

GF11 – Hearing Report (Submission for 195 Wakari Road) - 22 August 2022

Variation 2 – Additional Housing Capacity – GF11 (Rezoning Polwarth Road and Wakari Road)

Submitter: Kidston Family – Owners of 195 Wakari Road, Wakari, Dunedin

I'd like to summarise a few points within our original submission and further submission, as well as touch on a few concerns we have with the 42a Report. The majority of objections against GF11 and our site have already been addressed through council evidence, the 42a report, and also likely at future subdivision hearings.

Within Mr Sycamores expert evidence, we are presented with a proposed entrance layout to the site and a subdivision plan. I would also like to present them for discussion, even though these pieces of information will be dealt with through a subdivision hearing stage; I believe they provide significant weight in terms of discussions at a zonal hearing level.

Variation 2 is a change to the proposed District Plan (2GP) which includes a number of changes to enable additional housing capacity through specific rule and policy changes and through rezoning specific sites, of which we are current land owners within GF11.

Our family (Kidston and Bretherton), have strong links and historic ties to the area, and continue to do so with family members still residing there. Alongside 150 years and six generations of residing in the Wakari area, we have also been involved in developing and owning local businesses, considerable investments in property and housing, and were all raised and schooled in the area from kindergarten through to primary school.

From the 1940s to the 1980s the Bretherton family owned and redeveloped the shopping centre at the corner of Helensburgh and Taieri Roads, where the family operated the fruit and vegetable store, the grocer's shop, and the hairdressing salon. On the opposite corner my parents John & Mary Kidston re-developed the old substation site through the late 80's and early 90's, where the construction of six townhouses and a block of eight apartments remains an attractive quality development, 30 years on.

We believe rezoning this land into a quality General Residential 1 area will provide a unique opportunity for others to live in an area we know to be to be one of the best environments Dunedin has to offer. We would enjoy the opportunity to provide an affordable lifestyle to a diverse range of homeowners. The sites would be an attractive proposition, with close proximity to schools, shops, and the city centre, access to multiple existing recreational biking and walking tracks, and a boost in numbers for the local golf course, bowls clubs, tennis club, cricket and rugby clubs, all of which our family have been members of over the years.

With the current housing shortfall in Dunedin and an aging housing stock, rezoning the land will not only provide an additional housing solution but also provide the community with the land to construct warmer, dryer, healthier homes, in an established residential area close to the heart of the

central city.

The land itself is 5.9 hectares of gentle sloping topography in natural tiers which gives the ability to develop the land efficiently, with the density as per council plan and requirements. The site receives a good amount of sunshine, is generally easterly facing and is well located in close proximity to various schooling options from kindergarten through to primary, intermediate and secondary schools. Its location is close to public transport (bus stop / bus route) and provides various routes into the city via arterial roads such as Taieri and Balmacewen Roads. Easy access to the recreational areas of Wakari bike park, Ross Creek Reserve, the Pineapple track and Flagstaff, all of which would be of physical benefit to families and an invitation to an active lifestyle.

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION

In our original submission to the council, we were in full support of the rezoning with a couple of amendments in particular relation to our site at 195 Wakari Road.

The first was S103.001 that the General Residential 1 zoning should be extended to the top of the site boundary of 195 Wakari Road (in particular parcel - Lot 2 DP 12686). The SNL boundary line provided a portion of 2,130m² of void land (unable to be developed) at the top of the site. This was referred to in the 42a Report that this minor amendment is unlikely to have anymore than minor additional effects on the landscape values associated with the SNL and that the extension be accepted.

The second, was the removal of the historical set back encumbrance at the residential boundary along the eastern boundary of the site (closest to Wakari Road). This encumbrance is over 5,000m² in area. Both of these amendments the inclusion of the top of the site and the removal of the encumbrance would provide the most efficient and effective use of the land in its entirety. Other reasons for the removal of the encumbrance were to ensure vehicle access to the site, and concerns around if the council would guarantee the ongoing maintenance and responsibility of this encumbrance site.

The majority of existing home owners in the area, are in general support of the need to meet ongoing, and future demand of the housing and residential development within the Dunedin City.

However, the unique location of our site within the GF11 zone (bordering a number of residential properties), has generally meant that of submissions in opposition on the proposed changes, many focus on development of our site at 195 Wakari Road in particular.

Council has shown that there is limited risk in many areas of the expert evidence, and Mr Sycamore has provided expert and technical advice on our behalf, in terms of other aspects that have been raised by submitters and the council in regards to 195 Wakari Road.

FURTHER SUBMISSION

In terms of our further submission, we responded to the submitters, concerns and objections

received in regards to GF11 and also in particular those who object to the development of our site, most notably properties and parties who neighbour the site at 195 Wakari Road.

Following is an outline of concerns and key points made in the (first round) submissions that were received by the Dunedin City Council from the existing home owners as well as points raised within the 42a Report.

