Beachlands South Fast-track

Auckland Council Specialist Memo

Annexure H:

Urban Design

Mustafa Demiralp

09 October 2026

1.0 APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

Application and property details

Fast-Track project name:	Beachlands South
Fast-Track application number:	EPA reference: FTAA-2606-1256 Council reference: BUN60467962

2.0 Technical Specialist Memo - Urban Design

To:	Brooke Dales – Lead Planner Adonica Giborees – Principal Project Lead
From:	Mustafa Demiralp – Principal Urban Design
Qualifications & Relevant Experience:	I hold a Bachelor of Urban Design and Landscape Architecture and a Master of Urban Design. I have over 17 years of experience in urban design across both the private and public sectors in New Zealand. I have prepared urban design assessments and technical advice for resource consent applications, plan changes, and fast-track applications, and have been involved in a wide range of projects, including structure planning, master planning, and medium- to high-density residential developments. I am currently a Principal Urban Designer at Auckland Council, where I provide urban design advice on resource consent and private plan change applications, and contribute to hearings and assessment processes for large-scale residential, mixed-use, and subdivision developments.
Preparation in Accordance with the Code of Conduct:	I confirm that I have read the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 – Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (**Code**), and have complied with it in the preparation of this memorandum. I also agree to follow the Code when participating in any subsequent processes, such as expert conferencing, directed by the Panel. I confirm that the opinions I have expressed are within my area of expertise and are my own, except where I have stated that I am relying on the work or evidence of others, which I have specified.
Signature:	
Date:	9.10.2026

3.0 Executive Summary / Principal Issues

3.1 The proposal demonstrates a number of positive urban design outcomes, including a coherent masterplanned structure, a strong mixed-use centre, a substantial open-space and ecological network, and a generally logical distribution of residential density and land uses. Overall, the proposal establishes a strong urban design framework for a comprehensively planned coastal community.

3.2 The key urban design concerns relate to the limited north-south public road connectivity within eastern Marina Point and the extent to which some COALs are relied upon as the primary frontage and access environment for a considerable number of dwellings. A more localised concern also remains regarding vehicle-dominated frontage conditions associated with some narrow-frontage typologies.

3.3 Subject to the matters discussed in this memorandum, I generally support the proposal from an urban design perspective.

4.0 Documents Reviewed

The following documents have been reviewed in preparing this memorandum:

Appendix B: Planning Assessment – Reasons for Consent (specialist area).
Appendix C: Proposed Draft Consent Conditions (specialist area).
Appendix 1: Design Report.
Appendix 2: Architectural Drawings, including the Overall Masterplan and precinct-specific plans for the Marina, Village Centre, Community, Coastal, Central East and Employment Precincts, together with apartment, housing typology, streetscape and school design information.
Appendix 3: Open Space and Landscape Plans.
Appendix 4: Urban Design Assessment (Rev B), including supporting walking and cycling isochrone mapping.
Appendix 19: JOAL Lighting Plans.

5.0 Specialist Assessment

Positive Urban Design Outcomes

5.1 The proposal has a number of positive urban design attributes at the strategic and masterplan level. The overall structure is broadly coherent and generally aligns with the intended land-use, density and height distribution of the Beachlands South Precinct. Higher-density residential development is generally concentrated around Marina Point, the Village Centre and key transport and open-space areas, providing a logical relationship between intensity, public transport accessibility and principal community destinations.

5.2 The overall block and movement structure is also generally well connected and appropriate to the proposed mix of residential and mixed-use typologies. The masterplan provides a reasonably

legible network of streets and blocks, with multiple connections to Jack Lachlan Drive, including approximately five connection points across the wider development. In some locations the topography and ecological framework result in cul-de-sac street endings, and in parts of the development COALs perform functions that might otherwise be provided by public streets. Notwithstanding these localised qualifications, the overall block structure is generally suitable for the proposed development typologies and provides a coherent framework for movement, access and neighbourhood formation.

5.3 A notable strength of the proposal is that it establishes a genuine mixed-use community rather than a predominantly residential greenfield development. Residential development is integrated with retail, employment, hospitality, education, recreation, community facilities and visitor accommodation. The Village Centre provides a clear focal point for these activities and is appropriately located to support both the ferry terminal and surrounding residential neighbourhoods.

