

27 July 2023

55-57 Brookvale Road Development

Urban Design RFI Response

Attention:	
Rowena Macdonald <i>Consultant Planner</i>	rowena@sageplanning.co.nz

Dear Rowena,

In response to your request for further information for the 35 Lot Comprehensive Development at 55-57 Brookvale Road, additional detail about the application has been provided. Of note:

- Further comments have been provided detailing the design rationale of the proposed layout, and why alternative layouts were not pursued;
- Clarification of the reserve treatment, including additional renders;
- Proposed Consent Conditions to address concerns around material selection and communal ownership of private infrastructure assets;
- Further detail on landscaping elements, infringements, flood risk mitigations; and
- The inclusion of a concept lighting plan for the private accessways.

These are addressed in detail on the following pages.

Kind regards,

Cameron Rossouw

Urban Designer
Saddleback Planning Limited



3. Urban Design, Landscaping & Visual Effects

To assist with the assessment of landscape and visual effects of the proposal, and with assessment of how the proposed development aligns with the design guidance contained in the Hastings Residential Intensification Design Guide 2020, which link to the District Plan assessment criteria:

A. Design Statement

Please provide an updated Design Statement to include an assessment of the layout options investigated and the philosophy behind the design concept lodged. Note: Council policy planners have carried out an initial assessment of the proposal against the Hastings Residential Intensification Design Guide 2020. Their assessment is attached to this letter for your information, as it may provide some useful insight in preparing an updated Design Statement.

Saddleback Response:

1. The following comments have been provided in response to the above request in addition to the Urban Design Statement provided with the application.
2. A range of alternative layout options were investigated through the conceptual design process. Following a review of these options, it was determined the submitted proposal offered the best compromise between all stakeholders and development objectives. Including:
 - a. Discouraging vehicles moving through the development, and;
 - b. Encourage modal shift / pedestrian connectivity – particularly with the park space to the west.
3. While in theory Council's suggestion of an edge-lane would be a desirable outcome in most situations, in this instance, by virtue of the site parameters (shape, size, single access points), we felt it wasn't appropriate because:
 - a. The proposal is based on splitting off traffic as quickly as possible / reducing vehicle loads and movements progressively to the north. (Demarcated with the proposed roundabout and surface treatments).
 - b. The proposal utilises shared-space design to intuitively lower vehicle speed and support pedestrian use of the corridor space; and
 - c. Makes the west-east linkages (primarily the southern one) as 'pedestrian-friendly/dominant' as possible, including with shared space treatment of the road, planting, and additional demarcated footpaths.
 - d. Utilising an edge-lane in this case would:
 - i. Increase the amount of roading and related infrastructure required to service the development;



- ii. Likely lose a dwelling (unless the lane widths/spaces are compromised); and
 - iii. Tends to encourage vehicle movement through the development (as public view it as a suitable location for parking which undermines the objectives sought above).
- e. The current design allows dwellings to have rear-yards fronting to the park which:
- i. Allows direct entry to units from park, meaning that the park becomes much more like the front doors for daily activity (visitors will still tend to use the internal lane).
 - ii. Encourages the use of the park as an extension of residential spaces, promoting further activation and a sense of ownership for the community; and
 - iii. Allows living courtyards to be optimised for north-west sun (afternoon/evening time in spring–autumn) which is when most people socialise, further contributing to activation and CPTED principles.

B. Reserve Edges

Council staff consider the Guthrie Park interface as being particularly important as it fronts a public open space with high amenity values and public uses. Please identify on the plans provided, the specific treatment proposed for the reserve edges (Guthrie Park and Karituwenua Stream).

Specific front-on 3D perspectives would further assist in this regard – the inclusion of colour would be beneficial (in accordance with their cladding design statement) along with a front on, closer up, rather than oblique view from a distance.

Further, a 3D perspective view into the connection from the Reserve would be useful for assessment purposes, along with one from within the development looking out to the park along the pedestrian access, as this would assist in assessing how it feels in terms of public access from within the development to the reserve.

Saddleback Response:

4. The proposed treatment of the Guthrie Park Boundary is identified on drawings *LFPO1 (Rev C)* prepared by Oderings Landscaping, dated 30th January 2023 and included with the application. This treatment includes:
- a. To the rear yards of Lots 19-26, Lots 32-35
 - i. 1.2m high visually permeable fencing to the shared boundary (aluminium pool-style fencing with 100x100mm posts (gates to match), and;
 - ii. The front ~7m of lot 18 (approximately 130m cumulative length).
 - b. Lot 35 (approximately 25m), overlooking the carpark within Guthrie Park.



