

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
FOR THE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL**

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER of RC240033 an application for land use consent to construct a second residential dwelling in the Rural Residential Area at 353 Dunstan Road, Alexandra

BY **NATASHA WILLIAMS**
Applicant

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF PETER KLOOSTERMAN

Dated: 10 December 2024

Summary of evidence of Peter Kloosterman

Introduction

- [1] My name is Peter Kloosterman. My qualifications and experience are set out in my statement of evidence dated 2 December 2024.
- [2] My evidence has been prepared on behalf of the Applicant, Natasha Williams. It relates to RC240033, an application for land use consent to construct a second residential dwelling in the Rural Residential zone at 353 Dunstan Road, Alexandra, legally described as Lot 1 DP 316193 (**Site**).

Application

- [3] The site is on the east side of Dunstan Road, zoned Rural Residential.
- [4] There are established plantings of amenity trees and shelter belts along the east side of Dunstan Road. On the western side is the Ruru Wines vineyard.
- (a) The property is a gentle slope from Dunstan Road to a steeper terrace.
- (b) Surrounding land use includes rural/residential lots, a production vineyard, and recreational areas like the Otago Central Rail Trail.
- [5] The dwelling location was chosen to avoid compromising the vista of the neighbours at 347 Dunstan Road, whilst achieving the front and sideyard setbacks. Within the s 42A report, the Planner has suggested an alternative location to assist in reducing adverse landscape effects. The Applicant has adopted that suggestion, as well as rotating the building platform 90 degrees and providing an updated visual and landscape assessment to support the same. Further clarification is now also provided in the landscape plan and vegetation to be retained. Mr Vincent's suggestion to amend the building design / lower the height has not been adopted, because of these other changes addressed above which will now result in a very minor incursion only in respect of the Skyline, with no more than minor effects on landscape character.

[6] The application was notified, and no submissions were received. From this, we can ascertain the public have no issue with the proposal. The adjoining neighbours have provided their written approvals as they have no concerns with the proposal. Mr Tyler addresses how the revised proposal has a negligible change on those neighbours compared to the original. This endorsement and public lack of interest defines the perception of effects.

[7] In considering the effects of the dwelling on amenity and landscape values it is my professional opinion they are less than minor. This position is based on the findings of Mr Tyler's Landscape Report, and his further evidence and visual modelling of the proposal.

- (a) Mitigation measures can adequately address potential concerns.
- (b) A skyline intrusion is not a hard and fast rule – mitigation limits the impacts of this. The magnitude of a skyline breach and the visibility thereof must be considered, and these are not guided by 'avoidance type' directive policies, but rather, consideration of appropriate mitigation to achieve 'maintenance' of landscape character.

[8] The Council has chosen not to commission a Landscape peer review, so my evidence prefers and relies on that of Mr Tyler.

[9] In relation to cumulative development effects:

- (a) The proposal aligns with current density expectations for Rural Residential in the wider area.
- (b) The Vincent Spatial Plan defines a higher density of dwellings for the Rural Residential zone when the content of the Spatial Plan is codified into a Plan Change. This is a relevant other matter in terms of s104(1)(c) of the Act. The anticipated new densities under the zoning will be:

Rural Residential

Typical Sections: 0.5 - 2 ha
Density: 1 - 2 Dwellings /Hectare
Typical Housing Types: Detached houses on a rural section.

[10] The proposal is overall consistent with the key district plan objectives and policies relating to rural character and landscape values.

Landscape Condition

[11] In my lodged evidence I omitted to incorporate a suitable landscape condition to ensure the retention of plantings.

[12] For completeness, I suggest to include:

All trees marked as 'existing trees' within the landscape plan are to be retained. Any tree that dies or becomes diseased shall be replaced by an equivalent or similar species within the first available planting season

Conclusion

[13] The application is for a discretionary consent for second dwelling in a Rural Residential Zone.

[14] It exceeds the maximum height of 7.5 metres

[15] It creates a minor skyline breach when assessed from fleeting views from Dunstan Road; also requiring restricted discretionary consent.

[16] The evidence presented demonstrates the proposal, with appropriate conditions of consent:

- (a) maintains the environmental quality and rural character;
- (b) aligns with district plan objectives and policies and future spatial plan; and
- (c) does not result in inappropriate or significant adverse effects on landscape or amenity values.

[17] I recommend the Panel carefully consider the application, the content of the s 42A report, and the evidence presented, and approve the application with the proposed conditions.