5.4 The landscape and open-space framework is another key strength. The proposal establishes a substantial and integrated open-space framework, including the EPAN network, coastal pathways, parks, stormwater/open-space areas and other green links. This provides a strong landscape structure through the development and supports pedestrian and cycle connectivity between neighbourhoods, the coast, the Village Centre, schools and other key destinations. The broader coastal and open-space structure and connectivity are considered as particular strengths of the masterplan.

5.5 The proposed residential areas also provide a range of housing environments and densities. Marina Point appropriately accommodates the highest residential intensity given its proximity to the Pine Harbour Ferry Terminal and Village Centre, while the Coastal and Golf sub-precincts generally transition toward lower-density residential forms. This contributes to a legible overall urban structure and provides variation in neighbourhood character across the development. The range of apartments, terraced housing and detached dwellings also provides a good degree of housing choice and assists in creating varied neighbourhood conditions across the development.

5.6 The Village Centre is also positive in principle. Its block and perimeter structure is generally coherent, buildings largely address surrounding streets, and parking is predominantly internalised or located behind buildings. The mixed-use concept is supported and provides a clear focal point within the wider development.

5.7 The Community sub-precinct similarly provides a coherent structure around the schools, community uses and Community Park. The location of the park between the Village Centre and school/community uses provides a useful spatial relationship between civic, recreational and residential activities.

5.8 Overall, notwithstanding the more specific matters discussed below, the proposal provides a strong strategic framework for a comprehensively planned coastal settlement, with a generally logical distribution of land uses and density, a substantial open-space network, and a movement structure that places considerable emphasis on walking and cycling.

Precinct Overview

Sub-precinct A – Marina Point

5.9 Marina Point accommodates the highest-density residential development within the proposal and is appropriately located between the Pine Harbour Ferry and the Village Centre. The proposed density pattern is also broadly consistent with the Precinct Plan, with the THAB-zoned land concentrated through the central part of the sub-precinct around the Fairway Reserve and accommodating the principal apartment development. Residential intensity then generally reduces toward the outer edges of the sub-precinct, creating a gradual transition to lower-density development that is broadly consistent with the intended precinct structure.

5.10 The Fairway Reserve provides a strong and legible open-space spine through the precinct and assists in connecting the ferry terminal, residential areas and Village Centre. Apartment buildings generally address streets and public open spaces, providing good opportunities for passive surveillance and helping to reinforce the urban character of the precinct. The relatively compact form of development also supports efficient land use while allowing substantial open-space and ecological areas to be retained elsewhere within the wider masterplan.

5.11 The main concern relates to the movement and access structure, particularly the limited extent of public road frontage and north-south connectivity in the eastern part of Marina Point. A number of superlots rely heavily on COALs for access, although the urban design implications vary depending on their frontage relationship. The concern is more pronounced for MP12, MP14, MP22 and MP23, where the COAL functions as the principal access and street address, and dwellings have only a limited relationship with public roads, typically at the ends of the blocks. MP13, MP15, MP24 and MP25 also rely on COALs for vehicle access and servicing however benefit from a principal frontage to the Fairway Reserve/open-space edge. The eastern part of the precinct also relies on cul-de-sac streets and COAL connections rather than a more connected north-south public street network. Some frontages, particularly MP02, are also interrupted by frequent vehicle crossings. These matters are discussed further below.

Sub-precinct B – Village Centre

5.12 The Village Centre is intended to form the principal commercial, civic and social focus of Beachlands South and is appropriately located at the centre of the wider masterplan and in close proximity to the coast. The proposed arrangement is broadly consistent with the Precinct Plan direction, which anticipates a compact, walkable mixed-use centre accommodating commercial, employment, community and higher-density residential activities, supported by a high-quality public realm and pedestrian-focused street environment.

5.13 The overall block and perimeter structure is generally positive. Buildings largely address surrounding streets and public spaces, with parking and servicing predominantly internalised or located behind buildings. This creates a more pedestrian-oriented urban form and provides good opportunities for active frontages and passive surveillance. The approach is also consistent with the precinct assessment criteria, which seek buildings that positively address streets and open spaces, provide interactive ground-floor frontages and minimise the visual effects of ancillary parking.

5.14 The Village Park provides a positive civic and open-space focus within the centre. It incorporates a range of complementary spaces and activities, including a village green, bespoke playground and nature-play areas, plaza space, outdoor dining areas, seating, an outdoor stage and picnic opportunities. This variety provides a good mix of everyday use, informal gathering and community activity, and reinforces the Village Centre as the social heart of the wider development. The larger Community Park within Sub-precinct C performs a separate neighbourhood and recreation function.