Points that myself and family as the property owners of 195 Wakari Road, have addressed, would like to address, or open up further discussion with these property owners and the council:

The Encumbrance

In our initial submission we were wanting this encumbrance revoked, as we believe that would present the most effective and efficient use of the land. However, the majority of the neighbouring homeowners would like this encumbrance to stay and be planted out providing lesser impact on the existing owners views, privacy, and maintain their sunlight hours. The council has also recommended that this encumbrance could be used to link walkways and cycleways and be maintained as a social and recreation area.

It must also be noted that the current neighbouring ROW already provides a 6-metre buffer zone for the majority of the homes who have objected to the encumbrance being removed. So with the 6 metres plus a 20 metre encumbrance plus additional building setbacks, then the likely distance between houses would be upwards of 30 metres which will create privacy both ways (from the existing houses into the subdivision and from the new properties looking externally to the existing homes).

After taking on the concerns of the submitters, and landscape evidence from the councils in terms of ideas utilise part of this space for creating stormwater detention areas, which could also function as green amenity spaces along with tree planting. We would like to encourage further discussions on the aspects of this design with all parties involved (neighbours and council), to see if we can come to an amicable solution.

We have reconsidered our stance on the encumbrance and have retained it in our subdivision concept plan.

The Neighbouring ROW and site access

The current encumbrance takes into account the entrance to the proposed site (in between 191 Wakari Road and the Bain Neighbourhood Reserve), which has also been noted in the transport evidence.

There were concerns raised by submitters about access way (ROW) serving 161 to 191 Wakari Road.

Within the Transport evidence, access through 195 Wakari Road is considered beneficial from a strategic connectivity perspective but could be problematic to achieve due to the constrained width

of the leg-in and location of existing driveways immediately adjacent. A road access in this location is therefore likely to require the cooperation of neighbouring property owners.

This would allow the existing driveways to be absorbed into the new road width which would remove the conflict points next to the new intersection and also create a wider road corridor. This would be of benefit to those existing driveway (ROW) users because it will remove a portion of privately maintained access, therefore reducing their annual maintenance costs. DCC Transport would encourage consultation with these property owners in order to allow for a better result for the new and existing transport network.

We have had Terramark produce an entrance plan design providing a solution for both the council and neighbouring properties. Rather than the current restrictions imposed by the width of the right of way, we would like established a formed entrance way to the site and would like the opportunity to further discuss these options and improvements for the benefit of the existing homeowners and council.

As we have a number of residential properties along our eastern boundary and either side of our proposed access way currently, Wakari Road at that point is already relatively wide with kerb and channelling already in place along with footpaths and council connections. The formation standard of Wakari Road changes significantly further along at 205 Wakari Road, meaning considerable upgrades will be required as you head along Wakari Road and away from our site.

Section Sizes and Design Controls

In terms of the objections relating to section sizes and design controls that were raised, these would be further addressed during the subdivision hearing process, however it currently has impacts on the zonal process so are relevant to this hearing and decisions for our site. As we believe one zone across the site (General Residential 1) would be a considerably better use of this site rather than the mix zoning as recommended in the findings within the 42a Report.

A number of parties expressed that the minimum section sizes of 400m² would be detrimental to the rural nature of the area. We believe that being able to deliver a varying range of sections sizes from the minimum of 400m² will not only provide for a more diverse neighbourhood but allow more options for a larger range of owners from young families, first home buyers and retirees looking to downsize. The varying sizes in density will provide the most effective and efficient use of the land for the development of new homes.

The recommendation within the 42a is for mixed zoning across our site with the majority General Residential 1 zoning and then Large Lot Residential 1 zoning at highest point where it borders rural land and the SNL. The area identified at the top of the site is around 7,500m² in area, and when combined with the encumbrance of over 5,000m² it sets aside a significant amount of land to not be developed in the most effective and efficient way within the site.

As per our subdivision concept plan we would look to have larger sections at the top boundary of the site, which boundaries neighbouring rural zone land and the SNL. This will assist in the transition

from residential to rural interface and mixed with design controls will lessen the impact yet ensuring the site is used in the most efficient and effective way to deliver a better outcome for the city.

The 42a report states that 2GP does not manage urban design in residential zones and would not consider it appropriate to make an exception for GF11. There are other localities across the city where a precedence has already been set in terms of SNL directly bordering a residential area, without any additional design controls in place (Ravensbourne, Broadbay and Macandrew Bay), a site map of Ravensbourne shows the SNL line being lifted just to incorporate further residential sized sites so this situation is not unique to this situation.

Our belief is that this site is better utilised with one zone (General Residential 1) across the whole site of 195 Wakari Road) with design controls in place (which will be implemented across the whole site through the subdivision and planning phase).

