

Pre-Application Consenting Memo

| Pre-Application No. PRR00025404 | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Date of request | 15 th August 2017 |
| Applicant | Raheel Khan |
| Contact details | Phone 02102301509 |
| | Email raheelk@barker.co.nz |
| Site address | 11 Surrey Crescent Grey Lynn Auckland 1021 |
| Proposal | Retain and relocate the existing villa portion of the building on the site, and demolish the remainder of the building. A co-housing development consisting of approximately 18 units will then be established. |
| Plans and information | No name or date |



| Resource Management Documents | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) | Zoning | H3. Residential – Single House Zone |
| | Precinct | - |
| | Overlays | D18. Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential and Business |
| | Controls | Macroinvertebrate Community Index- Urban |

The Auckland Unitary Plan became ‘Operative in part’ (AUP(OP)) on 15 November 2016. For the purposes of this pre-application and any resource consent application that may be lodged, the AUP(OP) is the primary planning document that sets out the relevant zoning/overlays applying to the site, and the objectives and policies, rules and assessment criteria guiding development in this location

| Property Information | |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Legal Description | Pt Lot 17 SEC 52 DP 1720, Pt Lot 18 SEC 52 DP 1720, Lot 19 SEC 52 DP 1720, Lot 20 SEC 52 DP 1720 |
| Certificate of Title (If not provided) | This has not been viewed, so there may be easements, building line restrictions and other restrictions that need to be taken into account in preparing any development proposal. If the title is ‘limited as to parcels’, you may need to get this surveyed, particularly where some of the controls, are reliant on accuracy being insured. |

| Type | Y | N | Type | Y | N |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (Potential) Contaminated Land | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Coastal Erosion | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Land Instability | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Coastal Storm Inundation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Floodplain | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Coastal Storm Inundation (plus 1m sea level rise) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Overland flow paths (ephemeral/intermittent/permanent stream) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cultural Heritage Inventory | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Flood Sensitive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Combined Network | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Arterial Roads | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Building Frontage Control | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Vehicle Access Restriction Control | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Geology (rock breaking) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Meeting Record

| Meeting Record | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Date and Time | 29 August 2017 at 10.30am |
| Council Officers | Matthew Wright – Resource Consents Team Leader and Meeting Lead Priyanka Misra – Specialist Built Heritage Vinh Bui - Principal Traffic Engineer Yu-Ning Liu – Principal Urban Design Margot Thomson – Planner (minute taker) |
| Customer | Thom Gill - applicant and architect - Westergaard Gill Architecture Ayla Raymond-Roberts - architect Graeme Burgess - Burgess Streep Bronwyn Coomer-Smit - Flow Rebecca Skidmore - RA Skidmore Urban Design Raheel Khan - B&A Gerard Thompson - B&A |

| Outcome of Planning Provisions | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Single House Zone | <p>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.</p> <p>The zone is generally characterised by one to two storey high buildings consistent with a suburban built character, and provides quality on-site residential amenity for residents and for adjoining sites and the street.</p> |
| Special Character: Isthmus A | <p><u>Built Heritage and Character: Special Character: Isthmus A</u></p> <p>The Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential seeks to retain and manage the special character values of specific residential areas identified as having collective and cohesive values, importance, relevance and interest to the communities within the locality and wider Auckland region.</p> <p>These values set out and identify the overall notable or distinctive aesthetic, physical and visual qualities, built form, architectural values, urban structure, and vegetation and landscape characteristics.</p> |

All development is to have regard and respond positively to the identified special character values and context of the area as identified in the [special character area statement](#) (refer to 15.1 & 15.1.7.2). New buildings, alterations and additions maintain and enhance the built form, design and architectural values of the buildings and the area.

Planning considerations

Streetscape and Special Character

The following comments were made by Ms Misra.

- The relocation of the original dwelling within the site, to face Browning Street, aligning it with the next door villa on Browning Street, and subdividing around the dwelling to separate it from the 'parent site' proposed for the "Co-Housing" development can be supported from a Built Heritage Perspective. Overall, this aspect of the proposal is considered acceptable and would contribute to the special character of the Browning Street streetscape.
- In terms of the proposed "Co-Housing" development itself – the proposal as it currently stands cannot be supported. The following comments and suggestions have been made in order to assist in working towards an acceptable outcome:
 - In terms of the Built Heritage and Special Character Overlay, consideration must be made to the traditional pattern of subdivision, the historic pattern of development and the repetition and rhythm of the built form in the character area. Consideration must be given in terms of how the proposal responds to, and maintains and enhances the built heritage and special character of the area.

