

4 February 2022

Central Otago District Council  
Via EMAIL  
Olivia.Stirling@codc.govt.nz

Dear Olivia

### **FURTHER INFORMATION: RESOURCE CONSENT RC210409**

The following information is provided in response to your request for further information dated 18 November 2021 and also details amendments that are proposed to the plans and additional assessment to address the concerns which you have raised relating to density and character.

### **Response to Request for Further Information Points**

In response to Point 1, an Urban Design assessment is attached. This report concludes that *"the proposal will be an appropriate and encouraged development in this location.."* and overall considers that the relationship of the building to the public realm is well considered.

In response to Point 2, Campbell Hills from C. Hughes and Associated has provided the attached response and an amended subdivision scheme plan is also attached.

### **Amendments to the plans**

Since lodgement there have been some amendments to the plans and attached is an updated plan set.

The main changes are as follows:

- Change from a mono-pitched roof design to a gable roof design
- Changes to the location and sizes of openings
- Material changes
- Change to landscape design
- Changes to the site coverage proposed for each dwelling (some increasing and some decreasing)
- Changes to the outdoor living area sizes (some increasing and some decreasing)
- A small reduction to the setbacks from the road boundary from 3.5–4.5m to 3.3–4.3m

The amended proposal has been re-assessed and it is confirmed that the changes do not alter the assessment of effects detailed within the AEE. An updated shading plan is provided within the plan set which still shows that the overshadowing as a result of the proposal is the same, if not less, than that which could occur under a permitted baseline scenario.

The attached Urban Design assessment is based upon the amended plan.

## Affected party approval

Affected party approval from 84 Barry Avenue has been obtained and is attached.

## Permitted Baseline – Additional Assessment

In relation to the concerns which have been raised in relation to the density of the development and the potential adverse effects upon the character of the area, I refer to the attached Urban Design assessment. Furthermore, as set out below, the District Plan allows for many of the potential adverse effects that could be associated with the proposed density as a permitted activity.

The resource consent application as lodged outlined the following permitted baseline scenario for the subject site:

### 8 Permitted Activities

Section 104(2) of the Act states that, in considering the effects on the environment of allowing an activity, a consent authority may disregard an adverse effect if a national environmental standard or the plan permits an activity with that effect.

Under the District Plan, the construction of a residential dwelling and accessory buildings on the site is permitted subject to compliance with the following relevant standards:

- Density of no more than one residential dwelling per 250m<sup>2</sup> site area;
- Minimum front yards of 4.5m;
- One side yard of a minimum of 3m and one of 1.8m;
- Compliance with the height to boundary requirements from the side and rear yards with a maximum overall height of 7.5m. There are exceptions to the height to boundary requirements for gable ends of up to 6m in height.
- Maximum site coverage of 40%; and
- One car park per household unit.

Taking into account the above, the permitted baseline for the subject site is considered to be the construction of up to four residential dwellings which may be of two storey construction.

Subdivision to is a restricted discretionary activity, therefore there is no permitted baseline in this regard. Notwithstanding, the built form can be established without subdivision, therefore it is considered that the subdivision component can feasibly be unbundled from the land use portion of the consent, for which the above permitted baseline is considered to be relevant.

Based upon the initial feedback received in relation to the potential adverse effects associated with the density of the development, the following additional permitted baseline comments are provided, as it is considered that the adverse effects of the density proposed development are very similar to that permitted by the District Plan.

### *Permitted Baseline Scenario*

Based on the site area of 1011m<sup>2</sup>, the permitted density of the subject site is four residential dwellings.

There are no limits on the number of bedrooms that a dwelling can have. Therefore, it is considered feasible that four, 4 – 5 bedroom dwellings could be constructed on the site under the permitted baseline.

It is also possible and feasible that the four dwellings could each be occupied by 8 - 10 persons (based on two couples in each room). This could therefore mean that up to 40 persons could reside on the site. However, it is acknowledged that it is unlikely that the maximum occupancy would occur at any one time and that it is more probable that the number of tenants would be 20-30 if they were rented (50 – 75% occupancy).

