

Before Kaipara District Council

In the Matter of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

And

In the Matter of an application for Private Plan Change 84 (**PC84**) by **MANGAWHAI HILLS LIMITED** to rezone 218.3 ha of land between Tara Road, Cove Road, Moir Road and Old Waipu Road, Mangawhai from Rural Zone to the Mangawhai Hills Development Area.

Evidence of Garth Falconer on behalf of Mangawhai Hills Limited

Urban Design and Landscape

Dated 29 April 2024

Jeremy Brabant
Barrister
Foundry Chambers
Level 4, Vulcan Buildings
PO Box 1502, Shortland St
Auckland City
021 494 506
Email: jeremy@brabant.co.nz

Introduction

1. My full name is Garth James Falconer. I am an urban designer and landscape architect and the founder and director of Reset Urban Design Limited (Reset), a specialist urban design and landscape architecture practise based in Takapuna. I hold a Bachelor of Arts from Auckland University, a Post Graduate Diploma in Landscape Architecture from Lincoln University and a Master's Degree in Urban Design from Oxford Brookes University (UK).
2. I am a Fellow of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects Tuia Pito Ora and a member of the Urban Design Forum.
3. I have been practising for 34 years and have worked on a wide range of settlements and masterplanned residential and commercial developments across Aotearoa New Zealand such as Hobsonville Point, Waimanawa in Warkworth and Matakana village. I am also the author of two published books on the history of urban design and landscape architecture in New Zealand.
4. In response to issues raised by submitters I was instructed by Mangawhai Hills Ltd in November 2023 after the lodgement of the Private Plan Change 84 (PC84) to provide further urban design input and assessment, a revised landscape and visual assessment report and input to landscape design. I am familiar with the area to which the application for PC84 relates. I have visited the site and surrounds on a number of occasions, most recently on 6 February 2024.
5. Although this is not a hearing before the Environment Court, I record that I have read and agree to and abide by the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses as specified in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I rely upon the evidence of other expert witnesses as presented to this hearing. I have not omitted to consider any material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

Scope of Evidence

6. My evidence will address the following:
- a. Site and context;
 - b. Summary of the Proposal;
 - c. Summary of the Urban Design Statement¹ and Urban Design Assessment prepared by Reset and attached as Attachment 1;
 - d. Summary of Landscape Character and Visual Assessment prepared by Reset and attached as Attachment 2;
 - e. Response to Section 42A report (S42A);
 - f. Response to submitters; and
 - g. Conclusion.
7. In preparing my evidence, I have reviewed:
- a. The Operative Kaipara District Plan;
 - b. Kaipara District Council GIS information (aerial imagery, contours, zoning);
 - c. Mangawhai Spatial Plan 2020;
 - d. PC84 application including:
 - i. Assessment of Effects & Section 32 Evaluation Report (prepared by Barker & Associates, March 2023);
 - ii. Urban Design Statement (prepared by Barker & Associates, March 2023);
 - iii. Landscape and Visual Assessment Report (prepared by Greenwood Associates, March 2023);

¹ Prepared by Barker and Associates, Greenwood Associates and dated March 2023

- iv. Stormwater Management Plan (prepared by Chester, Feb 2023);
- v. Ecological Impact Assessment (prepared by Bioresearches, March 2023);
- vi. Cultural Effects Assessment (prepared by Environs Te Uri o Hau, July 2023);
- vii. Archaeological Assessment (prepared by Geometria, June 2023);
- e. Section 42A report and s42A report addendum; and
- f. Submissions and further submissions relevant to my expertise relating to the rezoning of the Site.

Summary of Evidence

- 8. The key features of PC84 to rezone the plan change area from Rural to a bespoke Development Area (Mangawhai Hills Development Area (**MHDA**)) include core provisions that provide for high quality large lot residential development set in an extensive natural landscape, framed by indigenous vegetation, wetlands and water systems.
- 9. Following a review of the Urban Design Statement and Landscape and Visual Assessment submitted as part of the PC84 application, I have assisted in the preparation of an Urban Design Assessment and a Landscape Character and Visual Assessment report that supports the rezoning request.
- 10. The proposal responds to demand for increased levels of housing in Mangawhai in an established centre and builds on the strategic location being close to Mangawhai Village. The proposal for residential housing adds to the growing population and enhancing the overall local community.
- 11. The capability of the plan change area to accommodate the proposed low density development has been well researched, with the retention and enhancement of the existing indigenous vegetation and waterways being the basis for the structure of the discrete interspersed residential neighbourhoods.

12. PC84 includes the Mangawhai Hills Structure Plan (MHSP) which illustrates spatial outcomes for the MHDA, noting that I have recommended changes to the MHSP as outlined in my evidence. This informs the spatial pattern of land use and subdivision, including detail of indicative primary and secondary road networks, a Landscape Protection Area (**LPA**), identified ecological features for enhancement and protection, indicative landscape and open space areas, and community hubs.
13. The proposed rezoning in conjunction with the carefully composed and comprehensive design features successfully enables a well-integrated development that aligns well with the anticipated development and character of Mangawhai and positively contributes to a well-functioning urban environment.

Site and Context

14. Mangawhai is a rapidly growing coastal community located on the southeastern coast of the Kaipara District and is well located 102km north of central Auckland and 70km south from Whangarei.
15. The Mangawhai area is of great historical, cultural, and spiritual importance to Te Uri o Hau, who I understand have mana whenua over the area. A separate Cultural Effects Assessment (CEA, July 2023) has been prepared by Environs Holdings Ltd on behalf of Te Uri Hau which provides further details on the cultural values of the area.
16. Since European settlement in the mid-19th century, Mangawhai has developed from a small rural service into two main settlements: Mangawhai Village, originally a traditional farming town centre set on the harbour containing cottages and a small shopping precinct, and Mangawhai Heads, a holiday settlement which has developed more recently on the eastern side of Moir Point near the coastline.
17. The Mangawhai area is a popular recreational destination and experiences a large number of visitors during the peak summer holiday period. The settlement is a rapidly consolidating urbanised centre with a number of residential subdivisions completed and further residential and retail

development planned in the nearby Mangawhai Central development. Mangawhai has become the second largest town and the fastest growing urban area in the Kaipara District.

18. The plan change is located close to Mangawhai Village and is opposite the Mangawhai Domain, the township's largest recreational reserve. The plan change area comprises 218.3ha of land and has long road frontages to several roads including Tara Road, Cove Road, Moir Rd and Old Waipu Road.
19. The plan change area has a strong topography, essentially a rising valley extending from the Mangawhai village centre with two ridgelines running northwest to southwest creating distinctive and defining landscape features. The plan change area contains two main streams that are of a low ecological value and are degraded due to the agricultural land use. The plan change area also contains a number of wetlands. The key terrestrial ecological values of the plan change area are associated with approximately 16ha of native vegetation remnants.
20. The plan change area is currently zoned Rural Zone, Mangawhai Harbour Overlay Area, and is largely an active working farm, with several smaller residential and lifestyle sized blocks to the south.

The Proposal

21. The proposal will provide increased levels of housing in Mangawhai on a large Site opposite a major reserve and adjacent to a well established urban centre. PC84 proposes to rezone the plan change area from Rural to a bespoke Development Area (MHDA) and include core provisions that provide for high quality large lot residential development set in an extensive ecologically rich landscape.
22. The locational context of the plan change area, its characteristics and capability has been comprehensively investigated and reviewed by an expert multi-disciplinary team including planners, geotechnical and civil engineers, traffic engineers, ecologists, economists, landscape architects and urban design specialists.

23. To sensitively fit development and enhance the nature of the plan change area, the MHDA enables a low density of development that is akin to a 'large lot' residential zone, taking into consideration the Operative Kaipara District Plan and the outcomes/objectives sought by the Mangawhai Spatial Plan intensification and growth strategy.
24. The plan change is supported by the Mangawhai Hills Structure Plan Urban Design Statement (**UDS**) which is the main supporting document that sets out the comprehensive approach to the Structure Plan design. The UDS includes an analysis of the site's constraints and opportunities which has informed the spatial outcomes. Of particular significance are the existing native vegetation, streams and wetlands, a prominent ridgeline and identification of access points and main circulation routes.
25. The UDS is based on a strong vision and guiding design principles that have shaped the design approach which is formulated on three site-specific design strategies; conservation design, water sensitive design and slope adaptive design. The core value of these design strategies is to minimise the environmental impacts.
26. The UDS informs the MHSP spatial pattern of land use and subdivision, featuring indicative primary and secondary road networks across the Site, a LPA on the northern ridge, extensive ecological features for enhancement and protection, indicative landscape and open space areas, and central community hubs.
27. The MHSP identifies appropriate areas for low density residential development enabling residential lots with a minimum net site area of 1,000m². This minimum lot size extends over the entire plan change area as the existing topography and natural ecological features restrict higher densities closer to the existing Residential Zone to the south of the plan change area.
28. The MHDA and MHSP seek to provide for the following outcomes:
- a. natural streams and natural wetlands are protected and enhanced by a minimum 10m margin of native revegetation.

- b. Significant indigenous vegetation areas are to be retained, enhanced with native revegetation and protected.
- c. A LPA is proposed across the northern ridgeline reflecting its higher degree of sensitivity in terms of visual change and landscape value.
- d. The proposed indicative roading network, including new access points, and an internal network of primary and secondary roads.
- e. A greenway network of walking and cycling paths is proposed to provide access along and to the stream corridors, wetlands, landscape features and future active open spaces.

29. The MHDA includes specific planning provisions to ensure that sustainable development and the desired environmental outcomes can be achieved. These provisions include land use and subdivision controls as well as standards in relation to built form, protection of natural features and provision of infrastructure.

30. Subsequent to lodging the application for PC84 and my review of submissions, I recommend that the MHSP be amended and refined. The key recommended changes are assessed in the Urban Design Assessment and Landscape and Visual Assessment by Reset as included in Attachments 1 and 2 and are summarised as follows:

- a. Extension of the LPA, along the northern ridgeline towards the Causeway Church property along with green corridors linking to the existing large bush area to mitigate potential development effects. This is a result of the visual effects assessment determining that due to a high degree of visibility and associated sensitivity along the ridgeline, a greater extent of the ridgeline should be included within the LPA. Following the viewpoint analysis it was evident that the area of northern ridgeline (within the Site boundary) was visible from a number of locations within Mangawhai, and that the extent of the LPA should be increased further, in order to mitigate potential effects from development in these locations.

- b. Extension of green corridors from the valley bottom east west and an indicative linear open space along the primary road to better create a network of green corridors and provide effective screening from adjoining sites to the west. The green corridors are 20m wide planting areas that will link the existing bush area with the ridgeline. These corridors will create separate 'pockets' of development divided by planting along the ridgeline, aiding in the visual mitigation, built form absorption into the landscape and enhancing the 'green backdrop'.
 - c. Closer fit of the roading network to the existing contour and the main entry off Tara Road shifting south towards Moir Road. The relocated main entry provides a more efficient access and connection point into the site, improving the overall circulation and legibility of the site layout.
 - d. The key recommended changes to the MHDA provisions are assessed below and discussed further in the planning evidence.
31. Two areas are designated for community uses, including an area along Primary Road 1 on the lower slope (Referred to as A. Main Community Hub) and an area at the northern end of Primary Road 1 near Old Waipu Road North (Referred to as B. Public Infrastructure Hub).
32. Two areas of potential educational facilities are identified. Both are located along Primary Road 2 with one at the entrance of the development (Referred to as C. Education Hub) and another near stream confluence (Referred to as C. Education Hub). From an urban design and landscape perspective, the recommended changes to the structure plan (Attachment 3) and associated provisions will effectively respond to matters raised in submissions and the s42A report.

Urban Design Assessment

33. The PC84 application did not include an Urban Design Assessment though it has been subsequently developed in response to submissions received and

the s42A report.² The Urban Design Assessment concludes that subject to changes recommended in this evidence, PC84 will achieve alignment with all of the District's planning framework.

