

**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 RICHARD TYLER

Dated: 10 December 2024

Summary of evidence of Richard Tyler

Introduction

- [1] My name is Richard Tyler. 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 Area at 353 Dunstan Road, Alexandra, legally described as Lot 1 DP 316193 (**Site**).
- (together, the **Application** or **Proposal**)
- [3] The Site is within the Rural Residential zoning on the north-eastern side of Dunstan Road, which runs north-west to south-east parallel with Clyde – Alexandra Road. The area is flat to slightly sloping up towards the elevated river terrace north of the Site.
- [4] I undertook a Site visit in May 2024 for the initial Application. During this visit the higher 8.2m poles were not up, only the lower poles for the smaller building gables. The Site has a significant number of trees which meant that even if the 8.2m poles were up, I would not be able to see them clearly from the road or easily discern a potential skyline intrusion. The river terrace slope beyond was also hard to make out through the foliage. I noted at the time that existing vegetation would provide enough screening even if there were a skyline breach.
- [5] I noted views from Dunstan Road are short and filtered, but did not assess from the nearby Rail Trail which runs along the southern side of Dunstan Road.
- [6] My resulting recommended condition in the report was that 75% of the trees along the road frontage should be retained to maintain screening from the road. I note this condition did not get picked up in the s 42A report.

- [7] The surrounding Rural Residential Zone has been subdivided on the north side with existing vineyards on the south of Dunstan Road. Landscape character is made up of:
- (a) seasonal screening trees to surrounding properties on the north side;
 - (b) more open productive vineyard landscape to the south;
 - (c) elevated river terrace to the north; and
 - (d) the Otago Central Rail Trail, with recreational and aesthetic values for users.
- [8] Following concerns raised by Mr Vincent in the s 42A report, the Proposal has been amended as follows:
- (a) Building rotated 90 degrees to reduce perceived bulk.
 - (b) Increased setback from the road (now 40.5m to road reserve boundary). This has the added advantage of a larger perceived landscape setback alongside the road, as viewed when trees are not in leaf.
 - (c) Updated landscape plan to preserve existing trees for seasonal screening.
- [9] I further assessed views 1-5 appended to my evidence to demonstrate the visibility of the initial and revised Proposal in relation to the skyline behind. The montages are a useful tool to understand the extent of the skyline breach with no trees in place, or in winter when views are more exposed into the Site. The montages provide a more accurate demonstration of potential effects rather than just relying on static photos of profile poles. I confirm the montages are based upon the actual and corrected heights of the proposed dwelling, being 8.792m from the existing ground level at the southern end of the larger gable, and 5.559m to the smaller gable. In summer, the Site is well screened from outside the Site, and in the winter, visibility remains softened and appropriate in the context of surrounding deciduous trees, with the building form and location mitigating any potential effects.

[10] The following is a summary of each key viewpoint for the revised Proposal:

- (a) From Dunstan Road: minor or imperceptible skyline breaches, especially driving past at 80kph, viewing obliquely and with seasonal screening.
- (b) From the Rail Trail: slower viewing speeds, very low visual effects due to design and setback, building now sits under skyline with no breach.
- (c) Views from neighbours:
 - (i) For views from the southern end of the dwelling on no. 347 to the north of the Site, the initial Proposal had the proposed dwelling 59m away, the revised Proposal is now 47m with the building rotated so the gables are running perpendicular to their view. Overall viewing distance is slightly less, and with reduced bulk, the Proposal will have a very low effect on their views, in comparison to the initial Proposal.
 - (ii) For no. 339 to the east of the Site, the revised dwelling location will remain 95m away from their dwelling, with a significant amount of large evergreen screening trees within their Site and along the neighbouring driveway. It is unlikely these trees may both get removed, if they did an open view of a dwelling at 95m will sit low on the skyline and have a very low effect on their views. Compared with the initial Proposal, the revised building may have a slightly larger bulk when viewed from here with the gable now running laterally to their view, but given the long viewing distance and immediate screening trees, any effect arising from the change to be very low at most.

[11] The design includes two simple gables, which further reduces perceived bulk and is an appropriate height and built form for the rural area.

[12] The dwelling design will appear similar to a rural barn and will complement the rural residential landscape character. In addition, the following factors will maintain rural character:

- (a) Existing vegetation maintains screening and privacy.
- (b) The existing dwelling on the Site is well-screened, with no visible increase in density from key public viewpoints.
- (c) When viewed collectively, the surrounding dwellings along this side of Dunstan Road are well-screened from the road, the proposed dwelling will not form a notable increase that will tip the threshold of adverse cumulative effects.

[13] The Proposal aligns with the relevant Objectives and Policies of the District Plan. Notably, it will:

- (a) maintain rural amenity, open space, and landscape character;
- (b) avoid undue prominence of built form;
- (c) minimise adverse effects on visual and landscape values;
- (d) result in very low adverse effects on visual and landscape values;
and
- (e) appropriately manage cumulative effects with the revised design and landscaping plan.

[14] If the Proposal is to be approved, I recommend the landscape plan be included in the suite of approved plans.