

**From:** Rachael Law  
**To:** [District Plan](#)  
**Cc:** [pjsewhoy@gmail.com](mailto:pjsewhoy@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** Goldfields Partnership - Submission on CODC Proposed Plan Change 19  
**Date:** Tuesday, 30 August 2022 2:44:57 pm  
**Attachments:** [goldfields sew hoy PC19 submission map.pdf](#)  
[Goldfields Partnerships Sew Hoy PC19 Submission.pdf](#)  
[goldfields sew hoy PC19 Form 5.pdf](#)

---

Hi there,

Please see attached:

- Form 5,
- submission, and
- location map

for Goldfields Partnership, landowner of Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 SO 24009, on Proposed Plan Change 19.

Regards,

**Rachael Law**

Planner

**M** 022 690 7898

**T** 03 443 0110

Paterson Pitts Limited Partnership, trading as:

**PATERSONPITTS**GROUP

**Surveying • Planning • Engineering**

**Your Land Professionals**

19 Reece Crescent, Wanaka 9305

or P.O. Box 283, Wanaka 9343, New Zealand

**T** 03 443 0110

**W** [www.ppgroup.co.nz](http://www.ppgroup.co.nz)

**Notice of Confidential Information**

The information contained in this email message is CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION and may also be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED intended only for the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient you must not read or do anything else with this message. If you have received this message in error please notify us immediately by return email or telephone (Phone 0800 774 768) and then destroy the original message. Thank you.

You must scan this email and any attached files for viruses. PATERSON PITTS LP, trading as PATERSON PITTS GROUP accepts no liability for any loss or damage however caused, whether directly or indirectly arising from this message or the attachments.

## Resource Management Act 1991

### Submission on Notified Proposed Plan Change to Central Otago District Plan

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

#### (FORM 5)

To: The Chief Executive  
Central Otago District Council  
PO Box 122  
Alexandra 9340

### Details of submitter

Name: Goldfields Partnership

Postal address: c/o Dr Peter Sew Hoy, 9 Douglas Avenue, Mount Albert, Auckland 1025  
(Or alternative method of service under [section 352](#) of the Act)

Phone: 021 739 469

Email: [pjsewhoy@gmail.com](mailto:pjsewhoy@gmail.com)

Contact person: Rachael Law, Paterson Pitts Group, Agent on behalf of submitter.  
[rachael.law@ppgroup.co.nz](mailto:rachael.law@ppgroup.co.nz)

(Name & designation, if applicable)

This is a submission on proposed Plan Change 19 to the Central Otago District Plan (the proposal).

I am / am not\* a trade competitor for the purposes of [section 308B](#) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (\*select one)

~~\*I / We am / am not (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:~~

~~(a) — adversely affects the environment; and~~

~~(b) — does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.~~

~~\*Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor.~~

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

(Give details, attach on separate page if necessary)

See attached

**This submission is:**

(Attach on separate page if necessary) Include:

- whether you support or oppose the specific parts of the application or wish to have them amended; and
- the reasons for your views.

See attached \_\_\_\_\_


**I / We seek the following decision from the consent authority:**

(Give precise details, including the general nature of any conditions sought)

See attached \_\_\_\_\_

- I support / oppose the application OR neither support nor oppose (select one)
- I wish / do not wish to be heard in support of this submission (select one)
- ~~I / We will consider presenting a joint case if others make a similar submission~~  
\*Delete this paragraph if not applicable.

In lodging this submission, I understand that my submission, including contact details, are considered public information, and will be made available and published as part of this process.