- i. 1.8m solid fencing with top 300mm visually permeable
 - c. To the side of Lot 18 (approximately 15m in length).
 - i. 1.8m solid fencing
5. In addition, low planting and specimen trees are proposed within the rear gardens of the lots bordering the parks which will contribute to the overall amenity value of the park and will represent a significant improvement to what is currently experienced.
6. Additional perspectives will be provided separately to demonstrate the pedestrian accessways between the reserve and the proposed development.



Figure 1: Render looking from Guthrie Park east through the pedestrian access link and roundabout beyond.



Figure 2: Render looking west from the roundabout towards the pedestrian link to Guthrie Park (Terraced Dwellings on the right).

C. Materials

The Design Statement (pg 5) states:

While a colour scheme is not provided for the development, a cladding design statement included in the masterplan document notes the following:

Too much colour variation within the development should be avoided as this contributes to a visually cluttered urban environment and detracts from a cohesive identity.

Dwelling types painted the same colour are not discouraged as variation will develop over time through occupier preference and landscaping.

Cladding Type A should typically be a darker, more recessive colour to anchor the buildings to their site. This should support reducing the visual dominance of garages.

Cladding Types B and C can be the same colour as the material difference and building form will provide visual variation. Where these are different colours, they should be natural, neutral, or tones of the same base colour.

no colour palette has been provided, instead opting for the use of a cladding design statement.



Please advise how the applicant anticipates effectively and practically implementing the above e.g., through offering consent conditions (consent notices).

Saddleback Response:

7. The following consent condition regarding material and colours are proposed:

Confirmation of Cladding Choices:

A Cladding Plan with supporting specifications should be prepared and submitted to Council for certification prior to construction commencing.

The Cladding Plan must contain:

- *Reference and alignment with the design principles outlined in the Urban Design Statement and Masterplan Document.*
- *Selection and location of cladding choices per dwelling.*
- *Selection and location of paint choices per dwelling.*

There plans must be supported by specifications that describe in a written form the more specific technical matters such as the quality of materials.

D. Typology A

Please review the zero lot boundary features for Type A (i.e. proposed Lots 7 & 16) as there is a window to the side wall (refer E2, drawings A105 and A106). Please provide updated drawings.

Saddleback Response:

8. A hatch denoting the zero-lot boundary has been applied to this typology noting that the window won't be constructed on Lots 7 and 16. This plan update has been provided separately.



Figure 3: Architectural Plans RFI Response (Sheet A106)

E. Landscaping

District Plan performance standard 8.2.6F(5) – which Council uses as a guide for assessment of comprehensive residential developments in the Havelock North General Residential Zone – anticipates a minimum of 20% of the exclusive use area for each residential building be landscaped with mixed vegetation cover and specimen trees. Please demonstrate whether the concept complies with this.



Saddleback Response:

9. Based on the landscaped plans prepared by Oderings, the following table represents the landscaped areas per lot. Plans have been provided separately for Council's review.

Lot Number	Landscaped Area	Lot Number	Landscaped Area	Lot Number	Landscaped Area
Lot 1	25.6%	Lot 13	20.8%	Lot 25	20.1%
Lot 2	21.1%	Lot 14	18.2%	Lot 26	29.1%
Lot 3	17.9%	Lot 15	14.1%	Lot 27	23.5%
Lot 4	22.9%	Lot 16	32.2%	Lot 28	19.0%
Lot 5	20.5%	Lot 17	26.6%	Lot 29	22.5%
Lot 6	32.7%	Lot 18	36.0%	Lot 30	14.4%
Lot 7	26.1%	Lot 19	17.7%	Lot 31	20.7%
Lot 8	20.0%	Lot 20	20.1%	Lot 32	30.0%
Lot 9	27.1%	Lot 21	20.1%	Lot 33	14.1%
Lot 10	33.8%	Lot 22	20.1%	Lot 34	27.1%
Lot 11	23.2%	Lot 23	20.1%	Lot 35	43.4%
Lot 12	22.9%	Lot 24	20.1%		

