

# Richard Knott Limited

Urban Design | Masterplanning | Built Heritage  
Town Planning | Landscape and Visual Assessment

To: Natasha Rivai, The Property Group

From: Richard Knott

Date: 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2022

Proposed Plan Change, 41 – 43 Brigham Creek Road

Re: Clause 23 Request for Further Information: Response to Urban Design Matters

---

This memo responds to the urban design matters raised in Auckland Council's Clause 23 request for further information. It should be treated as an addendum to my original 'Private Plan Change and Proposed Residential Development, 41-43 Brigham Creek Road, Whenuapai, Urban Design Assessment', dated 2nd September 2021

Request - Item 19	Response
Urban Design Assessment - Please provide an addendum to the urban design assessment. It is considered the current assessment provided assesses what would be included in a future land use consent application, not the plan change. Further detail is required to understand the rationale for the block patterns, roading structure and connections back into the Whenuapai neighbourhood. This addendum should include the following:	<p><i>Noted. The original report was prepared in light of the intention to concurrently submit both a Private Plan Change request and a resource consent for the residential development of the land to Auckland Council.</i></p>
a. Context:	
i. A robust assessment of the immediate context as well as the wider context. Reliance on the Whenuapai Structure Plan is not considered adequate for a plan change of this scale. Please consider aspects such as walking / cycling connections to key amenities such as schools, local reserves, playgrounds, shops, public transport stops (and other key everyday facilities). Please provide details of how safe and direct access can be provided across Brigham Creek Road	<p><i>Appendix 1 of the AUP(OP) states that 'Structure plans are an important method for establishing the pattern of land use and the transport and services network within a defined area. They can provide a detailed examination of the opportunities and constraints relating to the land including its suitability for various activities, infrastructure provision, geotechnical issues and natural hazards...'</i></p> <p><i>The Whenuapai Structure Plan identifies that 'The purpose of this document is to outline the structure plan for Whenuapai. This structure plan follows the requirements of Appendix 1 of the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part. It is the product of analysis of technical reports from numerous Auckland Council departments and infrastructure providers, community feedback received during the engagement process, and feedback from key stakeholders within the structure plan area. Whenuapai is part of the solution to Auckland's growth challenge; this document sets out how the structure plan area is to be developed from now and over the next 10-20 years and how Whenuapai will integrate with wider Auckland.'</i></p> <p><i>In light of these statements, it is appropriate that the proposed plan change is informed by and aligns with the expectations of the Structure Plan, otherwise the Structure Plan would have been prepared in vain.</i></p>

---

---

Key existing local reserves, and planned reserves identified on the structure plan, are all to the north of Brigham Creek Road. The zoned Business Local Centre Zoned land is also to the north of Brigham Creek Road; see Figure 1 and Figure 2 of my original report.

There is currently a controlled pedestrian crossing at the traffic lights at the intersection of Brigham Creek Road with Totara Road and Mamari Road. Whilst this currently provides a safe crossing from the south to north side of Brigham Creek Road, which would allow future residents to access the reserve in the north-west corner of this intersection (with adjacent coffee shop), Local Centre zoned land in the north-east quadrant of the intersection and other local facilities to the north of the road, there are currently no footpaths along Mamari Road or the south side of Brigham Creek Road linking to the site.

To provide safe walking and cycling connections to these facilities, it will be necessary to provide:

- The upgrade of Mamari Road to provide footpaths linking to the Brigham Creek Road intersection.
- The upgrade of the south side of Brigham Creek Road to provide a footpath,
- Alternative to the above, ensure the provision of a further safe crossing over Brigham Creek Road along the site frontage (preferably in the location of any road connection into the site from Brigham Creek Road), to provide a safe connection from the site to the existing footpath along the north side of Brigham Creek Road and so facilitate access to existing and planned local facilities.

---

ii. Further justification is required in terms of proposed zoning ie. why is Mixed Housing Urban zone proposed. The justification appears to be this zoning is in line the Whenuapai Structure Plan. Please provide a robust analysis detailing how the proposed zoning is in line with the relevant parts of the Regional Policy Statement of the AUP and National Policy Statement on Urban Development.

