revised working with heritage experts from Council and applicant team.
11-Apr	The Dominion Road building has too many elements, leading to a fussy appearance	Revised façade design for Dominion Road building since UDP1 has simplified and consolidated the grain in terms of number of modules and elements, in response to feedback.
11-Apr	The Dominion Road street frontage needs to be simplified and reduced in height (especially at the southern end).	Revised building design for Dominion Road building has simplified street-facing façade design as per above feedback item. The height and massing has also been revised since UDP1, with southern end droppped 1 level and stepped back.
11-Apr	The Dominion Road Building should be reduced to 4 storeys. If a 5 th storey is to be considered, it will need to only be on the northern half of the site, and will need to be well set back from the main street frontage and appear recessive and architecturally “light”.	As above, massing changes to Dominion Road building have retained a 5th storey but with massing changes and architectural development to further reduce the visible presence and prominence of this floor as seen from Dominion Road.
11-Apr	If 5-storeys is to be provided on Dominion Road, this will need to be carefully studied from a range of viewpoints to ensure visual dominance over and competition with the existing character buildings is avoided	As part of the massing studies and design changes undertaken since UDP1, key viewpoints at the Valley Road corner, from the north and at mid points along the subject site frontage, have been used to evaluate the visual street frontage relationship of the new buildings to the existing character buildings seen and experienced along Dominion Road.
11-Apr	The large (wide and tall) recessed glazed entry on Dominion Road does not relate well to special character. The passing public would still get glimpse views to the garden through a glazed ground floor lobby, even without a large full-height atrium	Design amended since UDP1 to address this feedback, with narrower, more recessive apartment entry that is both more residential in character as well as responsive to the special character.
11-Apr	Moving the lift core closer to the garden, rather than its current position close to the street, might also improve the composition of the Dominion Road frontage.	This option was tested post-UDP1 but was found to have knock-on consequences that negatively impacted the courtyard space and outlook for units facing the courtyard. The revised lobby design in combination with the other façade changes is considered sufficient to improve the overall composition.
11-Apr	If balconies are to be used on Dominion Road, we suggest that these are framed within a solid wall, rather than projecting out – projecting balconies are not found on the predominant historic building type in this area.	Addressed and this suggested strategy adopted as part of further development of façade.
11-Apr	This building should be reduced in height at the southern end (closest to Valley Road) to better fit with the special character values of the area. The current architectural composition of 3+2 storeys could lend itself well to dropping down to 3 storeys in the southern-most bay	Revised design has reduced southern end to 3 levels.
4-Jun	Design moves to split the cores within the Dominion Road building and make the apartment entry smaller scaled is positive.	Noted. This has been a key design change in response to UDP1 feedback.
4-Jun	Further work is required to make the top levels of the Dominion Road building appear even more recessive. The wide overhangs are not working successfully, and draw unnecessary attention to the upper levels.	Design amended to address this feedback, with wide overhangs and extent of shelter above outdoor terraces reduced to minimise the presence of upper floor in street views from the northern and southern ends of the development on Dominion Road.
4-Jun	It is recommended that the decks should be uncovered to reduce the building mass at upper levels (4 and 5) of the Dominion Road building.	As per item 14 above.
4-Jun	At the northern end of the Dominion Road building, the design may need to reconfigure the plan and the location of the decks to push the end wall further south.	As per item 14 above.
4-Jun	At southern end of the Dominion Road building, the design may need to reduce the footprint of Level 3 and 4 and/or perhaps wrap the brick base language around so the 4th storey appears smaller in scale	Addressed, as worked through in subsequent meeting with Council's heritage specialist.
4-Jun	Longer distance views from both ends will be important to understand the success or otherwise of the proposal.	Noted
4-Jun	If Level 5 of the Dominion Road building is to be acceptable, there will need to be a clear visual relationship between Dominion Rd and Valley Rd buildings, with the height of the development appearing to be centralised on the site.	This feedback has informed the further testing and development of massing changes and façade composition and materiality, to ensure the set back upper 4th and 5th floor levels of the Dominion Road building read recessively central to the site and not "coming forward" to the Dominion Road principal street facade.
4-Jun	Street wall: Composition and grain is considered to be improved, however the northern end of the Dominion Road building (4 storey element) needs to be further broken down into two sub-blocks as it is now appears too monolithic.	Addressed in subsequent further design development, following meeting with heritage experts that worked through this issue.
4-Jun	It is important for the Dominion Road entry to remain somewhat recessed in order for the break in the street wall to remain legible.	Noted, a narrower recessed entrance is being retained as part of the revised design proposals.

