

26 AUGUST 2021

JAMES OAKLEY
BIRCH SURVEYORS LTD
BY E-MAIL

Dear James

GOLDING ROAD PLAN CHANGE – COUNCIL CLAUSE 23 REQUEST

1. Thank you for providing me with the Council's request. You have asked me to respond to items UL3; UL4; and Non C123(1). I will provide my comments to each in turn.

UL3 - In a number of places (p.17 (k), p. 20(c), and p. 26(a), the UD assessment notes that an indicative location for a neighbourhood park is identified on the Precinct Plan.

2. At the time that I prepared my urban design report a neighbourhood park location was understood to be identified on the Precinct Plan, and it was located based on my concept plan. I supported this because in urban design terms such a park would be best-located at a relatively central point on the Site, relates to the stream network, the neighbourhood centre, and one of the key roads into the Site so as to make it as prominent and, one would hope, as widely-used as possible.
3. I acknowledge that the Council determines what open space reserves it seeks and where based on a number of considerations. At the time of my work, I only had available to me my own preferences and I was not informed of where (or if) the Council would seek a reserve on the Site. My enthusiasm for identifying the park on the Precinct Plan was ultimately in the hope of trying to ensure that the Council made what I consider to be the best decision by trying to influence its future decision.
4. On assessment of this and my thinking behind it, Tollemache Consulting Ltd determined that it was more appropriate to not indicate a park on the Precinct Plan. I do not consider it an essential matter in urban design terms and I

consider that there are a number of park configurations across the Site that could be acceptable depending on the adjoining subdivision pattern proposed at that time.

5. I remain of the opinion that the configuration I identified remains the optimal one in urban design terms.

UL4 - The UD assessment places considerable emphasis on the amenity role of the stream corridors that run through the Site and notes the value of providing street edges to these. It is noted that an indicative local road alignment on the western side of the southern stream edge is depicted on the Precinct Plan, however not the more central stream.

6. The streams will be a key amenity value shaper on the Site in a number of ways. Across the Site as a whole, the streams will shape the block and street pattern that eventuates, which will give contextual meaning and purpose to that pattern (i.e., it is not 'placelessly' derived from a generic grid or a random pattern). If the streams can be fronted with public roads, then they will provide a public amenity, and this would always be my preference. If the streams are backed onto, then they would provide additional private lot depth and visual amenity for residents.
7. The question of whether a stream will be backed onto or fronted onto is a result of many factors. First and foremost is whether a Council will accept a stream and riparian area as a drainage or utility reserve, or an Esplanade Reserve. That is not usually known until the time of a subdivision consent including by way of very detailed stream-width survey. If all or a majority of a stream is to be a public asset, then in my view the default response should be a park-edge road unless slope topography makes this impractical (this occurred in Flat Bush Stage 3). In this instance, my sense is that topography would not be a constraint on this Site. But if all or a majority of a stream and riparian edge is to remain in private ownership (and in Auckland I have experience of the Council turning down an offer of free land gifting, so as to facilitate a park-edge road, because of maintenance cost concerns), then it becomes much harder to find a plausible ownership structure for that if bisected from any other private land by a public road. In that scenario I would expect the stream to be generally backed onto.
8. In the concept plan, because I did not have information on precise stream widths or future Council ownership intent, and in part because the concept plan is a means of analytical design testing rather than an intended plan of actual subdivision, I 'covered all bases', by using it to test both scenarios. I do not agree that the concept plan can be used as a precise predictor of a future subdivision plan for the Site; that is why the Precinct Plan instead only focuses on key connections and elements.
9. However, I would not oppose Precinct provisions that promoted or encourage park-edge roads along public space edges where practicable to do so from the point of view of the overall neighbourhood structure.

Non CI23(1) - In relation to the indicative concept master plan the applicant is requested to explain:

a) The rationale or purpose of the large open space illustrated in Figure 4 below, with limited access from the north. And why is this open space not proposed as a suburb park?

10. The particular large open space in question was not conceived as a recreation park or space; it was shaped by Site contour and information from Birch Surveyors and my own site visit as a combination of swampy / wetland, and stormwater storage area. There is also an identified Significant Ecological Area in this part of the Site too. In summary it was envisaged less as a play space and more of a stormwater and ecological area.
11. The concept plan does not represent an intended subdivision design in this respect and would be the subject of a detailed survey and indication. But as a signal for what might be one possible outcome, I see it as nonetheless analytically valid.
12. In my opinion there is no need or benefit in a large recreation space in this location, and on the basis that it formed part of what an urban designer would term a “blue” network rather than a “green” one, I trust that this also makes the logic of the close-by neighbourhood park more apparent as well.

Please feel welcome to contact me should you wish to discuss any aspect of the above further.

Yours sincerely,



IAN MUNRO

urban planner and urban designer

B.Plan (Hons); M.Plan (Hons); M.Arch [Urban Design] (Hons); M.EnvLS (Hons); M.EngSt [Transport] (Hons); MNZPI

(e) ian@ianmunro.nz

(m) 021 900 993