5.15 The built form also benefits from variation in height, massing and architectural expression across the centre. The precinct contains a range of generally mid-rise buildings, including three- to six-storey forms, with modulation, balconies, varied rooflines and subtle differences in materiality and architectural treatment. This avoids a uniform built edge and contributes positively to the intended village character and sense of place. The architectural approach also responds to the precinct criteria seeking enclosure around public spaces.

5.16 Overall, the Village Centre is considered to provide a strong urban design framework and an appropriate civic and mixed-use heart for Beachlands South.

Sub-precinct C – Community

5.17 The Community sub-precinct accommodates a range of social and community infrastructure, including education facilities, recreation, visitor accommodation, and public open space alongside residential development. This is generally consistent with the Precinct Plan direction, which anticipates the area as a focal point for community and civic activities, with education, recreation and associated uses located in close proximity to the Village Centre.

5.18 A key strength is the concentration of these community facilities in a central and accessible location near Jack Lachlan Drive. The relationship between the schools, Community Park and Village Centre creates a strong civic and recreational focus, supporting convenient walking and cycling within the precinct and to the wider Beachlands area. The Community Park is particularly well located between the education area and Village Centre, providing an important link between civic, recreational and residential activities.

5.19 The residential block structure is generally coherent. CM3 adopts a positive perimeter-style arrangement with parking internalised within the block, while the surrounding residential development provides an appropriate transition to lower-density areas. Some dwellings, including Building B and some units in Building C, have less favourable south or south-east orientations. However, these represent a relatively small proportion of the total number of units within the superlot.

5.20 The precinct also accommodates the proposed hotel at CM5, which is a notably taller element. However, its relatively isolated position, substantial setbacks and open-space setting provide some capacity to accommodate the additional height. The additional section and shading information provided through the section 67 process has not identified any significant urban design concerns in relation to height or shading effects.

5.21 CM1 provides a generous COAL arrangement with a dedicated pedestrian route and is not considered inherently problematic from an urban design perspective. CM4 is more constrained, with parts of the COAL functioning as the primary frontage and access environment for dwellings

rather than solely as rear access. This reinforces the broader concern regarding the extent to which COALs perform the role of residential streets, discussed further below.

Sub-precinct D – Coastal

5.22 The Coastal sub-precinct is predominantly residential and shaped by the site's topography, ecological areas and coastal setting. This is generally consistent with the Precinct Plan, which seeks development that responds to coastal landform, while maintaining a more spacious residential character toward the coastal edge. The proposed coastal pathway, retained gullies, ecological areas and open-space corridors are key features that provide public access, amenity and integration with the natural environment.

5.23 The residential pattern is generally varied, comprising a mix of apartment, terrace and detached housing, with a reduction in intensity toward the more sensitive coastal edge. Many of the detached dwellings are relatively conventional and do not raise significant urban design concerns. There are also opportunities in parts of the precinct, including around C6–C8, for streets and development edges to positively contribute to the surveillance and activation of adjoining open-spaces.

5.24 The principal built-form issue relates to the taller apartment building within C1. At approximately 12 storeys, this represents a substantial increase in scale relative to the surrounding lower-density residential context and creates a relatively abrupt transition in built form. A building of this height might more typically be anticipated within the Village Centre or other higher-intensity parts of the masterplan. However, its relatively isolated position, substantial separation from neighbouring development and surrounding open-space context provide some capacity to accommodate the additional height. The additional shading information provided through the section 67 process has not identified a material urban design concerns.

5.25 Overall, the Coastal sub-precinct establishes a strong relationship with the coastal landscape and open-space network. The integration of the coastal pathway with ecological areas are particular strengths. The principal urban design qualification relates to the scale and transition of the C1 apartment building rather than the overall precinct structure.

Sub-precinct E – Golf

5.26 The Golf sub-precinct retains the existing golf course and clubhouse facilities while accommodating additional predominantly lower-density residential development. This is generally consistent with the precinct direction, which seeks to retain organised sport and recreation while enabling complementary residential development.

5.27 A key strength is the retention of a substantial open landscape within the wider masterplan. The golf course provides an established recreational and community asset and contributes to the visual amenity and landscape identity of this part of the development. The retained clubhouse also provides an opportunity to continue supporting recreational and social activity associated with the golf course.