34. The Urban Design assessment criteria considers objectives and policies of the statutory framework provided by the Regional Policy Statement and Operative Kaipara District Plan. It is also guided by the Seven Cs, New Zealand Urban Design Protocol 2005 (NZUDP) and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD). Also taken into consideration is the alignment with the guiding principles and matters set out in the Mangawhai Structure Plan and the associated Mangawhai Design Guidelines.
35. From the review of the relevant statutory and planning documents I have identified the key urban design aspects against which I have assessed the performance of PC84:
- a. **Provide for well-planned and coordinated development in an appropriate location. Contribute to sustainable resource use with avoidance of a sprawling pattern.** In my view the PPC site is well located in terms of transport network and its proximity to existing urban developments and amenities, and is highly suitable for residential growth provided a sustainable use of resources can be achieved.
 - b. **Complement the existing coastal built character of Mangawhai and respond to the planned future environmental outcomes of the Mangawhai Structure Plan.** The PPC presents an appropriate response to the site's features and the surrounding neighbourhood characters. It aligns with the spatial outcomes outlined in the Mangawhai Structure Plan, particularly in terms of providing adequate protection to the site's environmental features while minimising visual and landscape impacts on the adjacent rural hinterland.

² Note however that PC84 was developed with significant urban design and landscape input.

- c. **Maintain and enhance the existing natural features and landscape characteristics within the plan change and provide for the protection of valued natural environments from inappropriate land use and development.** The proposal offers effective protection and enhancement to the site's environmental features and presents a suitable spatial outcome that helps soften the transition from a semi-rural environment to urban subdivision patterns.
- d. **Preserve the existing wetlands, significant indigenous vegetation and ecological areas and enhance indigenous biodiversity.** The Mangawhai Spatial Plan's large ecological corridor will be protected and enhanced by this PPC. Together with a green corridor network I believe the PPC will be very successful in protecting and enhancing the existing wetlands, significant indigenous vegetation, and ecological areas, thereby increasing the indigenous biodiversity values within the site and its catchment areas.
- e. **Manage the scale of the development together with its likely subdivision pattern and built form to minimise the adverse environmental and character effects.** In my opinion the planning provisions of the PPC in combination with the Structure Plan will be effective in managing the scale of development and minimising the likely environmental and built character effects.
- f. **Connect well internally and with the surrounding neighbourhood while providing opportunities to access a range of transportation modes.** The PPC and the Structure Plan provide a well-connected internal movement network together with opportunities for access to multiple public roads surrounding the Site enabling connections to the wider area.
- g. **Provide a well-connected network of open spaces which integrates with the natural features of the area.** The proposed Structure Plan and planning provisions provide for a clear open space framework which will result in a well-connected and

interlinked open space network integrating with the site's natural characteristics.

- h. **Align with the guiding principles and matters set out in the Mangawhai Structure Plan and associated Mangawhai Design Guidelines.** The proposal appropriately responds to the Mangawhai Design Guideline, although many of the design details are to be further addressed through future subdivision and land use consents.

36. Considering the NPS direction to provide sufficient housing and employment capacity in well serviced locations, the PPC will add housing capacity together with potential education facilities close to well connected transport corridors and an established serviced urbanised centre. This will contribute to a well functioning urban environment.

37. Overall, it is considered that subject to the changes that I have recommended, PC84 will respond well to the constraints of the site and enhance its features. PC84 positively reflects the desired outcomes sought by the RPS and the KDP and aligns well the best practice urban design requirements set out by the NZUDP and from the NPS provides for a well functioning urban environment.

Landscape and Visual Assessment

38. The Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVA) Report) submitted with PC84 by Greenwood Associates (March 2023) focuses mainly on assessing the landscape character surrounding and on the site, and on the plan change area. The report did not assess the viewpoints or provide conclusions as to the level of effect.

39. Subsequent to lodgement a number of submissions were concerned with the visual effects of development particularly along the ridgelines. I have reviewed the sensitivity around the ridgelines within the plan change area and identified the need for a more detailed LVA including a comprehensive assessment of Visual Effects.

