

**UA Ref:** 24/068  
**Date:** 7 November 2024  
**To:** Elliot Thornton, Principal Planner, Cuttris  
**cc:** Stephen Sutorius, Sussex Trust  
**From:** Lauren White, Principal Urban Designer  
**Re:** 160 Mazengarb Road, Paraparaumu

This memo is provided in response to peer reviews and recommendations provided by Kāpiti Coast District Council in relation to the Resource Consent application for subdivision and development of 160 Mazengarb Road, Paraparaumu (letter dated 1 November 2024 and peer review by Boffa Miskell, dated 24<sup>th</sup> October 2024).

It addresses the following points/recommendations:

- A potential additional pedestrian connection to Mazengarb Road
- Larger pockets of landscaped areas for specimen trees
- Entrances for Units 8 and 19
- Relocating Type C designs to northern boundary

#### **Potential pedestrian connection to Mazengarb Road**

Given the proximity of a potential additional link between Units 2 and 3 with that at the main entry (less than 20m), it is not considered beneficial from a pedestrian permeability/convenience perspective. Recognising the potential benefit such a link would have for the legibility of units taking access from this proposed path (Units 8 to 11) and by duplexing four of the units along Mazengarb Road (units 1 + 2 and 4 + 5), this outcome was explored but shown to be inferior due to the following urban design outcomes:

- a width of only approximately 1m could be provided without losing a whole unit;
- this width would not provide for sufficient width for a higher number of users;
- this width would not provide for landscaping berms for amenity; and
- this width would not allow for landscaping to promote internal privacy in habitable rooms of Units 2 and 3 which in turn would likely rely on window coverings and thereby limit real and perceived passive surveillance of the space and in turn, public safety.

However, in response to this and other recommendations (see below), a number of design amendments have been made in this regard namely:

- the entry to Unit 8 has been relocated such that the number of units using this path is reduced to 3;
- units 9, 10 and 11 have been moved east such that their front paths/doors are closer to and more visible from the central shared area/primary pedestrian route; and
- the path is shorter and greater surface is made available for landscaping.

Given the limited benefit, potential negative outcomes associated with an additional path and the alternative design amendments described above, this is considered the preferred and acceptable urban design outcome.

### **Landscaped area**

Opportunities to accommodate landscaping has been a key intention of the design team. Even though duplexes are not preferred by the developer, their benefits to landscaping have been considered. In practical terms, using duplexes will not increase the side yard areas. Swapping one side yard to the other side (and accommodating the cost of an intertenancy wall) will make no material difference to overall coverage or impermeable surface. Whilst co-locating side yards can help to provide space for specimen trees, in this instance side yards will still not enable this due to their requirements for circulation and service areas/bikes etc.

In addition, duplexing units will result in private open spaces that are adjacent to each other and not benefiting from the separation distance afforded by the parking areas. Furthermore, whilst landscaping areas will be adjacent, so will car pads, increasing the overall width of continuous hard surface.

With respect to landscaping outcomes, I note:

- Specimen trees located to the front of each unit are accommodated in soil areas of approximately 3.5m x 2.5m which is relatively generous and capable of supporting mature healthy trees. Kowhai trees can reach 8-10m tall and have a canopy spread of 6m. Given they are planted at 6.5m spacings, in time, these trees will have a significant visual impact and contribution to the landscape quality of the development. When mature, their open nature will filter sun in summer but not completely shade outdoor spaces in winter.
- Planted areas combined with artificial grassed areas exceed the minimum landscaped area requirement (20%). Artificial lawn is considered to contribute to landscaping as it visually similar to grass, still provides open areas, visual separation etc. and should therefore be considered part of the landscape.
- Specimen trees and planted areas are located primarily around the central shared space where they will contribute to an overall perception of vegetation.
- A small number of additional specimen trees have been added to the proposal/updated landscape plan

In summary, I consider the level of landscaping, particularly in the central area, to provide visual softening of the buildings and paved areas and is appropriate in a medium density residential environment.

### **Entrances for Units 9 and 18**

Front doors to these units were initially placed such that they access and activate shared pedestrian pathway spaces and identified by canopies.

In response to comments from the peer review, we have amended the design so that Unit 8 can utilise the front yard for primary access (as do many other units) and Unit 19 relocates its front door to the east side, where although it is accessed down a side yard, is more visible and indicated through the proposed pergola structure.

### **Relocating Type C (double storey) to the northern boundary**

Type C designs as proposed have front access through their north facing outdoor areas. Using this design on the northern boundary is possible with a minor change to locate the front door down the side (as per Design B2). The proposal prioritised designs on both the northern and southern boundaries which maximized the number of front doors clearly visible from the shared central area. Type C's were also located where they provide some variation in otherwise consistent building height/roof lines.

However, I support removing Type C's from the southern boundary and locating two Type C's on the northern boundary as recommended, as this further reduces potential visual and shading effects to neighbours to the south and also provides some additional three-dimensional variation to the northern elevation (for both internal residents and those to the north). The adoption of contrasting cladding along the southern boundary will provide adequate visual interest along that edge.