It is not necessary to exactly mimic the existing pattern of development, however, thought must be given to the objectives, policies and special character statement, and how the special character context is maintained and enhanced through the proposed development.

- The applicants discussed that the intention of the terraced buildings in a "sausage" type formation is to mitigate the road noise from Surrey Crescent, reducing noise effects to the shared courtyard area. It is considered that the

massing of the proposed buildings does not respond to the special character context and historical pattern of development. From a built heritage and special character perspective, it is necessary to consider how the units could be broken up in order to be more in line with the historic pattern of development, and consider alternative noise reducing options.

- It is noted that the subject site is surrounded by sites with other zonings (e.g. business zones, and other residential zones with no built heritage and special character overlays), however, this does not mean that this site is a transition site. The site has been placed within the Built Heritage and Special Character Overlay and so any development must maintain and enhance the built form, design and architectural values of the buildings in the area as identified in the special character area statement. The streetscapes of Surrey Cres, Selbourne St, Firth St and Browning St do have some variety, however these streetscapes, included within the special character overlay, are made up of single houses. Again, it is necessary to consider how the units could be broken up in order to be more in line with the historic pattern of development.
- Give some thought to the design and materiality of the dwellings and how this will respond and contribute to the special character context of the area. The cumulative effects the proposal will have on the special character context need to be considered.

The comments provided by Ms.Misra did attract discussion from Mr.Burgess & Ms.Skidmore, who were both not in necessarily in agreement with the comments provided.

Ms.Liu understood the philosophy that is proposal has gone through, and supported the principles being applied, but acknowledged the discussion and points raised by Ms.Misra.

Whilst context is of importance, it is considered that this should draw heavily from sites to the north that share a similar zoning / overlay. The need to reduce noise in terms of the sites that front onto Surrey Crescent, other measures could also be employed that achieves the same

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | outcome. |
| <p>Planning Considerations</p> | <p>The following comments were made by Matthew Wright:</p> <p>Within the Residential Single House Zone, an Integrated Residential Development is a discretionary activity, but is subject to the AUP(OP) appeals. As such, it is necessary to refer back to the Legacy Plan zoning provisions of Residential 1 Zone in terms of density provisions. Resource consent, will be required for this aspect, and may also define the overall activity status.</p> <p>The normal notification provisions will apply.</p> <p>Reservation was expressed to a number of units being three-storey, noting that the height and bulk of buildings needed to maintain an existing or planned suburban built character of one or two storeys within a generous spacious setting. This is of importance, but with a different context being applied to both the street-facing and internal units.</p> <p>The intensity of development, which does reference one to two-storey dwellings, with multi-unit development not anticipated.</p> <p>Development is expected to maintain the amenity values of established residential neighbourhood. Whilst 18 units may be viable, given the points raised here and elsewhere, this may prove challenging.</p> <p>The rear complex should look in increased separation from its residential boundaries. Whilst not standards within this zone, acknowledging outlook space, or giving this due consideration is of benefit. Main outlook space, in terms of lounge / dining should face into the site.</p> <p>Equally, the same applies to outdoor space, but recognition is given the type of living being sought.</p> <p>The number of units proposed could potentially be supported noting all of the matters above.</p> |
| <p>Construction</p> | <p>In order to build your proposal, you will generate construction effects that although short-term need to be appropriately managed in order to protect nearby amenities and the environment.</p> <p>Consideration is given the sensitivity of the environment, the proposed duration and hours of operation. We are looking, where appropriate, how</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>the proposal complies with relevant standards</p> <p>In terms of your proposal, I draw your attention to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Noise • Vibration • Sediment & Erosion Controls • Construction Traffic • Works within the dripline of vegetation |
| Nearby Residential Amenities | <p>When we consider the impact of your development to your neighbours, we are looking at how its height, bulk and location maintains a reasonable level of sunlight access and privacy and to minimise visual dominance.</p> |
| Services | <p>The proposal will need to be accompanied by an infrastructure assessment which outlines how the water, wastewater and stormwater will be managed and that there is sufficient capacity in the network to accommodate the proposal.</p> |
| <u>Stormwater</u> | <p>Where stormwater runoff from impervious areas is either diverted or directed to a stormwater network or the combined sewer network, we are looking at the extent of impervious area that was lawfully established on the 19th September, or does not increase stormwater runoff to the combined sewer network (unless approved by the combined sewer network operator). Where there is an increase, consideration is given to measures that mitigate additional stormwater flows and potential increases in overflows from the combined sewer network. This could include separation of services, detention devices and a future connection to a stormwater network should one become available, and alternative means of disposal.</p> |
| Traffic | <p>The proposal is for 9 car parks (with stacking) and a 5.5 metre wide 2 way access from Firth Street.</p> <p>Vinh Bui provided the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is for 9 car parks (with stacking) and 3 metre wide vehicle access for ingress and egress movements from Firth Street. • Overall, in terms of vehicle access, as long as it is outside of the Vehicle Access Restriction, the access will be acceptable, subject |

