

SUBMISSION TO HEARING STREAM 6 - RESIDENTIAL ZONES

SUMMARY

My submission primarily relates to the proposed new Large Lot Residential Zone. I believe that the rule for minimum lot size in the new zone should be 2000 m², and that proposed LLR areas inside Wanaka's Urban Growth Boundary that may require special protection, as identified in the Section 42A report, should remain in, or be re-zoned to, the Rural Residential zone (perhaps with some relaxing of design controls that otherwise apply to that zone).

I regret that I have not had time to go through the reports and evidence for the Medium Density and High Density zones; however I have looked through the revised chapters and nothing stands out as needing my comments.

SUBMISSION

Wanaka's situation is different from Queenstown's in terms of the amount of Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zoned land within the Urban Growth Boundary; the LLR zone appears to have been devised to deal with this situation. While the new zone relates only to Wanaka at this District Plan review, care needs to be taken with developing appropriate rules so that the zone has some real meaning and can be applied at future plan reviews. Reproducing the minimum lot size of another zone seems contrary to the goal of differentiation between town and country.

Range of Zone Parameters - Density, Coverage and Setbacks

HDR	MDR	LDR	LLR	RR	RL	R
3 RUs per site	250 m ²	450 m ² or 300 m ²	A-4000 m ² B-2000 m ²	4000 m ²	10000 m ²	no rule for lot size
70%	45%	40%	15%	15%	no rule	no rule
2 m	1.5 m	2 m	A-6 m B-4 m	6 m	10 m	

The range of zones is to provide for choice in lifestyle options and to ensure differentiation of urban and surrounding rural areas, as part of the goal of sustainable management of the land resource for current and future generations. The newly created Large Lot Residential zone, however, seems out of step in terms of the big jump in lot size from Low Density Residential and in reproducing the existing lot size of Rural Residential areas. I consider this minimum lot size to be wasteful of the land resource within the Urban Growth Boundary. Relatively large lots also means fewer ratepayers and therefore relatively higher costs in providing and servicing infrastructure. A more dense peri-urban zone would be a buffer between low density and rural living areas; with a 2000 m² minimum lot size, density would still be half that of the old 'quarter-acre' sections of the 1960s. As said in my submission, with 15% coverage giving a maximum 300 m² house on a 2000 m² LLR section, there still remains 1700 m² for garden, both vegetation and open space, retaining a high visual amenity in the new zone.

Looking at the areas that were identified in the Section 42A report as better served by a 4000 m² minimum lot size:

- Beacon Point Road - although the form of the suburb is currently predominantly 4000 m² and larger sections, it seems reasonable to allow the higher density in this area. Since the existing setbacks are 6 m and new setbacks for the smaller 2000 m² LLR sections are 4 m, there would still be a good separation between dwellings and, as above, still an extensively green and open character.
- Remainder of Aubrey Road - the Outstanding Natural Feature of Mount Iron does need protection. I suggest that this area, currently zoned RR, remains in that zone. Over time, as the existing larger sites which run up to the flank of Mount Iron are subdivided, it may be possible in a future District Plan review to draw a new zone boundary with lower-lying (less sensitive) properties moving to LLR.
- Albert Town - I agree that the area around Matheson Crescent and Grierson Lane can be at the higher density, but consider that the remainder of the terrace above Albert Town could also accommodate the same density. While adjoining Mount Iron, this whole area is very flat and so any increased density would have minimal effect on views of the mountain. Controls on clearing of the indigenous vegetation could be included in the rules.
- Studholme Road - it may be better to have the larger lot size in this area, but the single property should be re-zoned to RR (which already provides for this lot size) along with relaxed controls on buildings as below.
- Far Horizon and Wanaka-Mount Aspiring Road - the Far Horizon subdivision has been designed with almost uniform lot sizes and could well be said to provide for another choice in lifestyle (that of a gated community). While I dislike the idea of gated communities as a general rule, and would not want to see more of these, this particular one seems to be a *fait accompli*, and perhaps can be left as is and retain the current RR zoning. Further along Mount Aspiring Road, an argument could be made that the area is not near any LDR zone and so on the outskirts of the town, but in fact it is no further from the town centre than Beacon Point. I have no preference for the zoning of this area, other than that it should be RR if the appropriate minimum lot size is decided to be 4000 m².

If the areas above are not considered by the Commissioners to be suitable for the increased density of the 2000 m² LLR, I suggest they belong in the Rural Residential zone. Since the rules for the Rural Residential zone are more prescriptive than is suitable for areas within the UGB, there would need to be some relaxing of these rules for areas within the UGB (in the same way that special rules are outlined for Lake Hayes, Bob's Cove, Ferry Hill etc).

IN CONCLUSION

The new Large Lot Residential zone needs to have some real meaning as a zone. The LLR-A and LLR-B division confuses the zone purpose, which is to provide a transitional area between higher urban and lower rural densities. Areas that are unsuitable for a density of 5 dwellings per hectare should be zoned Rural Residential, with relaxed control on buildings if the property is located within the Urban Growth Boundary.

NIC BLENNERHASSETT

94 Studholme Road South
P O Box 215, Wanaka 9343
nickblen@kinect.co.nz

7 OCT 2016

03 443 6128
021 709 419

RULES AFFECTED

- 11.1 Not 4000 m²
- 11.2.11 Maintaining character of established areas may not be appropriate
- 11.2.1.2 No need for this if 2000 m² throughout zone
- 11.5.3 Just 4 m setback throughout, not area A and B
- 11.5.9 Just 2000 m² throughout, not area A and B
- 11.5.10 No need for extra rule for Mt Iron if these sites remain in RR
- 11.5.11 This rule can apply throughout if 2000 m² minimum lot size
- 11.6 There are no controlled activities for this rule to relate to
- 27.5.1 Just 2000 m², no area A and B