

AUCKLAND URBAN DESIGN PANEL

RECOMMENDATIONS



Project:	Karaka North Village
Location:	135 Albert Street, level 14, room 8
Date:	30 th January 2020
Time:	1:30PM – 6:00PM
Members:	Lauren White (chair), Will Thresher, Shane Brealey, Matt Riley
Planner:	Andy Calder (consultant for council)
Urban Designer:	Chris Butler/Frank Pierard
Landscape Specialist:	Sally Peak (consultant for council)

- Support for the following reasons
- ✓ Support subject to some changes (stated below)
- Support subject to fundamental changes (stated below)
- Cannot support for the following reasons

Introduction

The Panel thanks the applicant for their presentation and appreciates the comprehensive nature of the design response. The proposal presents an integrated and innovative approach to residential development in the area and offers a varied experience and exposure to rural character.

The Panel recognises that a large amount of information was presented as part of the panel pack, including a number of specific (and sometimes detailed) issues upon which the applicant sought feedback. As discussed and given the time constraints, the scope of this particular panel was therefore generally focused on “higher order” issues associated with overall masterplan, development yield, density, and spatial allocation of open space.

The Panel notes there are a number of details within the proposed masterplan and accompanying diagrams that were not the subject of discussion and cannot be endorsed by the Panel at this time.

Development yield

On the assumption that infrastructure constraints are resolved, the Panel supports the increased development yield on the basis it provides a greater variety of residential choice as well as greater support for surrounding village facilities, particularly adjacent recreational activities. Furthermore, the increased yield is more likely to support the intended scale of the proposed village centre, the potential for public transport, and promote village identity and character.

The Panel notes that the proposed yield is an indicative maximum and that achieving this number is both ambitious and desirable. To that end, it is recommended that the link between staging/delivery and urban design outcomes are carefully considered. For example, the identification and sequencing of superlots should ensure opportunities for more intensive development are protected.

Departure from precinct plan

Recognising the infrastructure changes since the precinct plan was approved and the subsequent more detailed site consideration by the applicant, the Panel supports, in principle, the intention to diverge from the district plan's precinct plan.

However, there are a number of aspects of this divergence where the Panel has some concerns as follows.

- Whether or not the precinct plan's intended outcome for the rural character area is clearly addressed and achieved by the current proposal. This may include issues such as whether sufficient spaciousness is delivered at the western interface, and along the initial western stretch of Linwood Road
- Whether or not the guidelines as drafted will deliver on the outcomes sought by the precinct plan in both rural character area and general village environment.

Open space

The Panel supports the extent and variety of open spaces proposed by the masterplan. The Panel recognises the constraints with vesting these spaces with council, and strongly supports the intended public access and utilisation of these spaces in perpetuity.

To the extent permissible by law, the Council expressly disclaims any liability to the applicant (under any theory of law including negligence) in relation to any pre-application process. The applicant also recognises that any information it provides to the Council may be required to be disclosed under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (unless there is a good reason to withhold the information under that Act). However, the Council is able to withhold information for certain reasons including to prevent unreasonable prejudice to someone's commercial position. All resource consent applications become public information once lodged with council.

Connections

Pathway connections to esplanade

The Panel supports the intention to provide a publicly accessible, informal path network through the rural character area. The Panel recommends that careful consideration be given to a wayfinding strategy, including entry points to this network to ensure the network is perceived as public by residents and visitor alike. The Panel supports the intention of providing additional carparking in the locations shown and recommends that careful consideration be given to surveillance and landscaping of these spaces.

Northern connection

Whilst not the subject of discussion at this panel session, the Panel recommends that further consideration be given to connections to the north. This includes both potential additional pedestrian connections adjacent to the esplanade reserve as well as potential road connections from the proposed residential area to the north. Providing a road connection as well as a shared path connection ensures visibility and safety of the link.

Wider connections

With respect to the wider pedestrian network/connection to the existing node/intersection, future Karaka North Village centre, and the recreation facilities further south, the Panel recommends further consideration be given to pedestrian/cycling provision through the village centre area. These should be clearly identified on the masterplan along with pedestrian connections across Linwood Road and Dyke Road to ensure successful integration of village centre to existing heart.

The Panel prefers the level of connectivity to the village centre as illustrated by the masterplan for endorsement on page 9 of the presentation pack, and has concerns about the level of connectivity achievable should the retirement village eventuate.

The Panel recommends that, should the retirement village option be pursued, direct public road connection from the future residential areas is maintained to both the village square and village green. Furthermore, the Panel considers the secondary east-west road connection from village centre to rural character area should be ensured by the masterplan.

To the extent permissible by law, the Council expressly disclaims any liability to the applicant (under any theory of law including negligence) in relation to any pre-application process. The applicant also recognises that any information it provides to the Council may be required to be disclosed under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (unless there is a good reason to withhold the information under that Act). However, the Council is able to withhold information for certain reasons including to prevent unreasonable prejudice to someone's commercial position. All resource consent applications become public information once lodged with council.

Village centre

The Panel strongly supports the provision of on-street parking on Linwood Road and Dyke Road to support the viability of the village centre and to encourage slower traffic movement, as illustrated on page 29 and 30 of the presentation pack. However, it is recommended that further detail is provided within the masterplan with respect to built form (buildings fronting streets), active edges, and pedestrian connections.

The Panel recommends that outcomes in the village centre are driven by a set of guidelines, and any future applications for the village centre be subject to panel review.

Entry from Dyke Road

It is recommended that further consideration be given to visual outcomes, passive surveillance and building interfaces at the entry point on Dyke Road.

Guidelines

The Panel supports the intention to use guidelines to ensure good urban design outcomes are achieved, including assessment by Auckland Council staff as well as the use of private covenants and assessment by the developer. In general, the Panel supports the approach taken by the draft guidelines, with the proviso that landscape design and village centre outcomes are included.

Other matters

The Panel considers the following information is likely to assist council officers in their future considerations of the proposal:

- Potential impact of stormwater treatment devices on the pedestrian network
- Proposed staging strategy, creation/identification of superlots, and infrastructure delivery
- Clear rationale regarding the coastal interface including SEA, esplanade, rural character, fencing, and land management.

Conclusion

Given the Panel generally supports this project, a further Panel review of the masterplan is not expected subject to the resolution of the above items to the satisfaction of the Reporting Urban Designer.

To the extent permissible by law, the Council expressly disclaims any liability to the applicant (under any theory of law including negligence) in relation to any pre-application process. The applicant also recognises that any information it provides to the Council may be required to be disclosed under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (unless there is a good reason to withhold the information under that Act). However, the Council is able to withhold information for certain reasons including to prevent unreasonable prejudice to someone's commercial position. All resource consent applications become public information once lodged with council.