

29 October 2024

Kirstyn Royce
Southern Planning Solutions Limited

Email: kirstyn@planningsouth.nz

Dear Kirstyn,

Subject: RM240141 3 Andrew Don Drive – RFI Response

Following your request for further information (RFI), this letter responds to the RFI.

Point 1 - Cumulative effects

RFI: *The application references a number of visitor accommodation activities within the immediate vicinity of the subject site. However, the assessment of cumulative effects does not refer to these. Could you please revisit the assessment of cumulative effects with specific reference to the existing visitor accommodation in the area.*

Response: The cumulative effects from the proposed visitor accommodation activities in conjunction with the other nearby visitor accommodation activities will be less than minor given that there are at least 11 undeveloped and vacant sections within the surrounding block east of Andrew Don Drive that are permitted to accommodate six guests (or 66 guests in total), but currently do not. Therefore, there is capacity within the surrounding environment to accommodate 12 guests on the site without resulting in unacceptable cumulative effects.

In addition, the site is a rear property, tucked in behind an existing residential unit. Only one of the three units is proposed to be used to accommodate guests, with the VA unit and guest activities largely blocked from the western and southern neighbours by the impeding primary residential unit and the minor residential unit. Additionally, landscaping is proposed along the site's internal boundaries. These aspects reduce the on-site guest activities being seen at the same time as any nearby guest activities. Any on-site guest movement will be seen ancillary to the on-site resident activities, noting that the site will primarily accommodate workers and long-term tenants, opposed to the opposite.

Point 2 – Urban design assessment

RFI: *Given the breaches of the impervious surfacing standard and the breaches of the Tekapo Precinct provisions and Design Guide relating to the length of the VA unit's eastern and western façades, roof design, and materials, please provide an urban design assessment of the proposal prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person.*

Response: Please find attached as **Appendix 1** an urban design assessment as requested. That assessment considers “the proposal to be appropriate to its context, modest in scale and form, and of a design that aligns with the outcomes sought in the Design Guide”.

Point 3 – Impervious site coverage

RFI: *The application states that the impervious site coverage is 55.9% but the plans identify this as 60.8%. Please confirm which figure should be relied upon.*

Response: The impervious site coverage is 60.8%.

Point 4 – Height in relation to boundaries

RFI: *Please update the elevations to show compliance with the height in relation to boundary and maximum height standards.*

Response: Please find attached as **Appendix 2** the architectural plans revised to illustrate the height in relation to the site's boundaries. Those plans illustrate that the VA unit will intrude the northern recession plane by 0.377m vertically for a 0.85m width, and the gutter on the western elevation of the main residential unit will intrude the western recession plane by 0.12m vertically for its 12.3m width. These two intrusions require resource consent for a restricted discretionary under the Mackenzie District Plan pursuant to LRZ-S3.

The matters of discretion listed in RES-MD2 relate to:

- Adverse effects resulting from the bulk and dominance of built form.
- Effects on visual amenity values, privacy, outlook, sunlight and daylight access and use of outdoor living space for neighbouring properties.
- The adequacy of any mitigation measures.

The proposed northern gable end of the VA unit intruding the northern recession plane may cause some overshadowing in the northern reserve. The adverse effects on persons traversing the reserve will be less than minor. This is because the VA unit is setback 4.2m from the reserve, the roof projecting above the recession plane is pitched with the intrusion being small in scale with these aspects reducing the appearance of bulk. Also, these people are transient so it is not their outdoor living space that will be affected.

That same intrusion may possibly cause effect 11 Rodman Lane. However, the adverse effects will be less than minor given that the intrusion is occurring at the northern boundary, rather than the boundary shared between the site and 11 Rodman Lane. Also, that the intrusion is small in scale, and the VA unit is setback 2m from 11 Rodman Lane. 11 Rodman Lane also appears to be undeveloped and vacant so there is no outdoor living space affected. However, if and when 11 Rodman Lane is developed, the property is suitably shaped and sized to enable the future occupants to access adequate daylight and sunlight. There are no windows or doors on the elevation intruding the recession plane meaning that the future occupants of 11 Rodman Lane will continue to be able to access privacy and not be overlooked.

The proposed spouting of the main residential unit intruding the western recession plane may cause some overshadowing in the backyard of 5 Andrew Don Drive. However, the adverse effects will be less than minor given the discrete intrusion, the effects being limited to along the eastern boundary of 5 Andrew Don Drive, and that 5 Andrew Don Drive will continue to have sufficient access to sunlight and daylight within their backyard, noting that their outdoor deck is located at the north-west of the unit away from the site. The spouting will not impact the occupants of 5 Andrew Don Drive ability to access privacy given that no windows or doors intrude the recession plane. Also, the spouting will blend into the primary roof, which complies with the recession planes, when seen from 5 Andrew Don Drive opposed to being a dominant visual element.

Overall, the adverse effects of the recession plane intrusions on the surrounding environment will be **less than minor** and acceptable.

Point 5 – Affected parties

RFI: *As signalled previously, the affected party approvals of all adjacent neighbours is likely to be required at the time that a decision under section 95 A-F is prepared. That assessment cannot be undertaken until the information above is provided but this provides an opportunity for the applicant to approach the neighbours in the interim should they choose. Parties to be considered will be at least:*

- 5 Andrew Don Drive
- 7 Andrew Don Drive
- 9 Rodman Lane
- 11 Rodman Lane

Response: 7 Andrew Don Drive and 11 Rodman Lane appear to be undeveloped sections with no persons residing on those properties. Therefore, the proposal will not adversely affect any persons associated with 7 and 11 Andrew Don Drive.

5 Andrew Don Drive and 9 Rodman Lane are developed with residential units.

The applicant has not had any success in contacting the owner and occupier of 5 Andrew Don Drive, even with the assistance of the applicant's solicitor.

The applicant has been in contact with the owner of 9 Rodman Lane, and the owner advised by email (dated 8 October 2024) that they have no concerns with the proposal based on the documentation provided to them (refer to **Appendix 3**). The architectural plans provided to this owner would not have illustrated the grey colouring of the VA unit, but it should have indicated the VA unit's recession plane non-compliance (revision dated 27 September 2024). The applicant has since followed up with the owner (email dated 9 October 2024) to get the written approval form completed; no response has been received yet.

Regardless, given the conclusions of the urban design assessment, and the conditions of consent volunteered (as detailed in section 3 of the application), any adverse effects of the proposal on the owners and occupiers of 5 and 7 Andrew Don Drive and 9 and 11 Rodman Lane are considered to be less than minor.

Yours sincerely

PLANZ CONSULTANTS LTD

Terri Winder

Consultant Planner

Phone: 021 225 9323

Email: terri@planzconsultants.co.nz