

Record of a pre-application meeting for the residential development of the sites at 13 Cresta Avenue and 96 Beach Haven Road, Beach Haven – 11 August 2021

Office use only	
File number:	PRR00037673
Distribution list:	
Duration of meeting:	1.25 hours
Amount to be invoiced:	

1. MEETING DETAILS

Date 27 July 2021 **Time** 10.30am – Barker and Associates Office, Auckland Central

2. MEETING PARTICIPANTS - CUSTOMERS

Name	Area of expertise / profession / title
<u>Jessica Parulian (JP)</u>	<u>Planner (Barker and Associates)</u>
<u>Leon Da-Silva (LD) (via Teams)</u>	<u>Applicant (Da-Silva Builders)</u>
<u>Nick Mitchell (NM)</u>	<u>Urban Design (Barker and Associates)</u>
<u>Kevin Brewer (KB)</u>	<u>Architect (Brewer Davidson)</u>
<u>Laureline Guillou (LG)</u>	<u>Architect (Brewer Davidson)</u>
<u>Michael Williams (MW)</u>	<u>Engineer (Aireys)</u>
<u>Natalie Naidoo (NN)</u>	<u>Engineer (Aireys)</u>
<u>Mike Nixon (MN)</u>	<u>Traffic Engineer (Commute)</u>

3. MEETING PARTICIPANTS - COUNCIL

Name	Title	Role at meeting
<u>Mark Ross (MR)</u>	<u>Planner</u>	<u>Planning</u>
<u>Deb Lee Sang (DLS)</u>	<u>Urban Designer</u>	<u>Urban Design</u>
<u>Juliano Ramos (JR)</u>	<u>Development Engineer</u>	<u>Engineering</u>
<u>Vinh Bui (VB)</u>	<u>Traffic Engineer</u>	<u>Traffic Engineering</u>

APOLOGIES

None

4. SITE & PROPOSAL

Site address of proposal

Street number and name: 13 Cresta Avenue and 96 Beach Haven Road

Suburb, town or locality: Beach Haven

Brief Description of Proposal:

Da-Silva Builders are seeking consent to redevelop the subject sites and construct a total of 81 residential apartments, being 18 studios, 39 one-bedroom and 24 two-bedroom units. They will be contained in four blocks (Blocks A to D), with Blocks A, B and D running parallel to one another and Block C located in between, and perpendicular to, Blocks B and D.

Access will be from 13 Cresta Avenue via a common owned access lot (**COAL**) that bisects Blocks A and B and then runs along the eastern side of Blocks B to D. Use of the existing entrance strip serving 96 Beach Haven Road remains unresolved, though numerous persons from the applicant's side stated a preference for this to be pedestrian / cycle access only. A total of 63 at grade parking spaces are proposed along the length of the COAL.

Infrastructure will be installed and extended as necessary to service the development, and bulk earthworks will also be undertaken. JP stated that a separate application would likely be made for the bulk earthworks.

Location, site, floor, elevation, perspective, shading and compliance plans were provided for review prior to the meeting commencing. No new or additional plans were provided at the meeting.

It should be noted that the sites are currently zoned Residential – Single House (**SH**). However, a private plan change application has been made by the applicant to rezone these sites to Residential – Mixed Housing Suburban (**MHS**) (the portion of 13 Cresta Avenue fronting Cresta Avenue) and Residential – Mixed Housing Urban (**MHU**) (the rear portion of 13 Cresta Avenue and all of 96 Beach Haven Road). The private plan change is currently being reviewed by Council. JP confirmed that as the applicant will submit the proposed application before the plan change is decided, it will be considered against both the existing and proposed zoning provisions.

5. MATTERS / ITEMS DISCUSSED AT MEETING

The applicant team provided overviews of the development, during which the following matters were discussed:

Traffic

VB advised that a Traffic Impact Assessment (**TIA**) will be required, which needs to address all relevant traffic matters including:

- Traffic generation, noting that it is assumed that this will be addressed to a degree by the private plan change, being a consideration of the suitability of the proposed zone change. Nevertheless, the impact of generated vehicles, particularly along Cresta Avenue, will be required.

- An assessment of the effects of the proposed parking shortfall when considered against SH requirements. A key concern is that overflow parking may block sightlines, which will be a safety concern for exiting vehicles, particularly noting the proposed reduced width of the accessway at the entrance point. This needs to be carefully considered.
- An assessment of the acceptability of the vehicle crossing width will be required to ensure that vehicles will be able to safely enter and exit the site. A long-section showing the gradients along the length of the accessway, including the provision of 1:20 access platform (the first 4m of the accessway), should be provided. As the crossing will only provide for one-way flow, the line of sight assessment between ingress and egress vehicle movements at the road boundary will be required. Planting in this area should be limited to low-level ground planting.
- Details on the number of vehicle crossings along Cresta Avenue and associated separation distances should be provided along with an assessment of any traffic engineering implications.
- VB state his preference that the vehicle access onto Beach Haven Road is designed cater for pedestrians and cyclists only, with bollards located at both ends to prevent vehicular access. MN stated his preference for this outcome but noted that a final design solution had yet to be reached.
- Cycle parking requirements should be provided in accordance with Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part **(AUP(OP))**) requirements, with the location of such space clearly shown on the plans. Long-term (resident) cycle parking areas need to be secure (lockable) and sheltered.
- VB requested that the submitted plans show all parking space and manoeuvring dimensions, along with vertical clearance requirements and associated gradients. 85th percentile car tracking curves will be required for end parking spaces and parking spaces with non-compliant manoeuvring dimensions.
- VB stated that loading and rubbish collection / waste management requirements, and associated truck tracking curves, need to be considered and provided for.
- Noting the number of at-grade parking spaces proposed, lighting will be required. Given the importance of ensuring that these spaces can be safely accessed during the hours of darkness, a lighting plan should be provided with the application, noting that the detailed design requirements could be conditioned.
- A draft construction traffic management plan should be included within the TIA, with an estimation on the number of heavy vehicle movements generated per day, noting that restrictions on movements during peak hours may be required.

As an aside to the above, MR stated that he was aware that the traffic engineer assessing the private plan change was pushing for access to the site from Cresta Avenue to become a public road. MR queried this and noted that as this did not form part of the development as detailed in the pre-application plans, how appropriate was it for the development to be accessed by a COAL. MN confirmed that he was comfortable that it would function appropriately from a traffic engineering perspective and that he considered that a public road was not necessary. Vesting the access as a public road would also impact upon the proposed parking provision. MR acknowledged this and stated that the acceptability of the COAL arrangements will need to be assessed within the application. This includes durability / maintenance requirements. MR also stated that if public road vesting was approved / required through the plan change, then this would require a reconsideration of the proposed access arrangements and was a risk with preparing the resource consent application in advance of a decision on the private plan change.

Engineering

NN provided an overview of the engineering implications of the development and noted the following matters:

- On-site stormwater management will be implemented in the form of detention and treatment given existing capacity issues and the number of at-grade parking spaces proposed. All parking spaces will be constructed from permeable paving.
- As the proposed development will either remain under the ownership of the applicant or be unit titled, wastewater will be provided through a single bulk connection.
- The overland flow path (**OFP**) within the site will be redirected, with a scruffy dome proposed at a point adjacent to 11 Cresta Avenue. This will ensure that flows for downstream sites, and 15 Cresta Avenue in particular, are maintained at close to pre-development levels.
- Detailed earthworks plans (cut and fill, retaining wall location and design, erosion and sediment control etc.) will be provided along with geotechnical reporting. As previously noted, these works will likely be submitted under a separate consent, as the applicant would be looking to complete earthworks in the upcoming earthworks season.

JR acknowledged the summary provided and stated that it appeared all relevant matters had been covered, noting that commentary on the need (or not) for groundwater diversion / dewatering consents under chapter E7 of the AUP(OP) should also be provided. JR confirmed that consultation with Auckland Transport, Healthy Waters and Watercare Services Limited would be undertaken as part of the resource consent assessment.