4-Jun	The success of the scheme depends on utilising the extra couple of metres at the front of the site, if these extra metres are not used, then the top levels will need to be set even further back in order to have the correct appearance.	Given the status of the AT road widening designation, the proposal cannot at this stage seek to utilise this wedge of the site's street frontage. Design and all drawings are being revised to consistently show the building frontage to the set-back designation line, which will provide a clearer basis to evaluate how the proposal relates to the adjacent character buildings and the streetscape.
4-Jun	Splitting the Valley Road building in two, with more dual aspect apartments, is positive.	Noted
4-Jun	A 3 storey form facing and interacting with the street is positive, and 'wraps' the character around the corner. It will be important that this does not appear too horizontal, and does not appear as a building sitting on top of a single storey base. It must meet the ground, and like on Dominion Rd, must have an appropriate grain	This feedback has informed further refinement of the 3 storey Valley Road building massing and façade design, with a greater vertical emphasis and alignment between ground floor and upper level façade elements, as well as structure to ground that treats the parking entrance with the same grain and framing strucutre as if it is a missing retail module void.
4-Jun	The driveway opening should appear like a vacant shopfront that you drive through.	Adopted in revised design proposal, as noted in item 24 above.
4-Jun	For the Valley Road frontage, the art deco inspiration is fine, but not essential, and should not come at the expense of good overall composition.	Further development of the façade strategy has gone away from the Art Deco inspiration, and focused on overall good composition as per the feedback.
4-Jun	The end walls of the Valley Road 3 storey element must not be blank. Patterned brickwork, mural artwork, etc should be considered.	The end wall architecture has been revised further to avoid a blank monolithic wall. Brick cladding adds texture and interest to this wall in materials sympathetic to the special character.
9-Jul	Extra viewpoints would be helpful – particularly longer distance views looking up and down Dominion Road will be essential to determining whether the 5th storey on the Dominion Road building can be supported or not from a special character perspective. The changes to reduce massing at the southern end appear positive, but again will need to be checked with the viewpoints	An additional view has been added within the visual simulations.
9-Jul	Relationship with adjacent building is generally successful in terms of the overall mass to the streetscape (subject to longer distance viewpoints). Architectural treatment is key to the ultimate success of this building, and still needs work (see details below).	Noted.
9-Jul	The architectural treatment of the Dominion Road façade requires attention to resolve heaviness. Currently looks very grey and boxy, and has been oversimplified to a point that it appears too generic	The materiality and colouring has been refined. Brick is the primary façade material with a selected range of warm grey to buff tones. The Dominion Road elevation includes a two storey red brick element and a four storey cement plastered façade element, both drawing on the traditional façade materiality of character buildings on Dominion Road. The Dominion Road component buildings also incorporate contemporary cornice and brick detailing to add richness to the façade in a way that reflects historical detailing in a more contemporary way.
9-Jul	<p>Dominion Road is colourful and interesting with a lot of detail, and the design needs to do more to bring more life to the building/s. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Need to work with more colour. Red brick is favourable and an easy move to liven up the façade. o Suggest some form of cornicing at the top to add visual interest, help break up skyline, and frame elements. o Add richness and texture through ornament. Look at examples of techniques used on surrounding heritage buildings. For example header bricks on lintels, intermediate cornicing/banding, pilasters, decorative brick patterning, etc. o This does not need to mimic traditional elements precisely, but picking up cues from the character and using these in a modern way. 	The Dominion Road buildings including contrasting vertical brick courses above windows and balconies and frieze details to the tops of buildings, and window joinery and traditional stay details to some of the suspended canopies, which all have nods to the historic architectural vernacular. Further, the brick material palette used alongside the proposed variation in brick colours and finishes creates innate human scale, depth and richness to the facades, in ways that create a high level of visual interest viewed up close within the streetscape, in ways that are appropriate to the special character and create variety whilst also achieving cohesion.
9-Jul	The northwestern corner needs attention. Suggest wrapping the fenestration and architectural treatment from Dominion Road around to the side to alleviate the hard view against a blank wall from the north.	Texture has been added through carrying the brick courses around to the north.
9-Jul	Random window arrangement on the northernmost module is not successful. This undermines the overall approach to composition. Dominion Road has a strong character, and the whole of the Dominion Road should have a correspondingly strong character response. Valley Road is a more appropriate place to have a slightly different character/ identity.	The window arrangements have been resolved. A more ordered pattern of windows has been provided, improving the response to character.
9-Jul	Consider using verandah ties to add some texture and create visual interest. It will be important that each 'module' retains its own canopy, but some or all of them could use this traditional detail	Verandah ties have been added.
9-Jul	Four main 'modules' is working well in relation to the historic grain of Dominion Road.	Noted.
