

To: Fraser McNutt – Barker & Associates

From: Cam Wallace, Partner / Urban Designer – Barker & Associates Limited (B&A)

Date: 10 February 2026

Re: Strategic Planning and Urban Design Response - Ashbourne [FTAA-2507-1087]

Introduction

I have been asked to provide a response to the Planning Position Memo provided by Ms Susannah Tait dated 3 February 2026, with a focus on matters relevant to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD).

I have acted in an ongoing internal peer review capacity within B&A on various aspects of the Ashbourne proposal (**Proposal**), including the Masterplan and through its development and subsequent amendments post-lodgement.

Qualifications and Experience

I am an Urban Designer / Partner at B&A. B&A is a planning, urban design and landscape consultancy with offices around New Zealand. I have been employed at B&A since November 2018.

I hold the qualifications of Bachelor of Planning (First Class Hons) and Masters of Urban Design (First Class Hons) from the University of Auckland. I am a Full Member of the New Zealand Planning Institute (**NZPI**) and am a Registered Urban Designer with the Urban Designers Institute of Aotearoa (**UDIA**). I have 17 years of experience in the urban design, strategic planning and transport development, across both the private and public sector in New Zealand and United Kingdom.

I have a broad range of experience in strategic planning and urban design working on behalf of a range of clients including land developers, commercial entities and Councils around New Zealand. This has involved lead masterplanning projects for greenfield and brownfield redevelopment projects, design review and assessment for resource consent and private plan change applications of varying scales, strategic and spatial planning projects, and preparation / presentation of urban design evidence at Council hearings and the Environment Court. This has included recent project work related to strategic residential development within the context of the planning framework established by the NPS-UD including Future Development Strategies for Rotorua, Napier / Hastings, Nelson / Tasman, Gisborne and Queenstown Lakes as well as housing related plan changes in Rotorua, Nelson, Waikato District, Hamilton and Queenstown Lakes. This work has also included the development of methodologies to understand and assess the accessibility of urban areas (as well as smaller regional towns) to inform the implementation of Policy 1 and Policy 5 of the NPS-UD.

Ashbourne

From an urban design perspective, detached housing development on the periphery of a smaller New Zealand town / Tier 3 urban environment can still represent a positive and appropriate urban growth response, even where travel patterns are likely to remain largely reliant on private motor vehicles. In such contexts, urban design best practice does not necessarily require that new neighbourhoods replicate intensification models one might expect in a Tier 1 urban environment (such as terraced housing or

apartments clustered around a public transit stop), but instead requires that growth occurs in a manner that is structured, coherent, and supportive of the long-term functioning of an urban environment.

In addition, the cost dynamics of more intensive housing typologies such as terraces (or apartments) can result in outcomes that are not necessarily affordable or attractive in smaller housing markets. Construction costs for multi-unit developments, including requirements for fire separation, acoustic performance, increased structural loads, shared access arrangements, servicing complexity, and in some cases lift installation, can mean that these typologies are unable to achieve lower price points than conventional detached housing. In a smaller regional market, this can reduce development feasibility and result in a product that does not align with local market conditions.

Importantly, well-designed detached housing developments can also deliver high levels of on-site residential amenity through access to sunlight, privacy, larger private outdoor space, and greater adaptability of dwellings over time – a particular attraction of smaller towns as opposed to cities.

While it is acknowledged that such developments will generally be vehicle-oriented due to their location and limited public transport availability, this does not preclude good urban design outcomes. Urban design quality in this context is more appropriately assessed through factors such as internal street connectivity, safe and attractive walking and cycling conditions, integration with open space networks, and the creation of a coherent public realm that supports community interaction. Even in a car-based environment, neighbourhoods can be designed to avoid isolated cul-de-sac patterns, provide clear pedestrian routes, and achieve safe streets through passive surveillance and human-scaled design. I do not understand Ms Tait to raise any concerns with those aspects of the Ashbourne development.