10. Lots 3, 14, 15, 19, 28, 30, and 33 have been identified to be an infringement under 8.2.6.F(5). The actual, measured infringement to the landscaped areas of the sites above is:

- a. Lot 3 2.1% Infringement = 5.6 m²
- b. Lot 14 1.8% Infringement = 3.9 m²
- c. Lot 15 5.9% Infringement = 13.1 m²
- d. Lot 19 2.3% Infringement = 4.9 m²
- e. Lot 28 1.0% Infringement = 1.4 m²
- f. Lot 30 5.6% Infringement = 11.4 m²
- g. Lot 33 5.9% Infringement = 11.7 m²

11. An assessment of the effects has been provided below, suggesting that the effects are less than minor:

- a. The cumulative effects of the landscape infringement will not be noticeable within the development due to:
 - i. The extensive streetscape landscaping proposed within the shared-space laneways and park connections.



- ii. The sites immediate adjacency to Guthrie Park and Karituwhenua Stream which wrap around the site on three boundaries (west/north/east).
 - iii. The cumulative landscaping area across all residential sites is 24.4%, circa 360m² greater than the minimum sought.
 - iv. The impacted lots are within the development and are not immediately adjacent to the neighbouring residential property at 53 Brookvale Road.
 - v. A stormwater assessment has been undertaken to support the development, which demonstrates that stormwater from the site can be managed appropriately.
- b. Where individual lots do infringe the standards, the effects are managed as:
- i. All sites have consistent and significant front yard landscaping, and provisions for specimen trees, to maintain the landscaped character of the streetscape and minimise the visual dominance of dwellings.
 - ii. Lots 33, 19, and 14, 15 have rear living courts which back onto Guthrie Park and Karituwhenua Stream respectively, minimising the visual effects and impact on the residential amenity of this infringement.
 - iii. Lots 03, 30 are corner sites which results in more streetscape frontage, and greater separation from neighbouring dwellings. These are also supported by the extensive streetscape planting proposed which further offset the visual impact of the infringement.
 - iv. Lot 28 is a terraced dwelling and does not have a side yard. This dwelling can reasonably be expected to have less landscaping, though landscaping is still provided within the front yard, and across the rear of the site. This balances the need for landscaping with the need to provide useable outdoor living spaces, which we feel is the appropriate balance to achieve good residential amenity.

F. Outdoor Living Space / Service Areas

It is difficult to assess from the drawings and information provided whether outdoor living space / service area is adequate for each lot. Please provide a site plan(s) showing service areas and outdoor living spaces for each individual lot, rather than the overlay onto one plan for particular typologies.

In relation to outdoor living space, please demonstrate this not only in relation to size of the space but also whether or not they meet other aspects of District Plan performance standard 8.2.6F(4) – e.g. 2.5m minimum dimension, 4m diameter circle, north facing etc – which Council uses as a guideline for assessment of comprehensive residential developments in the Havelock North General Residential Zone. Refer District Plan performance standard 8.2.6F(7) in terms of guidance around service areas.



Saddleback Response:

12. Compliance to standards 8.2.6F(4) and 8.2.6F(7) have been provided separately and quantified below.

Lot Number	ODLS	Lot Number	ODLS	Lot Number	ODLS
Lot 1	125.7 m ²	Lot 13	56.5 m ²	Lot 25	58.5 m ²
Lot 2	78.2 m ²	Lot 14	50.2 m ²	Lot 26	99.6 m ²
Lot 3	64.1 m ²	Lot 15	56.2 m ²	Lot 27	48.2 m ²
Lot 4	56.6 m ²	Lot 16	132.3 m ²	Lot 28	38.9 m ²
Lot 5	66.4 m ²	Lot 17	69.5 m ²	Lot 29	48.6 m ²
Lot 6	121.7 m ²	Lot 18	101.6 m ²	Lot 30	32.8 m ²
Lot 7	89.6 m ²	Lot 19	43.1 m ²	Lot 31	35.3 m ²
Lot 8	60.4 m ²	Lot 20	58.5 m ²	Lot 32	90.7 m ²
Lot 9	91.9 m ²	Lot 21	58.5 m ²	Lot 33	31.6 m ²
Lot 10	137.2 m ²	Lot 22	58.5 m ²	Lot 34	29.9 m ²
Lot 11	61.8 m ²	Lot 23	58.5 m ²	Lot 35	123.9 m ²
Lot 12	62.7 m ²	Lot 24	58.5 m ²		