The proposed development includes 16 bedrooms and therefore the maximum occupancy is anticipated to be 32 people. As above, it is expected that this maximum occupancy will not occur at one time and that it is more probable that the number of tenants 16 – 24 people.

#### *Traffic Generation, Access and Parking*

As detailed above, the anticipated occupancy of the proposed development vs the permitted baseline is similar if not less. Consequently, it is considered that the traffic generation as a result of the proposal vs the permitted baseline is similar, if not less.

The District Plan only requires one car parking bay on-site per household unit. Therefore, a 4-5 bedroom unit only needs to provide one on-site parking space to comply with the District Plan and the remainder of the vehicles associated with the activity can be located on the street. The proposed development is for two bedroom residential dwellings all of which have one on-site car park each. The proposal is therefore anticipated to result in less demand on on-street car parking than what is allowed for by the District Plan as a permitted activity. This therefore has less potential streetscape, amenity and traffic safety effects also.

A complying development could also result in each of the four residential dwellings having their own independent vehicle crossing on to Barry Avenue or Mayo Place. This would lead to potential adverse effects in terms of pedestrian movement and safety that are greater than for the proposed development which has a shared access arrangement.

#### *Character*

The proposed development is for the construction of residential accommodation which is wholly consistent with the anticipated residential character of the zoning of the site.

The proposed townhouse type residential accommodation is less common within Cromwell than the typical standalone housing. The District Plan does not specify a preference over the construction of standalone dwellings vs townhouses and up to four townhouses could be constructed on the site as a permitted activity. Consequently, the proposed typology is not anticipated to result in any adverse effects compared to the permitted baseline.

#### *Built Form*

The assessment in the AEE of the bulk and scale infringements against the permitted baseline has already been detailed, however the following additional detail is provided in terms of

the overall bulk and scale of development that could be anticipated by the District Plan for the site under the permitted baseline.

There are numerous ways that the subject site could be developed, in terms of built form, under the permitted baseline. Some examples include:

- Four, two storey standalone dwellings
- Four, two storey townhouses
- Four apartments in a two storey building

One scenario which would result in a similar effect upon the Barry Avenue streetscape to the proposed development is the construction of four, two storey townhouses (for example, combine each two of the proposed townhouse designs into one townhouse). This, subject to some small design changes, would result in a very similar bulk and scale to the proposal.

Alternatively, four large two storey standalone dwellings could be constructed across the site which are separated from each other via a 3.6m distance. The streetscape effect of these buildings could be very similar to that which is proposed in terms of height and dominance.

## **Other Relevant Matters**

In addition to the matters assessed within the AEE, the following additional points are raised in response to the concerns raised about density and potential adverse effects on character.

### *Character*

Although the density of the proposal is greater than that which currently exists within the surrounding area, the site is located on a busy Urban Arterial Road within walking distance from both the town centre and the 'Old Cromwell' heritage precinct.

The Cromwell Masterplan has signalled a future change to increase the density of the site and other properties along Barry Avenue and therefore a change to the character of that road corridor.

Until recently the subject site was utilised for a garden centre which was open to the public. It consequently did not have a residential character. The residential nature of the proposal is considered to result in an improvement to the residential character and cohesion of the area compared to this prior use.

### *Traffic Movements*

Given the location of the subject site in relation to the Cromwell town centre, 'Old Cromwell' heritage precinct and schooling, occupants of the development will be able to easily walk and cycle to many of the locations that they need to go. It is considered that the location of the site supports the density in this regard.

The subject site was previously utilised as a garden centre. It is anticipated that the proposed development will result in less traffic movements to and from the site than this previous use.

*Housing Choice and Diversity*

Cromwell has an aging population and also single occupant households are becoming more prevalent. There is also a reported demand for smaller housing for affordability reasons. At the moment, there is limited availability of smaller housing stock with the housing stock being typically 3-4 bedroom standalone houses. The proposed development will provide additional housing choice and diversity which is a positive effect of the proposal.

Yours Sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "A. Leith", is placed over a light blue rectangular background.

Amanda Leith