| | |
|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>to complying with the appropriate sight distance.</p> <p>The applicant prefers a two-way access however will apply for a 3m wide access due to the 10 metre Vehicle Access Restriction of Surrey Crescent and Firth Street. There is concern of the sight distance between left turning traffic from Surrey Crescent and site traffic and the applicant shall address this issue through the traffic report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 2-metre splay on either side of the vehicle access(s) with fencing of 900mm high is considered appropriate for adequate pedestrian safety. • The plans submitted with a resource consent application must show tracking lines of how onsite vehicle manoeuvring will work, especially due to the proposed stacked parking. • In terms of the proposal, not providing the minimum number of vehicle parking spaces, the inclusion of the proposed bicycle parking of at least 2 parks per unit is acceptable. <p>The applicants will need to provide a traffic report addressing traffic generation, parking, tracking curves, bicycle parking, vehicle access, visibility splays and sight distance.</p> |
|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Preliminary conclusion on outcome

Overall, recognising where you are in the process, there are a number of aspects to carefully consider.

This centres on an appropriate response to its context, which does need to be heavily informed from the Single House Zone / Special Character Overlay. The mass and height of the development, and how it responds to streetscape and special character values are of importance, as well as its relationship with nearby residential amenities.

The comments from Ms Misra and Mr Wright and consider changes that can be made to better align the proposal with the objectives and policies of Built Heritage and Character: Special

Character: Isthmus A and the Residential – Single House Zone.

From a traffic engineering perspective, the proposal can be supported. Mr Bui has acknowledged that a traffic report will be required to support the application addressing traffic generation, parking, tracking curves, bicycle parking, vehicle access, visibility splays and sight distance. Regarding access to the site and think about alternative arrangements for one-way access.

Further discussion is encouraged before any application is lodged.

Preliminary conclusion on notification process

This was not discussed, but initial consideration is as the application stands, some form of notification is considered necessary.

This is a preliminary view only. A final determination on notification can only be made upon receipt of a formal application (and the form this takes), site visit and review and if the proposal is supported by written approvals.

Resource Consent Strategy

Application Documentation

A good quality application starts with a good quality proposal, one that includes all relevant information and documentation required for us to process your consent smoothly. This will help to reduce confusion, delay and cost, as we do not accept applications which have missing information.

We recommend you [engage a professional](#) (architect or consultant) to prepare your application, as the requirements are technical.

It is important that your application accurately identifies all of the reasons that your project will require resource consent. This may also include, any Overlays, Precincts or other features such as flooding or instability, there will be other rules that apply to your site and you will need to demonstrate that you comply with these or state that you are applying for consent.

Your consent application must include an [Assessment of Environmental Effects](#) (AEE). An AEE is a written statement identifying the effects of your proposed activity on the environment, and information on how you

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | might negate or modify these effects. |
| How to apply | <p>You are encouraged to apply online. This will save time and printing costs and you can track the progress of your application.</p> <p>Alternatively, you can post your application or come into one of our service centres.</p> |
| Fees and deposit | <p>You must include the relevant lodgement deposit with your resource consent application, to cover initial application processing costs.</p> <p>If the actual cost is less than the deposit amount, we will refund the difference.</p> <p>If the actual cost exceeds the deposit amount, which happens in most cases, we will invoice you for the additional costs.</p> <p>The deposit calculator gives an estimate of the deposit required.</p> |

| General Information | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Auckland Design Manual | <p>The Auckland Design Manual (ADM) provides a resource for everyone involved in design, building and development to either share their great design stories with others, or to seek inspiration, tools and best practice advice from those who have already been successful. Auckland's planning rulebook, the Auckland Unitary Plan will articulate the rules for the future growth, whilst the ADM illustrates how to achieve the quality outcomes sought by the AUP (OP).</p> |
| Development Contributions | <p>Development contributions are the fees charged by the council for extra community and network infrastructure needed as a result of development projects. You will pay development contributions for residential and commercial development such as new houses, and subdivisions. The money collected from development contributions pays for the cost of public infrastructure that is needed to meet the additional demand from growth. This includes network infrastructure such as stormwater and transport, open space reserves and community facilities. To get an indication of the contribution please use the Development Contributions Estimator.</p> <p>Water supply and wastewater services are not included in the</p> |

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Development Contribution. This is covered in the infrastructure growth charge . This charge is administered by Watercare. |
|--|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Important Information

All consent applications become public information once lodged with council. Please note that council compiles, on a weekly basis, summaries of lodged resource consent applications and distributes these summaries to all local boards and all mana whenua groups in the Auckland region. Local boards and mana whenua groups then have an opportunity to seek further details of applications and provide comment for council to take into account.