40. The LVA March 2024 prepared by James Paxton of Reset (which I adopt) and included in Attachment 2 (also undertaken based on Te Tangi A Te Manu Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines NZILA 2022) identified that the key landscape characteristic is that the surrounding landscape is both urban and rural in nature. The 'rural' landscape to the north and west comprises large areas of pasture with smaller residential lots distributed across the landscape. The 'urban' landscape to the south and east comprises recent residential developments.
41. A 360-degree survey of viewing audiences was undertaken which covered locations to the north, south, east and west of the Site, at a range of elevations, orientations, and distances (from approximately 0.2km to 4km from the Site). Viewing audiences broadly comprise road users (people in vehicles, pedestrian, and cyclists) and residents in the surrounding area.
42. Twenty-Two (22) viewpoints were selected, illustrated and assessed in detail as part of this report.
43. The LVA also considered the Mangawhai Design Guidelines which in particular seek that "Subdivision layout and the siting of building platforms must reduce the visual impact of structures within the landscape" (4.1.6 Building platforms) and avoiding development that dominates ridgelines and natural features is noted along with ensuring the retention of indigenous ecosystems (*ODP –appendix 25A Mangawhai Design Guidelines*).
44. While the proposed Structure Plan features noted above would result in significant positive effects on the Site from a visual perspective, various aspects and parts of the Site (particularly the ridgelines) are visible from a wide range of locations in and around Mangawhai, due largely to the size and extent of the Site and the unique topography.
45. As a result of the LVA, I recommend the following changes to the MHSP summarised as follows to manage adverse landscape and visual effects:

- a. Expansion of the LPA to roughly double the previous size to the east along the northern ridgeline connecting to the large existing bush area.
- b. Extension of green corridors westwards from the central valley and shifting of the green linear strip to the western edge of the Primary road 1.

46. As a result of the LVA, I recommend the following changes to the MHDA provisions, summarised as follows to manage adverse landscape and visual effects:

- a. Within the LPA provisions (applying along the northern ridgeline) further detailing of controls around building height. The highest point of any buildings, accessory buildings, and structures shall not exceed a maximum height of 5.0m above natural ground level of the 'Northern Ridgeline' as shown on the Mangawhai Hills Structure Plan.
- b. Within the LPA provisions (applying along the northern ridgeline) further detailing of controls around landscaping. An area of vegetation planting is to be provided along the length of any internal boundary which is 2m wide and a minimum 15m in length, is capable of achieving a minimum establishment height of 8m above ground level and at a density that will achieve canopy closure within 3-5 years.
- c. In addition, there will an area of native vegetation planting within the entire extent of the 'Green Corridors' as identified on the Recommended Structure Plan, which is capable of achieving a minimum establishment height of 8m above ground level and at a density that will achieve canopy closure within 3-5 years.
- d. Planting adjacent to the built form within the LPA aids in the visual mitigation and absorption of built features into the wider landscape. The planting noted above will eventually grow to be taller than the buildings, and will be a visible feature on the horizon,

therefore helping to retain a 'naturalistic' horizon line on the ridgeline.

47. When considered collectively, in my opinion even though PC84 will create a noticeable level of change, the plan change area can accommodate the anticipated future development enabled by the proposed zoning without significantly diminishing the landscape attributes, values and character of the Site and/or surrounding landscape. PC84 aligns with the objectives of the Kaipara District Council by providing a residential development opportunity that respects the natural setting and integrates into the wider landscape and character context of Mangawhai.
48. I consider that as the level of sensitivity of the plan change area to visual change is generally low, the PC84 provisions subject to my recommended changes are effective at reducing impacts. The overall adverse landscape and visual amenity effects of the rezoning are an acceptable change within the surrounding environment.
49. This assessment concludes that the plan change area can accommodate the proposed rezoning, subject to the proposed (amended) provisions and the PPC is appropriate in terms of its landscape and visual amenity effects.

Response to s 42A Report

50. The S42A report (updated 22 April 2024) reviews the plan change application and submissions. I note that the S42A assessment of urban design and landscape matters is solely based on the original application - further assessment has been subsequently undertaken as outlined above.
51. I have identified the key topics which align with my area of expertise and address those below.

