

BEFORE TAUPŌ DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER OF the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act')

AND

IN THE MATTER OF of an application for a Proposed Plan Change 37 Nukuhau

**SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR HEARING BY MORNÉ HUGO
ON BEHALF OF TAUPŌ DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Date: 9 November 2021

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

1 My qualifications and experience are set out in my Evidence-in-Chief.

CODE OF CONDUCT

2 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses outlined in the Environment Court's Consolidated Practice Note and have complied with it in preparing this evidence. I also agree to follow the Code when presenting evidence. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise and that I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my opinions.

BACKGROUND

3 I have prepared or contributed to the following documents:

- I have carried out a review of the applicant's Technical Assessment – Urban Design.
- I have prepared a statement of evidence relating to Urban Design matters only.
- I have reviewed all submissions relating to Urban Design matters.

4 In my 2021 report I provided comments on:

- Urban Design matters relating to the Proposed Plan Change 37 – Nukuhau.

5 This summary statement is based on the above documents (although it does not replace them), along with consideration of the following:

- Evidence-in-Chief of Nicholas Aiken, Urban Design Consultant from Vision Urban Environmental.
- Submission of Mr. Rowan Sapsford for Bike Taupō

COMMENTS ON URBAN DESIGN EVIDENCE OF NICHOLAS AIKEN

6 I am in general agreement with the Evidence in Chief provided by Mr. Aiken, as stated in my Evidence in Chief.

7 As such I support the proposed plan change application from an Urban Design perspective, subject to the appropriate level of control as proposed by the applicant and a higher level of detail to be provided at future design and consenting stages of the development parcels.

- 8 I agree with paragraph 40 of Mr. Aiken's evidence, that tree *planting (Low Volume Road – General Density (19m))* be limited to one side of the street, reflecting the lower position of this street type in the movement hierarchy.
- 9 In paragraph 41 of his evidence, Mr. Aiken discussed my proposal that a rule be imposed that 30% of the total length of stormwater reserve edges be required to have active road frontage. I concur with Mr; Aiken's concern around retaining design flexibility and agree that this be included as an assessment matter at time of subdivision, with the aim of achieving approximately 30% active frontage, either by a physical road edge interface, or alternatively a neighbourhood reserve of a functional width (minimum 20m) connecting the road edge to the stormwater reserve edge.

COMMENTS ON ROWAN SAPSFORD FOR BIKE TAUPŌ EVIDENCE

- 10 Mr Sapsford states in his that "*seek that adequate consideration is given to the safety of all road users and that the benefits of effective cycling infrastructure are recognised. That infrastructure is not currently in place in Nukahau and needs to be prior to development within the plan change area starting.*"
- 11 I confirm that I agree with Mr. Sapsford's view that adequate cycling infrastructure is required and should be incorporated into the plan change development area. As stated in my Evidence in Chief, The UDA proposes a connected off-road walking and cycling network to be established running alongside roads and green areas. I agree that this is a desired outcome of the proposed design of the development and is critical in providing choices of non-vehicular transportation to future residents. Space allocation for a cycle or shared path network through the stormwater gully areas is essential and will affect developable residential land parcels.
- 12 In my view the current structure plan layout, does not clearly indicate how this is achieved along the stormwater gully edges and should establish and clearly indicate appropriate setback area between the gullies and proposed residential land parcels for this function to occur. Greater precision (effectiveness) would be achieved through the following: *Clearly indicating space allocation and alignment of off-road cycleway / walkway connections on the structure plan diagram.*

OTHER COMMENTS

- 13 Submission 19 (19.2) proposes the requirement that additional reserve areas are provided other than the stormwater gully areas. I support this submission and understand that Council has provided the applicant with a calculation for additional reserve space as per below:

To identify an appropriate rate for the acquisition of suitable land the following approach is recommended:

- A 300m radial area covers a 28.3ha area
- 9000m² of reserve is envisaged to be required (being nominally a neighbourhood of approximately 7000m² plus pathways from one side to the other with a nominal 5m width (400x5)) within each service catchment, accepting that there may also be wider connectivity that comes from other local purpose/infrastructure reserves not within this area, or a realignment between the land required for pathways, and the size of a neighbourhood reserve)
- An analysis that generally 20% of any service catchment will likely be made up in roads or other LP reserve/gully networks), leaving 22.6ha for residential properties
- 9000/22.6ha = 3.98% of the developable service catchment is likely required for reserves serving the recreational needs of that community

Received by email from Hilary Samuel on 8/6/2021

- 14 This is an important to ensure appropriate levels of service in terms of functional and usable open space is provided, over and above visual amenity and circulation functions that are provided within the stormwater reserve networks.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I support the proposed plan change application from an Urban Design perspective, subject to the appropriate level of control as proposed by the applicant and a higher level of detail to be provided at future design and consenting stages of the development parcels.

Further information will need to include:

- Detailed subdivision layout plans;
- Detailed planting plans for all streetscape, reserve and stormwater corridors;
- Design details for any playground areas where relevant, including sign-off in accordance with the New Zealand Playground Safety Standards;
- Appropriate hard and soft landscaping specifications for all areas listed above;
- All landscape design works should be carried out by a NZLA Registered Landscape Architect

Morné Hugo

05 November 2021