Prepared by:

Name: Margot Thomson

Title: Planner

Signed:



Date: 12 October 2017

Reviewed by:

Name: Matthew Wright

Title: Team Leader, Resource Consents

Signed:



12th October 2017

Date:

Pre-Application Consenting Memo

| Pre-Application No. PRR00025404 | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Date of request | 15 th August 2017 |
| Applicant | Raheel Khan |
| Contact details | Phone 02102301509 |
| | Email raheelk@barker.co.nz |
| Site address | 11 Surrey Crescent Grey Lynn Auckland 1021 |
| Proposal | Retain and relocate the existing villa portion of the building on the site, and demolish the remainder of the building. A co-housing development consisting of approximately 18 units will then be established. |



| Meeting Record | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Date and Time | 19 October 2017 at 2pm |
| Council Officers | Matthew Wright – Resource Consents Team Leader Janelle Smith – Senior Planner Rebecca Fogel – Team Leader Built Heritage Priyanka Misra – Specialist Built Heritage Yu-Ning Liu – Principal Urban Design Margot Thomson – Planner (minute taker) |
| Customer | Thom Gill - applicant and architect - Westergaard Gill Architecture Graeme Burgess - Burgess Streep Rebecca Skidmore - RA Skidmore Urban Design Gerard Thompson - B&A |
| Additional Information | This meeting record should be read in conjunction with the 1 st pre-application memo that centred on a meeting dated 29 th August 2017. |

Matters discussed at meeting plus follow up

Integrated residential developments are provided for in the zone (as a discretionary activity, although this is subject to appeal). The Single House Zone, and its amenity values are based on special character (although the discussion on how the existing building and site contributes to this), and multi-unit development is not anticipated.

As discussed, acknowledging the overall context of the site and its surrounds we are comfortable with the overall concept and the introduction of multi-unit development.

Looking at the detail, we are considering the form, scale and height (as referenced by the Single House Zone); how development responds positively to the identified special character values, respond to the design, scale, height, setback and massing of development and is a compatible form which contributes to the identified special character values (Special Character Overlay – Residential). These provisions ‘anchor’ our considerations.

Whilst expressed differently, there are a number of common overlapping themes and similar outcomes sought.

The main point of difference, and where discussion has centred on is the 3-storey element primarily introduced along Surrey Crescent, and its design, form and height.

The form, scale and height is magnified by the proposed mansard roof space to the extent that this is not compatible with either the existing or planned suburban built character. I consider when compared to the Norfolk St example (which is higher at the street edge) means the scale and height of the building is visually dominant. We are focused on the form, scale and height, not the number of storeys.

We consider that carefully designed, with a traditional pure roof form (particularly street-edge or in street view), that can potentially provide living accommodation encompassed should be further explored.

Whilst two-storey would more easily lend itself to maintaining amenity values, there are also opportunities to consider on how living accommodation (within the roof) can be successfully accommodated into part or the whole of the frontage. Some opportunities are raised below.

Ms.Misra provided the following comments:

The relocated villa:

- As already discussed and outlined in the first meeting and minutes, the proposal to remove non-original additions of the existing villa and relocate the villa in alignment with other villas on Browning Street is acceptable.

Surrey Building:

- In the first pre-application meeting, the issues of height and massing of the proposed buildings were raised. The developed scheme presented in the second pre-application meeting has not addressed those issues. The proposed height and massing of Surrey building is still a concern. The building is considered to be one storey too high and not in keeping with the identified scale of the special character area. It is accepted that this site is bespoke and a little flexibility can be afforded to the built form and massing, which is why a two storey development on site, in a predominantly single storey character area is acceptable. Also acceptable is the idea of a positive built edge along Surrey Crescent, but that can be also achieved with a two storey building along Surrey Crescent. The roof form is exaggerated and the scale needs rethinking. The builtform must reflect the identified pattern of development in the special character area. It was suggested in the meeting that the roof space must be treated like a low height attic space as is traditional in the character area.
- In relation to the design of the building, it is acknowledged that a terrace-style building, although not a common building typology found in Isthmus A, would not be out of character for the area. However, the proposed design does not reflect the fundamental design features of terrace styled housing which includes front porches, verandahs and balconies, chimneys, individual entries to the units and repetition and rhythm of the openings and dormers.