Roading

52. For the Applicant, the evidence of Mr Kelly assesses technical traffic considerations.

53. The review of transportation matters by Councils expert Ms Gasson acknowledged that the site is well located close to Mangawhai village and Mangawhai Central particularly in terms of walking and cycling. I agree.
54. The S42A support for the Structure Plans roading network was also tempered by a concern for resilience in case parts were not achievable.
55. The chief concern was about the possibility the southern link through the fragmented ownership to Moir Street might not eventuate causing an extended travel loop back to mid Tara Road. Mr Kelly has addressed the technical aspects of this issue. For my part I confirm that even if those parts of the proposed road network requiring third party land and approval are not constructed, the urban design for the site will still be appropriate with suitable connectivity and linkages.
56. In response to submissions, the proposed intersection with Tara Road has been relocated further south towards the Moir Street intersection. In my opinion this provides a more centralised location that minimises extended looping back. Mr Kelly's evidence addresses this point in terms of further resilience and safety and supports the section 42 A suggestion that there should be a footpath extending from the access point along Tara Road to Moir Rd and a pedestrian crossing facility to Mangawhai Domain. I also support the footpath and crossing suggestion.

Urban Design, Urban Form and the NPS-UD

57. The S42A report correctly observes in my opinion that the current form of the township reflects a consolidation of the two historically disparate centres with continued expansion and recent developments such as Mangawhai Central and new walking and cycling links across the harbour.
58. In terms of policy direction, the S42A report notes that the ODP Structure plan is 20 years old, and that subsequent growth has clearly surpassed its projections. However, the S42A report also acknowledges the large area proposed in PC84 for conservation purposes and the proposed low residential density of development does align well with the ODP policies.

59. With regards to the more recently prepared Mangawhai Spatial Plan 2020 the s42A records that the site is within the area for growth and the Spatial Plan identifies the need for further growth around the two centres. The southern end of the plan change area is identified as one of the two most suitable urban locations for Mangawhai's future expansion (point 210 page 46) though the northern end is anticipated to be rural residential.
60. In terms of aligning the different medium and rural residential densities proposed with those suggested in the Spatial Plan for the PPC84 area, the s42A report acknowledges the investigation work that has led to the "more bespoke and nuanced approach of mixing density with large scale ecological restoration" (point 211 p 57) rather than the residential density anticipated by the Mangawhai Spatial Plan". Further the s42A report states that "PPC84 provides a more considered / detailed assessment of the block more developed than the high level Spatial Plan" (point 211 page 576). I agree. In my view the section 42A report correctly supports averaging of density across the plan area to achieve a large lot development that aligns with the area's capacity and enables a considered response to landform and ecology on the site.
61. Whilst acknowledging that the NPS 2020 does not directly apply to Mangawhai the s42A report does provide a section noting its direction (point 196 page 61).
62. The s42A report observes that a number of submitters are concerned that further residential capacity was not needed in Mangawhai.
63. The S42A report also identifies that the central objective of the NPS to create a "well functioning urban environment" (objective 3A NPS) is not just about access to serviced homes. Resilient communities also need ready access to employment opportunities and the wide range of community facilities, shops and services" (point 219 page 62).

The evidence of Mr Osborne addresses economic and demand considerations. He supports the plan change and (in response to relief sought by a submitter) including potential additional provision for commercial activity. The amendments I have proposed respond to this evidence.

Landscape Change

64. The section 42A report agrees that landscape change from a rural character to “a new housing area set amongst extensive ecological enhancement” is a change but not an adverse one (point 234 page 66) and that the proposal will integrate well with both the township to the south and rural lifestyle development in the wider area (point 235 page 52). Based on the assessments I have undertaken, and the analysis in the Urban Design Assessment and Landscape and Visual Assessment which I adopt, I agree.
65. The proposal to form a LPA with controls on height, earthworks and reflectivity are supported by the reporting planner (point 241 page 67). The LVA recommends a further increase in extent of the LPA within the revised MHSP and a change in provisions for height limit within the LPA in response to submissions (Refer to the Recommended Structure Plan showing extent of the LPA).
66. The section 42A report also agrees that the PPC84 Rules around setbacks, permeable fencing and landscape strips will effectively assist with developing a spacious and vegetated street scape compatible with a semi rural character (point 243 page 53). I agree.
67. Overall I believe the section 42A report is supportive of the urban design elements within transportation and urban form, which conclusion aligns with my opinion.

Response to Submitters

I have identified the a number of submissions as raising issues relevant to my areas of expertise and respond below thematically.

