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executive summary

This report documents an independent analysis of an application by Karaka & Drury Ltd for a private plan change to rezone 33.65ha of land currently zoned Future Urban Zone, centred at Burberry Road, Drury West, to Town Centre Zone, Terraced Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone, and Mixed Housing Urban Zone.

The application has been made to Auckland Council under the Resource Management Act 1991 (“RMA”) in terms of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) “AUP: OP”. The key conclusions of this report are that:

a. In urban design terms, the land is logically located and well-suited for a town centre and to support local high-density residential land uses. It would logically and contiguously extend the existing zoned area of Drury West, support that new neighbourhood, and be consistent with the land use outcomes identified by the Council in its Drury-Opaheke Structure Plan – August 2019 for the Drury West area. In particular, the proposal has been aligned with the Council’s preferred rail station and connectivity outcomes.

b. Rezoning of the land via a private plan change process is understood to be approximately 6-9 months ahead of the timing of any Council public plan change for the land because the Council’s Future Urban Land Supply Strategy identifies Drury West as being “development ready” by 2022, and that any new zoning in Drury West would in any event always include land that was contiguous with existing urban zoned land. The proposed re-zoning comprises sites that are accessed by and rely on Burberry Road, being 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 16A, 18, 20, 24, 25, and 30 Burberry Road.

c. The mix of land use zones proposed is consistent with the Council’s Structure Plan for the Drury West area although proposed height and key retail frontage overlays are also proposed to maximise the density and efficiency of town centre development near to a lake and planned train station in the area. These land use outcomes are also supported by and are consistent with the technical work KDL has undertaken on Drury West since 2014.

d. The proposed rezoning would enable a planned public primary school to use SH22 / Burberry Road, as well as consented development on 31 Burberry Road, and facilitate a direct connection from the new community to the new Drury West train station (identified in the Council Drury-Opaheke Structure Plan), expected to be operational by 2024. It would enable town centre-scale services to serve the new neighbourhood in Drury West, currently zoned for 2,600+ houses.

e. The proposed rezoning and Precinct Plan have been derived from a number of detailed master plan tests for the site, which have identified an optimal street structure, aligning roads for solar orientation and to also enjoy convenient access for customers. A key focal point for the new town centre zone is an existing 1.2ha lake, which will be retained and integrated as a key amenity feature to attract residents and visitors.

f. In my opinion, the proposal is the most appropriate way of re-zoning the land and will have urban design benefits. Potential adverse urban design effects would not arise.

g. Lastly, I consider that the private plan change proposal will not sit in conflict with either the AUP: OP framework for re-zoning Future Urban zoned land, or the specific objectives and policies of the AUP: OP relating to how land use zones should be used and spatially located including because of the high degree of alignment achieved between the proposal and the Council’s Structure Plan.

The private plan change application could be accepted on urban design grounds.
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1. introduction

1.1 This report documents an independent analysis of an application for a private plan change to rezone 33.65ha of land currently zoned Future Urban Zone, for Karaka & Drury Ltd centred at Burberry Road, Drury West. The application has been made to Auckland Council under the Resource Management Act 1991 (“RMA”) in terms of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) “AUP: OP”.

1.2 The proposal is the third made by the MADE group of companies in Drury West, and is known by the applicant’s design team as Auranga B2. The previous two rezoning exercises were each approximately 86ha in area and have together enabled upwards of 2,600 houses and a local centre. Construction of houses in the new community is now well underway.

1.3 For full details of the proposal, the documentation prepared by Tollemache Consultants Ltd is referred to, including its other technical attachments.

2. background, scope and involvement

2.1 I have been engaged by Karaka and Drury Ltd (“KDL”) to provide urban design services related to this Private Plan Change (“PPC”) application. I have been KDL’s urban designer since 2014 and the application by its affiliate Karaka and Drury Consultant Ltd (“KDCL”) for the original Special Housing Area (the Drury 1 Precinct, referred to by KDL and KDCL as “Auranga A”).

2.2 The proposal has been part of the planning and design process undertaken by KDL since 2014, and for that reason a summary of that process is included below.

Auranga A

2.3 KDCL and KDL approached me in 2014 with a vision for a SHA in Drury West. Their design team, comprising DesignUrban Pty Ltd., McKenzie & Co. Ltd., Tollemache Consultants Ltd., and I, was briefed to identify an optimal plan for the land that was well-integrated, maximised land efficiency, reflected best-practice urban design principles, and would overall make life for new residents as convenient and comfortable as possible.

2.4 An overarching requirement for the design team was to take all possible steps to reduce loneliness in the urban environment. Loneliness has been identified as the social isolation that is compounded when the built environment frustrates rather than facilitates chance encounters and general social interaction in high quality and safe public space settings.
2.5 To that end, we identified that a land use mix that was easy to access and move through, maximised social and economic opportunities, and was based around a clearly delineated public space environment was the best spatial strategy to facilitate the making of connections between people. The well-known principles of Transit Orientated Development, and in a more general sense Smart Growth, were compatible with and guided much of the work. We also worked carefully to align the land use outcomes we planned for with the then-Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan and related Council plans and strategies.

2.6 KDCL’s original SHA was on 84.6ha of the north-eastern part of Drury West and it provides for upwards of 1,350 houses as well as a small local centre. Its Precinct Plan is attached as Attachment 1, and the master plan that underpinned the Precinct Plan is included as Attachment 2. The design process included tests of a number of alternative urban form layouts and the placement of various centres, destinations and amenities. A representative selection of these is included as Attachment 3.

2.7 As part of the SHA application, it was necessary to consider a logical future urban form outcome for Auranga A so that the design team, and the Council, could have confidence that it was setting in train an efficient and logical outcome for Drury West as a whole. The Council had to that time completed very high-level, and little more than conceptual, future land use preferences for Drury West in its “Transport for Future Urban Growth” (or “TFUG”, since re-branded as “Supporting Growth” (Attachment 4)). This concluded that a large centre in each of Drury West and Drury East should occur, although it showed a potential Drury West centre in the south-western corner of the area generally aligned with Oira Road. The KDL / KDCL design team agreed with the logic of each ‘half’ of Drury having its own large centre because of the severe severance caused by State Highway 1, the rail line, and the Ngakoroa Stream all sitting side by side and bisecting the two areas.

2.8 For Drury West a future development of several thousand houses with a population up to +/- 25,000 persons, could not be efficiently or conveniently served if the primary centre for those residents was across State Highway 1 in Drury East. That is due to:

- the separation distance of Drury East from the western parts of Drury West, and because of the very constrained crossing environment (primarily SH22 and the SH1 interchange); and

- the combined width of the Ngakoroa Stream, SH1, and railway line severance.

- The SH1 interchange with SH22 is already highly congested. Even with future capacity improvements, it is inherently impractical to then ‘waste’ capacity improvements on unnecessary local through trips.

2.9 The Design Team did not agree with the logic of locating a Drury West centre in the south-west of the area (the TFUG / Supporting Growth decision appears to have been based on a rail station operational preference (maximum separation
distance between stations) rather than any demonstrable land use logic to achieve or maximise any identified urban form benefit).

2.10 The key defects in the TFUG / Supporting Growth concept were assessed to be as follows:

a. For commuting residents, the dominant travel direction (AM) will be east / north. However, requiring people in Drury West to travel in the counter-direction (west / south) to access their station is inefficient, adding unnecessary travel time and distance by way of a ‘double-around’ movement pattern.

b. Any strategic park and ride function (if desired) would only be successful if the station were towards the east, close to the north-bound SH1 offramp to intercept vehicles coming from the south. Locating the station in the west would preclude or at least undermine that management option.

c. Although a station was also planned in Drury East, commuters accessing it from Drury West would need to traverse the lower-amenity industrial area of Drury, with a variety of land use and street upgrades necessary (but unlikely to be provided in the short term). For PM / evening use in particular, inviting pedestrians to walk through a dark and largely empty industrial park was not in the team’s view in line with a “quality compact urban form”.

d. For any centre purposed to serve Drury West, co-location with a rail station is less relevant than most efficiently serving those people living in and moving through the area; while a potentially large number of commuters may use a rail station, in the AM (before 0800) and PM (after 1800) peak periods they would likely access the station at times that are not compatible with normal business hours (0900-1700). A key movement corridor for commercial exposure is SH22; the further west the station is located, the greater the divergence between SH22 and the railway line, pulling the centre further away from that corridor and making it more remote. That in turn diminishes the potential catchment, role and scale of the centre. The team’s view was that the centre should be close to and visible from SH22, so as to encourage users of SH22 to visit. This is a very common spatial characteristic seen in centre main streets.

e. As a result of the confluence of highway infrastructure (access), low-lying land, and the Drury South employment precinct, any additional employment growth in Drury West would be focused at or near that eastern part of the area. The further westwards a station locates, the less it would be able to function as a means of bringing employees into the area or otherwise serving employment activities as well as just conventional out-bound resident commuters. A station located at a more easterly location would also be more accessible for the approximately
1,000 household Drury South residential precinct that was also approved as a SHA (“Drury South Residential Precinct”).

f. A small local village around the station on a developable walkable catchment was identified as a reason in support of the TFUG location, but analysis undertaken of other station and centre locations identified that there was no superior efficiency (walkable catchment or density) to the TFUG / Supporting Growth location (Attachment 5) and, as such, it was not a factor that supports a western station location.

g. There are practical gradient issues in co-locating a centre directly adjacent to a rail station as conceptually envisaged by TFUG. The need to grade separate a road crossing bridge over the railway line that can achieve tolerable gradients (1:20 for universal access and large trucks) means that ramps on either side of the railway bridge itself could extend over 100m in length. It would not be possible to locate a main street on such a condition although such a bridge would likely be the most commercially desirous location.

h. Overall, the TFUG concept would, in my professional opinion, promote a disaggregation of the railway station, employment, and residential development within Drury West rather than integration and co-location which is the more desirable outcome in urban design terms. This would be reinforced by a likely disconnection between early residential stages in the eastern side of Drury West), and provision of essential town centre and rail facilities (likely to be delivered later the further west they are located, and also in line with the first stage / second stage FULSS split along SH22 promoted by the Council).