5.28 The residential development is generally lower in scale and sits comfortably within the open golf-course setting. The COAL-based residential blocks are also less concerning than in other parts of the masterplan. These areas generally comprise detached dwellings within a more spacious

setting, and the approximately 9m COAL profiles provide greater flexibility to accommodate pedestrian movement, landscaping and berm allocation.

5.29 A more localised concern relates to the fragmented nature of some residential clusters, including around JL1 and CE3, which are relatively isolated and terminate in cul-de-sacs or COAL-based arrangements. While this appears to respond to topography and the configuration of the retained golf-course and ecological areas, it results in some neighbourhood pockets being less directly connected to the wider street network.

5.30 Overall, the Golf sub-precinct benefits from the retention of a significant recreational landscape and generally provides an appropriate lower-density residential transition within the wider masterplan.

Sub-precinct F – Employment

5.31 The Employment sub-precinct is located along the eastern edge of the development adjoining Whitford-Maraetai Road and accommodates a mix of light industrial, commercial and mixed-use activities. This broadly aligns with the Precinct Plan direction, which seeks to provide local employment opportunities and support a more balanced mix of land uses across the wider development. Light industrial and business activities are concentrated near Whitford-Maraetai Road, while mixed-use areas provide opportunities for residential accommodation above ground-floor employment activities.

5.32 Superlot E1 is generally well organised, with building blocks positively addressing the public street through their frontage and orientation, while COALs function more conventionally as rear-access lanes. E3 follows a similar principle in part, although the rear block comprising Lots 1058–1073 is both addressed and accessed primarily from the COAL, resulting in a more vehicle-dominated frontage environment. The proposed architectural approach is otherwise appropriate to the intended employment and mixed-use typologies, with building modulation, roof form variation and frontage articulation contributing positively to the anticipated character of the precinct.

Urban Design Concerns and Unresolved Matters

COAL Reliance and Eastern Marina Point Street structure

5.33 A key urban design concern relates to the extent to which COALs are used as the primary frontage and access environment for dwellings that do not have direct frontage to a public road network. This is most evident within Marina Point, including MP10, MP11, MP12, MP14, MP22 and MP23, and also occurs CM4 within the Community sub-precinct and JL1 and CE3 within the Golf sub-precinct. Other Marina Point blocks, including MP13, MP15, MP24 and MP25, also rely on COALs for vehicle access and servicing, but benefit from a stronger principal frontage relationship with the Fairway Reserve/open-space edge. Several of these COALs serve relatively large groups of dwellings, and some submitted layouts indicate relatively constrained overall widths of approximately 6 m.

5.34 The concern is particularly pronounced in the eastern part of Marina Point, where limited north–south public street connectivity results in a movement network that relies heavily on COALs and cul-de-sacs. This reduces the clarity of the public street hierarchy and places greater reliance on private accessways to perform the role of residential streets.

5.35 A related issue arises along some east–west public roads, where blocks including MP12–MP17 and MP22–MP25, present side elevations toward the road rather than their principal residential frontages. This reduces opportunities for direct building address, passive surveillance and activation of the public street. Some dwelling typologies, including the T3-C typology, also appear to provide limited habitable-room glazing or activation opportunities to these side elevations, further weakening the relationship between buildings and the public realm.

5.36 Where COALs function as the primary frontage and access environment, the quality and functionality of these spaces become particularly important. Matters requiring further resolution include pedestrian amenity and separation from vehicle movement, landscaping and berm allocation, lighting, visitor access and parking, waste collection, servicing and vehicle manoeuvring.

5.37 The concern does not apply equally to all COALs. In some parts of CM1 and the Golf sub-precinct, wider profiles, detached housing typologies and more generous landscape settings provide greater flexibility and generally achieve a more acceptable outcome. The issue is therefore focused on the more constrained locations, particularly within Marina Point sub-precinct, where large groups of dwellings rely on COAL access in the absence of direct road frontage.

5.38 Within CM1, the COAL arrangement is relatively spacious and incorporates a 1.5 m pedestrian route. The COAL-accessed dwellings are generally detached with reasonable separation and landscaping opportunities, and the arrangement is not considered inherently problematic from an urban design perspective. Further consideration will nevertheless be required in relation to waste collection, bin storage, and the final allocation and treatment of berm and landscape areas.

5.39 CM4 presents a more constrained condition. In parts of the block, the COAL functions conventionally as rear access, including for Lots 875–882, while elsewhere it provides the principal frontage and access environment for dwellings such as Lots 863–870. In these locations, the pedestrian route is positioned immediately behind parking spaces, resulting in pedestrians moving through an area closely associated with vehicle manoeuvring rather than within a clearly separated pedestrian environment. A similar arrangement occurs around Lots 1228–1229. This is not considered an optimal urban design outcome and reinforces the broader concern regarding COALs being relied upon as the primary frontage and access environment in the absence of direct road-reserve frontage.

5.40 Where the E27.6.6 pedestrian access standards apply, the relationship between pedestrian routes, parking areas and vehicle access should be confirmed by the transport specialist, particularly in relation to the required physical separation of pedestrian access from vehicle movements.

<u>Vehicle-Dominated Frontage and Pedestrian Environment</u>

5.41 A further urban design concern relates to the relationship between dwelling frontage width and vehicle access in Marina Point MP02, in particular, the T2-A typology has a relatively narrow frontage width and the frequent provision of individual vehicle crossings results in a substantial proportion of the street edge being occupied by driveways. This reduces opportunities for continuous landscaping, street tree planting and a strong pedestrian-oriented interface.

5.42 The issue is therefore not simply the number of vehicle crossings, but the cumulative effect of a long row of narrow-frontage typologies where vehicle access occupies a significant proportion of

the street edge. In these locations, careful detailed design will be required to ensure pedestrian continuity, landscape provision and the residential character of the street is not unduly compromised by vehicle access.

Assessment Summary

5.43 Overall, the proposal establishes a strong and generally coherent urban design framework, supported by a logical distribution of density and land uses, an extensive open-space network, and positive relationships between development, public streets and key community destinations. The principal urban design concern relates to the limited north-south public street-based connectivity within eastern Marina Point and the extent to which COALs are relied upon as the primary frontage and access environment rather than public road frontage. A more localised concern also remains in relation to vehicle-dominated frontage associated with narrow-frontage typologies within MP02. These matters are addressed further through the recommendations and proposed conditions below.

6.0 Section 67 Information Gap

6.1 During the section 67 process, the applicant provided additional information in response to the urban design matters raised. The information provided was sufficient to address the specific information request and enable further assessment. However, in some cases the additional information did not fully resolve the underlying urban design concern associated with the matters raised.

6.2 The information requested, the applicant's response, and how this informed my assessment and urban design position are summarised below.

Item 1 – Varying Levels of Design Resolution and Future Design Flexibility

6.3 The information request sought clarification on how the proposed architectural and landscape certification would ensure that detailed design responds appropriately to individual lot and superlot contexts, including orientation, topography, retaining and interface conditions, CPTED, residential amenity and private-lot landscaping.

6.4 The application provided sufficient information to understand the intended urban design outcomes across the development, notwithstanding the relatively high-level nature of some residential areas. While much of the current approval material relies on masterplans, superlot plans, and generic housing typologies rather than fully resolved lot-specific designs, the proposed certification conditions will be important in ensuring these outcomes are appropriately realised as detailed design progresses.

Item 2 – Movement Network and Connectivity

6.5 The information request sought clarification of the proposed street hierarchy and connectivity, including the rationale for locations where through-road connections are not provided, particularly at the eastern end of Marina Point where north–south movement appears to rely significantly on COALs.

6.6 The applicant has explained that alternative through-road connections were considered and has identified ecological constraints, topography and gully geometry, block efficiency and the wider pedestrian/open-space network as reasons for the proposed arrangement. This provides a reasonable strategic explanation for why a more continuous public road network has not been pursued.

6.7 The additional information nevertheless does not resolve the concern that, in eastern Marina Point, COALs provide a significant proportion of the connectivity and access roles that might otherwise be provided through the public street network. This is particularly evident around MP12–MP15 and MP22–MP25, where the same access corridors operate as rear lanes for some blocks and as the principal frontage and access environment for others.

Item 3 – COAL Design and Function

6.8 The information request sought further clarification of the hierarchy, dimensions and intended function of COALs, including their role as pedestrian spaces, their relationship with public streets and open spaces, and their ability to accommodate access, servicing and other operational requirements where they serve larger groups of dwellings.