13. Lot 34 infringes standard 8.2.6.F(4). The ODLS for this lot is 29.9m², which is 0.1m² less than the rule requires. An assessment of the effects has been provided below:

- a. This infringement represents a technical infringement of the standard.
- b. The ODLS for this dwelling maintains good proportions and daylight access and is directly accessible from the living areas of the dwelling.
- c. The ODLS is immediately adjacent to Guthrie Park, with pedestrian access via a gate. This provides residents additional amenity through use of this public asset.
- d. The actual experienced area available for use for outdoor living for residents will be circa 55m². The variation between these numbers is the available spaces that do not meet the either the minimum 2.5m dimension or shading rules. While excluded, these areas support outdoor living because they:
 - i. Contribute to the lived experience/amenity of the dwelling,
 - ii. Remain of a useful dimension for outdoor living (2.0m is accepted for balconies)



- iii. Remain useful beyond daylight hours, negating the shading effects.

14. Lot 31 infringe standard 8.2.6.F(4)(b) as a 4m diameter circle cannot be accommodated within the ODLS. An assessment of the effects has been provided below, which we suggest results in a less than minor effect:



Figure 4: Lot 31 Outdoor Living Space (3.9m Diameter Circle Achieved)

- a. Lot 31 can support a 3.9m diameter circle within the ODLS. The ODLS circle infringes the standard by 0.1m, due to the corner of the living room.
- b. The onsite amenity for residents is not likely to be materially affected by this infringement because:
 - i. The ODLS is orientated to the north, maintaining sun access.
 - ii. The ODLS is directly accessible from the Living Room (north and east), and from the Master Bedroom.
 - iii. The dwelling to the north (Lot 30) is single level and won't result in any adverse shading or overlooking effects.
 - iv. The dwelling to the east (Lot 03) is two-levels but is appropriately set back from the common boundary to manage anticipated shading effects. Any overlooking effects are not likely to be significant as windows to the upper level are higher, and to the master bedroom/ W/R and Ensuite areas which is likely to be used at different times of the day than the ODLS.



- v. The ODLS, while not supporting a 4m diameter circle, is at least 24m², through an approximately rectangular form 3.0 – 4.1m x 5.6m. When combined with the secondary living court, the Lot achieves 35.3m² ODLS which is greater than the 30m² required by the standard.

15. All lots comply with the standard 8.2.6.F(7) for Services/ Utility Area/ Deliveries.

G. Managing Flood Risk

The Infrastructure Report accompanying the application states (section 4.3, pg 6):

'The proposed development intends to fill and raise the northern areas of the site to be above the flooding levels and finished floor levels (FFL's) to be above the flood levels plus a 200mm freeboard (using the 0.20m accuracy tolerance mentioned in 4.2). It is anticipated that by raising the ground here, this would decrease the capacity of the Karituwhenua Stream during flood events. To prevent this from happening, it is proposed to cut existing ground material from above the southern bank of the Karituwhenua Stream at the northern boundary. This will increase the capacity of the stream during flood events and thus offset the earthworks filling of the new lots in the north...

Proposed dwellings along the northern boundary that are near the 8.44m flood level will have minimum FFLs of 8.95m, while proposed dwellings along the northern boundary that are near the 8.74m flood level will have minimum FFLs of 9.25m. These FFLs have been chosen as they will provide a 200mm freeboard to compensate for the 0.20m accuracy tolerance from the HBRC flood hazard maps, as well as an additional 300mm as a margin of safety. It is assumed that the finished ground levels around these new dwellings will be around 150-250mm below FFL.'

However, the Landscape & Visual Effects Assessment accompanying the application does not address the visual effects of these measures. Please provide an updated Landscape & Visual Effects Assessment addressing the visual effects of the flood mitigation proposed.

Saddleback Response:

- 16. The flooding assessment is being updated in accordance with engineering queries. A statement from the landscape and visual specialist will be provided on completion of the flooding assessment if it results in increased FFLs of some of the dwellings.

H. Bin Storage

It is noted that some of the lots propose bin storage location within the front yard (e.g. Lots 8 & 9, 27-29). Council prefers not to have outdoor storage areas provided within the front yard, especially where there are alternatives which there appears to be in this instance. Please reconsider the location of these areas or provide information to show what this will look like from a visual perspective.



