

Before Queenstown Lakes District
Council

In the matter of the Resource Management Act 1991

And

In the matter of The Queenstown Lakes District Proposed District Plan
Topic 06 Residential

Supplementary Evidence of Jane Rennie

Dated 28 October 2016

The Estate of Norma Kreft (#0512); The Wanaka Trust (#0536)

Submitter's solicitors:

Vanessa Robb
Anderson Lloyd
Level 2, 13 Camp Street, Queenstown 9300
PO Box 201, Queenstown 9348
DX Box ZP95010 Queenstown
p + 64 3 450 0700
vanessa.robb@al.nz

**anderson
lloyd.**

8.1 Zone Purpose	While providing for a higher density of development than is possible in the Low Density Residential Zone, the zone utilises development controls to ensure reasonable amenity protection is maintained. Importantly, building heights will generally <u>be limited to two to three storeys.</u>	
Objective 8.2.3	Development provides high quality living environments for residents and <u>adjacent sites, consistent with the transition of the Zone to medium density housing.</u>	
New Policy	<u>In order to provide for a range of housing typologies subject to consideration of visual dominance, views, outlook and sunlight access, establish a tiered approach to maximum building heights that seeks to:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Enable 1-2 storey development;</u> <u>2. Manage development between 2-3 storeys to achieve quality urban design outcomes and maintain acceptable amenity values; and.</u> <u>3. Avoid adverse effects on amenity values and the wider townscape of building development in excess of 3 storeys in height.</u> 	
	Standards for activities located in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Non-compliance status
8.5.1	<p>Building Height (for flat and sloping sites)</p> <p>8.5.1.1 Wanaka and Arrowtown: A maximum of 7 metres except for the following: a. Within 15 metres of Designation 270: Queenstown Lakes District Council recreation reserve where the maximum height if 5.5 metres.</p> <p>8.5.1.2 All other locations: A maximum of 8 metres.</p> <p>Note: Refer to Definition for interpretation of building height.</p> <p><u>Where a proposal exceeds building height, discretion is restricted to the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>• Impacts on adjacent properties in respect of privacy, overlooking and views.</u> <u>• Impacts on the wider townscape character.</u> <u>• Access to sunlight and impacts of shading.</u> <u>• Built form and appearance.</u> <p><u>Assessment Matters:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a. The extent to which the infringement adversely affects the amenity values of adjacent properties, relative to a complying proposal, with particular reference to dominance impacts, views and outlook, and sunlight access to adjacent properties.</u> <u>b. The ability to mitigate any adverse effects of additional height through increased separation distances between buildings and adjacent sites, the provision of screening or other methods.</u> <u>c. The extent to which the infringement provides for greater articulation of rooflines and visual interest.</u> 	NC <u>RD</u>
8.5.4	<p>Building Coverage</p> <p>A maximum of 45%.</p> <p><u>Where a proposal exceeds building coverage, discretion is restricted to the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>• Built form, visual dominance and appearance.</u> <u>• Impacts on residential amenity and streetscape character.</u> <u>• Impacts on adjacent properties in respect of views, sunlight and shading.</u> <p><u>Assessment Matters:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a. The extent to which the infringement provides for greater variation in the built form through use of projections and recessed building elements, varied roof lines and materials and colours.</u> <u>b. Whether the balance of open space to buildings will achieve the character anticipated for the zone.</u> 	D <u>RD</u>

