

Memorandum

TO: Melissa Shipman; Planner

FROM: Peter Christos; Urban Designer

DATE: 04 December 2018

SUBJECT: **LUC-2018 – LUC- 357; 46 District Road**

Hi Melissa,

With regard to the above application and the likely effects on streetscape and amenity values. The above application relates to a proposed subdivision of a 4.9ha site within a rural zone. The subdivision would create two sites with houses on each. The property adjoins an R1 zone to the north and the coast-line (Roseneath and Blanket Bay) to the south and east. The site is proposed to be re-zoned as Rural Residential under the second-generation plan (2GP). Both the existing and proposed sites would be assessed as non-complying under the current plan because of yard set-backs and site size breaches.

The applicant has put forward that the current site is not suitable for rural activity because, amongst other reasons, it is physically constrained by the coast line and is too small. Upon a site visit, it was clear that the site is somewhat unique in terms of constraint and also in terms of not having a typical rural character.

The existing house overlooks the harbour with sweeping views to the north/east and south. The proposed new platform would be elevated above the existing house by about 5m with similar coastal views available. The proposed development is unlikely to alter the outlook of the existing house on site.

There is currently an unsealed access road to the existing property and this will provide access to the proposed new building aswell. There would be no visual changes to this road at the street and no significant earthworks required to provide access to the new site.

The applicant has confirmed that there will be no additional sheds, utility buildings or water tanks visible on site. No vegetation, of note, will be removed and no significant earthworks or retaining will be required to establish a new dwelling. The applicant has engaged a registered landscape architect to produce a planting plan which clearly shows views into the sites will be screened/partially screened by regularly spaced medium sized tree along the southern edge of the properties.

There are existing tall trees along the northern boundary of the property which provide good screening between the subject site and the back yards of housing along District Road. Further to this, there is a separation distance of about 190m between the existing house and its closest neighbouring property and about 130m between the proposed platform and housing along the southern edge of District road. District Road housing is generally about 10-15 m elevated above the proposed site while the subject site is about 40m above the coast line.

Other views into the site are from the Dunedin to Port Chalmers Road (SH88) and Blanket Bay Road and properties adjoining these roads. The existing house can be seen from SH88 but from distances more than 500m. While the house forms part of the skyline, however it is not visually dominant from the state highway. The proposed house is also likely to be visible from SH88 however, as it would be located further to the west, it would have the benefit of the existing tall trees providing a backdrop and the current skyline is unlikely to change further while these trees are in place.

I my view the proposed subdivision would not significantly alter the amenity of neighbouring properties or significantly alter the natural character of the site and surrounds. Because of this, I believe negative effects on streetscape and amenity values would be less than minor.

I note that a condition protecting screening along the northern boundary, between 46 District Road and existing R1 properties on District Road, should be considered to preserve the amenity values of existing residents.

Peter Christos,
URBAN DESIGNER

Lianne Darby

From: Peter Christos
Sent: Thursday, 6 December 2018 11:48 a.m.
To: Melissa Shipman
Subject: RE: LUC 2018 -357 46 District Road.docx

As in building design? My view is that it would be adequately screened to avoid effects. I don't see the need to impose architectural constraintsperhaps other than conditions relating to colour and reflection of the eventual building. Can we do that when no building design has been offered?

From: Melissa Shipman
Sent: Thursday, 6 December 2018 11:43 a.m.
To: Peter Christos <Peter.Christos@dcc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: LUC 2018 -357 46 District Road.docx

Hi Peter, thanks for the comments. I just wanted to confirm the following: Due to the non-typical rural character of the site, you don't consider any particular design parameters to be necessary?

Melissa Shipman

From: Peter Christos
Sent: Tuesday, 4 December 2018 3:59 p.m.
To: Melissa Shipman
Subject: LUC 2018 -357 46 District Road.docx

ta