

Before Palmerston North City Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of a proposed plan change to rezone
land at 611 Rangitikei Line to establish
the Whiskey Creek Residential Area

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF ANDREW BURNS

URBAN DESIGN EVIDENCE

3 JUNE 2022

Counsel Acting

M J Slyfield
Stout Street Chambers

(04) 915 9277
morgan.slyfield@stoutstreet.co.nz
PO Box 117, Wellington

INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is Andrew Davies Burns. My qualifications and experience are set out in my brief of evidence dated 18 May 2022.
2. I have provided urban design advice to the requestor since the inception of this Plan Change. I was a joint author of the Urban Design and Landscape Report (**UDLR**) which was submitted with the request (Appendix 3), and my evidence is outlined in a statement dated 18 May 2022.
3. This summary addresses the key points from my evidence, in two parts. Firstly, it presents a highlights package of the masterplan contained in the UDLR. Secondly it provides a response to the matters raised by Submitters and s42A report relevant to urban design.

THE MASTERPLAN

4. The masterplan for Whiskey Creek was grounded in a robust understanding of constraints prepared by a multi-disciplinary team. This analysed the site and its wider context [e.g. refer to Figures 2, 6, 11 in the UDLR]. Design principles were established to guide subsequent options and final masterplan development. Eight Principles were set out and included such themes as: a connected network; a sense of identity; a new urban edge to the city; neighbourliness; housing choice and mix of use, amongst others.
5. A range of high-level zoning scenarios were prepared followed by more detailed masterplan options that tested alternative spatial layouts. A Multi-Criteria Assessment was used to test options and identify a preferred Masterplan and Structure Plan [refer to Figures 21, 22].
6. The final Masterplan delivers an extension to the Cloverlea neighbourhood. It provides a coordinated, high-amenity development with new open spaces that extend the city's network of recreational corridors.
7. My evidence describes the six key strategies that underpin the masterplan. These include:
 - (a) External Linkages: New gateway connections at both local and strategic levels with Benmore Ave and Rangitikei Line.

- (b) Street Hierarchy: Provision of a new Collector road along the open space edge, Local streets and a laneway to the medium density area ensure public access to the flood plain.
 - (c) Off-Road Trails: Pedestrian and cycle trails through the proposed reserve that connect into surrounding streets and link with Mangaone Stream creating recreational city circuits.
 - (d) Block Pattern: Small blocks create a walkable, permeable neighbourhood. Blocks present frontages to the street and lots are aligned east-west for sun.
 - (e) Open Spaces: An 'absolute edge' is created by the floodplain and proposed reserve. Riparian planting integrated with recreational trails. Playable park spaces are keyed into the block layout.
 - (f) Lot Type & Density: Conventional suburban lots and medium density areas provide variation. Matched lot boundaries are achieved along the Meadowbrook interface.
8. My evidence confirms that the principles, the masterplan and key strategies are consistent with contemporary urban design best practice and will create a well-serviced, high amenity outcome.

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS AND SECTION 42A REPORT

9. Firstly, I note that no expert evidence on urban design has been provided on behalf of the Submitters and therefore the summary below only relates to the original submissions during notification.

Access to Sunlight and Sun Shading

10. At paragraphs 27 – 31 of my evidence I note that a number of Submitters oppose the plan change on the basis that their properties will be shaded by future development. My evidence recommends these submissions are rejected but that an additional rear boundary control (3m min setback) be considered to further enhance sunlight amenity for submitters.
11. My evidence acknowledges that the rear boundary condition will change for submitters from rural to residential zone. I note that more restrictive controls than the operative DP provides are proposed (5m max height; aligned lot boundaries; 3m rear setback) to mitigate effects.

12. At paragraph 30b I describe sunshade modelling I have carried out for three possible scenarios. One of these (Scenario 3) models a 25m tall, 5m setback evergreen shelter belt as a permitted outcome under the current rural zone that would shade all properties from around 9am throughout the day at mid-winter. At the autumnal equinox shading would occur from 11am for the rest of the day. I note that in comparison the proposed residential zoning would provide considerably more sun at mid-winter and the equinox to existing properties (my evidence para 30e).

Provision of a road and open space along the rear of existing Meadowbrook Drive properties

13. Submitters SO1, SO2, SO3, SO11 and SO15 request that a 15-20m open space and/or road is provided along rear boundary of their properties. I recommend these submissions are rejected for the reasons provide at paragraph 33 of my evidence, primarily that urban design best practice does not support such an outcome. I also note the s42A report agrees that the inclusion of a green strip along the rear boundary of Meadowbrook Drive properties "*would not be consistent with good practice from an urban design perspective*", and "*will not be an effective use of space, would be difficult to maintain*".

Privacy Effects

14. Three Submitters (SO1, SO2, SO26) oppose the plan change on the basis that they will experience adverse privacy effects. I recommend these submissions are rejected for the reasons provide at paragraph 35 of my evidence, primarily that the 5m height control will limit any proposed dwellings to a single storey and therefore any views towards the neighbours will be screened by 1.8m tall permitted fencing.

Loss of View

15. Six Submitters (SO1, SO2, SO3, SO7, SO11 and SO13) oppose the proposed plan change on the basis that it will result in a loss of view to the north. As described at paragraph 37a - c of my evidence I recommend these submissions are rejected. In my evidence I considered what views might be reasonably expected to be lost based on rural zone permitted landscape structures. A permitted outcome could see a 25m tall tree line set 5m back from the boundary, removing all northern views as of right. Equally, the

landowner could plant a tree crop that would block northern views. I acknowledge that loss of view can be regarded as an adverse change but I note that the views onto private land are not protected in the District Plan and therefore I regard the amenity that the northern views provide neighbours as a largely 'borrowed' or 'interim' amenity rather than fundamentally 'owned'. I note that an existing shelterbelt exists in the southeast part of the Site that already interrupts views for residents at the northeastern end of Meadowbrook Drive.

Section 42A Report

16. Paragraphs 41 – 50 of my evidence address urban design related matters in the s42A report. I make several observations around improvements to grammar, consistent terminology and readability. I generally agree with the s42A report with the following exception:
17. At paragraph 47 I request a correction to a provision that states streets and blocks are aligned predominantly north-south. This is not correct and should state that streets and blocks have a generally orthogonal alignment.

CONCLUSION

18. My evidence concludes that the Whiskey Creek Plan Change and Structure Plan develops the land for residential and recreational activities in an appropriate manner. From an urban design perspective, I am comfortable that the site can be rezoned for these activities.

Andrew Burns

3 June 2022