	<p>c. The extent to which the topography or landscape mitigates any visual dominance effects, including on adjacent sites and from the street or public space.</p> <p>d. The extent to which the infringement adversely affects the amenity values of adjacent properties, relative to a complying proposal, with particular reference to dominance impacts, views and outlook, and sunlight access.</p>	
8.5.5	<p>Density</p> <p>8.5.5.1 The maximum site density shall be one residential unit or dwelling per 250m² net site area.</p> <p>However, this rule shall not apply where the development can achieve certification to a minimum 6-star level using the New Zealand Green Building Council Homestar™ Tool.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the exceptions applying to developments achieving certification to a minimum 6-star level using the New Zealand Green Building Council Homestar™ Tool shall cease to apply at a date being five years after the date the Medium Density Residential Zone is made operative.</p> <p>8.5.5.2 The minimum site density for the Medium Density Residential zoned land in Frankton adjoining State Highway 6 and in Wanaka adjoining Aubrey Road shall be one residential unit per 400m² net site area.</p> <p>Where a proposal exceeds the density rule, discretion is restricted to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on adjacent properties in respect of residential amenity and neighbourhood character. • Impacts on adjacent properties in respect of outlook, sunlight and privacy. • Built form, visual dominance and appearance. <p>Assessment Matters:</p> <p>a. The extent to which the infringement provides for medium density housing as anticipated by the Zone.</p> <p>b. Whether the development contributes positively to residential amenity and streetscape and neighbourhood character, with buildings that are orientated to the street and avoid facades that are blank or dominated by garages.</p> <p>c. Whether the development provides a high level of residential amenity for occupants, including outlook, sunlight and privacy through site layout and orientation.</p> <p>d. Whether the development connects outdoor spaces to internal living spaces and ensure communal private open space are attractive and usable.</p> <p>e. The ability to mitigate any significant adverse effects of the density infringement through increased separation distances between buildings and adjacent sites, the provision of screening or other methods.</p> <p>f. The extent to which the development is designed to minimise visual bulk through building form, appearance and architectural detailing.</p> <p>g. The extent to which the topography or landscaping mitigates any density effects.</p> <p>h. Whether the design integrates access and parking and appropriately mitigates any significant impacts of these on the streetscape.</p>	NC RD
8.5.6	<p>Recession plane (applicable to flat sites only, and for including accessory buildings on flat and sloping sites).</p> <p>8.5.6.1 Northern Boundary: 2.5m and 55 degrees.</p> <p>8.5.6.2 Western and Eastern Boundaries: 2.5m and 45 degrees.</p> <p>8.5.6.3 Southern Boundaries: 2.5m and 35 degrees.</p> <p>8.5.6.4 Gable end roofs may penetrate the building recession plane by no more than one third of the gable height.</p> <p>8.5.6.5 Recession planes do not apply to site boundaries adjoining a town centre zone, fronting the road, or a park or reserve.</p>	NC RD

	<p>Note - Refer to Definitions for detail of the interpretation of recession planes. <u>Where a proposal exceeds recession planes, discretion is restricted to the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Impacts on adjacent properties in respect of privacy and overlooking.</u> • <u>ACCESS TO sunlight and impacts of shading.</u> • <u>Impacts on adjacent properties in respect to views.</u> • <u>Built dominance and visual appearance.</u> <p><u>Assessment Matters:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>The extent to which the infringement will result in significant adverse effects on the amenity values of adjacent properties, relative to a complying proposal, with particular reference to dominance impacts, views and outlook, and sunlight access.</u> b. <u>The extent to which the infringement provides for greater variation in the built form through use of projections and recessed building elements, varied roof lines and materials and colours.</u> c. <u>The extent to which the topography or landscape mitigates any visual dominance effects.</u> d. <u>The ability to mitigate any adverse effects through increased separation distances between buildings and adjacent sites, the provision of screening or other methods.</u> 	
8.5.7	<p>Landscaped permeable surface</p> <p>At least 25% of site area shall comprise landscaped permeable surface.</p> <p><u>Where a proposal does not provide 25%, discretion is restricted to the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The effects of any reduced landscape provision on the visual appearance or dominance of the site and buildings from adjacent sites and the public realm.</u> • <u>The ability for adequate on-site stormwater disposal.</u> 	NC RD
8.5.8	<p>Minimum Boundary Setback</p> <p>8.5.8.1 Road boundary setback: 3m, <u>except for:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>State Highway boundaries where the setback shall be 4.5m</u> b. <u>Garages which shall be setback 4.5m</u> <p>8.5.8.2 All other boundaries 1.5m <u>except for:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Sites adjoining Designation 270: Queenstown Lakes District Council recreation reserve where the minimum setback shall be 6m.</u> <p>Exceptions to side and rear boundary setbacks (excluding the setback in 8.5.8.2(a)) include:</p> <p>Accessory buildings for residential activities may be located within the setback distances, where they do not exceed 7.5m in length, there are no windows or openings (other than for carports) along any walls within 1.5m of an internal boundary, and comply with rules for Building Height and Recession Plane.</p> <p><u>Where a proposal infringes the boundary setback rules, discretion is restricted to the following:</u></p> <p><u>Impacts on residential amenity and streetscape character.</u></p> <p><u>Impacts on adjacent properties in respect of privacy and sunlight.</u></p> <p><u>Visual dominance of the buildings.</u></p> <p><u>Assessment Matters:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>The extent of any significant adverse effects resulting from the proximity of the development to adjacent sites, streets and spaces, in terms of visual amenity, building dominance, or loss of privacy or sunlight.</u> b. <u>The extent to which the intrusion towards the boundary is necessary to enable the efficient development of the site, including retention of natural features and significant trees.</u> c. <u>The extent to which the topography or landscape design mitigates any reduced setback.</u> 	D RD