9-Jul	Will need to consider how the main entry appears to pedestrians approaching from both directions. The entry strategy will need to be complementary to the overall grain of the building, and not detract from the composition that has been achieved in relation to heritage.	The principal lobby entry itself is considered well handled, with the combination of a well-articulated negative vertical recess and protruding canopy creating a legible and logical principal walk-up entrance to the apartment development on Dominion Road, that feels residential in scale and does not take away from the continuity of shopfronts as the prevailing condition at ground.
9-Jul	Signage should be considered now as part of the overall development so that there is an integrated/cohesive approach. The entry sign may be able to assist with the definition/legibility of the main entry point(s). Now is also the time to consider placement and design of other signage types (retail, wayfinding, etc.)	Signage has been included. See architectural drawings.
9-Jul	Consider a more interesting 'top' to the Valley Road & Carrick Road buildings. This might help alleviate the appearance of these being too bulky.	The top level of the Valley building has been refined through a treatment of vertical profile metal cladding to façade and roof form, which includes an elegant bullnose corner. The top level of the Carrick Building has a treatment of grey vertical metal cladding panels and a minimal extent of roof overhang to reduce perceived bulkiness.

9-Jul	In general, the massing of the 3-storey building on Valley Road works well. The corner view appears positive overall in relation to the heritage buildings on the corner, and visually ‘completes’ the block.	Noted.
9-Jul	Valley Road façade looks too heavy and reads too horizontal. This could be broken up with some variety in treatment/colour. Changing the proportions of the breaks from horizontal to vertical could help to make the façade feel more elegant. One further option could be to have some variety in parapet height (e.g. middle section slightly taller), so it does not appear so monolithic.	The easternmost module has reduced in size to reduce the appearance of bulk. Further, the central module has a slightly increased parapet height to reduce the horizontalness.
9-Jul	Valley Road building does not need to replicate the Dominion Road building – can be more modern but complementary, and can have its own identity	Noted and considered provided.
9-Jul	Residential scaled fence and planting seems more appropriate in response to Special Character Residential than previous iterations.	Noted and has been retained.

Date Raised	Issued Raised	Comments
11-Apr	The current proposal appears to be seeking a greater degree of building height (in particular) in places than the consented scheme, which might not be appropriate and give rise to a level of adverse landscape and visual effects that is unable to be mitigated to an acceptable degree.	An updated and expanded comparative set of drawings has been prepared that provides a better basis for evaluating how the height and massing of the proposal compared to the approved design, and potential effects.
11-Apr	The applicant is strongly encouraged to utilise the same representative viewpoints as done in the consented scheme to test the design of the proposal through modelling and visual simulations.	Addressed, with draft simulations for priority viewpoints being updated for UDP2 to reflect architectural development.
18-Mar	The Panel recommends setting up massing studies from viewpoints in a visual impacts assessment report.	Addressed as per item 3 above.
18-Mar	There needs to be further studies and investigations about the visual impact of the Valley Road building from the East, as these will confirm the appropriateness of the height and massing strategy and how the architecture addresses the building bulk proposed.	Eastern façade and its visual impact is the subject of further design focus and testing, review in model prior to UDP2.
18-Mar	Viewpoint analysis of 3D model should be undertaken for next UDP from more middle and long distance views in the neighbourhood such as from and around Mt Eden Road from the east, with reference to the viewpoints established in the assessment of the consented scheme on the site.	Noted.
9-Jul	Key concern remains with respect to the proposed fifth levels of each building and the difference in the location of this building height and associated bulk and mass.	This has been addressed within the UDLVEA and using the supporting visual simulations.
9-Jul	The set back of the fifth level on the Dominion building appears to be working well when viewed from Dominion Road viewpoints (both south and north of the site).	Noted.
9-Jul	The set back of the fifth level on the Valley Road building also appears to assist with mitigating adverse effects of when viewed from the Valley Road viewpoint (east of the site).	Noted.
9-Jul	The Carrick Place and Valley Road buildings are located closer to the site’s eastern boundary than the consented buildings and the fifth level of these buildings (combined) is appearing to be visually dominant when viewed from Carrick Place (north of the site). There is likely to be the potential for these adverse effects to be experienced by people within private properties on Carrick Place.	The fifth floor floorplate has been reduced and is stepped from the northern and western edges. Further, the different cladding treatment from brick to grey vertical metal cladding panels for the top floor penthouse level, and the minimal extent of overhang of the rooftop treatment to the upper floor, that further contributes to reducing the mass and perception of mass at the top of the building. With regard to the Valley Road building, the top floor treatment of vertical profile metal cladding to façade and roof form, including an elegant bullnose corner, assists with reducing the apparent bulk at this upper level.
9-Jul	Suggest that the applicant should explore alternative design responses for these fifth levels of the Carrick and Valley buildings, including consideration of possible redistributing units.	As above.
