

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. My name is Katherine Blagrove, and I am an Urban Designer at Urban Edge Planning Limited. I have been engaged by Frances Holdings Limited to provide urban design evidence in support of the submission prepared by Mr Thomas.
- 1.2. This is my colleague Jaime Devereux, who is a Director and Urban Designer at Urban Edge Planning Limited. She has been engaged by Frances Holdings Limited to provide urban design evidence in support of the submission prepared by Mr Thomas.
- 1.3. We have collaborated on our expert evidence. I was originally going to prepare the evidence, however, due to timeframes, and with only recently finishing at Auckland Council, Ms Devereux and I have prepared evidence in a collaborative manner.
- 1.4. **Correction**

In point 2.4 of our primary evidence the open space/reserve section table, it should say *“it could be located on either side of Road D”* instead of Road B.

2. URBAN DESIGN MATTERS

Introduction

I will be summarizing my position on the key urban design matters of:

- Location of the open space reserve
- Flexibility of the road layout in the northern portion of the site
- Minimum lot size
- Transport

Location of the road reserve

- 2.1. Frances Holdings Ltd have requested that the Structure Plan layout includes the potential for the open space reserve to be located on either the north or south side of Road D.
- 2.2. In his reply Mr McDonald has advised he supports this flexibility on the conditions that the reserve needs to be co-located with the river access and sightlines ought to be retained to the stop bank from Ruahine Street.
- 2.3. Mr Phillips considers the reserve could be located on the north side of Road D so long as it provides good connection to the river entrance and is supported by some car parking.

2.4. It is my understanding Mr McDonald, Mr Phillips and myself are in broad agreement that the open space reserve could be located on either the north or south side of road D subject to good design.

2.5. **Flexibility for road layout in the northern portion of the site**

2.6. PCE seeks a prescriptive road layout for all parts of the 4.5 hectare site.

2.7. Frances Holdings Limited are seeking flexibility in the northern part of the site between Road D and the northeastern end of the plan change area whereby the location and dimensions of the future accessway or road could instead be decided during the resource consent process. This would allow for greater flexibility in developing this part of the site and in my view enable similar or if not superior urban design outcomes.

Possible, but not exclusive alternative outcomes include:

- A park edge road- which would enable new houses to front, activate and provide passive surveillance to the stopbank. This would take into account the building line restriction along the stop bank.
- A laneway from Roxburgh Crescent edging the new open space reserve and providing shared amenity benefits which would provide for a continuous reserve to the riverbank.
- A laneway from Roxburgh Crescent linking into the southern end of Road B (as referred to by Mr McDonald)

2.8. Response to Mr McDonald

Mr McDonald is open to a lane so long as it continues to connect Roxburgh Crescent with street B, but considers that the continuation of lot B as a public road is the best outcome for the area.

I agree that an accessway (via a lane or road) that allows public pedestrian and cycling access (either through an easement or otherwise) remains required in this part of the site. However I consider that flexibility can be provided as to the exact location and design of the accessway and meet Mr McDonalds above requirements.

To clarify my position, my primary evidence did not state that I consider a connection itself was optional, it proposed that the location and design of the future access should be flexible.

Increasing lot sizes

2.9. PCE seeks a maximum lot size of 500m².

2.10. Frances Holdings Limited are seeking an increase in the maximum lot size from 500m² to 600m² to enable flexibility in development. I do not see a significant difference between providing a maximum lot size of 500m² and 600m².

2.11. Response to Mr McDonald

While I agree a 600m² lot can provide for standalone housing, I remain of the view that it can also provide for semi-detached housing and could offer more opportunities for development of multi-unit housing under the new provisions.

When looking at the surrounding areas, the average lot size is 736m² and therefore the lot size of up to 600m² still provides an increase intensity. It is noted that providing a site size of 600m² does not preclude development smaller than this.

This would still be consistent with policy 11.7 regarding greater housing density and smaller lot sizes.

I make note that commissioner Sweetman has queried the necessity for a maximum lot size.

I am not opposed it and it would have a better outcome than average lot sizes, which we note are included in the plan changes that Mr McDonald has referred to in his latest evidence. Average lot sizes have the potential to restrict latter lots in the development and create greater uncertainty than a maximum lot size.

2.12. I note that Mr Guthrie is requiring lots of 500m² exactly for 2 dwellings, instead of up to 500m² which would make it difficult to comply.

One (1) dwelling per site, except that there can be two (2) dwellings on a site of 500m²

This is because in my experience a site is rarely exactly 500m², particularly in brownfield areas.

2.1 Traffic,

I have no strong view on the car parking layout from an urban design perspective.

I support having a road width that enables sufficient space for safe and easy pedestrian access, street trees and lighting, particularly within the main roads of the structure plan.

3. SUMMARY

In summary,

- **there is broad agreement in providing for the location of the open space reserve.**
- **I consider providing flexibility location and design of the road in the northern part could achieve good urban design outcomes. Mr McDonald is potentially agreeable to a laneway which demonstrates alternative layouts could be possible.**
- **I am in support of housing intensification, however I acknowledge the restrictive nature of 500m² lots could limit development potential.**