Peripheral greenfield housing also plays a recognised role in the functioning of the wider housing market through a process sometimes described as “de-canting”. New housing on the edge of a town can provide an attractive option for existing residents to relocate to—particularly families seeking newer homes or older residents seeking modern, accessible dwellings. This relocation can free up established housing stock within the town’s existing urban area for new households, including first home buyers or renters. Over time, it can also support the redevelopment or intensification of more centrally located sites, as older housing stock and larger lots become available for renewal.

In this way, a detached housing development on the periphery of an existing town can also support the broader objectives of a well-functioning urban environment by contributing to housing supply and enabling housing churn, rather than constraining it. It can therefore be seen as part of a wider settlement growth pattern that supports both immediate housing delivery and longer-term opportunities for consolidation and intensification within the existing urban area.

NPS-UD Policy 1(a)

Ms Tait does not consider that the proposal is consistent with NPS-UD Policy 1(a) as it does not provide for a mix of typologies.¹ With respect to Ms Tait, I do not consider that she has accurately reflected Policy 1(a) in her assessment. Policy 1(a) is not expressed as a requirement that each individual development site must itself provide the full range of housing typologies or housing outcomes. Rather, the policy is concerned with whether planning decisions contribute to a well-functioning urban environment. This is reinforced by the explicit reference to “urban environments” as the unit of analysis, and the use of the words “have or enable”, which anticipates that different developments (across an urban environment) will contribute in different ways. Accordingly, it is inappropriate to assess the proposal against Policy 1(a) as though it must

¹ Page 7

independently satisfy the minimum housing variety outcome on a site-by-site basis. That approach misconstrues the policy intent and elevates a broad strategic directive into an unrealistic and inflexible compliance test.

The reasoning advanced in the opinion of Ms Tait, if applied consistently, would produce illogical outcomes that undermine the entire purpose of the NPS-UD. For example, under the same approach, a proposal comprising only a large apartment building could be characterised as inconsistent with Policy 1(a) because it would not provide detached or terraced dwellings. Likewise, a papakāinga development (which may appropriately provide a specific culturally based type of housing and tenure arrangement) could also be considered inconsistent because it may not offer a wide range of market housing typologies or price points.

The opinion of Ms Tait appears to equate “variety of homes” exclusively with built form typology (i.e. detached dwellings versus attached dwellings). However, Policy 1(a) is not limited to typology alone and does not require each development to deliver every housing typology. Rather, it requires that the **urban environment** overall has or enables such variety. In this sense, the NPS-UD framework necessarily relies on different developments contributing in different ways to the overall housing mix, rather than each proposal being required to deliver all forms of housing and create its own individual housing market. In my opinion, “type” can also reasonably be interpreted to include a range of housing formats within a detached typology, including variations in dwelling size, bedroom configuration, tenure, and household composition. In this case, the proposal provides for detached dwellings and retirement units with variation in floor areas, lot sizes, orientations, and internal configuration (as listed in **Appendix 1 and Appendix 2**). Importantly, the Design Guidelines enable flexibility for future residents to design dwellings to meet their specific household needs (i.e. more or less bedrooms, home office space) provided they conform to the core controls. This will help to enable the proposal to cater to a range of household circumstances and life stages, including smaller households, families, and older residents.

Policy 1(a) also explicitly includes “price” and “location” as key elements of housing need. The proposal contributes positively to these outcomes by enabling a range of lot sizes, orientation / outlook and dwelling scales, which will support a range of price points relative to a uniformly sized large-lot subdivision outcome. Further, the proposal contributes to housing supply in an area within a close distance to schools (early childhood, primary, intermediate and secondary) making it a particularly suitable area to attract households with young families (in contrast to say a development on the eastern periphery of Matamata) and therefore supports the availability of greater housing choice by location within the urban environment.

In my view, it is therefore incorrect to characterise the proposal as failing to provide housing variety solely because the dwellings are predominantly detached and that a proper assessment of the application in the round and within the context of the Matamata urban environment has not been undertaken.