2.11 The Design Team's higher-level starting point for Drury West was for a town centre serving the area located near the intersection of Jesmond Road and State Highway 22 (Attachment 6). At a high level, this location was identified as being the most logical and likely to well-serve the Drury West area. This urban form strategy reflected a conventional hub-and-spoke concept with a generally centralised major centre and a network of minor centres orbiting around it. The design was based on a working assumption of a 1,000ha area (approximately) accommodating a population of, conservatively, around 7,000 dwellings (or around 18,000 people) supporting one large town centre and at least four smaller villages (local or neighbourhood centres). The Design Team’s tests concluded that the upper yield bound for Drury West could exceed 10,000 houses (25,000 persons).

2.12 This was tested through a masterplan process for the area of land east of Jesmond Road, of approximately 250ha (Attachment 7). The conclusion of this process was that the preferred town centre location was slightly further eastwards of Jesmond Road, to a new north-south road approximately 200m east of Jesmond Road. This was on the basis of that location enjoying the same strategic SH22 access as a Jesmond Road centre, but being capable of better capitalising on the real-world ‘diagonal’ movement influence likely between Drury West residents and the potential for an expanded employment node based on
Drury South and the confluence of movement infrastructure (Attachment 8), and acknowledging the likely traffic-dominated character that a 4-lane arterial (Jesmond Road) would exhibit.

2.13 The master plan work formed the basis of a request to the Council to extend the approved SHA down to SH22 and provide for the part of the KDL / KDCL identified town centre in 2016 (Attachment 9). This proposal was rejected by the Council on strategic transport grounds (effects on SH22 and SH1, and uncertainty regarding a potential future train station); however, it is understood that NZTA (as the operator of the State Highway Networks), was not opposed to the request. It transpired that the Council had already resolved to support the Drury South Residential Precinct (now operative), and that, in conjunction with the new Auranga proposal, was regarded as a sub-optimal solution from a traffic infrastructure perspective.

2.14 Auranga A was approved in 2016 as (Private) Plan Change 15 to the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan. Subsequent to that approval the design team has been advancing the subdivision of the land, and at this time formed blocks and roads can be seen in the area. Titles for the first lots have been issued. An updated master plan for Auranga A (version 21) is included as Attachment 10. The subdivision remains very closely aligned to that master plan. An amalgamated plan that includes all subdivisions approved as at March 2020 is included for reference as Attachment 11. Houses are currently under construction and will be occupied by the time of a hearing on this PPC application (Attachment 12).

Auranga B1

2.15 Subsequent to the approval of Auranga A, the Design Team worked to further progress KDL’s requirement to expand the area of zoned land. The three key reasons for this related to:

   a. The costs of bulk infrastructure that KDL and KDCL were required to provide as part of urban development significantly increased. (KDL and KDCL had agreed to facilitate infrastructure networks through Auranga A that would strategically make feasible the development of the remainder of Drury West as well as Drury East, and further south to Drury South and Paerata in terms of wastewater services.)

   b. Additional scale was required to ‘lock in’ the potential for both a primary school and a secondary school in Drury West. These were regarded as essential components of a new community, and it was regarded as strategically critical to get these confirmed as quickly as possible.

   c. Market feedback impressing on KDL the importance of the new community needing a town centre as a focal point and ‘heart’ if it was to be perceived as more than ‘just another subdivision’.

2.16 As a part of developing Plan Change 6 (which was not a Special Housing Area under the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013), the Design
Team worked through Appendix 1 of the AUP: OP, which set out requirements for structure planning as part of re-zoning Future Urban zoned land.

2.17 Although the Council’s Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (“FULSS”) identified Drury West (north of SH22) as to be development ready in 2022 (Attachment 13), the Council staff expressed a view to KDL that a Council-led structure plan and a delay in KDL’s plans was their preference. KDL determined that it was unable to wait based on the matters above.

2.18 To that end, KDL undertook its own structure plan process to advance its own private plan change, including public consultation and feedback. After analysing the area and also discussing the process closely with Council staff, it became evident that the key questions to be resolved through a Council-led structure plan process would be:

a. The distribution of centres based on size and function;

b. The location of future railway stations and key infrastructure; and

c. The location and extent of non-residential (employment but not necessarily industrial) activities.

It was clear that the majority of the above factors related to the key north-south divide of SH22 and the approaches to the SH1 interchange, but not the majority of Drury West (north of SH22) itself – which lent itself strongly to residential-centric development.

2.19 The strategic decision was made to consider four separate structure plans that together reflected the realistic range of outcomes that were considered likely to eventuate from an alternative / future Council-led structure plan taking the above into account (Attachment 14). This was primarily to ‘cover all bases’ in terms of where a future / Council-led structure plan might land. In summary the thinking was that if certain land use outcomes were likely to remain the same irrespective of each different structure plan scenario tested, then those outcomes could be potentially brought forward without giving rise to any risks of strategic land use mis-placement occurring.

2.20 The preparation and evaluation of four different structure plan scenarios identified an overall preference for the KDL team (“Option 2”, Attachment 15), but also the identification of those parts of Drury West that were very unlikely to vary irrespective of what Council-led structure plan outcome might eventually be reached.

2.21 The KDL structure plan process reinforced earlier thinking that a centre located on Jesmond Road would be inferior to one located eastwards towards Burberry Road. Although less intuitive than the more ‘central’ Jesmond Road alignment, this was to facilitate a superior connection between the transport system, residential land in Drury West, and employment land south of SH22 as well as in the Drury South employment area accessed via Great South, McPherson, Burtt and Quarry Roads. This was identified as optimal based on detailed site-based
design tests as well as more strategic analysis of social and economic opportunities undertaken by Urbacity PTY Ltd. That area faces a number of competing constraints that would make a high-density, high-amenity town centre very difficult to achieve (Attachment 16), including:

a. Access restrictions along both SH22 and Jesmond Road (in the future) due to strategic traffic management preferences in favour of through traffic movement. This would make it difficult for development to front or engage with either of these key roads. A practical example of this is the manner in which Fred Taylor Drive bisects and disconnects the two halves of the Westgate Centre. In real-world terms, this would mean the Jesmond centre would need to have a main street that was set back or well-away from these key roads. On the north-eastern side, a stream running parallel with Jesmond Road would push development further back again.

b. This would in turn ‘pull’ the centre either south, west or east of the Jesmond Road / SH22 intersection.

c. Any extension of Jesmond Road south, to connect (in the future) with a potential Mill Road extension / bypass through to Pukekohe would require an overbridge to cross the railway line. A 5m tall bridge would require ramps at least 62.5m long either side (12.5% gradient). If a 1:20 gradient was required (to allow accessibility for the disabled), then the ramps would need to be at least 100m long either side of the railway line. For the majority of the ramp length it would not be possible to ‘front’ it with buildings or activity.

d. Placing the centre on the south-side of SH22 would make it more difficult to access for the residential activities likely north of SH22 (the majority of residential land likely in Drury West), and the railway bridge / ramp would also make it harder to access from the east or west of the centre (depending on its location). It appears likely that a bridge would also require realignment of Burtt Road in sections. The existence of streams in the vicinity of a bridge landing point would also likely require relocation of some existing roads.

e. Placing the centre west of Jesmond Road would make it very inaccessible to employment land south of SH22 and the Drury South area, making it much less likely that the centre would benefit from that potential activity, and the potential transport conduit between Drury West’s principal residential area and Drury South. In consequence, the retail offer in the centre would inevitably become smaller and less varied (i.e. it would become based entirely around the retail needs of local residents rather than also, for example, day-time workers), along with the vibrancy and vitality that comes with greater floor area, variety and choice.

f. Placing the centre west of Jesmond Road would also be inherently less convenient in terms of connecting with a potential railway station due to
the way the railway line diverges away from SH22 as it moves to the west.

g. The north-eastern corner of the Jesmond / SH22 would therefore represent the superior of the four possibilities; however, this option is still compromised by the combination of constraints in relation to access, a major underground gas main, and a stream / riparian area setback. As shown in Attachment 16, a successful centre outcome would be set well-back and remote from any of the major roads and the railway station.

h. Placing the centre further east of Jesmond Road with Burberry Road was identified as the superior option. Detailed testing identified that an alignment integrating with McPherson Road was the most achievable and would also allow the centre to utilise an existing (unnamed) lake as a key part of the centre’s amenity. This not only represents a unique opportunity in terms of potential amenity, but a centre in this location also has the potential to accommodate a convenient connection to any future railway station, and also to employment land in Drury South. This location stood out as offering the most consistent optimisation of multiple opportunities, or in other words a synergy.

i. Accordingly, the KDL proposal seeks to maximise and reinforce the connections between residential, employment, town centre, and rail facilities. This is considered directly in line with the approach to urban form sought in the Auckland Plan and Auckland Unitary Plan.

2.22 KDL’s wider Drury West master plan as at the time of the KDL structure plan exercise is included as Attachment 17. A specific town centre concept at the same time is included as Attachment 18.

2.23 Consultation with the Council’s staff during the preparation of a private plan change application the KDL Structure Plan and its findings were discussed. The staff understood and accepted the arguments in favour of the residential land identified, but remained strongly of the view that only a Council-led structure plan would be able to properly confirm the location of the Drury West rail station and centres network. Based on this and information regarding the likely timing of the Council’s own structure plan process, KDL determined to break its preferred Auranga B into two, separating out what was subsequently lodged with the Council (Auranga B1) from what is now the subject of this current PPC application (Auranga B2).

2.24 This resulted in the application to expand the zoned residential area through (Private) Plan Change 6 (“PC6”). The Precinct Plan for PC6 is attached as Attachment 19. The master plan that underpinned it is attached as Attachment 20. It was premised on a combination of Mixed Housing Urban and Mixed Housing Suburban zones.

2.25 The Council staff recommended that the request be accepted for processing and the Council Planning Committee voted unanimously to do so on 5 September 2017.
2.26 PC6 was approved by independent commissioners on 30 June 2018, and a single appeal relating to transportation requirements has been resolved. PC6 is now fully operative.