The Unitary Plan became operative in part in November 2016, approximately 2 months after the Whenuapai Structure Plan, however the Independent Hearings Panel has issued their recommendations in July 2016. I therefore assume that the team preparing the Structure Plan would have had good knowledge of the emerging RPS and that this would have informed the Structure Plan.

The Structure Plan predates the NPS(UD). Whilst the NPS (UD) 2020 (updated May 2022) requires reconsideration of densities within Tier 1 areas, In this instance I note that the Council themselves have not yet determined the appropriate future zoning and density for the land to the north of Brigham Creek Road. This area is marked as 'Area under consideration' on the maps which form the Council's preliminary response to the NPS-UD and MDRS (<https://aucklandcouncil.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=fbdb956a1ddc48799e5cd454d7c6097e>).

There is logic in there being a similar zoning on both the north and south side of Brigham Creek Road, so encouraging similar built outcomes on both sides of the street and contribute to the creation of a common sense of place and local identity. This is the approach promoted in the Structure Plan and shown in the proposed plan change.

In view of this, I consider that it would not be appropriate to pre-empt the Council's consideration of this matter and I do not consider that it would be justified at this stage to move away from the zoning proposed in the Structure Plan.

I consider that at such time as the Council confirm their suggested future zoning of the land to the north of Brigham Creek Road, it would be appropriate to review the zoning within the proposed plan change area.

---

<p>iii. Please provide further assessment in terms of the zoning proposed in relation to the interface with adjoining sites. Given development of this area is not anticipated for some time, due to infrastructure funding timeframes, what is the reason that no transition is proposed between the site and adjoining FUZ zoned sites?</p>	<p><i>Whilst adjoining sites may not be rezoned and released for development for some time, it would not be appropriate to compromise the potential capacity of the proposed plan change area and potentially encourage what could be considered to be a substandard form of development when surrounding land is eventually released.</i></p>
<p>b. Block Structure:</p>	
<p>i. Please provide rationale for the block depths proposed. The blocks appear to be too deep to provide good frontages to the street without the reliance on additional lanes.</p>	<p><i>The blocks have been specifically designed to allow the use of rear lanes. As noted in my original report this has been done to reduce the dominance of crossings, driveways and garages on the street and to allow dwellings to better orientate towards the street, bringing improved passive surveillance of the street (without parked cars interrupting views) and better definition of public and private space.</i></p> <p><i>Without this arrangement higher density developments, such as terraced housing, can result in frequent driveways, resulting in a large number of vehicle crossings. Such vehicle crossings reduce the usability of the footpath for pedestrians, and can be problematic for people with pushchairs, wheelchair users, the less physically able and partially sighted, and leads to front yards being dominated by parked cars. This is an inferior outcome to that which can be achieved with the use of rear lanes.</i></p>
<p>ii. Please provide rationale for the placement of the local roading connections. I note fixed intersections are shown, what has defined these 'fixed locations'?</p>	<p><i>The fixed intersection locations have been provided as a result of technical advice provided by others. However, the layout provided for the concurrent planning application has established that these are not an impediment to achieving good design across the site.</i></p>
<p>iii. Please provide details of what alternative block structures have been considered. This information is required to understand if the most efficient urban block structure is being proposed for the subject site. If additional internal roads (such as Jointly Owner Access Lots) are to be relied upon, please provide assessment in terms of the benefits and costs of such mechanisms (ie. the long term costs on future residents to maintain the surface, lighting, any landscaping, establishing legal mechanisms such as residents societies to oversee the long term maintenance of such spaces)</p>	<p><i>This matter is responded to by others.</i></p>
<p>iv. Please detail how the proposed block structure responds to the constraints of flood prone land</p>	<p><i>This matter is addressed by the stormwater expert.</i></p>

---

on the north east corner and also  
the overland flow path.

---

c. Roading Connections:

---

i. Rationale for the pedestrian  
throughfare proposed. If this  
east-west link is an important  
connection, please detail why a  
pedestrian only link is proposed  
rather than a road connection.

*Proposed rule 11.6.2. Building Setback and Connectivity requires that  
(4) there is 'Provision for a road connection between Mamari Road  
and Brigham Creek'.*

---



Richard Knott MRTPI IHBC IHE

Richard Knott Limited  
PO Box 272-1352, Papakura, 2244  
09 392 0091  
021 242 5865  
richard@rkl.co.nz