

**BEFORE THE KAIPARA DISTRICT COUNCIL PC78 HEARING PANEL**

**UNDER** The Resource Management Act 1991

**IN THE MATTER OF** Private Plan Change 78 (PC78) to the  
Operative Kaipara District Plan

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF URBAN DESIGN EVIDENCE OF MATT RILEY**

**ON BEHALF OF KAIPARA DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**22 JANUARY 2021**

---

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 My full name is Matthew James Riley. I have been engaged by Kaipara District Council (**'Council'**) to provide an urban design assessment of Private Plan Change 78 (**'PC78'**).
- 1.2 I am a Senior Associate at Barker & Associates (**'B&A'**), where I lead the firm's urban design team. I have 20 years' experience as an urban designer and planner, the last 15 specialising in urban design. I have a Master of Architecture (Urb.Des)(1st Class Honours), a Master of Planning Practice (1st Class Honours) and a Bachelor of Arts and Law, all from the University of Auckland. I am a member of the Urban Design Forum and a Panel Member (Chair) of the Auckland Urban Design Panel. I am also an independent commissioner for Auckland Council.
- 1.3 I wrote an urban design assessment, which formed part of the Council's s42A report, supporting the Plan Change. Since undertaking that assessment I have attended the November 2020 hearing days for PC78 and I have read the primary and supplementary statements of evidence of Ian Munro, urban design expert on behalf of the applicant, and the statement of evidence of James Lunday, urban design expert on behalf of Mangawhai Matters Inc, a submitter on PC78.
- 1.4 The purpose of this statement is to update the commissioners on my view of relevant urban design matters having attended the November hearing and having read the statements of Mr Munro and Mr Lunday.
- 1.5 In my view, the primary areas of contention between Mr Munro and Mr Lunday are:
- Whether PC78 is based on a sufficient level of urban design analysis;
  - Whether the urban form that PC78 would enable is an appropriate response to the receiving environment; and
  - Whether there are sufficient controls in PC78 to achieve good urban design outcomes.

## **2. SUFFICIENCY OF URBAN DESIGN ANALYSIS**

- 2.1 From Mr Lunday's presentation at the hearing, I understand he considers that the urban design rationale behind PC78 is based on an insufficient level of analysis.

2.2 I remain of the view expressed in my urban design report that Mr Munro's analysis of the site and its wider context and his methodology for developing the PC78 provisions is robust and thorough.<sup>1</sup>

2.3 I concur with Mr Munro's analysis of the site based on the characteristics of what he describes as its 'bowl', 'flank', 'saddle', and 'slope', and Mr Munro's conclusions as to the degree of visibility of these areas from outside the site. I disagree with Mr Lunday that the level of detail of analysis is insufficient.

### **3. RESPONSE TO THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT**

3.1 Mr Lunday is of the view that:

- the urban form which PC78 would enable is generic; and
- the operative Structure Plan, and in particular its required clustering of development within an open space framework, responds appropriately to the sensitivities and characteristics of the site, while the proposed Structure Plan and PC78 provisions do not.

3.2 I disagree. I consider the urban form that would be enabled by PC78 to be neither generic nor non-responsive to its context.

3.3 I consider that smaller lot sizes within the bowl and progressively larger lots sizes in other parts of the site positively respond to the degree of accessibility to the Estuary Estates commercial centre and the degree of visibility of parts of the site from outside the area.

3.4 In my view, the proposed Structure Plan appropriately recognises key spatial features of the area (areas of native vegetation and required amenity planting, in part as a response to slope and visibility) and requires an underpinning road, pedestrian and cycle network that would help develop a local sense of place based on the visual legibility of its connections.

3.5 I consider that the Operative Structure Plan's required 'clusters [of development] set in a naturalized [sic] landscape and open space framework', as described in Mr Lunday's summary statement, would likely produce an attractive development form of buildings within a landscape setting. However, nothing I heard or read in

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 4 of my urban design assessment.

the evidence of Mr Lunday, or in the landscape evidence of Mr D.J. Scott, leads me to the view that this particular development form is a necessary response to the site.

#### **4. ACHIEVING GOOD URBAN DESIGN OUTCOMES**

4.1 Mr Lunday is of the view that there are insufficient controls in PC78 to achieve good urban design outcomes. I disagree. I remain of the view that the operative provisions are unduly onerous and that the proposed provisions achieve an appropriate balance between prescription and flexibility in managing urban design outcomes.

4.2 In his supplementary evidence, Mr Munro recommends amendments to PC78 to make it explicit that the Mangawhai Design Guidelines in Appendix 25A of the District Plan are a matter for assessment.

4.3 In my view, Appendix 25A provides useful guidance on how to achieve subdivision patterns that positively respond to the Mangawhai context. Direct reference to Appendix 25A in PC78 would ensure that these guidelines are a part of the assessment process for any subsequent subdivision proposal.

#### **5. CONCLUSION**

5.1 Having heard the evidence of the applicant and evidence and submitters, I remain of the opinion that there are no urban design reasons to preclude PC78 from being approved.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Matt Riley', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

**Matt Riley**