2.27 One notable characteristic of PC6 was that it provided for the signalisation of the Jesmond Road and SH22 intersection based on subdivision within the PC6 area (as a matter of resource consent traffic assessment). This inherently provides an opportunity to provide a safe pedestrian crossing across SH22. It also provided for the entirety of an east-west collector road linking the Bremner Road bridge to Jesmond Road, a key route that had been identified from the earliest TFUG / Supporting Growth work. As at March 2020, AT has acquired that portion of the land required for the east-west collector within the original Auranga A / Drury 1 area (the developer will provide part of the width as a short-term local road designed to be widened in the future along its northern side).

2.28 Auranga B1 is an approximately 83ha area of land that is in two ‘lobes’, a north-western one north of Bremner Road, and a southern one east of Jesmond Road extending down to 221 Jesmond Road. It provided for upwards of 1,350 residential units.

2.29 As at 31 March 2020, the Auranga A and B1 areas enable an urban community of 2,600+ houses at a variety of densities, and substantial coastal improvements, over approximately 170ha of land. It is now one of Auckland’s largest new urban community projects, and 674 house lots and 38 super lots have been approved via subdivision consents to date. A related initiative to enhance and rehabilitate the Drury Creek Islands Recreation Reserve (15ha in 3 islands) is also an integral part of the KDL / KDCL development vision (Attachment 21). This has resulted in a ground-breaking partnership between DoC, local iwi, and the developer and is now regarded as a best practice project.

2.30 As at 31 March 2020, the Ministry of Education has purchased sites for a primary school and secondary school (Attachment 22). The primary school site is subject to a Designation (5062) in the AUP: OP with the MoE planning to have the school open by 2022. MoE has progressed its thinking to the point that it has identified a concept plan for the school’s layout (Attachment 23). The high school is understood to be planned to be open by the mid-2020s. The relevance of these is that they should not be regarded as potential or indicative schools in Drury West; they are ‘locked in’ and in an advanced stage of planning. These, and their future connectivity to a centre and rail station, also represent important aspects of KDL’s analysis to date.

Council Structure Plan

2.31 In 2017, the Council commenced its own structure plan process for Drury (Drury West and Drury East. As a part of this, and being proactive, a group of major landowners with an interest in the area determined to work collaboratively. This group comprising KDL, Stevensons Ltd, Fulton Hogan Ltd, and Kiwi Properties Ltd (“Drury Developer’s Group” or “DDG”) worked to test and agree a shared plan for the area. The KDL preference for Drury West had matured to a town
centre based on Burberry Road accessing a train station located between McPherson Road and Great South Road. This station would be visible from SH22, and be very accessible to both residents and workers. The master plan showing this concept is included as Attachment 24.

2.32 An initial concept put forward by the DDG provided for a railway station serving both areas in the original location of the Drury railway station (immediately west of SH1). This location required separate portal / entrance buildings and enclosed concourses to access the station (very similar to the way that subway stations and the planned Central Rail Link will operate). This resulted in all parties seeking to identify an option that would meet their preferences and those of Council staff. This was however opposed by the Council’s staff and this signal was accepted by the DDG, which from that point considered how two railway stations, one on each side, could be successful. Agreement was reached with the Drury East landowners. For the Drury West station, KDL’s ongoing work was based on a station shifting westwards so as to be slightly west of Burberry Road (Attachment 25).

2.33 The DDG’s work was completed and submitted to the Council in April 2018 in a series of reports led by Barker and Associates Ltd. The DDG’s concept structure plan for Drury West and Drury East is included as Attachment 26. The DDG proposed structure plan identified land use zones for the area but did not confirm the final size or classification of the key KDL Drury West centre or a proposed large centre in Drury East proposed by Kiwi Properties Ltd.

2.34 As part of the DDG exercise, KDL continued to refine its preferred town centre concept and, in particular, how it could logically work with a possible future Drury West rail station. This included considering master plan tests for the wider structure plan area (Attachment 27) as well as ongoing assessment of the various station and centre options that were ‘live’ at that point.

2.35 In total, the Auranga team assessed six rail station and four town centre locations in Drury West (Attachment 28) and also the land use practicalities and capacities associated with them. This analysis concluded that the optimum centre location was what has become Auranga B2, associated with a lake west of Burberry Road, and a rail station as close to SH22 and as far east as possible (while still connecting to Jesmond Road at its western end). The Auranga centre and station preference communicated with the Council as it worked towards its own draft Structure Plan is included as Attachment 29.

2.36 As a part of the dialogue with the Council, I was asked by my client to look to find common ground. This led to a revised concept plan for the Auranga centre, which was focused on a redirected main street from the eastern side of the Lake around to its western side, allowing a more direct connection to a station that sat mid-way between Jesmond Road and a realigned Burberry Road (its existing alignment has limited sightlines). This is included as Attachment 30. I regard this as a practical, pragmatic and workable middle ground. This sought to better connect the town centre with the likely rail station, which through the Council’s process had reverted further west towards Jesmond Road.
2.37 The Council continued to refine its thinking and released its final Structure Plan for the area in August 2019 (Attachment 31). This showed an outcome that was generally aligned with the Auranga proposal, with a large area north of SH22 identified as a centre of an unassigned category. The Structure Plan process did not include recommendations to change the FULSS or its prioritisation of the land north of SH22 in Drury West as to be development ready by 2022. The Structure Plan included a rail station location east of Jesmond Road, also aligned with the latest KDL option. It is clear that the proposal is strongly aligned with the Council’s Structure Plan.

2.38 The Council Structure Plan contains a Neighbourhood Design Statement ("NDS") which sets out a number of design requirements and principles. Given that the NDS does not form part of the AUP: OP I have in undertaking this assessment had regard to the NDS as a guideline but placed greater weight on operative planning instruments (not that any potential inconsistency was apparent). The assessment of the PPC will therefore include consideration of the relevant NDS “principles”.

Auranga B2

2.39 I have worked on the project on a consistent basis since 2014 and am very familiar with the proposal for Auranga B2. This proposal has been arrived at as the next logical step in the growth of Drury West, and has been aligned carefully with the Council’s Structure Plan as well as infrastructure and development planning. Its need is evidenced by the under-construction neighbourhood of 2,600+ houses, two schools, numerous parks, and an extensively improved coastal walkway network.

2.40 This report will now assess the KDL proposal in terms of the outcomes specified in the AUP: OP B2 RPS section.

3. urban design framework

3.1 Although historically focused on the way in which private space and development impacted on public space, ‘urban design’ now encompasses a wide range of potential considerations. This is best evidenced by the breadth of matters included in MfE’s 2005 New Zealand Urban Design Protocol. As a result of this breadth, urban design analyses, when based only on preferred or ‘ideal’ urban design prerogatives, do not always match well with relevant factors under the Resource Management Act 1991 (“RMA”). Practical challenges faced by urban designers working under the RMA, and which have been factored into this assessment, include that:

a. urban design outcomes only apply to the extent that they are relevant to the specific resource management issues relevant to each specific application;
b. RMA plans need to be interpreted in light of what the specific objectives and policies mean and with reference to the methods used by each plan to implement those provisions – not against what outcomes an urban designer might consider to be preferred or ideal in pure urban design terms;

c. the RMA provides for positive environmental effects but does not require them (unless a NPS or Plan requires them); and

e. a failure to achieve an ideal or preferred urban design outcome as a potential ‘missed opportunity’ is not the same as the creation of an adverse environmental effect, and is often irrelevant to whether or not what is proposed merits the granting of consent.

3.2 In this instance, the proposal is for a scale and type of land use and development that is in line with the plan-making and land use frameworks set out within the AUP: OP. As such, for this assessment it is not considered necessary to identify urban design outcomes or precedents beyond the provisions of the AUP: OP. However, based on direction or guidance contained in the AUP: OP (Appendix 1.3, the Auckland Plan, Auckland Design Manual, FULSS, and the Franklin Local Board Plan (2017) have been reviewed and considered. The Council’s Drury-Opaheke Structure Plan 2019, and KDL’s own Drury West Structure Plan, have been regarded as particularly critical inputs.

3.3 It is noted at the outset that the proposal is considered to be very well aligned with the Council’s Structure Plan and the Local Board Plan. The 2019 Council Structure Plan is also consistent with KDL’s earlier Structure Plan, so there is no need to separately compare and contrast those documents.

3.4 The key provisions of the AUP: OP relevant to the proposal in urban design terms comprise Appendix 1 (structure plan guidelines); B2 RPS (urban growth and form); E38 (urban subdivision); H6 (terraced housing and apartment buildings zone); and H10 (town centre zone).

3.5 The Council Structure Plan also includes a Neighbourhood Design Statement. The provenance and authorship of that document is unknown. The Statement does not explain the content of the Structure Plan, but instead is presented as an implementation tool to guide further and future work. It is not understood that the Appendix 1 AUP: OP provisions operate in this manner and that any NDS content would need to be incorporated into the AUP: OP as Precinct provisions for this to occur. In any event, the NDS contains five key principles that seem to function as a form of high-level design guideline. These are:

1. Neighbourhoods that vary in density and mix of uses according to their locational attributes. Supports compact quality development - the design should demonstrate the ability to increase density over time as the area is built out.

2. Neighbourhoods with many safe choices of movement with good access to services and amenity.
Promotes a safe, connected and permeable street pattern, enabling multi modal transport options

3. Neighbourhoods with many choices of use and activity that reflect the changing needs of the community and the sub-region.
   Enables a diverse built form that supports a mix of land uses to establish over time

4. Neighbourhoods that celebrate their unique identity and are attractive, safe and easily understood.
   Promotes a sense of character and positive identity

5. Neighbourhoods that protect and enhance the natural environment while enabling urbanisation.
   Protects the natural environment for climate resilience

3.6 These principles address what I would describe as fairly standard design starting points, and are not considered to include any guidance or direction that is not already addressed in the AUP: OP RPS B2 objectives and policies. They do not identify any Drury-specific design considerations or constraints.

3.7 I have had regard to all aspects of documents relevant to urban design aspects of this proposal. However, in the analysis reflected in this report, I have placed the greatest weight on the objectives and policies in the AUP: OP RPS being the relevant plan recently prepared under the RMA.

