

# Memo

To:	Mackenzie District Council C/- Terri Winder
From	Jonathan Clease, Planz Consultants
Date:	29 October 2024
Subject	RM240141 – 3 Andrew Don Drive - Urban Design Review

## Introduction

Planz Consultants has been engaged by Huale Huang (the applicant) to provide an urban design assessment of the three buildings (comprised of one residential unit, one minor unit, and one visitor accommodation unit) to be constructed at 3 Andrew Don Drive, Tekapo (the site) in response to point 2 of the Mackenzie District Council (MDC) request for further information (RFI) dated 19 September 2024.

Point 2 of the RFI reads:

*Given the breaches of the impervious surfacing standard and the breaches of the Tekapo Precinct provisions and Design Guide relating to the length of the VA unit's eastern and western façades, roof design, and materials, please provide an urban design assessment of the proposal prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person.*

This memorandum provides that urban design assessment.

I confirm that I am a qualified urban designer and hold a Master of Urban Design (first class honours) from the University of Auckland. I have experience in undertaking urban design assessments for a wide range of projects and scales, along with reviewing and preparing District Plan changes associated with urban design outcomes.

## Urban Design Assessment

The architectural plans prepared by Archiland dated 27 September 2024 illustrate the site being developed with three detached units, connected by decking, that will be used for a mixture of permanent residents or local workers and guests.

I have reviewed section 6.4 of the assessment of the environmental effects from the building design and formation prepared by Terri Winder dated 4 September 2024. I agree with that assessment regarding the design of the proposal and its alignment with the outcomes sought in the Takapō/ Lake Tekapo Character Design Guide (Design Guide).

In particular, I note that given the site's rear location, the non-compliances with the Lake Tekapo Precinct and Low Density Residential Zone provisions will, not be readily visible from the adjacent street network. As such, the assessment of effects is limited to those parts of the site that are visible from adjacent properties and from a nearby Council open space reserve to the north. any visual effects.

## Materials

Standard PREC1-S1 anticipates that at least two different materials will be used, including weatherboards or similar, plaster, alluvial stone, steel, or cob. The Design Guide indicates that this will help reduce the visual appearance of building scale. All three units will be constructed with a TAUCO weatherboard cladding system, which is an aluminum-Mg profile weatherboard. In response to the RFI, the cladding paint colour has been modified. The primary residential unit and minor residential unit will

continue to be finished in a brown colour, whereas the VA unit will be finished in a grey colour. The differing colours will make the cladding appear as two different products. The cladding colours will have a low light reflectivity value to ensure compliance with subpoint (3) of this standard. By using different paint colours to differentiate the residential units from the VA unit, the appearance of bulk will be reduced. Also, the clustered and separated nature of the units, single-storey and primarily gable roof design, and ranch sliders and windows on all façades break up the building mass. A combination of the matching cladding and roofing materials, and the proposed cladding colour ensure that the three units visually integrate into the surrounding environment.

When viewed from the surrounding environment, the three units will integrate well with the wider natural landscape due to the weatherboards and paint colours, albeit not including a second cladding material. The cladding material will be low light reflectivity value to avoid glare or compromise the landscape.

### Roofs

The roof angles stipulated in standard PREC1-S2 are envisioned by the Design Guide to help reduce building scale, whilst also providing an 'alpine' vernacular. The perceived primary roof form (i.e., the northern façade) has three gable ends at the front with three hipped roofs at the rear. The roof design of the two main units is compliant – it is only the roof of the minor unit that has a slope angle that is shallower than the permitted level.

I consider that the one-bedroom unit would appear secondary to the larger four- and five-bedroom units given its roof design, separation from those units, and rear location. The one-bedroom unit includes a simple low hipped roof form which is lower in pitch than the primary roof form. The differentiation in roof design and clustered approach reduces the proposal's appearance of bulk when viewed from the surrounding environment. The minor unit will be consistent with the lower profile and smaller form anticipated for accessory buildings that have a subordinate role to the primary residential unit on the site.

### Building Scale

Standard PREC1-S3 seeks to manage any long, continuous building façades. The Design Guide indicates that this is because most residential building forms in Lake Tekapo are small to moderate in scale, creating discrete profiles when viewing developments positioned on sloping areas of the town. The Design Guide also indicates that the perceived size of a building is key in determining the relationship to its site and surroundings. The eastern and western façade of the four-bedroom unit will be 17m long without any recess where the minimum recess required for a wall length over 14m is 2m long by 1m deep. These wall lengths are modestly scaled and not readily visible from any public place given the site's location and the orientation of this unit. A combination of the glazed elements, the verandah, and the eastern gable roof on these façades reduce the scale of the four-bedroom unit and provides visual interest. The proposed landscaping along the site's eastern boundary will also soften the scale of the four-bedroom unit.

### Building and Impervious Coverage

Standard LRZ-S5 states that the maximum building and impervious coverage of any site in the Low Density Residential Zone is 50%. The proposal will result in a cumulative building and impervious coverage of 55.9% equating to a 5.9% exceedance or 56.05m<sup>2</sup>. The matters of discretion listed in RES-MD4 relate to:

- The location, design and appearance of buildings on the site.
- The visual impact of the built form on the streetscape and surrounding environment.
- The extent and quality of any landscaping proposed to soften the built form.
- The adequacy of any mitigation measures.

Ms Winder's assessment of the building coverage non-compliance is repeated below.

A: 79 Lichfield Street  
P: PO Box 1845, Christchurch 8140  
T: 03 377 9829  
E: chch@planzconsultants.co.nz  
W: planzconsultants.co.nz



The appearance of bulk and large hardstanding area is reduced through a combination of the buildings and majority of the car parking area being tucked behind the 5 Andrew Don Drive dwelling, the proposed landscaping, and the broken built form. With 44.1% of the site still available for the landscaping and decking area, the proposal will have an open feeling.

I agree with the points raised by Ms Winder. In addition, I note that the building scale is modest, with the buildings being single-storey and having relatively low building coverage (27.4% of the site) that provides ample opportunity for landscaping and a dominance of open space over building.

Ms Winder's assessment also describes the proposed landscaping, which is supported by the landscaping detail illustrated on the architectural plans. I consider the approximately 280m<sup>2</sup> of soft landscaping area proposed (29.5% of the site) to be adequate and is greater than the building coverage. The 1.5m high native hedging proposed along the site's internal boundaries and the native garden reflects good quality.

The proposed building and impervious coverage would largely be hidden from the streetscape given its rear location, and it would only be visible from the adjacent properties. The visual impact of the coverage exceedance from the adjacent properties would be reduced by the broken built form, location of the units and the differing orientation, and the parking area being located on the northern side of the units away from most of the adjacent properties. The visual impact on the adjacent properties would also be softened by the proposed landscaping, noting that the perimeter hedging would be 1.5m high at the time of planting.

## Summary

Overall, I consider the proposal to be appropriate to its context, modest in scale and form, and of a design that aligns with the outcomes sought in the Design Guide.

Please feel free to give me a call on 022 170 0204 if you would like to discuss any of the above in more detail.

Kind Regards

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Jonathan Cleese'.

Jonathan Cleese

Director