North South Road

68. The Causeway Church have submitted that they do not want the north south road to go through their property.

Response

69. Whilst I believe the proposed primary road through the submitter's property is appropriate from a connectivity perspective, it isn't fundamental as the main entry road off Tara Road has been shifted southwards towards Moir Road which centralises access and lowers the need for the north south road if the link through the Causeway Church property did not proceed. This more central access point reduces the distance any extended looping back for properties located on the southern end of the plan area.

Streetlighting

70. A number of submitters have expressed a desire that low impact street lighting be included in the controls for the PPC. The reviewing planner agrees streetlighting is required but does not believe a control on lighting is necessary.

Response

Whilst I agree that street lighting is required, and low impact /LED lights are preferable, I consider that this is a matter for Resource Consent

Building Coverage

71. One submission seeks an increase in permitted site coverage. The reporting planner believes the proposed rule package provides an appropriate building envelope.

Response

72. In my opinion, the specifically designed PPC 84 provisions for permitted maximum site coverage areas of 250m² in the LPA or 330m² in other residential areas is sufficient for family homes whilst maintaining discrete building forms within the larger natural landscape.

Building Setback

73. A submitter seeks larger setbacks between buildings to maintain spaciousness. The reporting planner believes the proposed controls are in

line with the ODP and are pragmatic towards accessory buildings, recommending no amendments to the proposed rules.

Response

74. The proposed setback from the street and internal boundaries are sufficiently large (5 and 7m respectively) to create a spacious streetscape where space dominates rather than built form. The ability to locate small accessory structures on the internal boundaries allows for servicing. Planted strips on perimeter lots will further assist in integrating with adjacent lifestyle landscape character.

Minimum house size

75. One submitter seeks a minimum house size of 250m². The reporting planner does not accept this submission due to concerns for enabling a wide range of house sizes rather than just large houses.

Response

76. The minimum site size of 1000m² provides for a range of potential house designs. To restrict the minimum home size as suggested would limit the scope for range of house types and sizes to provide a broad based community, without any sustainable management basis for doing so.

Colour Palette

77. A number of submissions seek specific provisions to define the colour palette of homes.

Response

78. Currently the provisions include restrictions for built development within the LPA including on mirror glazing, and reflectance. Overall the PPC84 provisions setting of reflection values for cladding and roofs directs toward darker colours. Reflectance value proposed is similar to that of other sensitive areas such as Jacks Point in Queenstown. However I do not believe on further restrictions in defining specific colours as some of the submitters

suggest, as this could limit architectural expression and tend towards monotony.

Esplanade Reserve

79. A submission suggests the Council should take a public esplanade strip along the northern ridge.

Response

80. Leaving the technicalities of the type of reserve requested to one side, I believe the proposed provisions of the LPA will successfully integrate development along the northern ridge. Public trails are enabled through the plan area that connect with existing established bush. There is no functional or sustainable management reason in the context of my expertise for a reserve to be taken in this location.

Conclusion

81. In summary, the proposed PPC will have a number of positive urban design effects and aligns well with the planned growth of Mangawhai.
82. The Site is well located close to Mangawhai village and its complex landscape features have been thoroughly investigated to inform a sensitive conservation and regenerative design approach that effectively provides for environmental protection and integration.
83. The proposed large lot residential development represents a logical and sympathetic response to the site and surrounding context, taking into account the existing semi-rural character, and the topographic and ecological constraints of the Site.
84. The Structure Plan provides for clear and comprehensive development outcomes. The key elements of the Structure Plan include a large LPA on the northern ridgeline, and a well-connected network of vehicular, pedestrian, and cyclist connections, enhancing accessibility within the site and to surrounding areas. Additionally, it incorporates an interlinked open

space network that promotes pedestrian access to natural features while enabling additional linkage between the residential neighbourhood and its natural landscape setting.

85. Planning provisions are considered effective in ensuring a high quality residential environment and mitigating built character and environmental effects on the surrounding neighbours.
86. Overall, it is my opinion that the proposal positively reflects the desired outcomes sought by the NPS, RPS, and the KDP and aligns well the best practice urban design requirements set out by the NZUDP.
87. In conclusion, I support the proposed PPC from both an urban design and landscape design perspective.



Garth Falconer

Dated 29 April 2024