3.8 Having considered the relevant provisions of AUP: OP and related documents identified above, the planning outcomes and environmental effects to be addressed can for simplicity be synthesised under the following topic headings:

   a. The development should contribute to a quality compact urban form that supports and enhances Drury West.

   b. The development should achieve a well-connected, integrated built form outcome, with residential areas having high amenity, and being healthy, attractive and safe.

   c. Non-residential activities support the needs of people and the local community.

   d. The development should maintain or enhance the character of Drury West, and provide adequately for infrastructure.

   e. Open spaces should be well integrated and physically connected where possible.

   f. Reverse sensitivity effects with adjacent land uses are managed.

   g. The proposal should demonstrate how the site’s opportunities and constraints have been positively responded to.
4. site and context analysis

site analysis

4.1 The Site has been described in the Tollemache Consultants Ltd. planning assessment, and I agree with and adopt that description for the purpose of my analysis. In urban design terms, the Site’s key characteristics are:

a. The Site is 33.65ha and formed from 10 allotments, all legally accessed from Burberry Road. The Site undulates but is readily developable. It rises up from SH22 and in places offers views southwards across SH22.

b. The Site has an extensive frontage to State Highway 22 but this is not accessible. Burberry Road is not considered suitable to accommodate additional development on the basis of its slope and sightlines with SH22. An obvious realignment would be to align with the existing McPherson Road on the south side of SH22, which is an underpass beneath SH22.

c. The Site contains an approximately 1.2ha lake and this is a potentially iconic amenity feature for the area. The lake was either created or at least enlarged as a result of landform changes made when SH22 was formed, given the way that one of the streams that feeds it bends and runs parallel to the edge of SH22 adjacent to the lake (Attachment 32).

d. The Site has in recent years been in rural lifestyle living and hobby farming. The land is mostly in pasture, although a variety of houses and trees are also obvious.

e. The Site is strategically important in Drury West because it sits along SH22 near SH1, and also opposite Great South Road. This is a key part of the area in terms of the movement of existing and future travel demands.

f. The land is currently zoned Future Urban Zone, and has Mixed Housing Urban zoned-land to the immediate north.

g. In the Council’s FULSS, the land is identified as ‘Stage 1’, and is further denoted as to be ‘development ready’ by 2022. It is understood that ‘development ready’ means rezoning and infrastructure agreements would be in place. This implies that the land has been earmarked for imminent re-zoning.
h. In the Council’s Drury-Opaheke Structure Plan 2019, the land is identified as a combination of centre-zone (of an unassigned type), and terraced housing and apartment buildings zone. The Drury West rail station is identified as sitting south of this, between Jesmond Road (to be extended), and McPherson Road.

i. It is understood that the Government has fast-tracked funding to undertake substantial infrastructure investment in the area including Drury East and West. For Drury West, this includes a rail station operating by 2024. This would necessitate rail track improvements, bridge improvements, and potentially improvements to McPherson Road, an underpass that currently accommodates only two vehicular travel lanes, and no pedestrian or cycle facilities.

j. Overall, the Site is unremarkable from the point of view of former rural land that has been identified as being suitable for near-term urban use. It contains no archaeological sites of significance or any other major constraints that might curtail urban re-zoning. The lake offers potential for high amenity ‘place-making’ as a destination in its own right; the proximity of the Site to the Ngakoroa Stream and wider coastal environment is another major benefit.

5. the proposal

5.1 The proposal has been described in the Tollemache Consultants Ltd. planning assessment, and I agree with and adopt that description for the purpose of my analysis. The Proposal is to rezone the land to Town Centre, Terraced Housing and Apartment Buildings, and Mixed Housing Urban zones, and to also use the additional height and street frontage controls that also apply to the Town Centre zone in the AUP: OP. A copy of the proposed Precinct Plan that includes the proposed zone pattern is included as Attachment 3.

5.2 The Proposal is to use ‘stock’ AUP: OP zone provisions, i.e., provisions that are already employed in the plan and a Precinct Plan to confirm additional requirements including key future road links to be delivered at the time of development. This differs from previous Auranga Plan Changes that have relied on a bespoke precinct, on the basis that the Council’s staff have identified a general preference that the standard AUP: OP provisions be used. This is consistent with the Council’s own and recent plan changes (i.e. Whenuapai (PC8)).

5.3 The proposed re-zoning is considered to reflect the Council’s Structure Plan vision for the land. Although the Structure Plan does not identify a particular role or type of centre for Drury West, the Structure Plan has identified an area of 15.74ha, clearly identifying it as a relatively large centre intended to meet the needs of the Drury West residents. A town centre has been proposed in the PPC on the basis that it more readily enables the activities needed by a community of
between 18,000 – 25,000 persons (such as supermarkets, department stores and large offices), and allows the density benefits of being near a (future) rail station to be maximised. This makes it more efficient and effective than a Local Centre, and likely to maximise economic development and the creation of employment.

5.4 A key road in the KDL vision is Burberry Road. Currently its alignment with SH22 is not regarded as safe and it would require a realignment before it can be used to connect with the existing zoned land in Auranga A and B1. The proposal is to realign this with McPhersons Road and ultimately add signals (as a matter to be determined at the time that resource consents are applied for). This realignment is considered important, given that both the planned primary school and a land use consent for 71 residential units including creation of a new public recreation reserve on 31 Burberry Road (Attachment 34), need a connection that will properly integrate with the community. The land use consent includes roads to vest that connect to Burberry Road, but a condition limits any access to it until a new Burberry Road and SH22 intersection is completed. Opening up this site and also providing greater access to the new public reserve is, in my opinion, a desirous and efficient planning outcome.

5.5 The outcome would be a signal-controlled intersection and pedestrian crossing at Jesmond Road (likely as a separate matter due to operative provisions from PC6)\(^1\), and another at the realigned Burberry / McPherson Road intersection (proposed in this PPC although shorter-term left-in / left-out may prove appropriate). This would provide convenient and safe access from north of SH22 (where in any scenario the majority of residents will live) to either side of the area identified for a rail station.

5.6 The proposal is also to provide for a mid-block intersection between these two points, although this would be a left in / left out only access until such future time as SH22 was generally downgraded to a 50km/h urban arterial road standard (inevitable when all land in Drury West, including both sides of SH22, occurs). In the future, this could accommodate either another full signal-controlled intersection and pedestrian crossing point, or a pedestrian / cyclist overbridge depending on the final placement of the rail station and its platform access points. Lastly, a longer-term connection to Great South Road and probable additional signal-controlled crossing point is identified. However, in the short term, the proposal would be for one or at most two signal-controlled crossings of SH22, with others coming over a longer term, and likely as part of Council-led projects.

5.7 The proposal is anchored by a 15.3ha town centre zone, noting that once the 1.2ha lake and margin, future roads and open spaces, and a stream along the SH22 frontage are taken into account, it would leave at most 8ha of developable land). The proposal is to maximise the utility of the Town Centre zoned land, the proximity of the lake and future rail station, by including a 27m building height overlay. This would enable employment and residential potential to be maximised. The Town Centre zone also allows placement of the Key Retail and

\(^1\) PC6 also provides for this in the alternative to be a roundabout, which would have no pedestrian crossing facilities and make the current PPC proposal the more important.
General Commercial road frontage controls, which are not used in the AUP: OP with Local Centres but are intended to guide future built form outcomes. These are proposed along the realigned Burberry Road and the new ‘Lake Road’.  

5.8 The KDL concept is based on the principle of the ‘movement economy’ and bringing together, as efficiently as possible, four key elements which I will now address.

**Employment potential**

a. In my opinion, some of Auckland’s least successful urban expansions have occurred when provision of housing has not been integrated with planning for employment. Without a plausible source of local employment in new growth areas, preferably that can deliver at least as many jobs as would be needed by the new residences, the risk is that Auckland’s existing commuter transport problem will be exacerbated. In that respect, shifting commuters out of private cars and onto passenger transport still represents an inferior option as compared with providing them with a variety of valid local options; they are likely to simply spend more time commuting.

b. In my opinion, employment land is an ‘apex’ land use planning issue, for the simple reason that unlike residential uses, which can locate almost anywhere, employment uses are only viable in certain circumstances or locations. There are, of course, a number of reasons why particular business activities only occur near major motorway junctions, and why service stations, fast food outlets, and larger-format (car-based) retail developments always occur on sites that share similar attributes. All commercial and employment activities are similarly limited, if not as obviously.

c. The land south of SH22 and close to SH1 will connect to Drury South Employment area, and is best suited for more employment activity, preferably higher-value and higher-intensity uses, which could include offices, professional services, research and development, and mixed-use developments. Great South, McPherson, Burtt and Quarry Roads connect the highways efficiently. Larger-scale employment activities require very prominent and accessible sites, and can occupy land that is otherwise unsuited for residential activities. These would also complement the Drury South Employment area.

d. For this reason, the KDL approach is premised on the promotion of as much employment activity as possible south of SH22 and east of Jesmond Road. It is noted that the Council Structure Plan is generally consistent with this ambition. But it is in summary spatially locked to this part of Drury West due to operational and locational considerations. This has the effect of pulling other elements, including a centre and rail station, closer towards it.