9-Jul	Supportive of the approach taken by the applicant to give more prominence and importance to the secondary accessible entrance (as viewed / experienced from the street); however, it is suggested that additional design exploration should be considered to further improve internal accessibility / quality of experience for users of this access, which could become a popular alternative route.	The internal width of this route has been increase.
9-Jul	Acknowledge that these remain a work in progress; however, the versions provided by the applicant to date are helpful in understanding the proposal as the design evolves.	Noted.
9-Jul	Discussion around how virtual model views of the proposal from private viewpoints could assist in an understanding of potential visual dominance effects.	N/A
9-Jul	Peter noted It is pleasing to hear that the applicant is factoring in practicalities such as the structural weight requirements of planting above podium level; and confirming opportunities to plant trees on the site into soil that is at natural ground level (either existing or proposed).	Noted.

Date Raised	Issue Raised - Planning	Comments
11-Apr	Built form/ design at each site interface will require careful assessment.	Assessed within the UDLVA.
11-Apr	A detailed shading analysis will need to be provided.	A hour by hour analysis is provided within the architectural drawings.
11-Apr	Special circumstances needs to be considered and whether there is any public benefit for notification.	Public notification has been requested.
11-Apr	A detailed review of the EC issues is required, before and after mediation. The increased design in building back into spaces that were deliberately designed out previously to mitigate concerns/effects requires careful consideration.	Understood. Consider the effects are appropriately mitigated.
9-Jul	Provide cross-sections along the pedestrian access from Carrick Place between the existing situation and proposed, change in levels and to understand how site levels and the boundary interface is managed	See architectural drawings.

Date Raised	Issue Raised - Engineering	Comments
8-Apr	Infrastructure capacity assessment of wastewater network is required	Please refer to Civil Engineering Report
8-Apr	Fire Hydrant testing needed to be part of infrastructure assessment	Please refer to Civil Engineering Report
8-Apr	Soakage report is needed to confirm how the stormwater disposal is to be managed	Please refer to Civil Engineering Report
8-Apr	Flood assessment report is necessary addressing flood level, flood extent within the property, proposed FFL and compliance with free board requirements	Please refer to Civil Engineering Report
8-Apr	Assessment against E36 AUP(OP)	Please refer to Civil Engineering Report
8-Apr	Earthworks requires assessment against E12	Assessed within AEE and Civil Engineering Report.
8-Apr	Any retaining walls (unlikely) need to be indicated with heights.	Please refer to Civil Engineering Report
22-Aug	The application needs to appropriately demonstrate how the proposal will manage the 600m3 storage and ensure compliance with the free board for ensuring the flood water doesn't enter into occupied areas.	Please refer to Civil Engineering Report. The storage is proposed to be managed by ponding, stormwater tanks and soakage.
22-Aug	The DE has advised that the applicant should be cautious about accepting any discharge (1 in 100) into the soakage to be considered as to offset the storage. There should be sufficient detail and a clear explanation about possible effects on aquifer storage capacity and possibility of failure of aquifer accepting 100-year flood amount in future. It is advised that this option should be avoided	Refer Civil Engineering Report.
22-Aug	Council requires a clear indication and assessment regarding how the OLFP is to be diverted within the site and it should be noted that even if any other OLFPs are considered to be minor Council may not be in position to support the argument as it doesn't enter the site due to upstream developments which can be changed or removed at any stage by upstream property owners. It is better the OLF entry and exit is maintained as indicated by HW in their memo.	Refer Civil Engineering Report. The OLFP to the north is not captured by the AUP(OP) definition due to the small catchment size.

Date Raised	Issue Raised - Engineering	Comments
8-Apr	Tracking must be provided for the largest vehicle anticipated to use the loading space to ensure that the vehicle can exit the site in a forward direction. Reverse manoeuvring onto Valley Road is not supported.	Tracking diagrams are provided in the traffic assessment accompanying the resource consent.
8-Apr	Tracking will need to be provided for the tighter parking spaces	All vehicle parks meet the required dimensions of the AUP(OP).
8-Apr	Tracking needs to be provided to ensure vehicles can easily manoeuvre around the structural columns that are located in the vehicle access at basement level	As above.
8-Apr	Provide breakdown of parking numbers	106 car parks are provided, 103 in the basement and 3 in the Carrick carport. 135 resident cycle parks are provided and 8 visitor cycle parks are provided.
8-Apr	Address use of stacked parking - how this work must be explained where it is used by multiple dwellings	Stacked parks are to be allocated to a singular unit.
8-Apr	Commentary required on the wall mounted cycle parks and how these operate	The wall mounted carpark are detailed within the architectural drawings.
8-Apr	Pedestrian refuge to be clearly shown on plans	Noted.
8-Apr	The grass berm is not appropriate, as the grass likely won't survive	Noted.
8-Apr	Draft Construction Traffic Management Plan is required to be lodged with the application	