6.9 The additional information provides typical COAL cross-sections and broadly clarifies the intended design approach. However, the broader concern remains that a significant number of residential areas rely on COALs as the primary frontage and access environment in the absence of direct road frontage, particularly within Marina Point and CM4. The detailed urban design implications of this arrangement are discussed in Section 5.3 above.

Item 4 – Vehicle Crossings and Pedestrian Continuity

6.10 The information request sought clarification on how frequent vehicle crossings proposed within Marina Point would be managed to maintain pedestrian continuity, frontage landscaping and streetscape quality.

6.11 The applicant has provided sufficient clarification of the intended approach, including the consolidation of crossings where practicable, consistent footpath surface treatments, and targeted landscape planting. However, a localised urban design concern remains in relation to narrow-frontage typologies and the cumulative effect of repeated crossings, as discussed in Section 5.3.

Item 5 – Height, Built Form and Interfaces

6.12 Additional information was requested regarding the effects of taller buildings, including shading analysis, sections and visual information illustrating relationships with surrounding development.

6.13 The applicant has provided the requested sections and shading diagrams for Blocks CM5, CM3, C1-A and MP01. No material shading concerns have been identified for CM5, CM3 or C1-A (Apartment Type 4).

6.14 For MP01, the shading analysis does not indicate significant effects on existing residential properties. Some shading is shown for proposed residential Lots 272–274. While the scale transition at MP01 is somewhat abrupt within its immediate context, the generous separation to

surrounding development, particularly to the east, means this is not considered to result in significant urban design concerns at this stage.

6.15 C1-A is one of the taller buildings and is located within a relatively low-density setting, including nearby detached residential lots. While the building represents a notable increase in scale relative to its surroundings, the absence of material shading effects, its spacious setting, and separation from neighbouring dwellings provide some support for the proposed height and form.

6.16 From an urban design perspective, a building of this scale might more typically be anticipated within the Village Centre or other higher-intensity parts of the precinct. Nevertheless, I do not consider its location to give rise to a significant urban design concern that would warrant further information at this stage. The treatment of the building base and ground-level interface will, however, be important in assisting its integration with the surrounding lower-density context and providing an appropriate transition in scale and character.

6.17 In relation to wider visual dominance and landscape effects arising from the height of C1-A and the other taller buildings, I defer to Council's landscape specialist.

Other Section 67 Requests

6.18 The remaining urban design information requests related to the open-space network and precinct linkages, walkability and access to key destinations, and park/open-space edge relationships.

6.19 The applicant provided additional explanation and supporting information addressing these matters, including clarification of the open-space and play provision within Sub-precinct F, walking and cycling catchment analysis for key destinations, and the rationale for locations where continuous park-edge roads have not been provided.

7.0 Recommendation

7.1 Overall, I consider the proposal to establish a strong strategic urban design framework, and most matters raised through the section 67 process have been satisfactorily clarified. The following recommendations are intended to address the remaining urban design concerns.

Eastern Marina Point Street Structure

7.2 I recommend introducing at least one additional north-south public road through the eastern part of Marina Point to achieve a more legible and connected public street network. This would reduce reliance on COALs as the primary frontage and access environment for larger groups of dwellings, minimise nested COAL arrangements, strengthen the relationship between east–west streets and adjoining development, and provide a clearer hierarchy between public streets and private accessways.

COAL Frontage and Function

7.3 Where COALs remain the primary frontage and access environment for dwellings without direct road frontage, particularly within Marina Point and CM4, the detailed design should demonstrate an acceptable residential environment. This should include clear pedestrian provision, landscape

and berm allocations, lighting, visitor access and parking, waste and bin collection, servicing and vehicle manoeuvring. Where relevant, the pedestrian access arrangements should also be confirmed against the applicable E27.6.6 requirements.

Public Street Activation in Eastern Marina Point

7.4 For blocks where side elevations address public roads, including parts of MP12–MP17 and MP22–MP25, opportunities should be taken to strengthen the relationship with the street through additional habitable-room glazing, entrances or other architectural measures, where practicable, to improve passive surveillance and frontage activation.

MP02 Narrow Frontage Typologies

7.5 The detailed design of the T2-A typology within MP02 should seek to minimise the cumulative dominance of vehicle crossings and maximise pedestrian continuity, frontage landscaping and opportunities for street-tree planting.

C1-A Building Base Options

7.6 It is recommended to test options for varied building base treatment of the taller apartment building within C1, so that the lower levels provide an appropriate transition in scale and character to the surrounding lower-density residential development.