Saddleback Response:

17. All bin storage areas are proposed within bin enclosures and are will therefore be screened. In most instances (particularly when the bins are within the front yards of the proposed dwellings) additional screening is provided through on-lot planting. Providing bins in this location is convenient for servicing and enables rear yards to remain clear of servicing and be the primary living space.

Typical bin enclosures examples are shown below:



18. Accepting that Council's preference for service areas is not to be between the dwelling and road, Standard 8.2.6.7(b) does not include internal private roads and therefore does not apply to these identified sites. Nevertheless, the following assessment has been provided as to their suitability as proposed.

19. Lots 8 and 9 are rear lots and therefore the location of the bins within the front yards will not be visually dominant from the streetscape. The front yard locations identified are preferred as to not compromise the rear-yard amenity of these lots, while maximising the front yard courtyard spaces.

20. Lot 28 is a terraced lot (no side-yard) and it is therefore not possible to have the bins in a different location without requiring residents to bring it through the dwelling.

21. Due to the site design of Lots 27 and 29 the bin enclosures will be in visually prominent locations from the streetscape regardless of location (corner sites) or will compromise the rear-yard amenity (within outdoor living courts). The bin locations as illustrated are to the south of the dwellings, and are screened by both the enclosure, hedging, and low planting.



I. Lighting

Please provide a Lighting Design and assessment showing street lighting and any illumination proposed for access lots and public pedestrian areas, sufficient and appropriate to the anticipated residential setting.

Saddleback Response:

22. A proposed lighting plan in alignment with Council's standards is provided separately.

J. Common Space Management (where held in Private Ownership)

The AEE accompanying the application (pgs 14 & 15) states that the maintenance obligations for the underground stormwater infrastructure within the proposed commercial carpark, and within the private jointly owned access lots, will be met by the owners and a Residents Association (or similar entity).

Please provide further information addressing, more fully, how infrastructure in private ownership is to be managed and maintained (including any connections to Reserves).

Saddleback Response:

23. The following consent condition is proposed:

Assets owned by Incorporated Society

Lots 4-34 share common assets, which are located within Lots 100-103. To ensure that Lots 4-34 remain adequately serviced and connected, an Incorporated Society must be created by the consent holder to own, and be responsible and liable for the ongoing operation, maintenance and repair of the common assets within Lots 100-103.

The following requirements must be met in order to satisfy this condition:

- a. Ownership of the common assets must be transferred to the Incorporated Society before any Lots 100-103 are transferred to new owners. The assets are required to remain in the ownership of the Incorporated Society, except with the prior approval of the Council.*
- b. The Incorporated Society must not be disestablished without the prior written consent of the Council.*
- c. The structure, functions and rules of the Incorporated Society must include provision for the following items:*



- *Requirements for all lot owners to automatically be and remain a member of the Incorporated Society for so long as they are a registered proprietor of a Lot;*
 - *Requirement that the Incorporated Society must not be disestablished without the prior written consent of the Council;*
 - *Requirements for all lot owners to fulfil the obligations of a member, as set out in the Rules of the Incorporated Society;*
 - *Details of how the common assets will be managed and maintained;*
 - *Ongoing compliance with the relevant resource consent, bylaw, or other requirements of Council;*
 - *An acceptable method of management of the Incorporated Societies future affairs, and for the raising of funds from members from time to time to adequately finance any future maintenance and renewal obligations. The Rules should identify a process for setting, collecting and enforcing the payment of levies;*
- d. *All costs associated with the establishment and maintenance of the Incorporated Society must be borne by the consent holder.*
- e. *A copy of the document(s) describing the functions, powers, duties and liabilities of the Incorporated Society must be provided to the Council for certification. The document(s) must evidence each of the requirements above and that the ongoing operation, maintenance and repair obligations of this condition will be adequately provided for.*

Further, to ensure that future owners maintain membership of the Incorporated Society, the following must be registered as a consent notice on the records of title to be issued for Lots 4-34:

“Lots 4-34 are served or serviced by common assets which are located within Lots 100-103. For so long as they are a registered proprietor of that Lot, the owners of Lots 4-34 must be members of the established Incorporated Society that jointly owns and is responsible and liable for the ongoing operation, maintenance and repair of the common assets located within Lots 100-103.”