**Rail station**
A Drury West rail station has been identified by the Council for several years and has been confirmed by the Government. A number of locations have been identified along the fixed rail corridor. The KDL preference, which I share, is that the station should be as eastwards as possible, including east of Jesmond Road, for the following reasons:

i. If the station can serve employment areas, it means the station could efficiently bring employees into the area in the AM peak, rather than just act as a residential commuter service taking people out. This would lend itself to a busier and more efficient investment.

ii. The station is intended to serve all of Drury West, not just a small local walkable ‘village’ area immediately around it. The upshot is that the further west the station is located, the less centrally or conveniently it would serve Drury West. It would also recede southwards away from SH22, making it less visible in the urban environment. (In my opinion, some visual connection or proximity between the station and SH22 would be preferable.) An eastern location brings it closer to SH22 such that it would be identifiable and legible from the highway. Testing undertaken by KDL has also shown that even in terms of immediate local or walkable area, there is no potential station / centre location west of Jesmond Road that could achieve a more efficient or developable area than is proposed in the Auranga B2 PPC.

iii. Should a park ’n ride service be proposed, the most logical location for this would be the Drury West station, as traffic coming from the south (SH1) or west (SH22) could access the park ’n ride without having to travel through or add loading on the Drury interchange. But from the south in particular, the park ’n ride facility would only be convenient if it were close and accessible to the SH1 off-ramp. The upshot is that the further the station moves to the west, so does its practical ability to act as a convenient vehicular interceptor / transfer point diminish. Any location for the railway station further west than Jesmond Road becomes less efficient until a location is reached at which the station is not feasible as a park ’n ride at all due to the sheer inefficiency and inconvenience of travellers having to divert so far westwards, only for the train to then come back eastwards anyway.

iv. In terms of existing infrastructure, an eastern location could benefit from the existing rail crossings at Great South Road (over bridge) and McPherson Road (underpass). Jesmond Road would require only a modest extension to access the western end of a station if the station was east of Jesmond Road, with McPherson Road already providing a form of
access. All other station options, especially west of Jesmond Road, require increasingly costly and large-scale roading projects to connect to the station from ‘day 1’.

**Residential**

f. The land north of SH22 is best-suited to residential activity and associated facilities, including schools. Planning for these is already well-advanced and in the process of delivery. Given the optimum location of new employment land, and the existing Drury South employment area, a natural diagonal axis from the northern side of SH22 across to the south-east becomes evident, including through a Jesmond Road extension, McPherson Road, Great South Road, and Quarry Road. Connecting residents with jobs in this manner as efficiently and directly as possible sets up an obvious movement path which, if well planned, would also achieve the desirable outcome of minimal disruption or additional loading on the SH1 interchange (by enabling people to directly cross SH22 rather than have to join east-west traffic moving along it).

g. In terms of access to rail, the land east of Jesmond Road is the most obvious and efficient means of bringing residents to the station. This is via the ‘drain’ of Jesmond Road (a signal crossing across SH22 has been provided for in the provisions of PC6), and the realigned Burberry Road that is also planned in this PPC. Other residents would move in a more natural travel direction; from the west, people in the AM period would be generally travelling in that direction already, so accessing the rail station would not require them to undertake double-around movements.

h. A planned bus network using a new east-west collector road at the Bremner Road bridge (which has been planned and provided for in approved subdivisions to date, including land purchase by AT) would intersect with Jesmond Road and then access the station. This would also bring buses passed the purchased MoE primary and secondary school sites and link with the station.

**Drury West Centre**

i. In recognition of the likely patterns of movement identified, being east-to-west (SH22), southwest-to-northeast (rail), northwest-to-southeast (local residential to employment travel), and south-to-north (SH1 traffic that could be diverted to a rail station park ‘n ride), an obvious focal point emerges where all of these movements cross or at least come close to one another. This is in my view the optimum location to locate a centre based on all observable instances of how centres have located across history. This will allow a centre to benefit from as many visitors for as many reasons as possible, all of which can maximise the potential for social and economic exchange.
j. The northern side of SH22 is considered to be the optimum location for the centre for a number of reasons: the land is more elevated; access to the coast and schools is more convenient; the lake presents itself as a natural destination and amenity for residents to enjoy; and because only a small proportion of centre-transactions are likely to come from rail station arrivals (with the result that there is no need for the station and centre to be on the same side of SH22 or even directly adjoining one another). In this respect, the relationship between the proposed town centre and future rail station is consistent with, or superior to, many that can be seen across Auckland.

k. If the station and a centre were located further west and south of SH22, it is much less likely that any employment-related activity or synergy would occur, and potential that the centre itself would reduce in potential to a small convenience retail centre only serving a relatively small local population of commuters. Conversely, by being able to leverage from the SH22 traffic, a strong movement path between houses and jobs, planned and confirmed public schools, and a desirable natural amenity feature, it is likely that the scale of the centre can be maximised with as many additional jobs and services as possible. This has been examined in detail by Urbacity Pty Ltd, as well as Space Syntax Ltd. The Urbacity Pty Ltd report is specifically referred to. Commute Ltd has also identified the notable difference that the KDL proposal would likely make in morning-peak vehicular traffic generation, based in large part on the synergies and efficiencies of the co-locational strategy that underpins the proposal.

l. These interactions mean that a town centre with full public and private services, public spaces, amenities, supermarkets and department stores can and should be supported, because it would most effectively meet the needs of Drury West residents and employees.

5.9 The KDL PPC for Auranga B2 can therefore be seen as an attempt to harness efficiencies and the natural desire lines of large-scale movement flows in Drury West. The four elements described above, if coordinated with one another, will mutually reinforce each other and become more successful as a collective than if they were disaggregated and treated as mutually exclusive parts of the urban environment. In this respect, Auranga B2 can be seen to mirror principles of Transit Orientated Development, maximising local employment, maximising travel efficiency, and minimising the need for major new enabling public infrastructure (road connections and bridges).

5.10 In summary and overall, the Auranga B2 proposal:

a. Has resulted from four years of continuous urban design and planning analysis focused on securing the best possible opportunities for Drury West (and Drury East).

b. Has resulted from a methodical and detailed planning and testing process that has worked through a number of alternative locations and
iterations to identify the best overall outcome for the entire future community. These have focused on the entirety of Drury West and how to promote efficiencies. The result of this has been a progression of ‘moves’ of an optimal centre from Jesmond Road east towards Burberry Road.

c. Has been designed to be consistent with adjacent large developers’ and the Council’s preferences for Drury West.

d. Is substantiated with a greater amount of technical work and corroboration than any other greenfield town centre in Auckland to date.

e. Has resulted from substantial collaboration with the Council at all levels.

5.11 The KDL town centre is a key part of fulfilling KDL’s sustainability objectives for the new community it is leading the development of. The key factor that distinguishes the KDL proposal from alternatives that would locate a centre further west is that it’s intended function is not only to serve a narrow ‘residential convenience’ function only, but also serve potential employees, through commuters, and local residents equally as a Transit Orientated Development. This combination will result in a greater number of people visiting the centre for a wider range of reasons, and at different times of the day and week. The KDL proposed town centre is not likely to be a retail-dominated centre but a destination offering amenity values, shopping, living, and working opportunities. Achieving this outcome requires a strong connection to all of the centre’s residential, employment and rail station catchments. The inclusion of a lake as a key amenity feature is regarded as essential to encourage medium-rise development (up to 27m in height) and high-density apartments that offer a high-quality lifestyle choice, as well as just access to the transport system and a potential future rail station.

6. assessment

the development should contribute to a quality compact urban form that supports and enhances the Drury West

6.1 This key objective is primarily derived from B2.2.1(1), B2.2.2(4), B2.6.1(1), B2.6.2(1), and Appendix 1 in the AUP: OP. It relates to all five of the principles identified in the Council Structure Plan NDS but in particular principles 1 and 3.

6.2 In my opinion, the proposal will successfully contribute to the quality compact urban form sought for Auckland, and also both support and enhance Drury West. My key reasons for this are:

a. The Council’s Drury-Opaheke Structure Plan sets out the following expectations for the Drury West centre (section 3.13.2):
• serve the needs of the future population of the western half of the Drury – Ōpāheke structure plan area as it grows over time in conjunction with other centres in that area

• provide for high densities aiming to achieve at least 110 persons per hectare within a walkable distance of the railway station

• provide high job numbers, particularly close to the station and FTN, but elsewhere as well

• be adjoining SH 22 between Jesmond Road and Burberry Road

• provide for vertical mixed-use, i.e. business on the ground floor and residential above between SH 22 and the station

• ensure that residents will be able to access all the services and facilities they need within no more than 10 minutes’ walk

• provide an attractive, well-connected, walkable street environment with emphasis on pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the:
  o centre core
  o station,
  o FTN route,
  o surrounding residential areas
  o industrial business areas to the east

• provide for community and social infrastructure

• provide for affordable housing

• provide an attractive mixed-use urban environment with a high standard of design

• promote the cultural and heritage values of the area

• protect and enhance the blue-green network that supports the area including through water sensitive design, tree planting, parks, greenways and riparian enhancement margins

• promote a high standard of design along the margins of the Hingaia Stream and tributaries including avoiding bulky building close to the stream

• avoid urban development in the 1 in 100-year floodplain.

b. The proposal achieves all of these ‘criteria’ (“expectations”). In terms of the density and built form quality outcomes sought, it is considered that a Town Centre zone with 27m maximum height overlay and the use of Key Retail and General Commercial frontage controls will be more effective,
efficient and appropriate than a Local Centre zone. Specific reasons are detailed below but in terms of “at least 110 persons per hectare”, this equates to approximately 45 dwellings / hectare which, when considered in net terms (exclusive of roads etc.), equates to a minimum density of around 1:150m2. Given that on many centre-zoned sites there will be no residential uses likely, I consider that in the centre zone this will require the order of dwellings at approximately 1:100m2 (or higher density) in ‘real world’ terms.

c. KDL’s structure plan process, and the Council’s own parallel process, have demonstrated that the optimum rail station and centre locations in Drury West have been identified. The PPC proposes zones and built form outcomes that are consistent with these and which will give effect to them and the Council’s FULSS.

d. The proposal will meet the needs of the residents of Drury West, provide employment, and integrate the highest densities of both jobs and houses with a planned rail station. By 2024, when the Drury West station will be operational (and accompanying access to it has been formed by the Council and Government), hundreds of dwellings in Drury West and the first stage of town centre development will also be operational and generating passengers.

e. The KDL master plan tests show how a town centre anchored around a retail main street can be logically and successfully achieved, in a way that also integrates with major transport routes and the future rail station. The fact that the station platforms have not yet been precisely fixed has been taken account of in the design of the proposal, given the ‘end’ points of Jesmond Road extension and McPherson Road are sufficiently flexible for a station to be landed between them. The mid-block (interim left in / left out) connection to SH22 can be configured and future access (possibly by way of pedestrian overbridge) provided once the station is operational in 2024.

f. The proposal maximises the enablement of development density near the future rail station, through the additional height overlay as well as the high-density zones proposed. The Town Centre zoning is more appropriate than a Local Centre zone in that respect as it allows a better-suited maximum scale of development that can also make best use of the scale and visual amenity of the lake (and maximise employment opportunity).