MR queried the assessment that the OFP diversion would maintain downstream flows at close to pre-development levels and did this mean that they would experience increased flows. MW confirmed this to be the case and stated that flow changes are generally unavoidable when OFPs are modified, but noted that in this instance, the changes were not likely to be significant. MR acknowledged this but stated that this may result in issues with the need for written approvals if effects could not be assessed as less than minor. As the OFP would need to be amended to allow for the bulk earthworks to occur, this assessment will need to be included with this application.

Urban Design

KB provided an overview of the urban design considerations of the development, with DLS then providing the following commentary, noting that an overall urban design assessment / statement should be provided with the application:

Site Layout

- The site is a rear site with its main entry from Cresta Avenue (approximately 13.5m wide). Through-access for pedestrians and cyclists only is supported via the existing entrance strip to Beach Haven Road, providing more direct access to the Beach Haven local centre. Given the site access constraints, vehicle turning within the site will need to be accommodated and it appeared that this had not been reflected in the site layout presented.
- Surface-level carparking is to be provided for within the development (63 carparks). It is noted that some of these are located within the 13.5m wide accessway from Cresta Avenue with existing trees and landscape planting also shown that will help soften and alleviate the appearance of the

carparks. Retention of these landscaped / planted elements is supported and is important going forward.

- The proposal seeks to ‘pull in’ from existing neighbouring properties to avoid any overlooking and privacy concerns. This approach is supported.

Access and Circulation

- Site entry is proposed off both Cresta Avenue and Beach Haven Road, noting that the on-site pedestrian network is incomplete on the COAL side of Blocks B, C, D. A pedestrian path is provided through the site on the western side of buildings, but not on the eastern side of blocks B and D. Given there will be pedestrian circulation on this side of the buildings to access vehicles, a complete pedestrian pathway should be provided. It was indicated by KB that there is less room available to provide a footpath, so alternatives such as pedestrian markings on the COAL or the creation of shared space design to complete the pedestrian pathway on the eastern side could be considered. From an urban design perspective, the continuation of the footpath network is preferred as pedestrians do not need to make grade / level changes.
- Pedestrian crossings / priority should be designed into the COAL surface to coincide with and reinforce building entry and entry path locations. The COAL should be treated as though it is a street / street condition for the site and buildings i.e., buildings should address it and pedestrian access / amenity provided. The idea of a shared surface design for the COAL was raised by the applicant. This would be acceptable in principle noting that speed calming and pedestrian safety within the COAL environment is an important outcome.
- The entrance lobbies into each building should be defined / accentuated to ensure that they are clearly legible.

Building Location

- The proposed building layout is supported. The rotation of Block C so that it does not follow a consistent orientation with the rest of the buildings is supported and assists with providing better outlook over the COAL for passive surveillance and better opportunities for built form definition to the COAL and communal garden areas (as opposed to flank / side walls).
- It was indicated by the applicant the building location enabled outlook distances from all units to be compliant. This is accepted, noting that there will be a level of compromised outlook for a number of the units in Block D where they face the southern side wall of Block C. This was acknowledged by the applicant and will be assessed accordingly within the application.
- The building corners that terminate views on the access approaches to the site, being the northwestern corner of Block B and southeastern corner of Block D, should be designed, treated and considered as built form entrance markers into the site. As a result, they should be well articulated and treated.

Interfaces

- The property interfaces appear to have been well considered to-date. Interfaces within the site, such as those between ground level apartments and the COAL / common garden areas will need consideration. The topography on-site may also be a challenge, but it is suggested that the design adopts the following principles:

- Ground floor apartments and COAL interface: There are patio areas for ground floor units, located adjacent to the COAL (Block B and D). Privacy for these units needs to be balanced with pedestrian and visual amenity within the COAL (i.e., not tall, solid walls). Raising the ground level units so they are slightly above COAL level is a good technique where it can be achieved.
- Ground floor apartments and common garden areas: Similar to the above, boundary treatment / fencing needs to be considered and balanced between achieving privacy for individual units and amenity for the common areas. Inter-unit boundary treatments / fencing also needs to be considered with regard to height, design and materials. Utilising planting where possible is recommended to avoid widespread appearance of fencing on the site.
- Between buildings – upper floors: At this stage and as previously noted, it appears privacy is satisfactory between buildings as a result of separation distances. However, to avoid any future overlooking and privacy issues, the location of windows, sill heights and floor level differences should be further considered.