- The materiality and the finishes proposed for this building are in keeping with the traditional materials predominantly found in special character area.

Courtyard Building:

- The Courtyard building is lower than the proposed Surrey building. The bulk is broken up by the stepping of the building to following the contours of the site. The openings in this building are evidently more rhythmic and repetitive as compared to Surrey building. The materiality and finishes proposed are different from Surrey building but still traditional in the special character area.

Suggestions provided by Ms Fogel include:

- Dropping the height of some portions of the Surrey Crescent building so that you further differentiate the blocks
- Introduce a subtle change with the colour scheme so that it gives the sense of breaking up the bulk of the Surrey Crescent building
- Developing the roof space along the Surrey Crescent building and give consideration that traditional roof forms are more of an attic form rather than a 3rd storey.

The following comments were provided by Ms Smith:

- Regardless of Built Heritage and Special Character Overlay, consideration needs to be given to the fact the site falls within the Residential - Single House Zone. Although the detail of how the building should fit into the Overlay is one matter, the development as a whole still needs to demonstrate that it meets the objectives and policies of the Single House Zone.
- Whilst it is acknowledged that integrated housing development is a discretionary activity within the Single House Zone, any such development must still be reflective of the bulk, scale, height etc. envisaged by the plan. In particular, the Single House Zone anticipates spacious sites, with dwellings of 1-2 storeys. Given the surrounding context, with larger apartments along Surrey Cres (albeit a different zone), Council is accepting of the concept of co-housing on the site and the proposed intensity, however this has to be designed in a way which also meets the future planned character of the area and zone.
- Currently, the form of the buildings, especially those along the street front of Surrey Crescent, are of a scale and appearance which is more fitting to a higher intensity zone such as Mixed Housing Urban Zone. The proposed buildings need to be carefully considered in terms of bulk and scale.

The following comments were provided by Ms Liu:

- It is considered that from an Urban Design perspective, the design of the proposal is 'nearly there'.

- In terms of the street interface/efficiency use of the land, please consider removing/relocating the (stacker) parking from the corner of Surrey Crescent and Firth Road. In order to create a continuous frontage on Surrey Crescent, it is recommended to place/extend the proposed building at this corner.
- In terms of the interface between the courtyard building and neighbours, please consider relocating the entrance of upper level units to be accessed from the courtyard. This is to minimise additional activity generated by the increased intensity onto the neighbouring properties imposed by the proposed development.

In addition to the comments above, I would like to draw your attention to the following:

- **Provision of on-site amenities.** In the Single House Zone, there are an absence of standards given the context of development normally associated with the Single House Zone. Consideration of how either individually or collectively on-site amenities is provided, noting also the need to create a safe environment. Reference, or guidance from other standards elsewhere in the plan (in terms of outlook, outdoor space) should be considered. I accept, given the concept, there is a 'shared' responsibility to terms of this aspect.

Preliminary conclusion on outcome

Overall, we are generally supportive of the proposal and the potential introduction of multi-unit residential development.

Whilst there are comments from Ms.Liu in terms of extending the frontage, the only area of difference is the road frontage and how you are introducing a 3-storey element. We support a positive built-edge but how living accommodation (in the roof) can be successfully accommodated into part or the whole of the frontage. At present, we have reservations to the mansard roof space.

Two-storey would be preferred, but the opportunity to introduce a 3rd storey element may be possible.

Preliminary conclusion on notification process

This has been raised elsewhere, and in discussion with Ms.Khan (B&A).

The proposal is likely to be considered a non-complying activity. If discretionary, it may be treated as a residential activity under the new RMA provisions. This may impact on the notification provisions and pathways.

Some form of notification is required, and a recommendation of public notification is a likely outcome. If not, we do consider that your neighbours will need to be involved in some capacity whether it be through limited notification and / or written approvals/

This is a preliminary view only. A final determination on notification can only be made upon receipt of a formal application (and the form this takes), site visit and review and if the proposal is supported by written approvals

Important Information

All consent applications become public information once lodged with council. Please note that council compiles, on a weekly basis, summaries of lodged resource consent applications and distributes these summaries to all local boards and all mana whenua groups in the Auckland region. Local boards and mana whenua groups then have an opportunity to seek further details of applications and provide comment for council to take into account.

Prepared by:

Name: Margot Thomson

Title: Planner

Signed:



Date:

24th October 2017

Reviewed by:

Name:

Matthew Wright

Title:

Team Leader, Resource Consents

Signed:



25th October 2017

Date: