

BEFORE THE KAIPARA DISTRICT COUNCIL'S HEARING PANEL

IN THE MATTER OF the Resource Management Act 1991 (**the Act**)

AND

IN THE MATTER An application for Private Plan Change 85 (**PC85**)
-**MANGAWHAI EAST** by Foundry Group Limited
(formerly Cabra Mangawhai Limited) and Pro
Land Matters Company to rezone approximately
94-hectares of land at Black Swamp and
Raymond Bull Roads, Mangawhai

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JASON EVANS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANTS
(URBAN DESIGN)**

16 December 2025

Jeremy Brabant

Barrister

Level 7, 50 Albert Street, Auckland Central

PO Box 1502, Shortland St, Auckland 1140

M: 021 494 506

E: jeremy@brabant.co.nz

INTRODUCTION

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

1. My full name is Jason Glenn Evans. I am a chartered town planner (**MRTPI**). I hold a Bachelor of Science (Hons) in Environmental Planning and a Post Graduate Diploma in Urban Design from the University of the West of England (1993).
2. I have 35 years professional local government and private sector experience in master planning, urban renewal and regeneration, resource consents, building conservation and policy planning.
3. I was instructed by Proland Matters Ltd and Foundry Group Limited (formerly Cabra Mangawhai Limited) in November 2023 to undertake the urban design for Proposed Plan Change 85 (**PPC85**). Previous to this appointment I had completed a master planning exercise for the southern portion of the plan change area. I am familiar with the area having visited the Plan Change area and Mangawhai more generally on many occasions for work and leisure. I am the author of the urban design report entitled Mangawhai East Private Plan Change Request 26.6.25 and Mangawhai East Design Guide (**Design Guide**).

EXPERT WITNESS CODE OF CONDUCT

4. 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.

PROJECT INVOLVEMENT

5. I have been involved with PPC85 from its inception. My role has included site analysis, strategic planning input, and the preparation of the structure plan and urban design framework that support the plan change request.

6. This work has involved collaborating with the applicant team, engineers, planners, landscape and transport specialists, and engaging with the planning provisions to ensure a coherent and high-quality urban outcome. My input has been directed at ensuring the proposal reflects sound urban design principles and responds appropriately to its physical and strategic context.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

7. In this evidence, I summarise the key aspects of the urban design and strategic spatial planning assessment as set out in the assessments I have prepared in support of PPC85, which seeks to enable a quality residential neighbourhood at Mangawhai East.
8. My evidence covers the following matters:
 - a. The spatial and strategic rationale for urban expansion in this location, including the suitability of the site relative to other growth areas;
 - b. The urban design logic underpinning the structure plan, including street network design, block structure, land use mix, density patterns, and the integration of open space and natural features;
 - c. A response to the key conclusions of the Section 42A report, including matters of strategic alignment, servicing, connectivity, and perceived character effects;
 - d. A response to submissions relating to urban form, walkability, neighbourhood character, and development intensity;
 - e. An overall professional opinion / conclusion on the appropriateness of PPC85 from an urban design perspective, with reference to national and local policy direction.
9. My evidence draws on the structure plan, planning provisions, technical assessments, and strategic growth documentation associated with PPC85. I also reference my earlier analysis of the Mangawhai Spatial Plan 2020 (**Spatial Plan**) as it relates to the subject site and surrounding areas which I append as **Attachment A**.

OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL

10. PPC85 seeks to rezone approximately 94 hectares of land located at Black Swamp Road and Raymond Bull Road, Mangawhai (**Site/Plan Change area**) to enable the development of a quality residential neighbourhood.
11. The structure plan that underpins the proposal is informed by traditional urban design principles, with a focus on creating a walkable, connected, and contextually integrated settlement pattern that complements Mangawhai's existing character while supporting its future growth.
12. Key components of the proposal include:
 - a. Structure plan informed by detailed concept planning and urban design testing, rather than a fixed master plan, to establish realistic development yields, logical spatial relationships, and good urban design outcomes;
 - b. A centrally located Neighbourhood Centre Zone, providing for small-scale retail, services, and community activities within walking distance of surrounding dwellings;
 - c. A mix of residential densities, including Large Lot Residential, Low Density Residential, and Medium Density Residential areas, arranged to provide transitions in intensity and a choice of living environments that respond to topography, landscape values, and adjacent land uses;
 - d. A network of public open spaces, green corridors, and ecological buffers, with particular emphasis on integrating stormwater management and enhancing natural character; and
 - e. Attention to edge conditions, including landscape treatment and spatial transitions to rural land, the coastal environment, and key visual catchments.
13. The development approach reflects a desire to avoid fragmented, low-yield rural lifestyle subdivision in favour of a coordinated, strategically aligned neighbourhood. The structure plan enables efficient, timely infrastructure

servicing, supports a more sustainable pattern of land use, and provides a framework for walkable living, housing diversity, and community identity.

Strategic Alignment and Spatial Planning

14. The Section 42A report raises concerns about the strategic alignment of PPC85, citing the Spatial Plan as the basis for preferring other growth areas, particularly Area D, west of the Village. In my view, the Spatial Plan was not subject to a level of analysis or testing that would justify treating it as a definitive basis for long-term planning direction. Its conclusions were in many cases subjective, overly generalised, and in some respects inaccurate when tested against actual land use constraints and urban design principles.
15. The Spatial Plan mapped several “growth areas” and assigned suitability categories (e.g. low, moderate, high) without clearly articulating how those rankings were derived. *Area D*, for instance, received a favourable designation but is in fact:
 - a. Constrained by steep topography and poor aspect;
 - b. Included a sizeable ecclesiastical land use, which is unlikely to transition to medium-density residential in the foreseeable future; and
 - c. Offers difficulties to service efficiently due to limited access and terrain challenges.
16. These are not peripheral issues, they fundamentally undermined the viability of Area D as a walkable, integrated neighbourhood. Subsequently Plan Change 84 Mangawhai Hills has provided a more comprehensive response, effectively merging areas C and D of the Spatial Plan. In this context I note that ‘area C’ in the Spatial Plan actually ranked lower than PPC85 (area G) in terms of suitability.
17. By contrast, the Site (*Area G*) was assessed as “moderate” suitability, yet it comprises:
 - a. Large, contiguous landholdings under proactive ownership;
 - b. Gently sloping, north-facing terrain of pleasing aspect and solar access;
 - c. Logical proximity to the Village, road access, and infrastructure connections; and

- d. Presents a highly suitable platform for comprehensive, design-led development.
18. The Spatial Plan served a useful role in initiating community conversations about growth, but it was not the outcome of a robust urban suitability analysis. It did not consider matters in enough depth. In this regard, in my opinion it is best characterised as a high-level concept document, not a robust basis for a statutory growth framework. In addition, there have been various changes to Government Policy directives since the Spatial Plan was prepared and adopted. These include the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (**NPS-UD**) changes since 2020 and the acknowledgment that Kaipara is now urban environment,¹ the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land 2022 (**NPS-HPL**) and changes to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (**NPS-FM**) and the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 (**NPS-IB**). The current planning framework is therefore different to when the Spatial Plan was prepared.
19. Relying too heavily on its mapped preferences risks entrenching suboptimal planning outcomes, particularly if it directs growth to areas that are not realistically, efficiently developable, or that would produce fragmented, disconnected, or inefficient neighbourhood forms; or are in locations where there is no or little demand for living environments.
20. In contrast to the weaknesses identified in the Spatial Plan's growth assumptions, PPC85 offers:
- a. A clear and feasible urban expansion opportunity that aligns with landscape, infrastructure, and ownership realities;
 - b. A structure plan and concept masterplan based on sound urban design principles, tested for yield realism and walkability;
 - c. The ability to absorb growth in a location that is logically connected to the wider Mangawhai settlement pattern and reflects the polycentric character of the area; and

¹ I refer here to the recent council-level decisions on Private Plan Changes 83 and 84 in which the Commissioners determined that the NPS-UD does apply to Mangawhai.

- d. An alternative to continued ad hoc rural lifestyle subdivision, which risks undermining strategic urban form objectives and offers a poor macro sustainability model, now and into the future.
- 21. Mangawhai's development has historically followed a polycentric pattern, shaped by geography, infrastructure, and historical land use. The original Mangawhai Village evolved around the estuary crossing and early civic institutions, while Mangawhai Heads developed as a coastal holiday settlement with beach-oriented character. More recently, Mangawhai Central has emerged as a new retail and service hub between the two centres, supported by more favourable terrain and arterial road access. These centres have developed in response to distinct landform, catchment, and functional drivers, and are not linearly coalesced but spatially distributed across the wider settlement area.
- 22. This decentralised structure is further reinforced by natural barriers, particularly the estuary, which limits direct connectivity between nodes and influences daily travel behaviour. As a result, Mangawhai functions less like a consolidated township and more like a constellation of localised centres, each serving a surrounding residential community. This pattern with naturalised or planned breaks creates polycentric urban form. The PPC85 proposal aligns with this logic and established form, providing a scaled centre to support planned and existing development south of the estuary.
- 23. The Section 42A report (paragraphs 298–303) acknowledges that Mangawhai has developed with multiple centres but raises a broader concern about the strategic desirability of establishing a new neighbourhood centre on the southern side of the estuary. While this hesitation is understandable in the abstract, it does not reflect the developmental reality already unfolding in this area, nor does it engage with the risks of failing to provide a structured, serviced, and walkable alternative. It is also notable that the PPC85 area lies closer to Mangawhai Village than the recently approved Mangawhai Hills development, reinforcing its functional relationship to the existing settlement pattern.

Above: Plan showing polycentric urban form with PC85 forming southern node

24. The southern side of the estuary is already subject to increasing development pressure, much of which is being realised in the form of low-density countryside living subdivisions. These patterns are uncoordinated, land-consumptive, and lack provision for public open space, pedestrian networks, or local services. In the absence of an alternative structure, this trend will likely continue, undermining the broader objectives of compact urban form and efficient infrastructure investment.
25. In this context, the PPC85 proposal presents a strategic intervention, offering a cohesive neighbourhood structure with appropriate density transitions, integrated open space, and a modest local centre scaled to its catchment. Far from fragmenting the settlement pattern, it provides a centred, walkable alternative that relieves pressure on existing nodes and avoids further rural lifestyle sprawl.
26. This is particularly important given the estuary's role as both a physical and functional separator. For residents south of the estuary, existing centres are not within practical walking or cycling distance. The provision of a small-scale centre in this location is not an attempt to replicate or compete with Mangawhai's primary centres, but is a pragmatic and contextually appropriate response to the area's continued growth trajectory and geographic separation.

27. The PPC85 proposal has been developed through a considered urban design process that reflects best practice in neighbourhood planning. This enables a neighbourhood structure that is walkable, legible, and capable of delivering high-quality urban form over time.
28. The layout is shaped around a coherent movement network that includes a central spine road connecting to Black Swamp Road and Raymond Bull Road, with a logical supporting grid of secondary and local streets. This indicative network is designed to enhance internal connectivity, and support multiple points of access. The result is a fine-grained and adaptable block structure that supports both pedestrian movement and future staging flexibility.
29. The plan locates a Neighbourhood Centre at a central nodal point, easily accessible from within, and outside the Plan Change area. This centre can accommodate small-scale retail, village scale commercial services, and community uses, allowing residents to meet daily needs locally and reinforcing a 10-minute neighbourhood model. The surrounding residential zones are arranged to support this logic, with Medium Density Residential zoning concentrated around the centre and along key connections, while Low and Large Lot Residential zones are located at the Site's periphery and in more sensitive areas to provide a natural edge and lower-intensity transition.
30. The Neighbourhood Centre proposed in the Site is not a conventional, high-density, retail core. Instead, it will adopt a low-density, open-form village character, consciously reflecting the rural setting and aiming to create a strong sense of local identity. The design approach will draw on a rural, agrarian vernacular, with a series of modest, standalone buildings arranged around shared open spaces, laneways, and greens. The delivery of these outcomes will be directed by revised development provisions and supported by a Design Guide (see **Attachment B**).
31. Rather than forming a traditional main street or continuous commercial frontage, the centre is structured more like a farmyard cluster, an ensemble of pavilions, sheds, and small-scale structures that frame, rather than dominate, the public realm. A focal point green space will operate as an informal civic heart, enabling markets, gatherings, and everyday social interaction.
32. This approach supports a diverse mix of uses while maintaining a strong relationship with the surrounding landscape. It offers an alternative to the generic

suburban centre typology, aligning instead with Mangawhai's scale and character, and reinforcing the overall intention to deliver a walkable, contextually grounded neighbourhood.

33. Public open spaces are interspersed throughout the plan change area and aligned with natural features where possible. The structure plan integrates stormwater corridors, walking and cycling routes, and green spaces in a way that reinforces ecological and recreational value. This approach also supports neighbourhood identity by creating green links and visual relief within the built form. In my opinion, the proposed spatial configuration avoids residual or tokenistic open space and instead treats the public realm as a structural element of the urban form.
34. Built form outcomes are shaped by a Design Guide which sets out expectations for streetscape character, interface conditions, housing typologies, and materials. While not intended to operate as a part of the proposed Development Area Provisions the guide will offer a privately regulated framework to support developers, designers, and Council in achieving a consistent and high-quality urban character. It reinforces key urban design principles, enclosure, legibility, passive surveillance, and transition, while allowing some flexibility for architectural expression and evolving housing typologies.
35. In summary PPC85 reflects a cohesive urban design response, shaped by the Site's physical qualities and broader settlement context. It promotes:
 - a. Walkable and connected neighbourhood structure;
 - b. A logical distribution of land uses and residential intensities;
 - c. Integration of open space and natural systems;
 - d. A public realm that reinforces amenity and place identity; and
 - e. Flexibility within a clear urban design framework.

Landscape Visual and Character Integration

36. The PPC85 Site occupies a transitional landscape between the Mangawhai Harbour's estuarine edge and the gently rising pastoral and lifestyle lands to the east. While nominally rural in zoning, the landscape has been modified over time through a combination of farming, horticulture, residential development, and

tourism-oriented activities. As outlined in the Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment (**LVA**) prepared by Rob Pryor of LA4 Landscape Architects (Appendix 7 to the plan change documentation), and reaffirmed in his expert evidence to this hearing, the surrounding context includes lifestyle blocks, a holiday park, a brewery, and horticultural and service activities. In my opinion, these existing land uses already blur the line between rural and peri-urban character.

37. From an urban design perspective, this context is significant. It indicates that the surrounding landscape is not pristine or static, but part of an evolving peri-urban fringe. Attempting to preserve the current pattern of dispersed rural lots risks entrenching a trajectory of low-density, fragmented, and car-dependent development. Such outcomes are unsustainable and inconsistent with contemporary planning and design principles that promote compact, walkable urban form and contribute to a lack of housing choice, typology and affordability.
38. PPC85 instead provides a structured and coordinated alternative to that trend. The plan change proposes an integrated neighbourhood form with clear transitions in density and open space that work with, rather than ignore, the Site's landscape setting. The landscape framework developed as part of the plan change, including riparian restoration, wetland protection, and enhancements to the coastal edge underpins the plan change and supports a coherent neighbourhood identity.
39. The proposed zoning pattern reinforces this intent, with lower-intensity residential development located near sensitive landscape edges, particularly along the coastal margins and higher elevation ridgelines. The Large Lot Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones act as both a buffer to adjoining rural land and estuary margin acting as a soft visual edge, easing the transition from built form to open landscape and estuary margin. This approach aligns with the LVA's recommendations and supports low visual impact outcomes.
40. As noted in the LVA and in Mr Pryor's evidence, the Site itself does not exhibit high natural character values, except along the coastal interface. The surrounding landscape has already been significantly modified, and the Site is considered capable of accommodating urban development without generating unacceptable visual or landscape character effects. Over time, the proposed planting strategy and built form controls will assist in visually embedding the development into its setting, improving landscape integration and amenity.

41. My assessment is that PPC85 introduces a place-based urban structure supported by a landscape framework that delivers ecological, amenity, and spatial benefits. As a result the landscape character of the area will change, but in a cohesive and design led way. I see that as a forward-looking approach that enhances the interface between built form and landscape, and reinforces the identity and legibility of Mangawhai's settlement edge. In my view that is a more appropriate outcome from an urban design perspective than the land being incrementally consumed through ad hoc rural lifestyle development, which would itself lead to landscape character change.

Connectivity & Movement

42. The PPC85 structure plan has been developed with walkability and legibility as core design drivers. The movement framework prioritises internal and external connectivity, providing for the creation of a permeable street and open space network that encourages active modes and supports neighbourhood cohesion.
43. The primary circulation route takes the form of a central spine road connecting Raymond Bull Road in the north to Black Swamp Road in the south before connecting to the southern block. Importantly, the spine road then connects into the adjacent block south of Black Swamp Road. This allows for further linkage toward the Tomarata Road / Insley Street junction, supporting long-term integration with the wider transport network and reinforcing a connected settlement structure. The concept street network follows an organic grid pattern, allowing for staging flexibility, topographical response, and a coherent urban block layout. This alignment provides strong north-south legibility while enabling multiple lateral connections through secondary and local streets. The proposed street layout is designed to facilitate walking and cycling throughout the neighbourhood. It integrates with open space corridors, stormwater networks, and green links, ensuring that pedestrians and cyclists are not confined to vehicle corridors. The result is a fine-grained movement network that supports 10-minute neighbourhood principles and reinforces the relationship between daily life and the public realm.
44. One of the design strengths of the structure plan is its integration of movement and place. Key destinations, including the neighbourhood centre, reserves, and future community facilities, are located on or near primary routes and framed by public space. This reinforces walkability by placing important functions within easy reach of most dwellings and supports passive surveillance and social interaction. The

indicative block structure enables short, direct walking connections without reliance on long cul-de-sacs or disconnected spines. In combination with street design provisions and the urban Design Guide, the layout enables future development to deliver a high-quality public realm, appropriate street enclosure, and active frontage.

45. In urban design terms, a walkable neighbourhood must first function within itself, supporting daily life without requiring long-distance travel. PPC85 achieves this by locating residential areas within walking distance of a centre, open space, and key movement routes. The proposal is not dependent on external upgrades to succeed in walkability terms, though it is capable and committed to wider connectivity to the village via the Insley Bridge walking and cycling upgrade.
46. In my view, the structure plan supports a resilient and adaptable movement framework, one that supports modal choice, encourages local trips to be made on foot or bicycle, and lessens reliance on car-based networks that result through lower density development patterns. This contributes to reduced emissions, better health outcomes, and stronger community cohesion all of which are consistent with effective town planning.

COMMENTS ON S42A REPORT

47. Overall, the s 42A report concludes that PPC85 and the structure plan are capable of delivering an acceptable urban design outcome within the Site. However, the officer is “less convinced” about the resultant urban form delivered at a township level.² Notwithstanding that conclusion, the officer records that his urban design concerns are not insurmountable and invites further assessment.³
48. The Section 42A report raises a number of matters relevant to urban design and spatial planning. Many of these have already been addressed in the preceding sections of my evidence. However, it is helpful to summarise my responses and identify the areas where I respectfully disagree with the reporting officer’s conclusions.

² Section 42A Report at [504].

³ Section 42A Report at [505].

Strategic Alignment (Paras 275–297)

49. The officer expresses concern that the proposal is inconsistent with the direction of the Spatial Plan, which did not identify this location as a preferred growth area. As discussed in paragraphs 14 – 19 of my evidence, I consider that the Spatial Plan was not based on sufficiently robust analysis to serve as a definitive long-term growth framework. Its suitability rankings were broad and, in some cases, misaligned with actual land use constraints and urban design principles. In any event the PPC85 land was identified as one of the options, so it is clear that even the council, at the time, considered the location had merits for urban expansion and I note that the reporting planner endorses this but concludes that it is the timing of the proposal that does not stack up. In my opinion, PPC85 represents a more appropriate spatial planning response to other options when assessed on its own merits and better aligns with more recent central Government policy – i.e. the NPS-UD.

Local Centre Justification (Paras 298–303)

50. The Section 42A report questions the appropriateness of establishing a new neighbourhood centre south of the estuary, suggesting that such a centre may not be justified given the existing centres in Mangawhai. I consider this position to overlook both the polycentric structure of Mangawhai's historic development pattern around the estuary and the physical and functional separation created by the estuary itself. As outlined in paragraphs 21-31 of my evidence, the centre is not intended to replicate or compete with other nodes, but rather to serve the daily needs of residents in the immediate and surrounding catchment. This is consistent with traditional neighbourhood planning and will help mitigate the risk of further disconnected rural lifestyle development.

Landscape and Character (Paras 304–312)

51. The officer raises concerns about the potential impact of the development on the landscape character of the area. As detailed in paragraphs 36-41 of my evidence and supported by the specialist LVA and expert evidence of Mr Pryor, I consider that the Site is capable of accommodating the enabled development without adverse landscape or visual effects. The plan change includes a range of measures, including density transitions, coastal edge treatment, and open space integration, that support a sensitive and appropriate response to context. The visual images provided by Mr Pryor show the relationship of the Site, visually, to the existing

urban area and also the existing scale and nature of residential form in the plan change area.

Connectivity & Movement

52. The Section 42A report acknowledges the internal street network as generally well-conceived but raises concerns about the absence of firm connections to the wider movement network. While I agree that longer-term integration with the wider Mangawhai area is desirable, I do not consider the current lack of external cycle/pedestrian links to be a fatal flaw. The plan change will in fact deliver these connections and the Development Area provisions contains appropriate triggers to ensure that intersection, and footpath connections / upgrades are provided in conjunction with development. Urban upgrades to the Black Swamp road frontages will also occur in conjunction with development . As outlined in Section 4E, PPC85 has been designed to function as a walkable neighbourhood in its own right, with the potential to connect more widely over time.
53. Importantly, I note that the applicant is committed to providing a multimodal connection across the estuary via the Insley Street Bridge corridor, which has already been identified by Council as a future implementation priority. This connection, when delivered, will further strengthen integration between the PPC85 neighbourhood and the wider Mangawhai settlement structure.

COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS

54. Submissions on PPC85 covered a broad range of issues, many of which fall outside my area of expertise. However, several matters were raised that relate directly to urban design, settlement structure, and landscape integration. These included concerns about:
 - a. The **appropriateness of urban development** in this location, including perceived encroachment into rural landscape;
 - b. The **proposed density and housing typologies**, with some submitters concerned about overdevelopment or suburbanisation;
 - c. The **potential for visual and character effects**, particularly from higher-density areas or built form on elevated land;

- d. The **function and scale of the proposed neighbourhood centre**, including whether it duplicates or undermines existing commercial nodes;
 - e. The **walkability and connectivity** of the proposal, including access to services and potential reliance on vehicles.
55. Many of these concerns are understandable when considered in the abstract or in the absence of the detailed urban design rationale informed by the full range of technical reports. However, as set out in the preceding sections of my evidence, I am satisfied that the proposal offers a well-considered, contextually appropriate neighbourhood structure that addresses these concerns in a practical and responsive way. A choice of living environments will be provided, with a high level of amenity and community connection.
56. Regarding the density and built form concerns, the structure plan enables a range of residential zones, with higher densities concentrated around the neighbourhood centre and along key routes. These higher density areas will be subject to resource consent and design assessment to ensure proposals align with the quality urban design outcomes envisaged for the area. The proposal avoids blanket intensification and provides clear transitions to lower-density interfaces and open space. In my view, this is an appropriate response to the site's capacity, topography, and strategic position.
57. On the matter of character and visual effects, the plan change has been shaped around landscape values and supported by expert landscape analysis and design recommendations. The inclusion of lower-intensity zones and landscape treatments along visually sensitive edges, and the integration of open space and planting, are specifically intended to soften the built form and retain amenity.
58. Concerns about the neighbourhood centre reflect a common apprehension about commercial development in greenfield settings. However, the proposed centre is deliberately scaled and designed to reflect local character, adopting a low-density, rural vernacular typology rather than a conventional suburban retail format. It will also be designed to provide a community focal point including areas of open space. It is intended to serve the daily needs of the local catchment, not to compete with existing centres.

59. Finally, in relation to walkability and connectivity, I note that the structure plan delivers a fine-grained street network, multiple access points, and integration of movement and green space. As noted earlier, the proposed Development Area provisions will deliver a future multimodal link across the estuary via Insley Bridge, which would further strengthen walkability and strategic cohesion.
60. In summary, while I acknowledge the concerns raised by submitters, I am of the view that the urban design response presented through PPC85 is both robust and responsible. It provides a clear and coherent structure for future growth in a way that is sensitive to context, responsive to community identity, and aligned with best practice principles.

CONCLUSION

61. In my opinion, PPC85 presents a well-considered, contextually responsive urban design proposal that reflects the unique qualities of the site and the evolving settlement structure of Mangawhai. The structure plan and associated provisions promote an integrated and walkable neighbourhood form, with appropriate transitions in built form and land use intensity, supported by strong landscape integration and movement logic.
62. The plan change offers a credible alternative to ongoing fragmented rural lifestyle subdivision, delivering a spatially coherent neighbourhood structure that is more sustainable and efficient in the long term. It recognises Mangawhai's polycentric development pattern and responds to its geographic and infrastructural realities by providing a scaled, locally focused centre on the southern side of the estuary to meet the daily needs of existing and future residents.
63. The plan change aligns with both local planning goals and national urban development direction. It addresses concerns raised in submissions and the Section 42A report through a comprehensive urban design rationale, supported by technical assessments and implementation tools such as the revised development area provisions and Design Guide.

64. In summary, I consider that PPC85 will contribute positively to the urban form, amenity, and identity of Mangawhai. It provides an opportunity to proactively shape growth in a manner that is contextually grounded, strategically sound, and reflective of best practice urban design principles.

Jason Evans

16 December 2025