

## Lynley Scott

---

**From:** Brett Giddens <brett@townplanning.co.nz>  
**Sent:** Friday, 17 November 2023 4:33 PM  
**To:** DP Hearings  
**Subject:** Questions for Experts | Te Pūtahi Ladies Miles | On behalf of Corona Trust (Submitter #99) (3028-23)

Afternoon Lynley,

Corona Trust requests the Panel consider the following questions of the witnesses noted below.

**Michael Lowe** (Council Urban Designer)

1. Please explain how limiting the lot width in Sub Area H2 to a minimum of “20-25m” will “help reduce the potential overlooking on the Corona Trust land”? [ref: paragraph 58 (c) of rebuttal].
2. Given there are only four building sites consented on this terrace, have you calculated the number of allotments that would result from your suggested minimum lot width rule and compared that number against the four building sites to ascertain whether your suggestion is appropriate given your recommendation at your paragraph [64] that “the provisions controlling the built form outcomes on the H2 sub-area condition adjoining Corona Trust should be amended to be generally in keeping with the existing Koko Ridge Consent”?
3. In light of your answer above, do you agree that a building setback coupled with the height limit of 5.5m would be the best method to reduce the potential for overlooking and is a key issue for the Panel’s consideration?
4. Please clarify what rule(s) prevent the southern boundary of Sub Area H2 from being demarcated by a 2m high fence for each residential property, each of differing colours and materials? Is this an appropriate landscape outcome along the terrace edge? Do you consider that there is merit in having a landscape buffer within the setback within Sub Area H2 along the southern boundary?
5. Rule 49.5.6 (minimum building setbacks) allows “accessory buildings” within the setbacks (including the southern boundary). An accessory building includes a garage or sleep out. Do you consider that garage or sleep outs along the boundary and terrace with 53 Maxs Way is an appropriate outcome? If not do you agree that the appropriate response is to remove the exception allowing accessory buildings relating to Sub Area H2?
6. Bearing in mind you have recommended a minimum allotment width of 20-25m, do you consider around 14 residential buildings at 5.5m height, 16m in length (Rule 49.5.7) and 4m from the southern boundary an appropriate outcome from an urban design perspective?

**Steve Skelton** (Council Landscape Architect – from paragraph 20 of his rebuttal)

7. With regard to Sub Area H2 of the Lower Density Residential Precinct, please explain the effects arising from 14 residential buildings 5.5m high located along the southern boundary of the zone applying the following setbacks from the cadastral boundary:
  - a. 2m
  - b. 4m
  - c. 10m
  - d. 20m

(Ref: Paragraph 29)

8. In light of your answers to the question above, please comment on this in consideration of Policy 49.2.7.8.

9. Please explain from a landscape perspective why you consider there is no need to have a landscape buffer (of any width) between the Sub Area H2 and the lower terrace on Maxs Way?
10. Did you take into account the that the escarpment location and form to the south of Sub Area H2 has been recently modified by earthworks (note: this can be seen on Google Earth)? In light of this and the position of Mr Jeff Brown (who supports a setback from the cadastral boundary), do you consider that it is most certain to apply a setback from the cadastral boundary?
11. For residential buildings in Sub Area H2 that are established 4m from the southern boundary at 5.5m in height, please explain:
  - a. how the effects of “significant glare” would be managed taking into account the rule framework? (ref: Policy 49.2.7.4)
  - b. how the visual effects of storage and car parking along the southern boundary would be managed in the rule framework? (ref: Policy 49.2.7.5)

**Jeff Brown** (Council Planner – general comments, and from paragraph 110 of rebuttal and more specifically from paragraph 118)

12. Given the requests to extend the zone and increase densities in some precincts, is the notified 2,400 household figure referred to throughout the Variation and supporting evidence of the Council an ‘upper limit’ or should be it expected that the end figure could be higher?
13. If it is expected that the figure above is to be higher than 2,400, how does this correlate with the policy that directs that residential densities in each precinct are to be “achieved” (e.g. Policy 49.2.2.1)?
14. With regard to the Low Density Residential Precinct, Sub Area H2, how does increasing the density from 450m<sup>2</sup> to 300m<sup>2</sup> (60 to 108 units) align with the need to manage the total number of residential units to avoid effects on SH6 under Policy 49.2.2.4? Are there adverse cumulative effects arising from this increase in light of the other requests for additional density?
15. In the context of your recommendation to increase the density of development in Sub Area H2 of the Low Density Residential Precinct from 60 to 108 (paragraph 114), how does this additional development impact the properties on Maxs Way from a built form? Have you considered the additional effects arising from residential flats being permitted and accessory buildings being located within the setback?
16. In the context of Policy 49.2.7.8, how does 14 residential dwellings, 5.5m in height, 16m in width, 4m setback from the southern boundary of the zone with all windows and outdoor spaces facing the Remarkables *maintain* the amenity values enjoyed by users of the neighbouring properties on the lower terrace on Maxs Way, with particular consideration of privacy and dominance?
17. With regard to Sub Area H2, further explain how in your opinion the effects of four dwellings 5.5m high setback 4m compare to the effects of 14 dwellings of the same setback and height in the context of Policy 49.2.7.8, and how this infill does not result in “poor and unanticipated urban design outcomes and adverse effects on landowners on the lower terrace at Maxs Way” as set out in your paragraph 124.

Many thanks,

Brett



**Brett Giddens – Director**

Cell: 021 365 513 | Email: [brett@townplanning.co.nz](mailto:brett@townplanning.co.nz)

Town Planning Group | [www.townplanning.co.nz](http://www.townplanning.co.nz)

Offices in Queenstown, Wānaka, Christchurch & Auckland