We would look to include design controls addressing:

- Setbacks
- Build heights
- Landscaping including Planting and Fencing Covenants
- Building materials
- External colours and reflectivity

We would like to envisage a subdivision that would use natural colours and materials to blend into the surrounding environment, and lessen the visual impact for the existing homes and visitors to the area, and to assist in the transition from residential to rural and blend into the surrounding environment.

This would also assist in regards to the directives of The National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity for greater intensification in areas of high demand. Especially given the sites location to the cities CBD.

Also in regard to this, Policy 2.2.4.1 requires that land is generally zoned at a standard or medium residential density unless particular factors make this inappropriate.

In relation to this policy, and The National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity, we believe with the topography of the site, along with precedence already set elsewhere in terms of how residential sized sections transition into SNL without any further design controls in place, present any factors which are appropriate, for the need to transition from General Residential 1 to SNL via a Large Lot Residential 1 Zone, especially when the land it is transitioning into is initially privately owned rural paddocks rather than directly into native vegetation SNL (as in some of the previous forementioned areas that have set precedence).

We would like to think that the council would be wanting to ensure the site is used to maximum potential to alleviate the issue of housing shortfall in the city. Especially given that our concept subdivision plan (61 sections) at 195 Wakari Road would in fact deliver more available sections to

the city, than the whole area of other Greenfields sites.

Only the Greenfields sites:

GF5 (49-70 sections) in Fairfield,
GF6 (32-72 sections) in Green Island
GF16 (39-93 sections) in Portobello

Would offer something similar in terms of estimated feasible capacity for the city, and that is just in regards to our site, let alone the whole of GF11.

Then you would also need to weigh up the distance these other sites are located from the CBD, and the benefits of such a development of GF11 in regards to the low carbon vehicle emissions generated by living so close to the CBD, which GF11 is relatively low compared to other sites.

The overall GF11 area (23.3Ha) is one of the largest Greenfields sites identified with the estimated feasible capacity of 240 - 308 dwellings under General Residential 1 zoning, and with its easy access to the CBD I would think that it should be the most logical in terms of council investment.

In many of these cases the 42a Report states that further investigation is required to determine costs associated with the upgrades and infrastructure, and where the development of GF11 along with the position of Wakari Road in the 2GP's Road Classification would sit within the council's hierarchy of Greenfield sites to be developed.

In terms of 3 waters the 42a report considers GF11 as low priority due to the fact of the multitude of property owners across the site. The 3 Waters report states that, currently the provision of foul sewer is programmed within DCC's 2021-31 10 Year Plan. However, timing will be dependent on:

1. DCC's priority for providing a foul sewer network connection to GF11 compared to other rezoned sites that need 3 Waters network connections.
2. The developer's timeframes for development of GF11. DCC does not want to prioritise provision of 3 Waters network connections for this site if developers have no plans to develop the site for many years.

The council is already aware of one property owner in GF11 at 265 Wakari Road not being interested in developing their site.

Surely any associated costs in terms of roading, infrastructure and network connections, would need to be balanced with the significant development potential of the GF11 site, in a location reasonably close to town with no issues related to hazards, loss of significant natural landscapes or indigenous biodiversity.

We are all for a well-designed, collective, and holistic approach in terms of the development of the overall GF11 site. But feel and believe this all or nothing approach in terms of getting a full

agreeance by the multitude of property owners, in terms development and infrastructure along with the introduction of an RTZ overlay for the entire GF11 would potentially hinder any development in that area for a significant number of years which would go against the narrative in which the variations and identification of Greenfields sites for the 2GP has been introduced.

As each property owner will be operating to a different timeline and will be dependent on the desire and willingness of other parties in order to have RTZ lifted so that development can be realised (this is of concern when we see the limited amount of property owners within GF11 who are willing to present at the hearing).

Having lived in the Wakari Helensburgh area for over 150 years I believe our family are very well equipped to comment in terms of how the rezoning of GF11 would be a positive addition to the cityscape of Dunedin.

In closing I would like to reiterate our support of the council initiative in rezoning the land at 195 Wakari Road as part of GF11. We would look to progress with the development in a swift manner, opening communication lines to existing neighbours, and work alongside the council in terms of the density as per requirements, to create the most effective and efficient use of the land to help provide the city a solution to its current and future housing demand.

We would continue to engage with experienced expert professionals to deliver a strategically planned subdivision, which would encourage good urban design and ensure enough opportunities for the development of new homes. We would be looking to provide a smart development and a quality product, with differing price points to encourage a diverse community, offering an affordable option for families and homeowners, where young and old can enjoy living together as a community close to the city centre.

We are making this submission in full support of the council's variation for greenfield rezoning the land at 195 Wakari Road to General Residential 1 with the amendments as outlined by ourselves in this document along with the expert evidence that has been provided in relation to our site by Mr Darryl Sycamore from Terramark.