g. The proposal will realign Burberry Road’s SH22 connection, making it safer, more connected, and better aligned with existing routes to the south of SH22, namely McPhersons Road and Great South Road.

h. The proposal logically provides for extension of the north-south network generally across both sides of SH22, as indicated on the Council Structure Plan.
i. The inclusion of the lake as a key amenity feature is considered to be essential, in conjunction with the town centre and future rail station, to assist to attract high-density development on the basis of a high-quality amenity being on offer for new residents to enjoy, over and above the more functional amenity of transport infrastructure. In my view, this makes it more likely that the zones will be able to be maximised than has often been the case in Auckland (e.g. Massey North / Redhills where THAB zone is being developed to include single-storey detached dwellings and 2-storey terraced units). It is also directly relatable to the Council Structure Plan NDS and its desire to promote identity, character and amenity.

j. The proposed zone configuration is consistent with the patterns generally seen across Auckland under the AUP:OP, whereby a centre is the focal point of development, with a supporting THAB zone around that, fading outwards again to the MHU zone (at least as it relates to the existing Auranga A and B1 areas that have been zoned to date). In that respect, I consider the proposal to be comfortably in line with what the AUP: OP intends.

k. The proposal will promote an efficient and effective ‘bridge’ between the residential land zoned and otherwise identified (in the two structure plans) north of SH22, and the employment land zoned and otherwise identified in the south and south-east. The planning has in particular focused on aligning new connections with Great South Road and McPhersons Road so as to allow easy access back and forth, through the town centre, so as to minimise additional loading on SH22 itself and in particular the SH22 / SH1 interchange. These will in the long-term provide direct and efficient access from local residents to local jobs.

l. I consider the zone frameworks proposed will result in a high-quality built form outcome that is consistent with the principles of a Transit Orientated Development, and also the centre-based pattern (which is closely aligned with TOD planning anyways) described within the AUP: OP. The AUP’s existing zone provisions and consent requirements are to be relied on, supplemented by the transport requirements set out in the Precinct Plan and the Key Retail Frontage (“KRF”) and General Commercial Frontage (“GCF”) overlays. These will require resource consent to be obtained for all new buildings, with design quality along streets a key consent matter in all cases. This will ensure the key streets are visually interesting, safe, and contribute effectively to new urban amenity values.

m. The KRF and GCF instruments give valuable urban form direction, and it is noted that these are only used in the AUP: OP in Town and Metropolitan Centres, and not Local Centres. This is in my opinion another urban design benefit arising from the use of a Town Centre zone rather than a Local Centre zone, and it gives greater certainty that a high-quality outcome will result along the key road frontages.
n. At 15.3ha (approximately 8ha maximum net), the size of the Town Centre zone, is consistent with both structure plans and analysis by Urbacity Pty Ltd so as to meet the needs of the local catchment and not draw catchment from any adjacent area including Drury East across SH1. In my view, this is an important filter in ensuring that a quality compact, and efficient, urban form outcome is arrived at.

o. The extent of centre shown by the Council in its Structure Plan includes the subject Site but also the site at 41 Jesmond Road. Based on the design tests and analysis of that site I have participated in, I am satisfied that, in real-world terms, it is not likely that a centre zone can viably locate on all of that site as a result of the access limitations on SH22 and Jesmond Road, the likely large intersection at the corner of those roads, the presence of a stream along SH22 frontage, and what would be a relatively internalised residual development area. In my opinion, this land is better suited for a THAB zoning, but in any event the PPC does not foreclose or predetermine what the landowner and the Council may identify through another plan change in the future. As between the site at 41 Jesmond Road and the subject Site, I am satisfied that the subject site is the most logical and appropriate location for a centre simply because of the significant northwest-to-south-east movement dynamic that will occur because of McPherson Road and Great South Road, and ability to develop a main street on a high-visibility corridor directly accessible but set-back from key intersections and SH22.

p. The PPC would allow for Burberry Road to become something of a spine road north to the coast, parallel to Jesmond Road, allowing two effective routes for people to access the train station in the future. Connectivity to the future primary school would be direct via Burberry Road, and from the future secondary school via Jesmond Road. I consider that this is efficient and desirable.

q. A Town Centre zone would enable the full range of commercial services needed by a population of between 18,000 – 25,000 persons to be accommodated. For example, in the Local Centre zones, supermarkets are not readily provided for, or office uses. By contrast, the Town Centre zone accommodates both, and I consider these are very relevant uses given the scale of population the centre is intended to serve. This will complement, rather than compete with, planned centres in Drury East.

r. The proposed Precinct provisions tie in development within the centre to key milestones related to traffic connectivity and infrastructure, and operation of the rail station. I consider that this will be sufficient to ensure that an appropriate coordination is achieved.

s. I consider that the frontage controls, additional height overlay, indication of future roads, and limitation of access along the SH22 frontage are appropriate controls over and above the ‘standard’ suite of rules that are contained within the AUP: OP zone and subdivision provisions. I do not
consider any further or additional limitations or Precinct provisions are necessary on an urban design basis.

6.3 On the basis of the above, I consider that:

a. In terms of any potentially adverse urban design effects, I consider that the proposal would not result in any problematic or unusual effects that do not typically come with land development or subdivision. The design process followed, Precinct Plan and associated Precinct provisions proposed will be successful at avoiding, remedying or mitigating potential urban design effects related to a quality compact urban form and Drury West.

b. In terms of the relevant AUP: OP provisions (and the Structure Plan NDS), I consider that the KDL proposal is consistent with the built-form outcomes sought including the circumstances in which establishing a new high-density town centre node is appropriate following the centres-based policy framework and real-world Transit Orientated Development model.

c. Having regard to all of the above factors, I consider that the proposal represents the most appropriate urban design outcome for the PPC land and it is supported.

the development should achieve a well-connected, integrated built form outcome, with residential areas having high amenity, and being healthy, attractive and safe

6.4 This key objective is primarily derived from B2.3.1(1), B2.3.1(3), B2.3.2(1), B2.3.2(2), B2.4.1(2), B2.4.2(8), B2.4.2(9), B2.6.1(1), B2.6.2(1) and Appendix 1 in the AUP: OP. It relates to all five of the principles identified in the Council Structure Plan NDS, in particular principles 2 and 4.

6.5 In my opinion’ the proposal will achieve this objective. My key reasons for this conclusion are:

a. The proposal is consistent with the outcomes identified in the KDL structure plan and the Council’s Structure Plan. The realignment of Burberry Road corresponds to a north-south connection south of SH22 related to the future rail station.

b. The Precinct Plan’s spatial layout of new roads and the placement of zones has been arrived at over four-years of analysis and meetings with adjacent landowners and the Council. The town centre location is considered optimal in terms of the likely movement of people along SH22 and in a north-west – south-east direction between Drury West and the SH1 / Drury South employment area. Aligning urban centres to locate on the busiest possible road junction but in a way that will not interfere with the critical movement role of key roads such as SH22 and SH1 is referred
to by urban designers as the ‘movement economy’ and it is considered essential in achieving viable, street-based urban centres distinct from drive-up destination retail parks. This is expanded upon further in the report by Urbacity Pty Ltd. The PPC is consistent with this model and this has been independently verified by analysis from Space Syntax Ltd, London. In my opinion the proposal has been optimally planned to leverage commercial trade benefits from existing and likely movement corridors.

c. The proposal is very well integrated with SH22, Jesmond Road, a future rail station, McPherson Road and Great South Road, and includes a proposed realignment of Burberry Road to help achieve this. I consider that the proposal represents best-practice in this regard.

d. The connection between the future railway station, retail main street, lake, and both SH22 and Jesmond Road has been arrived at through very detailed master plan testing and represents a safe, efficient and convenient ‘bringing together’ of all of these respective opportunities and constraints.

e. The Ministry of Education’s new primary school (opening by 2022) will also have convenient access to the proposed town centre and future rail station because it has access to Burberry Road and this corridor will connect through the centre to the station.

f. The lake will provide a very high-amenity setting for high density housing around the town centre, and the KRF and GCF frontage overlays will further reinforce the planning importance of achieving a high-quality built form outcome along the key road frontages.

g. The proposed planning provisions would require a visually interesting, walkable, and safe street network to eventuate through the subdivision process; in my view, the master plan accompanying the proposal provides a very helpful indication of the type of outcome that is likely. This demonstrates the ability to form legible and walkable block dimensions, a well-connected street network, and direct connections to the various amenities within Drury West including the coastline, open spaces, schools, the centre and the future rail station. The key road frontages would be highly activated on account of the KRF control.

h. I consider that the presence of the future rail station, convenient movement routes, a retail main street and the lake, and the existing open spaces associated with the streams and coastal edge in Drury West, will together facilitate healthy, active lifestyles. I consider that the proposal is part of a wider effort to actively minimise unnecessary private motorcar use and instead promote walking, cycling and passenger transport system use. This extends to the emphasis on maximising local employment opportunities and access to the land south of SH22 and Drury South employment area.
i. The Precinct rules would link the delivery of new development to the satisfaction of identified transport upgrades including on SH22. I refer to Mr. Hills' expert advice (Commute Ltd.) on that matter. But this will ensure that the creation of the new transport connections and development proceed hand-in-hand.

j. I consider that the adverse effects associated with creating the new urban form and structure would involve a variety of staging, road works, and disruption in the local environment. I do not consider the proposal will give rise to any such effects at a scale or in a way that is materially different or more adverse to any other alternative land use zone solution would, and in that respect the Proposal is unremarkable.

k. Overall, housing in the area and within the THAB and MHU-zoned land that is part of the PPC would benefit from the presence of amenities, a well-connected starting point in the existing zoned land immediately north and investments made in enhancing the coastline and Drury Creek islands, that public schools are confirmed, the future rail station, and future employment opportunity in the local area. In my opinion, the proposal provides for a 'model' residential re-zoning that will support the quality compact urban form sought by the AUP: OP.