Floor Plans

- All proposed buildings are three-storey walk-up apartments and a maximum of three units is accessed via the common stairwell for each level. This is acceptable and results in dual aspect floor plans for almost all units, which is positive. The exception is the studio units located at the back of the common stair (there are three of these per floor in Block A; one per floor in Block B; one per floor in Block C; and one per floor in Block D). An assessment on the acceptability of these single aspect studios should be provided.

Outdoor Living Space

- Limited information was provided regarding outdoor living space. It is recommended the applicant review their proposal against the applicable standards and seek compliance.

Architecture

- As mentioned under Access and Circulation, the COAL should be treated as though it is a street / street condition for the site and buildings. Buildings should address the COAL in terms of position, uses within the floor plan and elevation design.
- A materials and colour palette should be included within the submitted architectural plans.

Landscape Architecture

- Landscape design (planting and hardscape aspects) throughout the entire development is important and should be carefully designed and considered by a suitably qualified landscape architect. This includes consideration of all necessary retaining walls and ensuring that they are designed and located in a manner that does not inhibit wayfinding or overall site permeability for residents and visitors.
- The landscape design and amenity of the pedestrian / cycle link to Beach Haven Road is important to ensure the surface design is 'more than just bollards'.
- Landscape input is also encouraged to assist with: the design of common spaces; balancing privacy, outlook and surveillance at ground floor; suggesting suitable boundary treatments between units;

and creating amenity in the COAL and central common garden area (particularly if this will be used to mitigate balconies that do not meet AUP(OP) standards).

Planning

The following planning issues were identified by MR:

- While it was accepted that the applicant can make an application before the private plan change is decided, as the SH rules remain in place, the density of development would be unlikely to be considered favourably. As such, MR noted that the best approach would be to submit the application under the proposed zoning and have it assessed under these requirements, noting that the application could not be decided until the private plan change is decided and any appeals resolved, as private plan changes do not have any legal effect until this stage. The over scale of development appeared appropriate and supportable based on the MHS and MHU zoning proposed by the private plan change.
- The above bullet point notwithstanding, careful consideration will need to be given to the sites at 11 and 15 Cresta Avenue noting the implications of positioning what will be a very busy accessway with parking adjacent to them. This is a notably different outcome to what they could currently expect to be developed next to them, noting that they will have an opportunity to have an input into the private plan change through the notification process. The flooding implications in terms of adverse effects on persons are also important with respect to 15 Cresta Avenue and any other downstream properties that are affected by the OFP modifications. MR suggested that it is likely 15 Cresta Avenue will be considered an affected party noting the amenity and flooding considerations. JP queried if an acoustic report to confirm compliance with permitted noise standards would assist. MR stated that it would, but that the other nuisance implications that cannot be accurately captured in a 'compliance assessment', such as car doors opening and shutting, people conversing and the passing of vehicles, will need to be assessed from an overall planning perspective.
- The eastern elevations of Blocks A and B, the western elevations of Blocks A and D, and the southern elevation of Block D were noted as being somewhat bland and blank, resulting in potentially adverse amenity effects with respect to adjoining sites that will have visibility of them. It was suggested that architectural design techniques be implemented to improve their visual appearance.
- The amount of outdoor living space allocated to a number of the studio units was queried, noting that some appeared to be very small, particularly the balcony areas for the upper-level units. KB stated that this design has been based on development previously proposed on Residential – Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zoned sites. MR stated that this arrangement is unlikely to be supported within the subject environment and should be increased to ensure that functional, quality outdoor living environments are provided.