Lot 2010 Open Space Opportunity

7.7 Consider whether Lots 765–769 could be incorporated into, or more closely integrated with, Lot 2010 to create a larger and more legible neighbourhood park. The existing block configuration presents a strong opportunity for an open space substantially framed by public roads, with improved visibility, access and passive surveillance.

8.0 Proposed Conditions

8.1 The proposed condition framework already includes a number of provisions relevant to urban design. Conditions 93–95 provide for architectural certification, dwelling relocation and application of approved housing typologies at detailed design stages; Condition 97 provides for detailed landscape certification for publicly accessible areas; Conditions 102–105 address waste management and lighting in specified circumstances; and Condition 199 addresses the construction of COALs.

8.2 In my view, this framework generally provides an appropriate basis for subsequent detailed design. However, two additional conditions are recommended.

- The first addresses the heavy reliance on COALs as the primary frontage and access environment for a large number of dwellings that lack the benefit of public street frontage.

- The second is intended to ensure that where dwelling locations change or approved typologies are subsequently applied in a materially different context, the urban design relationships relied upon in the current assessment are maintained.

Amendment to Condition 199 and new Condition 199A – COAL detailed design

8.3 Condition 199 currently requires COALs to be constructed to the road controlling authority's standards to provide access to dwellings, buildings and car parks. While this addresses the basic access function, it does not expressly address the broader urban design role of COALs where they provide the primary frontage and access environment for dwellings rather than public street frontage. In particular, the condition does not specifically address pedestrian amenity, frontage quality, landscape and berm treatment, waste and servicing arrangements, visitor parking, lighting, or the relationship between dwelling entrances and the accessway.

8.4 I therefore recommend that Condition 199 be supplemented by the following:

[199A] COAL Detailed Design

Prior to construction of any COAL that provides the primary pedestrian and vehicle access to dwellings without direct public street frontage, the Consent Holder must submit a detailed COAL Design Plan to Council for certification.

The plan must demonstrate an integrated and functional residential frontage and access environment and where relevant include the following:

- *carriageway and pedestrian-route dimensions;*
- *pedestrian access designed in accordance with the relevant E27 pedestrian access standards, including E27.6.6 where applicable, with appropriate physical separation from vehicle access, parking and manoeuvring areas;*
- *landscape and berm allocation, including planting locations and dimensions;*
- *lighting;*
- *dwelling entrances and opportunities for passive surveillance;*
- *visitor parking arrangements;*
- *waste and recycling storage, presentation and collection arrangements;*
- *servicing and emergency access; and*
- *vehicle manoeuvring and measures to minimise conflict between pedestrians, parked vehicles and servicing activity.*

New Condition 95A – Contextual urban design assessment

8.5 Conditions 94 and 95 allow dwelling locations to change within individual lots and approved housing typologies to be applied to specified residential lots. While this provides appropriate flexibility, a typology or dwelling arrangement that performs well in one location may generate different urban design relationships when applied to another lot, orientation or interface.

Condition 97 also expressly excludes landscaping on private lots from the later detailed landscape certification process.

8.6 The existing conditions therefore do not expressly require consideration of how changes in dwelling location or typology may affect site-specific urban design outcomes, including the response to topography and retaining, orientation and street or COAL interface, relationships with adjoining development and public open space, CPTED and passive surveillance, privacy and outlook, pedestrian access, boundary treatment and private-lot landscaping.

8.7 I therefore recommend the following additional condition:

[95A] Contextual Urban Design Assessment

Where a dwelling location is changed under Condition 94, or an approved housing typology is applied under Condition 95, in a manner that results in a materially different relationship to:

- *a public road;*
- *a COAL;*
- *a public open space;*
- *an adjoining residential site;*
- *a significant retaining structure or level change; or*
- *another key frontage or interface shown in the approved plans.*

The Consent Holder must submit a design assessment to Council for certification that the requirements of Condition 95 have been met. The assessment must demonstrate that an equivalent or better urban design outcome is achieved, having regard to:

- *orientation and address to streets, COALs and public open spaces;*
- *passive surveillance and CPTED;*
- *relationships to adjoining dwellings and boundaries that address privacy and outlook;*
- *topography, retaining and level changes;*
- *pedestrian access and legibility; and*
- *associated private-lot landscaping, including frontage planting, privacy planting, boundary treatment and interfaces with streets, COALs and public open spaces.*