6.6 On the basis of the above, I consider that:

a. In terms of potentially adverse urban design effects, I consider that the KDL proposal would result in subdivision and development outcomes that are comfortably consistent with the outcomes sought by the AUP: OP and Structure Plan NDS. I am confident that the design process that was followed and the Precinct Plan and associated Precinct provisions proposed as a result will be successful at avoiding, remedying or mitigating potential urban design effects.

b. Having regard to all of the above factors, I consider that the proposal represents the most appropriate urban design outcome for the PPC land and it is supported.

Non-residential activities support the needs of people and the local community

6.7 This key objective is primarily derived from B2.3.1(1), B2.4.1(5), B2.4.2(10), B2.5.1(3), B2.5.2(7) and Appendix 1 in the AUP: OP. It relates to all five of the principles identified in the Council Structure Plan NDS but in particular principles 2 and 3.

6.8 In my opinion, the proposal provides for the employment and economic needs of Drury West in a manner that will also support the local community. It will also do so in a way that will not result in problematic amenity effects between employment and residential activities. My key reasons for this conclusion are:
a. The proposal and the land use zones proposed are consistent with the
KDL structure plan and the Council’s Structure Plan.

b. The scale of the town centre is consistent with the structure plans and
catchment analysis by Urbacity Pty Ltd. It will meet the needs of the
catchment in a location that I consider to be very convenient. The
alignment proposed with the lake will add a unique character quality to
the centre and further enrich its appeal to users. The centre will meet the
daily needs of locals within Drury West and will not draw catchment from
other areas.

c. The KDL master plan tests show that a variety of retail and non-retail
uses can be provided in a logical and coordinated manner. I have
confidence that the main street, associated anchors, and supporting
commercial uses can be provided in a way that is efficient and will meet
the needs of locals in Drury West.

d. I consider that a Town Centre zone will be more effective and efficient in
meeting the needs of the local community than a Local Centre zone (or
no centre zone at all).

e. In summary:

i. A Town Centre zone lends itself to more efficient building heights
and a higher-density population able to walk to the future train
station, but in a way that does not consume ground-level space
best put to commercial use (a problem in Mixed Use zones in
particular). The additional height overlay of 27m is particularly
relevant.

ii. A Town Centre zone lends itself to offices, a supermarket and
department store, likely to anchor a retail main street but also to
meet the needs of an 18,000 – 25,000 person local population in
Drury West. A Local Centre zone would be inferior in that respect,
and would likely require people to cross SH1 to Drury East or
travel to Pukekohe, a very inefficient an unnecessary outcome for
the meeting of every-day needs.

iii. A Town Centre zone and scale of activity is much more likely to
attract civic facilities, public squares and plazas, and services
needed by the local community such as Browns Bay, Glen Innes,
or Onehunga, whereas local centres tend to be more basic retail-
based ‘villages’ such as St. Heliers, Mairangi Bay or Kingsland.

iv. A Town Centre zone provides much greater potential for non-retail
employment and commercial activity including offices and
professional services than a Local Centre zone.

f. The proposal would overall be sufficient to meet the daily needs of
residents in Drury West but would not achieve a scale of commercial
activity that would be likely to compete with a planned major Metropolitan Centre in Drury East. In that respect, the sub-regional facilities likely in such a centre including large-scale shopping malls and entertainment complexes would be accessible to residents of Drury West on an occasional basis, as occurs across Auckland. In my opinion the proposal has been designed to complement the proposed Drury East Metropolitan centre and will work in tandem with it.

g. In terms of the future rail station to the south of SH22, I have reviewed the relationships between stations and centres across Auckland and there are a variety of spatial relationships evident. There is in my view a relatively modest functional benefit of having the centre and station close together, but it is not essential that they adjoin or be directly adjacent to one another. That the two will be within a convenient walk of one another will be sufficient to promote interaction between them. In any event, the centre would benefit from the station but is not reliant on it, due to its co-location with the major transport routes and likely flows of passing traffic though Drury West.

6.9 On the basis of the above, I consider that:

a. In terms of any potentially adverse urban design effects, I consider that the proposal would result in subdivision and development outcomes that are comfortably in line with the outcomes sought by the AUP: OP and the Structure Plan NDS, and that will help to meet the needs of the community. I am confident that the design process that was followed and the Precinct Plan and associated Precinct provisions proposed as a result will be successful at avoiding, remedying or mitigating potential urban design effects.

b. In overall consideration of the above, I consider that the proposal represents the most appropriate urban design outcome for the PPC land and it is supported.

the development should maintain or enhance the character of Drury West, and provide adequately for infrastructure

6.10 This key objective is primarily derived from B2.3.1(1), B2.3.2(1), B2.4.1(2), B2.4.2(8), B2.4.2(9), B2.6.1(1), B2.6.2(1), and Appendix 1 in the AUP: OP. It relates to all five of the principles identified in the Council Structure Plan NDS but in particular principles 1, 4 and to a lesser extent 5 (notably, stormwater and flooding).

6.11 In my opinion, the proposal will maintain and enhance Drury West’s planned character values and does provide for infrastructure. My key reasons for this conclusion are:
a. The proposal is consistent with the KDL structure plan and the Council’s Structure Plan. But the proposal will not maintain the existing rural and rural lifestyle character of the area. In any event, given the Council’s desire for the land to be development ready by 2022, that appears to be a foregone conclusion.

b. The proposal is for development to proceed hand-in-hand with new infrastructure, including necessary transport infrastructure. Proposed Precinct provisions are intended to align development with new infrastructure. Other infrastructure has been planned for via previous PV15 and PC6 processes.

c. Drury West is zoned Future Urban, and approximately 170ha has already been rezoned through Plan Variation 15 and Plan Change 6. The Council and KDL structure plans have identified a common urban development future for the land and, in that respect, the planned character of the area is considered to be what should be focused on rather than the existing rural lifestyle living character that predominates.

d. The proposal will give rise to a new urban character based on a visually concentrated town centre and its main street, and convenient linkages to a future rail station and a large employment area. The provisions of the AUP: OP will require all subdivision and development to obtain resource consent, and design quality is a matter of consideration in all of them. I consider that it is very likely that a high-quality built form outcome will be achieved, particularly along the key streets where either a KRF or GCF are proposed.

e. The lake will provide a unique amenity for the centre and give it a sense of place that will be distinctive in south-Auckland’s centres. In my opinion it is very likely that this will become a highly-popular part of the area and will attract visitors from across Drury West.

f. No vehicle access is proposed along SH22 and it is likely that this will become a landscaped buffer area accordingly.

g. The placement of the centre and its main street on the realigned Burberry Road will mean it will act as something of a gateway into Drury West. In my opinion this will set the scene for a high-quality and street-based development pattern connecting the northern coastline with SH22.

h. In urban design terms, a town centre with building heights of up to 27m will not have problematic adverse effects on the environment due to the separation distances from the Town Centre zoned land to third-party properties, and the presence of major urban infrastructure and spatial barriers including SH22, SH1 and the Drury Interchange, and Great South Road bridge.

i. The proposed town centre will be of a scale, extent and urban character commensurate with the scale of urban community planned for Drury
West, ranging from 18,000 – 25,000 persons and based on medium to high density development across the approximately 1,000ha area.

6.12 On the basis of the above, I consider that:

a. In terms of any adverse urban design effects, I consider the proposal would result in an overall enhancement of the character and amenity of Drury West as a major urban community and expansion of Auckland. The design process followed, Precinct Plan and associated provisions proposed will be successful at avoiding, remedying or mitigating potential urban design effects. The PPC will also achieve the outcomes sought by the AUP: OP and the Structure Plan NDS.

b. In overall consideration of the above, I consider that the proposal represents the most appropriate urban design outcome for the PPC land and it is supported.

open spaces should be well integrated and physically connected where possible

6.13 This key objective is primarily derived from B2.2.1(1), B2.3.1(1), B2.3.1(3), B2.7.1(1), B2.7.2(1), B2.7.2(2), and Appendix 1 in the AUP: OP. It relates to all five of the principles identified in the Council Structure Plan NDS, in particular, principles 2 and 4.

6.14 Although formal public open spaces, other than what would be required as an esplanade reserve along the Ngakoroa Stream, are not proposed, the proposal will in my opinion be appropriate. My key reasons for this conclusion are as follows:

a. The proposal is consistent with the KDL structure plan and the Council’s Structure Plan. There is no identified need for new open space on the Site, although the lake and associated stream are identified as existing open spaces that are not to be developed.

b. The proposal does not propose any new public open space at the level of a plan change, and it is understood that no esplanade reserve around the lake’s edge would be triggered. In any event, were that determined as necessary at the time of subdivision, the KDL master plan shows how a generous public edge around the lake could be achieved; I would expect that provision for public access to the lake will be made, particularly given the importance of public space interfaces in the AUP: OP provisions generally. As all development would require a resource consent, I consider it most unlikely that this would not occur.

c. The proposal integrates with the existing subdivision pattern of the Drury 1 Precinct, including park-edge collector road that runs along the western
side of the Ngakoroa Stream. This will allow users of the centre to readily access the coast.

d. It is likely that, as the town centre main street develops, a civic open space of some form will be developed; whether that would remain in public or private ownership would be determined at the time of development taking into account its scale.

e. The town centre main street is itself considered to be the key public open space that will result from the proposal and I consider it is well thought-through, including by having a generally north-south alignment. As noted earlier the additional use of the Key Retail Frontage control would further reinforce its built form quality.

f. The proposal provides for a number of connection options for the future rail station on the southern side of SH22.

6.15 On the basis of the above, I consider that:

a. In terms of any adverse urban design effects, I consider the proposal would result in well-integrated open space network and level of land use integration. I am confident that the design process that was followed and the Precinct Plan and associated Precinct provisions proposed as a result will be successful at avoiding, remedying or mitigating potential urban design effects. The PPC will also achieve the outcomes sought by the AUP: OP and the Structure Plan NDS.

b. In overall consideration of the above, I consider that the proposal represents the most appropriate urban design outcome for the PPC land and it is supported.

**reverse sensitivity effects with adjacent land uses are managed**

6.16 This key objective is primarily derived from B2.5.1(3), B2.5.2(10), B2.7.1(3), and Appendix 1 in the AUP: OP.

6.17 In my opinion, the proposal will successfully manage potential reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent activities. My key reasons for this conclusion are:

a. The proposal is consistent with the KDL structure plan and the Council’s Structure Plan. The proposed land use zones are as per the Structure Plan. The scale of the centre has been sized to meet the needs of the Drury West catchment and, as such, will not in my opinion attain a scale or intensity that would become a cause for concern for existing development.

b. The proposal uses MHU and THAB zones to integrate and buffer the proposed Town Centre zone from existing MHU-zoned land to the north
of the Site. The residential zones and future Esplanade Reserve would buffer development from the coast.

c. It is considered unlikely that the additional height overlays provided for the PPC will result in adverse effects of concern on any other site or area on the basis of separation distance from them, and that resource consent would be required for all new buildings in any event.

d. The proposed zones are to be used in a pattern that is reflected across Auckland, with a centre as the focal point surrounded by THAB, and then MHU zoned land. That cascade of intensity itself will assist to mitigate the effects of development from the central core outwards.

e. Potential reverse sensitivity effects on the transport system have been mitigated by the placement of land uses so that there will be no pressure for property access along the State Highway, and the alignment of new roads with existing roads. The proposed realignment of the intersection of Burberry Road’s and SH22 is consistent with this, and also responds to existing safety issues.

f. The staged manner in which the centre would develop and the links to transportation upgrades set out in the proposed Precinct provisions will ensure that SH22 transitions over an appropriate timeframe to an urban arterial with intersections and crossing points, without unnecessarily impacting on its through-movement efficiency for vehicular traffic.

6.18 On the basis of the above, I consider that:

a. In terms of any potentially adverse urban design effects, I consider the proposal would result in successfully planned mix of uses that will not give rise to any reverse sensitivity effects of concern. I am confident that the design process that was followed and the Precinct Plan and associated Precinct provisions proposed as a result will be successful at avoiding, remedying or mitigating potential reverse sensitivity effects. The PPC will also achieve the outcomes sought by the AUP: OP.

b. In overall consideration of the above, I consider that the proposal represents the most appropriate urban design outcome for the PPC land and it is supported.

the proposal should demonstrate how the opportunities and constraints of the site have been positively responded to

6.19 At the fundamental design and layout level, the manner in which a proposal responds to its site characteristics, opportunities and constraints is regarded by urban designers as one of the key ways that potential adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated (and that potential positive effects can be maximised). In this respect, this key objective draws on and is relevant to all
provisions of the AUP: OP RPS relevant to the PPC and to all five of the principles identified in the Council Structure Plan NDS.

6.20 In my opinion, the proposal represents a logical and successful response to its context. My key reasons for this conclusion are:

a. The proposal is consistent with the KDL structure plan and the Council’s Structure Plan, and the principles of the Council Structure Plan NDS.

b. KDL’s entire approach is based in large part on an efficient best use of the existing McPhersons Road and Great South Road connections over the railway line, the only such crossings in all of Drury West. All other scenarios require costly and time-consuming new connections to be formed. That those two roads also lead directly to Drury South employment area as well as the future rail station adjacent to Jesmond Road reinforce their importance.

c. The KDL Master Plan tests demonstrate that the proposed zones and Precinct requirements can deliver a high-quality and well-integrated outcome including a retail main street that is accessible and conveniently located, connectivity to adjacent land use areas and a future rail station, and the existing lake amenity feature.

d. The location of the Town Centre zone has been arrived at based on recognising the site and SH22 area as a key confluence of movement pressures. The location reflects a combination of best-connecting planned residential and employment uses together, being proximate and visible so as to viably make commercial activities possible; being close to a planned future rail station (which is very constrained in terms of possible location); and, being close to the existing lake. I consider it to be excellently located to serve Drury West, on the basis of a small number of additional local or neighbourhood centres also being provided in the outer areas of Drury West (the existing Local Centre north in the Drury 1 Precinct is an example of this).

e. The additional height overlay sought is a direct response to the proximity of the existing lake and future rail station as a logical and high-quality location for high-density development.

f. The proposed zones are a direct response to the AUP and an attempt to use existing instruments rather than unnecessarily create new ones to enable development.

g. The use of the KRF and GCF frontage controls reflect the intention for street-based and high-quality built form outcomes along the key streets.

h. The Proposal is premised on coordinating the roll out of new development with the provision of identified traffic upgrades and improvements. In my opinion, this reflects the transport constraints, especially of the SH22 corridor. That is also reflected in the placement of
zones back from SH22 and the proposal for a north-south main street away from the SH22 edge rather than seeking to locate along it.

i. The master plan tests also demonstrate how the proposed zone layout and likely future development work with the natural slope of the land down from the Bremner Road crest to SH22. This will provide views out from the town centre to the future rail station and help to integrate it visually into the centre.

j. While SH22 as a major transport corridor running through the development area is not of itself desirable, it is a common occurrence and can be seen in many instances across Auckland associated with the State Highway network. The key urban design issue lies in managing direct effects associated with the highway edge, as well as coordinating those land uses that benefit from Highway proximity and visibility, and those that do not.

k. I consider that the proposal has successfully addressed this to the extent that SH22 will not in real-world terms be any different to any Auckland Urban area that has a four-lane arterial road though it (premised on a future 50km/h speed limit being in place). Examples are Albany Village and the former SH1; the bisection of Albany Metropolitan Centre and its catchment to the north, east and west by SH1 and SH1A; Ellerslie Town Centre and residential land on the east of SH1, Massey North metropolitan centre and its bisection from its residential catchment to the east by the North Western Motorway; and many more.

l. The proposal provides for convenient and proximate connections between the rail station identified in the Council’s Structure Plan, and the optimal location for a town centre based on KDL’s analysis of the locality. As part of this, the provisions provide for connectivity across SH22 in a manner that will maintain its through traffic efficiency as much as is possible in the context of planned urban development along each of its sides.

6.21 On the basis of the above, I consider that:

a. In terms of any potentially adverse urban design effects, I consider that the proposal responds logically and appropriately to the site’s opportunities and constraints. I am confident that the design process that was followed and the Precinct Plan and associated Precinct provisions proposed as a result will be successful at ensure that the opportunities and constraints relating to this site have been recognised and in ensuring that any potentially adverse urban design effects of the proposal can be addressed. I consider the PPC will achieve the outcomes sought by the AUP: OP and also the Structure Plan NDS.

b. In overall consideration of the above, I consider that the proposal represents the most appropriate urban design outcome for the PPC land and it is supported.
overall urban design merit

6.22 I have carefully considered the overall urban design merits of the proposal in light of the above analysis and make the following comments.

6.23 The proposal has followed a design-led process (that is now into its fifth year) that has considered all plausible alternatives and identified a well-designed and most-appropriate framework for the site. In my opinion, the design process was comprehensive and of a scope and depth that is commensurate with the scale and nature of potential environmental effects associated with the PPC proposal. Further, I consider that the proposal has been the subject of more technical substantiation and analysis than any other new town centre I am familiar with.

6.24 The proposed zone framework, provisions and Precinct Plan will ensure subdivision and development maintains and enhances the planned character and other qualities of Drury West. I am confident, based on the concept master plan, that the proposed zones will be of a size and design that will comfortably achieve the ‘downstream’ resource consent provisions triggered in AUP: OP.

6.25 The design principles and aspirations set out in the Structure Plan NDS, although non-statutory, will also be achieved by the PPC.

6.26 On balance, I consider the proposal to adequately reflect the outcomes sought by the AUP: OP for new urban centres in the Future Urban zone, and that any potential adverse urban design effects arising from subdivision and development of the land can be adequately addressed. Numerous positive effects will also follow, including for the existing community.

6.27 On the basis of the above, and overall, I consider that the proposal can be supported on urban design grounds.

7. conclusions

7.1 The key conclusions of this report are as follows:

a. In urban design terms, the land is logically located and well-suited for a town centre and to support local high-density residential land uses. It would logically and contiguously extend the existing zoned area of Drury West, support that new neighbourhood, and be consistent with the land use outcomes identified by the Council in its Drury-Opaheke Structure Plan – August 2019 for the Drury West area. in particular, the proposal has been aligned with the Council’s preferred rail station and connectivity outcomes.
b. Rezoning of the land via a private plan change process is understood to be approximately 6-9 months ahead of the timing of any Council public plan change for the land because the Council’s Future Urban Land Supply Strategy identifies Drury West as being “development ready” by 2022, and that any new zoning in Drury West would in any event always include land that was contiguous with existing urban zoned land. The proposed re-zoning comprises sites that are accessed by and rely on Burberry Road, being 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 16A, 18, 20, 24, 25, and 30 Burberry Road.

c. The mix of land use zones proposed is consistent with the Council’s Structure Plan for the Drury West area although proposed height and key retail frontage overlays are also proposed to maximise the density and efficiency of town centre development near to a lake and planned train station in the area. These land use outcomes are also supported by and are consistent with the technical work KDL has undertaken on Drury West since 2014.

d. The proposed rezoning would enable a planned public primary school to use SH22 / Burberry Road, as well as consented development on 31 Burberry Road, and facilitate a direct connection from the new community to the new Drury West train station (identified in the Council Drury-Opaheke Structure Plan), expected to be operational by 2024. It would enable town centre-scale services to serve the new neighbourhood in Drury West, currently zoned for 2,600+ houses.

e. The proposed rezoning and Precinct Plan have been derived from a number of detailed master plan tests for the site, which have identified an optimal street structure, aligning roads for solar orientation and to also enjoy convenient access for customers. A key focal point for the new town centre zone is an existing 1.2ha lake, which will be retained and integrated as a key amenity feature to attract residents and visitors.

f. In my opinion, the proposal is the most appropriate way of rezoning the land and will have urban design benefits. Potential adverse urban design effects would not arise.

g. Lastly, I consider that the private plan change proposal will not sit in conflict with either the AUP: OP framework for re-zoning Future Urban zoned land, or the specific objectives and policies of the AUP: OP relating to how land use zones should be used and spatially located including because of the high degree of alignment achieved between the proposal and the Council’s Structure Plan.

7.2 In my professional opinion, the private plan change application can safely and confidently be accepted from an urban design perspective.