No further matters were raised, and the meeting was closed.

6. ANY OTHER MATTERS / ITEMS ARISING / CORRECTIONS / CLARIFICATIONS

The following additional comments following on from the pre-application meeting are provided below, noting that additional floor plans of each typology proposed were also provided:

Urban Design

Additional notes from DLS:

Interface

- Drawings / documentation that communicate the design outcomes adjoining the COAL and the COAL itself should be provided. This can include sections and perspective views.

Floor Plans

- I have taken look at the individual unit plans received following the pre-app. The proposed units are on or meet minimum sizes in the AUP(OP) but are below floor area sizes recommended by the Auckland Design Manual (**ADM**).
- The Type 1 single aspect studio units are approximately 8.8m x 3.9m wide. An 8m maximum depth is a rule of thumb for single aspect units for natural ventilation and daylight admission (ADM).
- The Type 2, one-bedroom units are narrower than the studios at 3.6m wide but do have double aspect for better ventilation and daylight. This is positive as it assists with alleviating concerns regarding their narrow width.
- The Type 3-7 units, which are one- to two-bedroom units, appear acceptable at this stage. The review has been mostly over the living spaces of these units, which typically accommodate a 3.5m distance or width and is acceptable. There is also efficiency in the layouts of these units regarding circulation.

Outdoor Living Space

- The balconies on the of the unit plans appear small or just on AUP(OP) standards, particularly the Type 1 Studio (appears to be 600mm deep x 3.9m wide). There will be 18 of these Type 1 Studio units. Balconies are a preference in principle (rather than none). The availability of the common garden space can assist with mitigating under-sized balconies, subject to the design and quality considerations and type of facilities provided.

Comment from MR – I concur with this assessment. Plans should illustrate how the studio living areas and balconies could be furnished / utilised to ensure that they will provide an appropriate level of functionality for future occupants

Architecture

- The four proposed buildings have a different architectural, material and colour treatment and this distinction between buildings is supported to avoid a consistent / same approach to all buildings within the development.
- For all proposed buildings, where elevations express living areas through balconies, the building appearance is generally satisfactory. However, where bedrooms are typically expressed on parts of

the elevation or the entire elevation, there is a lot more uniformity and flatness to the elevations. Effort should be made to alleviate these. It is suggested that the applicant could do this in the following ways:

- Review the overall fenestration approach for all building elevations featuring bedrooms, particularly those against the COAL and visible from common garden areas.
- Modulate the elevations by articulating the presence of the two or three groups of apartments (those that share a common stair access) within each building, noting that this could be a way of enhancing the southern elevation for Block A and potentially others.
- Review the building face and cladding design to introduce recesses or projections, use of different brick colour and / or materials to enhance its appearance.
- Consider the roofline in overall design expression.

7. IMPORTANT INFORMATION

The purpose of a pre-application meeting is to facilitate communication between applicants and the Council so that the applicant can make informed decisions about applying for consents, permits or licenses.

The views expressed by Council staff in or following a pre-application meeting are those officers' preliminary views, made in good faith, on the applicant's proposal. The Council makes no warranty, express or implied, nor assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, correctness, completeness or use of any information or views communicated as part of the pre-application process.

The applicant is not required to amend their proposal to accommodate the views expressed by Council staff, nor to comply with any suggestions made by Council staff. Further, it remains the applicant's responsibility to get their own professional planning and legal advice when making any application for consents, permits or licences, and to rely solely on that advice, in making any application for consents, permits or licences.

To the extent permissible by law, the Council expressly disclaims any liability to the applicant (under any theory of law including negligence) in relation to any pre-application process. The applicant also recognises that any information it provides to the Council may be required to be disclosed under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (unless there is a good reason to withhold the information under that Act). However, the Council is able to withhold information for certain reasons including to prevent unreasonable prejudice to someone's commercial position.

All resource 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.

**Approved as accurate
record of meeting by
meeting lead**

Name:

Mark Ross

Signature:

