

BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of an application to Hamilton City Council for Private  
Plan Change 7 to the Hamilton City District Plan by  
Green Seed Consultants Limited

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF COLIN ANDREW HATTINGH (URBAN DESIGN)**

**Dated 27 OCTOBER 2021**

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. My name is Colin Andrew Hattingh. I hold the qualifications of Bachelor in Town and Regional Planning (Pretoria University, South Africa) and Master of Urban Design (University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa).
2. I have over 20 years' experience in planning and urban design within the Local Government context. For the past 11 years, I have held the position of Senior Urban Design Planner for Hamilton City Council (**HCC**). My role in preparing this report is that of an expert urban design planner. I am an associate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.
3. I provided a memorandum assessing urban design matters arising under the proposed Rotokauri North Private Plan Change (**PC7**) dated 5 July 2021 which was included in Appendix D to the s 42A report.

## **CODE OF CONDUCT**

4. I have read the Environment Court Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and agree to comply with it. I confirm that the opinions expressed in this statement are within my area of expertise except where I state that I have relied on the evidence of other persons. I have not omitted to consider materials or facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I have expressed.

## **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

5. This statement covers a short summary of my memorandum appended to the s 42A report, which reviews the urban design assessment undertaken by Mr Ian Munro dated April 2019, and secondly, provides a few comments on the evidence of Mr Munro, dated 24 September 2021.

## SUMMARY OF MEMORANDUM

6. The key conclusions reached in my memorandum include:
- a) Overall support for the various **provisions and standards**, as these align with and are a logical response to the extensive site analysis and master-planning process undertaken by the applicant, in conjunction with Council officials and others. In my opinion, the provisions will help deliver the vision and design principles that have guided and informed the proposal.
  - b) Overall support for the refined **Structure Plan diagram**, which responds to the various site opportunities and constraints and offers a well-considered framework for this portion of the Rotokauri cell.
  - c) That there is good alignment with several Operative District Plan (**ODP**) **objectives and policies**, particularly within chapter 2 (Strategic Framework) and chapter 25.15 (City Wide, Urban Design) which promote development and urban environments that (amongst others) respond to best practice urban design and sustainable development principles, that promote the retention and enhancement of urban amenity values and that integrate land use with transport planning to provide permeable, highly connected and sustainable transport networks.
  - d) Overall support for the **Urban Design Assessment** (Attachment 15) and the focus that has been placed on (amongst others) the creation of a well-connected and walkable block and street pattern; a legible road hierarchy; the provision of public fronts and private backyards for many homes, a positive streetscape environment and a mix of house types including affordable options.

- e) Overall support for the approach to the provision of **duplex units** and the inclusion of an Acceptable Solution Code at Rule 14.4.

#### **UPDATED POSITION**

- 7. I have read through the statement of evidence from Mr Munro, dated 24 September 2021.
- 8. Regarding the proposed specific duplex housing solution, I concur with several of the statements made, particularly that they are:
  - a) Not experimental or untested (over 30 completed in the Auranga development).
  - b) Offer slightly different outcomes in terms of privacy and the size of outdoor living areas.
  - c) Able to be marketed and priced at two different points which will help provide for a more varied mix of purchasers and owners.
- 9. I have the following additional commentary on one or two of the statements made - for example that:
  - a) The concept of parking in front of another person's dwelling is very common in many forms of medium density housing – while true, that usually applies to larger, comprehensively designed projects with terraced or apartment typologies (as shown in the examples provided), not individual duplexes, as in this case.
  - b) Our assumptions about what future occupants might prefer are misplaced – again while true, this assumption applies to both parties.
  - c) The key benefits of the 'off set' duplex design compared to the 'set back' version, include that car parking and driveways do not visually

dominate the street frontage and that having a unit projecting forward promotes visual amenity and containment of the street, enhanced opportunities for passive surveillance, and a greater likelihood of social interaction – in my opinion, the generation 1 design (set back version) seems to be a simpler solution. Comparing the two, I would argue that the streetscape outcomes are similar and are dependent on the detail design aspects and execution of these and on the quality of the materiality and landscaping that is applied. Both have similar total areas of paving and landscaping – just configured in different ways. In the ‘generation 1’ design, both units have equal opportunities for passive surveillance towards the street.

- d) My ‘fear’ that living behind another unit’s single car park might not deliver the level of on-site amenity I might personally prefer – my opinions are not based on any fears but are based on finding the best practical solution for eventual residents.

- 10. No new matters have been raised.

## **CONCLUSION**

- 11. To summarise, from an urban design perspective I support the proposed plan change and consider that it demonstrates the application of several best practice urban design principles, in accordance with the approach taken by the Operative District Plan.
- 12. I support the position taken by Mr Sharman through the s 42A report.
- 13. While it remains my opinion that proposed Rotokauri North Acceptable Solutions Code (Rule 4.14) is too specific and could have included the ‘generation 1’ design as another permitted option, there is confidence that

should an alternative design be submitted, that consistency and good outcomes can be achieved through the consenting process.

**Colin Andrew Hattingh**

**27 October 2021**