

Memoran	dum	PO Box 91250, 1142 +64 9 358 2526	PO Box 1094, 3240 +64 7 960 0006	V	1auranga Level 5 35 Grey Street PO Box 13373, 3141 +64 7 571 5511
	gton (11340, 6142 (85 9315	Christchurch PO Box 110, 8140 +64 3 366 8891	Queenstown PO Box 1028, 9348 +64 3 441 1670		Dunedin PO Box 657, 9054 +64 3 470 0460
Attention:	Commissione				
Company:	OCC / Hayson Knell				
Date:	08/09/2023				
From:	Morné Hugo				
Message Ref:	PC92 Presentation				
Project No:	BM230371 – Plan Change 92 Omokoroa Submission				

My name is Morné Hugo, I am a Partner at Boffa Miskell Limited, a national consulting firm of Landscape Architects, Urban Designers and Planners with nine offices across New Zealand and over 250 staff. I have been employed by Boffa Miskell for sixteen (16) years, and prior to that I had Boffa Miskell for sixteen (16) years, and prior to that I had my own small consulting practice in South Africa.

I have over 28 years of experience as a practicing landscape architect and urban designer. I am a Registered NZILA Landscape architect. I currently serve as a member of both the Tauranga and Hamilton Urban Design Panels.

I am representing Omokoroa Country Club (OCC) at this hearing. I participated in the Expert Conferencing Session relating to Planning and Urban Design and participated in the preparation of the Joint Witness Statement (JWS).

I confirm that I have reviewed the final JWS and full S42A Report. I am supportive of <u>all</u> the proposed wording changes.

In terms of 14A.7 Matters of Discretion – Urban Design

Overall, the rules as proposed in Attachment B, are heading in the right direction and do a relatively good job of supporting good urban design outcomes. I do however support the view of OCC that there is still substantial room for debate and miss interpretation of the proposed rule framework, that would lead too poor urban design and visual amenity outcomes, that would be locked in for a very long period of time and lead to the rapid deterioration in quality and visual amenity of the entire Omokoroa Peninsula.

Whilst I support the new rules that have been proposed to be included in the Urban Design section of the District Plan, I am of the view that they are not comprehensive enough to lock in suitable urban design and landscape amenity outcomes to guarantee the protection of the neighbourhood's quality.

It can already be seen, even prior to the new MDRS rule framework, that the Omokoroa area has come under extensive pressure of intensified residential subdivisions and increased demand for housing. This pressure is not in itself a bad thing, but it can be clearly seen from several current examples, that developers are driven primarily by the wish to include as many dwellings as possible without any real regard for urban design and visual amenity outcomes. This situation will be significantly exasperated by further ability to intensify and increase building heights and bulk under the proposed PC92 plan framework.

If we do not ensure that quality urban design is protected within the plan and aligned with key guidance documents like the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol and the newly released National Medium Density Design Guidelines, the end outcome for residents of Omokoroa and other similar areas, will be simply dreadful and irreversible.

I fully support the need for the requirement for an Urban Design Assessment to be provided for any development of four or more residential units. This is in my view a critical aspect and the only method of

ensuring a quality urban design and amenity outcome is achieved. It relies on the professional experience of a qualified Urban Designer and the subsequent Peer Review process to be carried out to a high standard.

I support using the Advice Note as a method of cross reference and highlighting the importance of Council's Residential Outcomes Framework document as one of the key reference documents to form part of an Urban Design Assessment. I do however think the wording could be further strengthened to read: "Advice note: Council's Residential Design Outcomes (RDO) document provides guidance to assist with addressing the matters of discretion, and alignment with the key outcomes of the RDO should be demonstrated as part of the Urban Design Assessment process."

The RDO document has been specifically developed by Council to protect a minimum level of good urban design and amenity outcomes, and whilst being a non-statutory guidance document, it is essential in my view that it be referenced in the District Plan as mentioned above and is then more definitively one of the tools to be used by developers and designers to ensure quality outcomes are maintained.

I suggest that three additional items should be added under 14A.7, that will ensure that the following items are more clearly defined and not open to interpretation:

- a) The requirement that a comprehensive landscape plan is to be submitted to Council for any developments of 4 or more dwellings, compiled by a suitably qualified person;
- b) A requirement that fencing on all road frontages, have a maximum 1.2m solid fencing, and then any fencing up to 2.0m in height is required to be of a 60% permeable design.
- c) A requirement that sufficient design variety and material variations are required between adjacent dwelling units in a comprehensive development of 4 or more units to avoid monotonous and repetitive design outcomes.

The above list is by no means exhaustive and in my professional opinion is an absolute minimum to ensure some level of quality.

In my view the balance of 14A7.1 is acceptable as a minimum requirement. Under A. Development Layout item iv (in JWS), it is critical in my view that the overall natural topography of the Ōmokoroa peninsula is protected from large, wholesale and indiscriminate earthworks that could destroy the natural character of the peninsula.