

**Kim Seaton**

**Summary Statement of Evidence: Planning**

**Kauri Lodge Rest Home 2008 Limited**

**CORRECTION TO EVIDENCE:**

Figures 2 and 4 omit the submitter's landholdings at 17 Kauri Street. Figure 1 correctly shows that land holding. The amended Attachment 1 is attached.

**SUMMARY:**

My name is Kim Seaton, I am a principal planner with Novo Group Ltd, appearing on behalf of Kauri Lodge Rest Home 2008 Limited.

The Kauri Lodge site is zoned a combination of Residential Medium Density, and Residential Suburban under the District Plan. It is subject to multiple overlays within the District Plan as amended by PC14. Following rebuttal evidence, those overlays now include:

- The Riccarton Bush Interface Area
- The Accommodation and Community Facilities Overlay
- The Airport Noise Influence Area (entirety of the site).

My principal issue with the PC14 provisions as notified is that they were less enabling of development on the site, particularly retirement village and residential units in the Residential Medium Density zone, than the operative provisions. Further, the notified PC14 provisions effectively had no specific rules for retirement villages on site formerly zoned Residential Medium Density.

Kauri Lodge's position is simply that it does not wish to "go backwards", that the planning provisions need to be at least as enabling of retirement village and other residential development on the submitter's site as the operative provisions are.

I participated in the planner's joint witness conferencing this week for retirement villages. One of the options explored is a version of what Mr Kleynbos recommended in his initial s42a report, being to "grandfather" the operative provisions. In my evidence (attachment 2) I endeavoured to amend the PC14 provisions for the Medium Density Residential Zone, to incorporate the existing retirement village provisions into the

document. Those efforts have now been largely overtaken by the discussions in the joint witness conferencing.

Following the provision of rebuttal evidence by Mr Kleynbos and Ms Hoddinott for Council, the areas of outstanding disagreement between themselves and myself are:

- i. The final form of the retirement village provisions, having generally agreed that the provisions should not be more onerous than at present – this is a matter being addressed in the joint witness conferencing;
- ii. The rules applying to sites that were formerly zoned Medium Density Residential and/or that are subject to the Accommodation and Community Facilities Overlay, in the Riccarton Bush Interface Area – the officers have indicated that existing provisions will now prevail so that development is not any more restricted than currently, with the exception of side yards. However without the benefit of a post-rebuttal rewrite of the rule package, I have found it difficult to be certain that the previous issues have been entirely resolved in the context of the Kauri Lodge site with its complexity of overlays;
- iii. The side yard requirements in the Riccarton Bush Interface Area – Ms Hoddinott maintains that one side yard can be 1m but that the other should be 3m. I maintain that the 3m side yard requirement is not justified, because it does not account for trees (no controls), it does not account for situations where side yards are not neatly aligned to allow views to Riccarton Bush, and it does not account for situations where side yards are at 90 degrees to Riccarton Bush (i.e. Kauri Street).



**Figure 3:** Extent of Accommodation and Community Facilities Overlay (submitter's site shaded pink, Overlay extent outlined in orange hatches)



**Figure 4:** Notified PC14 zoning/qualifying matters affecting the submitter's site (site outlined in red, vertical stripes are Riccarton Bush Interface Area)