  
Signature Rachael Law, agent  
on behalf of submitter

26/08/22  
Date

**Submissions close at 4pm on Friday 2 September 2022**

Submissions can be emailed to [districtplan@codc.govt.nz](mailto:districtplan@codc.govt.nz)

**Note to person making submission:**

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that a least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious;
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- it contains offensive language;
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

## Goldfields Partnership – submission on Proposed Plan Change 19

Name: Goldfields Partnership

Postal address: C/- Dr Peter Sew Hoy

9 Douglas Avenue

Mount Albert

Auckland 1025

Phone: 021 739 469

Email: [pjsewhoy@gmail.com](mailto:pjsewhoy@gmail.com)

### Submission:

The submitter is the landowner of Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 SO 24009 and as one of the last large vacant sites in Cromwell close to the town centre, they would like to develop it in a unique and innovative way to do it justice. Therefore, the submitter opposes PC19 in its entirety as it applies to their site (Sections 2 and 3) in both provisions and zoning, and opposes PC19 in terms of its provisions in its entirety as it applies to the remainder of their site (Sections 4 and 5).

### Reason for submission:

The site's current zoning is a mixture of Residential Area (RA) (where adjacent to Waenga Drive) and RRA(12) under the Operative District Plan, which allows for:

- RA - Minimum lot size of 250m<sup>2</sup>, in general accordance with standards.
- RRA(12) – Minimum lot sizes of 500m<sup>2</sup>, in general accordance with standards.
- RRA(12) – adjacent to SH6 – Minimum Lot size of 1000m<sup>2</sup>, in general accordance with standards.
- There is also an existing concept plan for the site, as approved under 7.3.3(i)RRA(12)(ii).

The site is long and slightly curved, between State Highway 6 (SH6) to the west and the existing residential area of 'new' Cromwell to the south and east with Business Resource Area (BA) to the north (which in reality is not used for business activities at all but rather as a retirement village under the Golden View Lifestyle Village). The site is subject to a building line restriction off SH6, and has a very narrow point in the centre of Section 4.

The proposed site zoning under Proposed Plan Change 19 (PC19) zoning is for the northern allotments (section 4 and 5) Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ), and for the southern allotments (sections 2 and 3) Low Density Residential Zone (LRZ), with a 30m building line restriction off SH6 along the entirety of the site.

- Minimum lot size of MRZ - 200m<sup>2</sup> (elevates to Non Complying).
- Minimum lot size of LRZ - 500m<sup>2</sup> (elevates to Non Complying).

Overall, the PC19 proposed zoning significantly limits the development potential of the southern portion of this exceptional site (being Sections 2 and 3 SO 24009 of this the last large vacant close to the town centre of Cromwell) and the provisions of the MRZ also work to limit the development potential of the northern section of the site (sections 4 and 5 SO 24009). The submitter is opposed to the rezoning of the site from RA to LRZ, and opposes provisions of the MRZ.

**Specific Relief sought:**

Amend the mapping related to the subject site (Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 SO 24009), and amend the provisions (including any consequential amendments or amendments which result in the same effect sought) as follows:

Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
Mapping	<p>Mapping change:                      Rezone the site known legally as Sections 2 and 3 SO 24009 from Low Density Residential Zone (LRZ) to Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).</p>	<p>The site is currently zoned RA with a minimum lot size of 250m<sup>2</sup> adjacent to the Waenga Drive area. The bulk of the site is zoned RRA(12) with minimum lot sizes of 500m<sup>2</sup>, with the lots adjacent to SH6 having a minimum lots size of 1000m<sup>2</sup>. There is an existing concept plan for the site which has been approved under rule 7.3.3(i)RRA(12)(ii).</p> <p>The proposed LRZ zone would allow minimum lot size of 500m<sup>2</sup>, in conjunction with a 30m State Highway setback through a building line restriction. These restrictions result in very little area for any actual development on the site, and limit the potential for a Comprehensive Residential Development through the MRZ zone, on one of the last vacant sites large enough in Cromwell to achieve such a development.</p> <p>The boundary between the proposed MRZ and LRZ in PC19 is illogical and follows the cadastral lines. In this instance, the cadastral and property lines were set up for the old proposed boundary between State Highways 6 and 8B. For the MRZ area the boundaries need to be as rectangular as possible to achieve the outcomes sought. With the proposed lot sizes being so small, a curved site boundary would</p>

Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
		<p>significantly limit development potential.</p> <p>The MRZ zoning would enable the site owner more options for potential development of the site to take the best opportunity of the site.</p>
<p>Mapping</p>	<p>Mapping change:            30m building line restriction setback from SH            - delete from planning maps.</p>	<p>In conjunction with new standard MRZ-S5 Setback from road boundary – Within 80m of the sealed edge of a State Highway – the issue associated with this original 30m setback is covered and this building line is now rendered unnecessary.</p> <p>Furthermore, this building line greatly restricts the ability for this site to achieve a comprehensive residential development (and the site is one of the only ones in Cromwell vacant and large enough to achieve this type of development) and to be able to provide for a road and housing in the narrow portion of the site (Section 4 SO 24009). Its relevance is low now given the proposed new standard MRZ-S5 SH setbacks.</p>
<p>MRZ-R11 Excavation</p> <p>Activity Status: PER</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Any extraction of material shall not exceed 1m in depth within 2m of any site boundary; and</li> <li>2. The maximum volume or area of land excavated within any site in any 12-month period does not exceed 200m<sup>2</sup> per site.</li> </ol>	<p>Amend 2. To remove reference to volume as below and amend minimum area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The maximum <del>volume or</del> area of land excavated within any site in any 12-month period does not exceed 2500m<sup>2</sup> per site</li> </ol>	<p>Not possible to have a m<sup>2</sup> amount as a volume.</p> <p>200m<sup>2</sup> is too small an area, and across these vacant sites would require a consent to achieve any build. Seek that the area is changed to match the Otago Regional Council trigger for residential earthworks.</p>

Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
<p>MRZ-R13 Retirement villages</p> <p>Activity Status: RDIS</p> <p>Where the activity complies with the following rule requirements: MRZ-S2 to MRZ-S6.</p>	<p>Amend standard. Remove requirement to comply with MRZ-S4 Building coverage.</p> <p>MRZ-R13 Retirement villages</p> <p>Activity Status: RDIS</p> <p>Where the activity complies with the following rule requirements: <u>MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S5 and to MRZ-S6.</u></p>	<p>Given that in most designs retirement villages are much denser in development from usual developments, and considering that requiring compliance with S2, S3, S5 and S6 will protect the character and amenity of the zone when experienced from outside of the site, the compliance with S4 for a retirement village would be unreasonable.</p>
<p>MRZ-S1 Density</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Where the residential unit is connected to a reticulated sewerage system, the minimum site area per unit is 200m<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>2. Where the residential unit is not connected to a reticulated sewerage system, the minimum site area per unit is 800m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>3. Where MRZ-S1.1 is not met but the minimum site area per unit is 180m<sup>2</sup>: DIS.</li> </ol> <p>Where MRZ-S1.2 is not met, or MRZ-S1.1 and MRZ-S1.3 are not met: NC.</p>	<p>Amend standard. Seek that the elevation for non-compliance with the density standard is to Discretionary instead of Non-Complying</p> <p>MRZ-S1 Density</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Where the residential unit is connected to a reticulated sewerage system, the minimum site area per unit is 200m<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>2. Where the residential unit is not connected to a reticulated sewerage system, the minimum site area per unit is 800m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>3. Where MRZ-S1.1 is not met but the minimum site area per unit is 180m<sup>2</sup>: DIS.</li> </ol> <p>Where MRZ-S1.2 is not met, or MRZ-S1.1 and MRZ-S1.3 are not met: <del>NC</del>DIS.</p>	<p>The proposed elevation to NC is a very high elevation. The policy direction in the subdivision and MRZ chapters should be sufficient to guide decision makers without requiring a NC resource consent pathway.</p>
<p>MRZ-S4 Building coverage</p> <p>The building coverage of the net area of any site must not exceed 40%.</p>	<p>Amend standard. Seek that the building coverage is changed from 40% to 60%.</p> <p>MRZ-S4 Building coverage</p>	<p>Given the small lot sizes allowed in the zone, the net building coverage needs to be correspondingly higher to be able to allow for reasonable sized buildings on these sites, especially considering this</p>

Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
	<p>The building coverage of the net area of any site must not exceed <del>460</del>460%.</p>	<p>standard relates to net site area and not site area.</p>
<p>MRZ-S6 Setback from internal boundary</p> <p>Any building or structure shall be setback a minimum of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 1m from any internal boundary (except that this does not apply to common walls along a site boundary, or to an uncovered deck less than 1m in height); and</li> <li>2. 15m from the margin of any lake.</li> </ol>	<p>Amend to include the following exemptions to the standard:</p> <p>MRZ-S6 Setback from internal boundary</p> <p>Any building or structure shall be setback a minimum of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 1m from any internal boundary (except that this does not apply to common walls along a site boundary, or to an uncovered deck less than 1m in height); and</li> <li>2. 15m from the margin of any lake.</li> </ol> <p><u>This standard MRZ-S6.1 does not apply to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Uncovered decks of less than 1m in height.</u></li> <li>• <u>Multi-unit housing residential units and retirement villages.</u></li> <li>• <u>Two or more residential units connected horizontally and/or vertically by a common wall or common floor.</u></li> </ul>	<p>The deletion of the exception for decks and common walls from the standard text and their subsequent inclusion in a separate section makes the standard clearer to read.</p> <p>The proposed inclusion of multi unit housing and retirement villages from the internal boundary setbacks enables the ability to construct these types of developments without the need for triggering a standard. These setback aspects will be managed by market demand.</p> <p>The inclusion of ‘horizontally and or vertically’ and ‘common floor’ recognizes that buildings and dwellings can be separated by a common or party wall vertically, where two dwellings exist side by side with a party wall between them; but also horizontally, where two or more dwellings exist in the same building over different storeys, one on top of another separated by common floors.</p>
<p>MRZ-S7 Outdoor Living Space</p> <p>Each residential unit must have an exclusive outdoor living space:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. for units with common living space at ground floor level, of at least 30m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 4m; and</li> <li>2. for units located entirely above</li> </ol>	<p>Delete standard MRZ-S7 and add in ‘provision of useable, accessible outdoor living space for residents’ as Matter of Discretion for MRZ-S4 through MRZ-S6.</p> <p><del>MRZ-R7 Outdoor Living Space</del></p> <p><del>Each residential unit must have an exclusive outdoor living space:</del></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>1. for units with common living space at ground floor level, of at least 30m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 4m; and</del></li> </ol>	<p>Delete MRZ-S7 as it is unnecessary when considered in conjunction with the other bulk and location standards MRZ-S1 through MRZ-S6. By adding it as a matter of discretion where the other standards are breached the ability to consider the space provided for residents to recreate outdoors within their own sites is allowed as a reason for which council can approve or deny a consent application. This is added as a matter of discretion to MRZ-S4 through MRZ-S6 as MRZ-S1 doesn’t have matters of</p>



Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
<p>the ground floor level, that comprises a balcony of at least 12m<sup>2</sup>, with a minimum dimension of 1.5m; and</p> <p>3. located on the north, west or east side of the residential unit and which is accessible from the living space of the residential unit.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved: RDIS</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. provision of useable outdoor space; and</li> <li>b. accessibility and convenience for residents; and</li> <li>c. whether there is suitable alternative provision of public outdoor space, in close proximity, to meet resident's needs.</li> </ul>	<p><del>2. for units located entirely above the ground floor level, that comprises a balcony of at least 12m<sup>2</sup>, with a minimum dimension of 1.5m; and</del></p> <p><del>3. located on the north, west or east side of the residential unit and which is accessible from the living space of the residential unit.</del></p> <p>MRZ-S4 Building coverage Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>e. provision of useable, accessible outdoor living space for residents.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S5 Setback from road boundary Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>d. provision of useable, accessible outdoor living space for residents.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S6 Setback from internal boundary Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>e. provision of useable, accessible outdoor living space for residents.</u></p> <p>Alternative relief sought: keep MRZ-S7 with amendments (but do not keep both outdoor living space and outlook space): Change 'dimension' to 'width' in .1 Remove references to orientation of outdoor living space in .3 Insert new matter of discretion to consider potential site or topographical constraints.</p> <p>MRZ-R7 Outdoor Living Space</p> <p>Each residential unit must have an exclusive outdoor living space:</p>	<p>discretion, and breaches to solely height or height in relation to boundary controls are unlikely to have any affect on the provision of useable outdoor space for residents.</p> <p>Alternative relief sought: Overall the requirement for Outdoor Living Space and that of Outlook Space are requiring the same thing, and so are unnecessary repetition; thus if the primary relief sought is not granted and this standard remains, it is sought that MRZ-S10 not be retained at all.</p> <p>The use of the word 'dimension' is not clear whether the intent is a circle with a dimension of 4m, or a square with a depth of 4m. The change to 'width' clarifies this standard.</p> <p>The orientation of a house and the outdoor space that one enjoys is a purely personal choice. Where located on a south facing hill slope, there will be limited sunlight access, and thus the requirement for north, east and western orientations of outdoor areas (and houses, given that .3 requires access directly from living areas to the outdoor area) becomes an unreasonable and unnecessary control and consent application. The same may be true in areas with a predominant wind that is from a northerly direction, rendering an outdoor living space to the south of the residential unit desirable.</p> <p>The insertion of the consideration of topographical and other site constraints recognizes that in some instances provision of this space may not be practical due to</p>

Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
	<p>1. for units with common living space at ground floor level, of at least 30m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum <del>dimension</del> <u>width</u> of 4m; and</p> <p>2. for units located entirely above the ground floor level, that comprises a balcony of at least 12m<sup>2</sup>, with a minimum dimension of 1.5m; and</p> <p>3. <del>located on the north, west or east side of the residential unit and</del> which is accessible from the living space of the residential unit.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved: RDIS</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>topographical and other site constraints; and</u></li> <li>b. provision of useable outdoor space; and</li> <li>c. accessibility and convenience for residents; and</li> <li>d. whether there is suitable alternative provision of public outdoor space, in close proximity, to meet resident’s needs.</li> </ol> <p>Alternative relief sought: Retain the references to orientation in .3, and insert elevation from MRZ-S7.3 for CON activity:</p> <p><u>Activity status where compliance not achieved with MRZ-S7.3:</u> <u>CON</u></p> <p><u>Matters of control are restricted to:</u></p>	<p>real world existing built form and / or natural landform.</p>

Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>topographical and other site constraints; and</u></li> <li>b. <u>provision of useable outdoor space; and</u></li> <li>c. <u>accessibility and convenience for residents; and</u></li> <li>d. <u>whether there is suitable alternative provision of public outdoor space, in close proximity, to meet resident’s needs.</u></li> </ul>	
<p>MRZ-S8 Landscaping</p> <p>At least 30% of the site shall be planted in grass, trees, shrubs or other vegetation.</p>	<p>Delete standard MRZ-S8 and add in ‘provision of landscaping which increases the proposal’s compatibility with the character of the area and provides a balance between built form and open space’ as Matter of Discretion for MRZ-S2 through MRZ-S6.</p> <p><del>MRZ-S8 Landscaping</del></p> <p><del>At least 30% of the site shall be planted in grass, trees, shrubs or other vegetation.</del></p> <p>MRZ-S2 Height Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>e. provision of landscaping which increases the proposal’s compatibility with the character of the area and provides a balance between built form and open space.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S3 Height in relation to boundary Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>d. provision of landscaping which increases the proposal’s compatibility with the character of the area and provides a balance between built form and open space.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S4 Building coverage</p>	<p>Delete MRZ-S8 as this type of control unnecessarily creates consent applications for applicants who are looking for low maintenance sites. As the matters of discretion are around balance between built form and open space, and the other bulk and location standards require a 40% site coverage as well as yard minimums, it is considered that this standard is not necessary to achieve a compatibility with the character of the area or a balance of built form and open space, which will be achieved through the other standards and landscaping can be addressed as matters of discretion for breaches to these other standards.</p> <p>Landscaping is thus added as a matter of discretion to MRZ-S2 through MRZ-S6 as MRZ-S1 doesn’t have matters of discretion.</p> <p>Alternative relief sought: A 30% vegetation requirement in conjunction with a 40% site coverage will not allow much room, especially considering the provision for carparking and driveways, which is assumed to not be located in the same spot as trees or shrubs, likewise for stormwater sumps and the like</p>

Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
	<p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:  <u>e. provision of landscaping which increases the proposal's compatibility with the character of the area and provides a balance between built form and open space.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S5 Setback from road boundary  Matters of discretion are restricted to:  <u>d. provision of landscaping which increases the proposal's compatibility with the character of the area and provides a balance between built form and open space.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S6 Setback from internal boundary  Matters of discretion are restricted to:  <u>e. provision of landscaping which increases the proposal's compatibility with the character of the area and provides a balance between built form and open space.</u></p> <p>Alternative relief sought, keep with amendments:  Amend from 30% to 20%.  Remove 'planted in grass, trees, shrubs or other vegetation' and replace with 'vegetated'.</p> <p>MRZ-S8 Landscaping</p> <p>At least <del>3</del>20% of the site shall be <del>planted in grass, trees, shrubs or other vegetation.</del>  <u>vegetated.</u></p>	<p>given there is no reticulated stormwater in the District. These on site systems need maintenance from time to time and can be undermined by tree roots and other vegetation. Therefore the amendment for 20% landscaping is proposed.</p> <p>The wording change proposed is to simplify the standard. As it is drafted as an 'or' standard in which any of the options are suitable, the word 'vegetated' is all inclusive and is simpler.</p>
<p>MRZ-S9 Service and Storage Space</p> <p>1. Each residential unit must have an outdoor or</p>	<p>Delete standard MRZ-S9 and add in 'provision of useable and accessible service and storage space for residents' as Matter of Discretion for MRZ-S4 through MRZ-S6.</p>	<p>Delete MRZ-S9 as it is unnecessary when considered in conjunction with the other bulk and location standards MRZ-S1 through MRZ-S6. By adding it as a matter of discretion where the</p>

Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
<p>indoor service space of at least 2.5m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 1.5m available for use for the storage of waste and recycling bins.</p> <p>2. The required spaces can be provided either individually or within a communal space for multiple units.</p>	<p><del>MRZ-S9 Service and Storage Space</del></p> <p><del>1. Each residential unit must have an outdoor or indoor service space of at least 2.5m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 1.5m available for use for the storage of waste and recycling bins.</del></p> <p><del>2. The required spaces can be provided either individually or within a communal space for multiple units.</del></p> <p>MRZ-S4 Building coverage Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>e. provision of useable and accessible service and storage space for residents.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S5 Setback from road boundary Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>d. provision of useable and accessible service and storage space for residents.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S6 Setback from internal boundary Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>e. provision of useable and accessible service and storage space for residents.</u></p> <p>Alternative relief sought, keep with amendments:</p> <p>MRZ-S9 Service and Storage Space</p> <p>1. Each residential unit must have an outdoor or indoor service space of at least 2.5m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum</p>	<p>other standards are breached the ability to consider the space provided for residents to have usable and accessible storage and service space within their own or communal sites is allowed as a reason for which council can approve or deny a consent application. This is added as a matter of discretion to MRZ-S4 through MRZ-S6 as MRZ-S1 doesn't have matters of discretion, and breaches to solely height or height in relation to boundary controls are unlikely to have any affect on the provision of useable service and storage space for residents.</p> <p>Alternative relief sought: The use of the word 'dimension' is not clear whether the intent is a circle with a dimension of 1.5m, or a square with a depth of 1.5m. The change to 'width' clarifies this standard.</p> <p>Standards are requirements, and the language used needs to be active, thus the change from 'can be' to 'are'.</p>

Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
	<p><del>dimension</del> width of 1.5m available for use for the storage of waste and recycling bins.</p> <p>2. The required spaces <del>can be</del> <u>are</u> provided either individually or within a communal space for multiple units.</p>	
<p>MRZ-S10 Outlook Space</p> <p>Each residential unit must provide the following minimum outlook spaces:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. for a principal living room, 4m in depth and 4m in width;</li> <li>2. for a principal bedroom, 3m in depth and 3m in width; and</li> <li>3. all other habitable rooms, 1m in depth and 1m in width.</li> </ol>	<p>Delete standard MRZ-S10 and add in 'provision of visual privacy and outlook between habitable rooms of different buildings on the same or neighbouring sites' as Matter of Discretion for MRZ-S4 through MRZ-S6.</p> <p><del>MRZ-S10 Outlook Space</del></p> <p><del>Each residential unit must provide the following minimum outlook spaces:</del></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>1. for a principal living room, 4m in depth and 4m in width;</del></li> <li><del>2. for a principal bedroom, 3m in depth and 3m in width; and</del></li> <li><del>3. all other habitable rooms, 1m in depth and 1m in width.</del></li> </ol> <p>MRZ-S4 Building coverage Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>e. provision of visual privacy and outlook between habitable rooms of different buildings on the same or neighbouring sites.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S5 Setback from road boundary Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>d. provision of visual privacy and outlook between habitable rooms of different buildings on the same or neighbouring sites.</u></p>	<p>Delete MRZ-S10 as it is unnecessary when considered in conjunction with the other bulk and location standards MRZ-S1 through MRZ-S6. By adding it as a matter of discretion where the other standards are breached the ability to consider the space provided around residential units to maintain a level of privacy and outlook is allowed as a reason for which council can approve or deny a consent application. This is added as a matter of discretion to MRZ-S4 through MRZ-S6 as MRZ-S1 doesn't have matters of discretion, and breaches to solely height or height in relation to boundary controls are unlikely to have any affect on the provision of uninterrupted open space / depth outside of habitable rooms.</p>

Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
	<p>MRZ-S6 Setback from internal boundary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p><u>e. provision of visual privacy and outlook between habitable rooms of different buildings on the same or neighbouring sites.</u></p>	
<p>MRZ-S11 Fencing</p> <p>The maximum height of any fence along a road boundary shall be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 1m, where less than 50% of the fence structure is visually transparent; or</li> <li>2. 1.8m, where 50% or more of the fence structure is visually transparent.</li> </ol>	<p>Delete standard MRZ-S11 and add in 'provision of fencing that is of a suitable height and permeability to ensure adequate sunlight access and privacy for residents, and whether the height of fencing has adverse effects on streetscape' as Matter of Discretion for MRZ-S2 through MRZ-S6.</p> <p><del>MRZ-S11 Fencing</del></p> <p><del>The maximum height of any fence along a road boundary shall be:</del></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>1. 1m, where less than 50% of the fence structure is visually transparent; or</del></li> <li><del>2. 1.8m, where 50% or more of the fence structure is visually transparent.</del></li> </ol> <p>MRZ-S2 Height</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p><u>e. provision of fencing that is of a suitable height and permeability to ensure adequate sunlight access and privacy for residents, and whether the height of fencing has adverse effects on streetscape.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S3 Height in relation to boundary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p><u>d. provision of fencing that is of a suitable height and permeability to ensure adequate sunlight access and privacy for residents, and whether the height of fencing</u></p>	<p>The height and permeability of fencing materials is a purely personal choice. When this standard is considered in conjunction with MRZ-S7, which as drafted has requirements for the orientation of the outdoor living space for a site, this could potentially be requiring below average fence heights along a road frontage and exposing resident's outdoor space to the street, thereby reducing their privacy in their onsite recreation space, unless a consent is sought.</p> <p>Furthermore, most young children or pets (e.g cats or dogs) would be able to jump a fence of 1m in height. While the standard as drafted allows for a height of 1.8m, this comes with a loss of privacy through more than 50% permeability. This 50% or more permeability may also enable smaller dogs sufficient space to escape sites.</p> <p>The deletion of the standard and allowance for landowners to choose their own fencing along road boundaries, whilst including this aspect for as a matter of discretion for the remainder of the bulk and location standards, enables Council to consider this factor when processing applications for breaches to standards.</p> <p>Alternative relief sought:</p>

Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
	<p>has adverse effects on streetscape.</p> <p>MRZ-S4 Building coverage Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>e. provision of fencing that is of a suitable height and permeability to ensure adequate sunlight access and privacy for residents, and whether the height of fencing has adverse effects on streetscape.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S5 Setback from road boundary Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>d. provision of fencing that is of a suitable height and permeability to ensure adequate sunlight access and privacy for residents, and whether the height of fencing has adverse effects on streetscape.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S6 Setback from internal boundary Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>e. provision of fencing that is of a suitable height and permeability to ensure adequate sunlight access and privacy for residents, and whether the height of fencing has adverse effects on streetscape.</u></p> <p>Alternative relief sought: keep with amendments to .1 minimum height and transparency and .2 transparency.</p> <p>MRZ-S11 Fencing</p> <p>The maximum height of any fence along a road boundary shall be:</p>	<p>Allowing the minimum height to be 1.2m, which is a more standard low fence height in residential areas, and removing the requirement for transparency, enables far more choice for landowners. 1.2m still enables adequate sunlight access to outdoor spaces, whilst the ability to have a fence with materials of choice will support the ability to have some privacy in outdoor space if it is orientated towards the road frontage.</p> <p>The 1.8m alternative remains, with the transparency set at at least 50%. This allows for sunlight access and privacy for residents, whilst also the ability to ensure children and pets (in particular dogs) stay within the bounds of the site.</p>



Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <del>1.2m, where less than 50% of the fence structure is visually transparent;</del> or</li> <li>2. 1.8m, where <u>a minimum of 50% or more</u> of the fence structure is visually transparent.</li> </ol>	
<p>MRZ-S12 Habitable Rooms</p> <p>Each residential unit must have a habitable room located at ground floor level.</p>	<p>Delete standard MRZ-S12 and add in 'provision of habitable rooms at ground floor to ensure activation of frontages and visual interest' as Matter of Discretion for MRZ-S2 through MRZ-S6.</p> <p><del>MRZ-S12 Habitable Rooms</del></p> <p><del>Each residential unit must have a habitable room located at ground floor level.</del></p> <p>MRZ-S2 Height Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>e. provision of habitable rooms at ground floor to ensure activation of frontages and visual interest.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S3 Height in relation to boundary Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>d. provision of habitable rooms at ground floor to ensure activation of frontages and visual interest.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S4 Building coverage Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>e. provision of habitable rooms at ground floor to ensure activation of frontages and visual interest.</u></p> <p>MRZ-S5 Setback from road boundary Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>d. provision of habitable rooms at ground floor to ensure activation of frontages and visual interest.</u></p>	<p>Delete MRZ-S12 as it is unnecessary when considered in conjunction with the other bulk and location standards MRZ-S1 through MRZ-S6. By adding it as a matter of discretion where the other standards are breached the ability to consider the street activation and visual interest is allowed as a consideration for Council in the resource consent processing for breaches to the bulk and location standards. This is added as a matter of discretion to MRZ-S2 through MRZ-S6 as MRZ-S1 doesn't have matters of discretion.</p>

Notified Provision	Relief sought	Reasons
	<p>MRZ-S6 Setback from internal boundary</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p><u>e. provision of habitable rooms at ground floor to ensure activation of frontages and visual interest.</u></p>	

**PC19 zoning  
Sew Hoy Site**

Created Date: 18/07/2022  
Created Time: 12:37 PM  
Created By: anonymous



Projection: NZTM2000  
1297444,33278718,5002768,33715847  
Bounds: 1301360,9027042,5007648,35872733

Scale: 1:5000  
Original Sheet Size A3



The information displayed in the Geographic Information System (GIS) has been taken from Central Otago District Council's (CODC) databases and maps. Digital map data sourced from Land Information New Zealand (LINZ).  
Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>  
It is made available in good faith but its accuracy or completeness is not guaranteed. CODC accepts no responsibility for incomplete or inaccurate information. If the information is relied on in support of a resource consent it should be verified independently.