8.5.9	<p>Continuous Building Length</p> <p>The continuous length of any building facade above one storey ground floor level shall not exceed 46m-24m.</p> <p>Where a proposal exceeds this length, discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Building dominance</u> • <u>Building design, materials and appearance</u> • The extent to which variation in the form of the building including the use of projections and recessed building elements, varied roof form, and varied materials and textures, reduces the potential dominance of the building. • The extent to which topography or landscaping mitigates any dominance impacts • The extent to which the height of the building influences the dominance of the building in association with the continuous building length. 	RD
-------	--	----

Comment [JR1]: This format outlines the 'matters of discretion', whereas Rule 8.5.7 (Landscape Permeable Surface) includes 'assessment matters' and 8.4.11 (Residential Units) is a mix of the two approaches. This approach is inconsistent and may need rewording.

Julia Chalmers

From: Rosie Hill <rosie.hill@al.nz>
Sent: Friday, 28 October 2016 4:32 PM
To: DP Hearings
Cc: Vanessa Robb
Subject: RE: S0512 Supplementary evidence Matter: 1500702

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear both,

Further to my below email, please note the following explanation may also assist the Commissioners with context for this supplementary evidence. Kindly please pass this on as well.

1. Ms Rennie has prepared revised text and a new policy to enable consideration of a 2-3 storey building scenario in the MDR as follows:
 - a) Zone Purpose 8.1
 - b) Objective 8.2.3
 - c) New policy on height approach
2. We wish to note that Ms Rennie considers that the matters of discretion and assessment matters for height that she has outlined remain appropriate in consideration of a 2-3 storey building proposal.
3. Ms Rennie does recommend that if the Council adopts this approach it should amend Rule 8.5.1 to reflect the following:
 1. Permitted height up to 7m
 2. RDC beyond 7m and up to 11m
 3. NC for beyond 11m
4. Ms Rennie has also made minor refinements to the assessment matters to address the adjacent/adjoining issue (used adjacent given the Act), reference to wider context/townscape where relevant and wording around impacts on views.

Kind regards
Rosie

Rosie Hill
Solicitor

Anderson Lloyd

d +64 3 450 0728 m +64 27 460 0243 f +64 3 450 0799
Level 2, 13 Camp Street, Queenstown 9300, New Zealand
PO Box 201, Queenstown 9348
e rosie.hill@al.nz | www.al.nz

This email is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this email in error then please: do not disclose the contents to anyone; notify the sender by return email; and delete this email from your system.
[Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.](#)

From: Rosie Hill
Sent: Friday, 28 October 2016 4:26 p.m.
To: 'DP Hearings'
Cc: Vanessa Robb
Subject: S0512 Supplementary evidence Matter: 1500702

Dear Morgan and Julia

Following the conclusion of the hearings yesterday, Submitter 0512 was granted leave to file supplementary evidence.

Accordingly please find the attached supplementary evidence of Ms Rennie for the attention of the Commissioners.

Please acknowledge receipt by return email.

Regards
Rosie