NPS-UD Objective 3, Policy 1(c)

Ms Tait has expressed concerns with the proposal’s alignment with Objective 3 and Policy 1(c) which broadly relate to matters around accessibility to services and employment opportunities.² In my opinion there are some issues with Ms Tait’s interpretation in terms of both its ordinary reading and their application to a Tier 3 urban environment such as Matamata as well as the factual matters which she has asserted.

Objective 3 of the NPS-UD sets out very broad expectations around where new housing and business sites will be provided for Tier 1, 2 and 3 urban environments. Ms Tait states that she does not consider that Matamata’s town centre has ‘many’ employment opportunities. Ms Tait appears to have potentially misread

² Page 8

this objective and has combined both elements of subpart (a) into a combined test to be met (i.e. she has read the objective as an “and” rather than an “or”). Objective 3(a) reads:

“the area is in or near a centre zone or other area with many employment opportunities”.

In no way does it state or require a centre zone itself to provide many employment opportunities which makes sense within the context of the wider NPD-UD policy framework, nor does it require that an urban environment must provide full employment opportunities for future residents.

Regarding the first point, this is because centres do not function purely as places of employment but rather are important for providing access to a wider range of retail, commercial and community services required to support people’s everyday lives (e.g. pharmacy, hairdresser, supermarket or library). Regarding the proposal, I observe that the Site is located approximately 4 or 5-minutes’ drive from the Matamata town centre, less than 10-minutes cycle and approximately 20 to 30 minutes’ walk. In my opinion, these distances more than qualify as being “near” to the town centre – especially in the context of the density of development being proposed. Further, the Site is also located near to other areas with many employment opportunities being the industrial area located in Matamata East. Further I would observe that Matamata functions as a service town for its rural hinterland. One of the inherent features of this function is that it provides housing for workers who may be employed in rural trades and services – this avoids the need to have greater levels of housing more broadly spread out across rural areas. Although Ms Tait raises specific concerns that people may have to rely on car-based travel to jobs in the wider district because of the proposal, I consider that the provision of housing for that purpose is in fact a key function of Matamata.³

Regarding the second point, the NPS-UD does not require an urban environment’s employment opportunities to match its population – rather that areas with many employment opportunities (e.g. an industrial estate) are one of several factors that should help inform where some housing should be located.⁴ This is understandable noting that an individual’s housing preferences may be informed by a wide range of different factors. For example, some people choose to live a specific area due to proximity to schooling or family connections rather than employment. Further, I observe that employment opportunities are now less reliant on a specific physical location with the rise in remote working in recent years following the COVID-19 pandemic. This allows for people to access more remote employment opportunities that may have otherwise been unavailable to them previously. This trend can be seen in Matamata West itself where those who worked from home (WFH) between the 2018 and 2023 census’ increased from 9% to 12.5%. WFH itself accounted for almost 1/3 of all employment growth in Matamata West between census dates. In this sense, areas of “many employment opportunities” are further supplemented by remote or rural working opportunities.

Regarding Objective 3(b) of the NPS-UD, Ms Tait incorrectly states on three occasions that there is no public transport service serving the Site. I observe that Matamata is currently serviced by the Eastern Connector Service which provides three-return weekday trips with onwards links to Morrinsville and Hamilton.⁵ The closest stop served by this route is location on Smith Street approximately 450m east of the Site via Station Road meaning that the northern portion of the Site has proximate access to a bus service within a 5- to 10-

³ The 2023 Census indicates that approximately 20% of residents in Matamata West travel outside of the Matamata urban environment for employment – with the most common areas being those rural areas immediately west of the Site (Hinuera at 7% and Waharoa-Peria at 5%).

⁴ Objective 3 of the NPS-UD only requires “one or more” of a series of locational attributes to apply, not all.

⁵ Section 3.4.2 of the Ashbourne Integrated Transport Assessment

minute walking time. Further, I observe that the Waikato Regional Council has recently signalled changes⁶ to public transport serving Matamata-Piako in the medium term as well as aspirations for expansion of public transport services in the long term. This includes a potential increase in frequency to 1-hour services at peak times to / from Hamilton, a new connection to Cambridge and a new internal Matamata “loop” service at 1-hour frequencies. These signalled changes are in response to increased growth in towns like Matamata along with an increased demand to access education and employment opportunities in Hamilton. Within the context of a Tier 3 urban environment / rural service town, the provision of more frequent public transport services to major regional employment / civic nodes as well as around Matamata itself is promising and would be consistent with the policy framework of the NPS-UD. I would further observe, the signalled changes to public transport serving Matamata may be able to be improved (i.e. greater frequency), or the planned future improvements more viably be brought forward, as a result of the additional housing capacity (and demand for those public transport services) offered by Ashbourne which could benefit the wider urban environment of Matamata.

I also observe that the wording of Policy 1(c) is important when considering an application within a Tier 3 urban environment. The core requirement of the Policy is that urban environments have good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces. The application material and commentary above demonstrate this fact. I also observe Ms Tait agrees that the proposal has good access to community services and open spaces. Further, the reference in Policy 1(c) to “public or active transport” is secondary and subordinate to the overall accessibility outcome and implies that accessibility can be achieved through a range of methods, depending on context, which includes travel by private vehicles. The wording of Policy 1(c), read in conjunction with Policies 3 and 5, in my view clearly signals that public and active transport are examples of ways in which good accessibility may be achieved (and where greater housing densities may be more appropriate) but are not a mandatory prerequisite in every context.

Overall conclusion on consistency with the NPS-UD

For the reasons above, I consider that the proposal is consistent with the NPS-UD. The proposal contributes positively to the housing supply and choice within the wider urban environment and provides a range of housing outcomes within the detached typology, including retirement units and flexible dwelling design through the proposed Design Guidelines. When considered in the context of the broader existing and planned housing environment of Matamata, the proposal appropriately contributes to enabling a variety of homes that meet the needs of different households.

Further, I consider that it is not appropriate to assess an individual development application against the NPS-UD without sufficient consideration of the wider context of the urban environment in which it will be located. Adopting the approach of Ms Tait represents an unworkable interpretation of the NPS-UD which few, if any development, could meet and elevates a broad strategic policy into an unrealistic site-level compliance test. Rather, the appropriate assessment is whether the proposal contributes to the wider urban environment’s housing supply and choice in a manner that is responsive to the context in which it is located.

Appendix 1 – Residential Sections and Typologies

Appendix 2 – Residential and Retirement Villas Typology Information

⁶ https://yourvoicematters.waikatoregion.govt.nz/future-bus-services/news_feed/matamata-piako-district

Appendix 1 – Residential Sections and Typologies

Appendix 1 Full Schedule of Typologies

These tables identify the residential typology assigned to each lot. Typologies shown in colour include a site plan, floor plan, and two alternative front and side elevations with different rooflines and cladding options. The remaining typologies are provided with a site plan and a single front and side elevation only. For typologies without floor plans, lot developers will be required to prepare their own floor plans and, where necessary, adjust the provided elevations to ensure they remain compliance with the approved Development Controls and this Design Guide.

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
1	500.8	12
2	501.0	4
3	502.6	5B
4	501.9	5B
5	534.5	5B
6	567.0	5B
7	614.2	5B
8	663.6	8
9	438.9	2A
10	445.4	2A
11	435.0	1A
12	433.6	1A
13	432.1	1A
14	434.9	1A
15	437.8	10
16	438.6	12
17	437.5	1A
18	434.1	1A
19	435.1	1A
20	436.1	1A
21	442.5	12
22	440.9	12
23	439.6	8

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
24	428.4	12
25	435.7	12
26	432.2	1A
27	432.2	1A
28	432.2	1A
29	432.2	1A
30	437.6	12
31	446.0	10
32	440.0	1A
33	439.9	1A
34	440.0	1A
35	440.0	1A
36	431.6	1A
37	433.3	1A
38	453.4	6B
39	500.0	3
40	500.0	3
41	500.0	3
42	500.0	3
43	500.0	3
44	500.0	3
45	443.0	G
47	443.0	G

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
48	500.0	3
49	500.0	3
50	500.0	3
51	500.0	3
52	601.7	2B
53	518.4	1B
54	513.6	1B
55	513.6	1B
56	513.6	1B
57	505.6	1B
58	547.0	12
59	520.6	1B
60	520.7	1B
61	501.0	8
62	500.6	1B
63	500.6	1B
64	500.6	1B
65	501.9	8
66	519.7	1B
67	520.6	1B
68	561.3	1B
69	502.1	8
70	509.0	6B

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
71	519.4	3
72	510.6	3
73	577.7	8
74	500.6	1B
75	500.6	1B
76	499.5	1B
77	585.1	8
78	532.0	3
79	501.3	12
81	476.5	12
82	484.3	8
83	483.1	6B
84	613.9	5B
85	570.2	5B
86	564.3	5B
87	492.4	5B
88	512.5	5B
89	496.6	8
90	500.0	3
91	500.0	3
92	500.0	3
93	500.0	3
94	500.0	3

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
95	500.0	3
96	500.0	3
97	500.3	3
98	520.6	12
99	491.0	12
100	489.0	12
101	378.5	E, M
102	362.2	K
103	362.4	K
104	374.4	E
105	450.0	5A
106	450.0	5A
107	506.1	1B
108	456.7	1B
109	609.3	8
110	478.7	2B
111	431.7	2A
112	447.4	2A
113	447.4	2A
114	431.7	12
115	448.0	3
116	448.0	3
117	448.0	3

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
118	448.0	3
119	466.3	12
120	464.6	12
121	454.8	12
122	449.8	12
123	466.1	12
124	481.8	8
125	481.4	3
126	481.4	3
127	526.7	8
128	526.7	8
129	481.4	3
130	481.4	3
131	481.8	8
132	852.3	7
133	853.8	7
134	851.3	7
135	769.6	7
136	787.3	7
137	774.2	7
138	372.7	9A, L
139	352.4	G, H
140	352.4	G, H
141	352.4	G, H
142	352.4	G, H
143	352.5	G, H
144	352.4	G, H

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
145	357.4	J
146	508.1	5B
147	526.3	4
148	526.5	4
149	526.6	4
150	526.8	4
151	524.6	6B
152	533.1	8
153	489.3	3
154	482.8	3
155	476.3	3
156	470.1	3
157	495.0	8
158	531.3	3
159	518.0	8
160	495.6	8
161	529.8	3
162	506.3	3
163	502.8	2B
164	749.6	6B
165	529.6	5B
166	500.3	3
167	500.1	3
168	501.3	3
169	509.0	3
170	502.3	3
171	502.3	3

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
172	502.3	3
173	502.3	3
174	502.3	3
175	502.3	3
176	502.3	3
177	502.4	3
178	478.5	3
179	478.3	3
180	458.6	10
181	470.2	1A
182	462.6	8
183	603.6	3
184	603.6	3
185	603.6	3
186	603.6	3
187	603.6	3
188	603.6	3
189	603.6	3
190	672.9	3
191	485.9	11
192	424.1	6A
193	425.4	6A
194	425.3	6A
195	425.3	6A
196	441.6	6A
197	491.6	6B
198	522.5	8

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
199	500.4	3
200	500.4	8
201	526.2	1B
202	424.4	6A
203	433.0	6A
204	459.4	6B
205	494.2	5B
206	452.2	12
207	360.0	C, D
208	360.0	C, D
209	360.0	C, D
210	360.0	C, D
211	360.0	C, D
212	360.0	C, D
213	360.0	C, D
214	360.0	C, D
215	360.0	C, D
216	360.2	C, D
217	371.5	E, M
218	355.2	K
219	355.3	K
220	367.0	E
221	450.0	5A
222	450.0	5A
223	450.0	5A
224	450.0	5A
225	450.0	5A

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
226	450.0	5A
227	357.4	J
228	352.3	G, H
229	352.2	G, H
230	352.3	G, H
231	352.3	G, H
232	352.3	G, H
233	352.3	G, H
234	391.9	9A
235	398.9	9A
236	352.4	G
237	352.4	G
238	352.3	G
239	352.3	G
240	352.3	G
241	352.3	G
242	383.5	J
243	383.5	N
244	352.3	G, H
245	352.4	G, H
246	352.4	G, H
247	352.3	G, H
248	352.3	G, H
249	352.3	G, H
250	415.8	N
251	441.8	8
252	450.2	5A

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
253	350.2	A
254	350.2	A
255	350.2	A
256	557.1	8
257	503.9	A
258	427.4	A
259	350.9	C
260	395.6	C
261	385.7	I
262	519.0	8
263	386.0	I
264	396.7	K
265	350.3	C
266	350.2	C
267	350.2	C
268	774.1	7
269	771.7	7
270	780.3	7
271	790.3	7
272	738.9	7
273	730.0	7
274	723.6	7
275	718.4	7
276	713.1	7
277	711.2	7
278	660.9	8
279	707.1	8

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
280	704.0	7
281	709.0	5B
282	351.2	F
283	354.4	F
284	352.7	B
285	351.8	B
286	351.8	B
287	351.8	B
288	351.8	B
289	351.8	B
290	351.8	B
291	403.1	B
292	406.1	11
293	352.0	B
294	353.1	B
295	354.1	B
296	355.1	B
297	356.2	B
298	357.2	B
299	404.6	6A
300	429.9	12
301	397.0	E
302	351.0	C, D
303	351.0	C, D
304	351.0	C, D
305	351.0	C, D
306	351.0	C, D

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
307	483.4	8
308	471.4	8
309	430.9	3
310	452.9	3
311	435.4	8
312	430.5	8
313	435.9	8
314	439.0	8
315	390.7	K
316	393.8	K
317	375.8	E
318	454.9	8
319	450.8	3
320	450.3	3
321	450.2	9A
322	487.1	8
323	498.9	5B
324	498.5	5B
325	497.7	5B
326	496.8	5B
327	483.1	8
328	484.1	8
329	494.2	5B
330	495.5	5B
331	496.7	5B
332	492.8	5B
333	496.5	8

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
334	436.8	8
335	443.8	3
336	436.6	3
337	426.0	8
338	526.2	8
339	503.9	3
340	504.0	3
341	504.0	3
342	539.2	8
343	512.3	2B
344	511.5	2B
345	514.4	6B
346	509.3	8
347	500.8	8
348	503.9	6B
349	516.7	6B
350	516.8	8
351	496.6	8
352	502.6	3
353	476.8	3
354	503.7	8
355	738.3	7
356	500.5	5B
357	500.0	5B
358	495.7	5B
359	491.8	5B
360	487.7	5B

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
361	580.4	6B
362	545.1	1B
363	424.0	2A
364	618.7	8
365	495.1	5B
366	495.1	5B
367	495.1	5B
368	495.1	5B
369	495.1	5B
370	488.4	8
371	578.5	9B
372	555.0	5B
373	555.1	5B
374	555.0	5B
375	555.0	5B
376	555.0	5B
377	782.2	7
378	1005.8	7
379	800.0	7
380	800.3	7
381	800.5	7
382	800.3	7
383	800.3	7
384	800.0	7
385	800.2	7
386	800.1	7
387	800.2	7

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
388	800.4	7
389	944.3	7
390	800.5	7
391	800.3	7
392	800.4	7
393	800.4	7
394	800.0	7
395	800.0	7
396	800.4	7
397	800.0	7
398	800.4	7
399	800.0	7
400	800.0	7
401	800.4	7
402	800.1	7
403	800.4	4
404	446.9	6A
405	493.0	5B
406	493.3	5B
407	493.5	5B
408	493.8	5B
409	494.1	5B
410	486.4	8
411	481.7	8
412	494.5	5B
413	494.5	5B
414	494.5	5B

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
415	494.5	5B
416	494.5	5B
417	448.4	6A
418	654.5	2B
419	750.3	8
420	857.7	8
421	533.7	4
422	539.3	4
423	544.9	4
424	550.5	4
425	738.4	4
426	702.9	4
427	723.2	8
428	807.8	8
429	704.1	7
430	500.6	8
431	472.2	5B
432	479.3	5B
433	500.2	8
434	495.6	5B
435	495.9	5B
436	496.1	5B
437	496.4	5B
438	496.7	5B
439	497.0	5B
440	594.4	8
441	590.3	8

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
442	494.5	5B
443	494.5	5B
444	494.5	5B
445	494.5	5B
446	494.5	5B
447	494.5	5B
448	530.9	12
449	517.4	3
450	517.3	3
451	517.2	3
452	517.0	3
453	517.3	3
454	517.3	3
455	520.8	8
456	407.4	3
457	400.5	9A
458	402.8	8
459	702.1	8
460	623.6	8
461	423.9	3
462	460.0	2B
463	460.0	1B
464	465.0	1B
465	471.2	2B
466	434.1	10
467	452.2	3
468	462.0	8

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
469	452.9	11
470	448.9	9A
471	494.7	3
472	479.0	12
473	468.2	12
474	750.7	7
475	799.5	7
476	793.3	7
477	794.3	7
478	796.1	7
479	800.0	7
480	800.0	7
481	799.7	7
482	801.3	7
483	801.5	7
484	801.8	7
485	801.8	7
486	804.0	7
487	737.6	3
488	782.7	8
489	769.9	7
490	826.1	7
491	840.3	7
492	840.0	7
493	553.2	8
494	526.9	8
495	496.8	8

Lot #	Size (m ²)	Typology
496	504.0	8
497	490.0	8
498	480.1	12
499	413.8	11
500	484.5	8
501	502.3	4
502	551.7	8
503	504.2	8
504	507.8	8
505	539.4	8
506	489.9	4
507	488.5	8
508	504.1	8
509	500.5	4
510	500.4	4
511	492.4	8
512	535.9	1B
513	540.9	4
514	541.0	4
515	568.8	4
516	688.5	8
517	696.5	8
518	392.4	N

Appendix 2 – Residential and Retirement Villas Typology Information

Residential Typology Designs 400m² and Under

Typology	Bedroom	Bathroom	Garage	Building Footprint
A	3	2	1	153.9m ²
B	3	2	1	121.5m ²
C	3	2	1	125.4 m ²
D	3	2	1	148m ²
E	3	2	2	148.8m ²
F	3	2	1	129.7m ²
G	3	2	1	137.2m ²
H	3	2	1	138.5m ²
I	3	2	1	137m ²
J	3	2	2	143.6m ²
K	3	2	1	146.3m ²
L	3	2	2	155.5m ²
M	3	2	2	152m ²
N	4	2	2	157m ²

Residential Typology Designs Over 400m²

Typology	Bedroom	Bathroom	Garage	Building Footprint
1A	4	2	2	185.7m ²
1B	4	2	2	185.7m ²
2A	4	2	2	181m ²
2B	4	2	2	181m ²
3	4	2	2	176.6m ²
4	4	2	2	214.5m ²
5A	4	2	2	192.7m ²
5B	4	2	2	192.7m ²
6A	4	2	2	169.4m ²
6B	4	2	2	169.4m ²
7	4	2	2	290.7m ²
8	3	2	2	152.4m ²
9A	3	2	2	160.2m ²
9B	3	2	2	160.2m ²
10	4	2	1	146m ²
11	3	2	1	132m ²
12	4	2	2	154.2m ²

Retirement Villas

Typology	Bedroom	Bathroom	Garage	Building Footprint
Type BE(N)	2	2	1	125m ²
Type BE(S)	2	2	1	125m ²
Type BW(N)	2	2	1	125m ²
Type BW(S)	2	2	1	125m ²
Type CE(N)	2	2	2	147m ²
Type CE(S)	2	2	2	147m ²
Type CW(N)	2	2	2	149m ²
Type CW(S)	2	2	2	149m ²
Type DE	3	2	2	187m ²
Type DW	3	2	2	187m ²