

SUPPLEMENTARY EXPERT STATEMENT

IN THE MATTER OF: RESOURCE CONSENT SP/0179/20

3MS of Cambridge Limited Partnership

1863, 1865, 1871 and 1881 Cambridge Road

STATEMENT OF: Matt Riley, Urban Designer

DATE: 21 May 2021

-
- 1 This report sets out a supplementary expert statement on the above application.
 - 2 I have read the expert statements of all the Applicant's and submitters' experts. My area of focus has been on the statement of the Applicant's urban designer Stuart Mackie and the statement of Jimmy Zhuang, urban designer for the owners of 1835 Cambridge Road, Mr Xiaofeng Jiang and Ms Liping Yang ('Submitter 4').
 - 3 Below, I record matters on which I would like to bring the commissioners' attention to areas of agreement and difference in opinion between myself, Mr Mackie and Mr Zhuang.

MATTERS OF AGREEMENT IN OPINION

MR JIMMY ZHUANG: URBAN DESIGNER FOR XIAOFENG JIANG AND LIPING YANG

DEVELOPMENT OF 1835 CAMBRIDGE ROAD UNDER NOTIFIED VERSION OF 3MS ILLUSTRATIVE STRUCTURE PLAN

- 4 At paragraph 5.20 of his statement, Mr. Zhuang considers the testing of potential subdivision layout on neighbouring sites against the Notified version of the 3Ms Illustrative Structure Plan undertaken by Mr. Mackie in an appendix to his statement.

He considers that in relation to the land owned by Mr. Xiaofeng Jiang and Ms. Liping Yang at 1835 Cambridge Road, this does not show good urban design outcomes, due to the large number of rear lots and JOALs.

4.1 I agree with Mr. Zhuang.

MATTERS OF DIFFERENCE IN OPINION

MR STUART MACKIE: URBAN DESIGNER FOR THE APPLICANT

DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS FOR ADJOINING LAND

5 At paragraphs 47-59 of his statement, Mr. Mackie responds to concerns that both myself and submitters have raised in terms of whether adjoining land can be developed in a manner that achieves reasonable urban design outcomes, with a particular focus on land to the west. He concludes that while there are some limitations, *'sites to the west of the 3Ms site seem to be developable in a reasonably straight-forward way'* (paragraph 58).

6 The difference between myself and Mr. Mackie appears to be on the range of options and flexibility to adjoining land owners to develop in a manner that achieves reasonable urban design outcomes.

7 I disagree with Mr. Mackie that adjoining land could be developed in a straight-forward way. There is uncertainty about the alignment of the north-south collector road and any stormwater swale. This, combined with the generally small size and narrow width of neighbouring lots, is such that I consider the subdivision options available to adjoining owners to develop in a manner that achieves positive urban design outcomes are very limited.

LEGIBILITY AND CHARACTER

8 At paragraphs 25-36 of his statement, Mr. Mackie responds to my assessment of the legibility and character effects of the application. He examines constituent parts of the proposal that differ (or may result in difference – where on land outside the 3Ms

site) from the Structure Plan. While his statement does not have an explicit conclusion on this matter, I understand that he differs from my view that the legibility and character effects of the proposal at the wider C2 Growth Cell level are not as strong as the Structure Plan.

- 9 My view on this matter remains the same. While assessing the effects of each change from the Structure Plan individually has merit, an overall holistic assessment is then required. When viewed as a whole, I remain of the view that the direct changes from the Structure Plan, or those that are likely to result from it – as adjoining land is developed – will not produce the same strength of legibility and character outcomes as the Structure Plan.

RECOMMENDED CONSENT NOTICE ON LOCAL CENTRE LOT 301

- 10 At paragraph 61 of his statement, Mr. Mackie agrees in principle with my recommended condition of consent that a consent notice be placed on the Local Centre Lot 301 in regards to how any future building on that Lot may interface with the Lot 503 stormwater reserve to the south. He considers that requiring a minimum 20% of glazing on the southern elevation of a Local Centre building facing towards the stormwater reserve could be premature, as the overall desired outcome is good quality design.
- 11 I agree with Mr. Mackie that good quality design is the overall desired outcome. A primary element of that, however, is passive surveillance of the reserve. Given the conditions that the spatial arrangement of Lots 301 and 502 set up, which have the potential to lead to poor design outcomes if not appropriately managed, I consider it appropriate to achieve a ‘baseline’ of reasonable overlooking of the reserve. In my opinion, this would be achieved by a minimum percentage of glazing of a future building facing the reserve. I consider a minimum 20% glazing to be reasonable and practicable.

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

12 Having read the relevant evidence, my overall recommendation remains the same.

Signed

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Matt Riley', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Matt Riley
CONSULTANT URBAN DESIGNER