

POST ENGAGEMENT PREFERRED OPTION UPDATE REPORT TO DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

DATE:	5 December 2018
TOPIC NAME:	Residential
SCOPE DESCRIPTION:	Alpine Villages (RE012)
TOPIC LEAD:	Jocelyn Lewes
PREPARED BY:	Jocelyn Lewes (Strategy and Policy Planner)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<i>Summary of Preferred Option Endorsed by DPC for Further Engagement:</i>	<p>That the Proposed District Plan retain the specific management provisions for the Alpine Villages of Arthur's Pass and Castle Hill, with minor modifications.</p> <p>That Lake Coleridge not be identified as an Alpine village in the Proposed District Plan.</p>
<i>Summary of Feedback Received:</i>	<p>Feedback from community committees and major landowners indicating general support for preferred approaches, but seeking minor amendments to reflect existing conditions.</p>
<i>Recommended Option Post Engagement:</i>	<p>That the preferred options previously endorsed by DPC be amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the requirement for a 40° roof pitch in Arthur's Pass not be carried forward into the Proposed District Plan; • That the alignment of the zone boundary between Living 1A and Business 1A land in Castle Hill be amended to reflect the underlying subdivision, approved by resource consent; <p>That the updated Preferred Option described above progresses to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase'.</p>
<i>DPC Decision:</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>That the preferred options previously endorsed by DPC be amended as follows:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>That the requirement for a 40° roof pitch in Arthur's Pass not be carried forward into the Proposed District Plan;</i> • <i>That the alignment of the zone boundary between Living 1A and Business 1A land in Castle Hill be amended to reflect the underlying subdivision, approved by resource consent.</i> 2. <i>That the updated Preferred Option described above progresses to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase'.</i>



1.0 Introduction

1.1 Overview of Preferred Options Endorsed by DPC

The preferred option endorsed by DPC on 10th October 2018 involved including specific objectives, policies and rules in the Proposed District Plan to retain the special and distinct character of Arthur's Pass and Castle Hill Villages and to manage the effects of these villages on the surrounding alpine and high country environment and in particular the Arthur's Pass National Park.

This option also concluded that specific management provisions not be applied to Lake Coleridge as this village did not demonstrate clear and distinct special characteristics that warranted additional consideration.

It was noted that the precise drafting of the objectives and policies should be considered in conjunction with the ONL Overlay workstream to determine the extent to which the effects of the Villages on the surrounding environment and particularly the National Park need to be addressed through the specific management provisions for the Villages.

2.0 Summary of Feedback Received

The preferred option has been subject to targeted consultation with community committees, the Department of Conservation and the two major landowners at Castle Hill.

2.1 Department of Conservation

No feedback was received from DoC in relation to the preferred options report for Alpine Villages. DoC had previously provided feedback on the Outstanding Landscapes and Natural Features workstreams in which they indicated that the present schedule of prohibited plants unable to be planted at Arthur's Pass village should be retained.

2.2 Arthur's Pass

Feedback was received from the **Arthur's Pass Community Centre Committee** in relation to the preferred options for Alpine Villages. This committee noted that the existing minimum 40° roof pitch rule included in the operative district plan is out of character for Arthur's Pass Village. They requested that this be varied.

The **Arthur's Pass Association Committee** did not provide any feedback on the preferred options report for Alpine Villages. However this committee had provided feedback during the initial public consultation period in relation to signage, night sky, water, wildfire and geotechnical risk. This feedback has been incorporated into the relevant workstreams.

2.3 Lake Coleridge

No formal feedback was received from the **Lake Coleridge Community Committee**. The committee did seek clarification as to what the implication of the endorsed approach of not recognising the village as an

Alpine Village would be. Following clarification that no specific management provisions would be lost as none currently exist no further feedback was received.

2.4 Castle Hill

Castle Hill Village Community Association

The **Castle Hill Community Association** advised that they were unable to respond to the preferred option within the timeframe provided, despite an extension of time being offered.

It is noted that the minutes of the meeting of the committee on 5th November 2018 did acknowledge receipt of correspondence from Council in relation to the District Plan Review. However the minutes seem to reflect that discussions were more around the process than the content.

Castle Hill Landowners

Feedback was received from two major landowners at Castle Hill, both of which indicated that they were generally supportive of the preferred approach, but requested minor amendments.

Both landowners enjoy the benefit of resource consents over their land. One landowner, within the village boundary, requested that the underlying zone boundary be realigned to reflect the recent subdivision consent. The other landowner requested that the DPR process consider providing additional protection of these consent rights by the inclusion of a special precinct or overlay for ‘tourism and accommodation development’ over the land, which is located outside of the township boundary, in the Rural (High County) Zone.

Both landowners also requested minor changes to the existing rules – one in relation to an increase in height within the Business 1A zone and the other to provide greater control over the reflectivity of building materials, specifically chimney flues.

One landowner also raised concerns that the combination of the current provisions around bulk and scale (e.g. site coverage, roof pitch, height and recession planes), section sizes and the slope of sections may result in some sections being unable to built upon with a complying dwelling. While the landowner requested that Council undertake further investigations into these aspects, they also indicated that they were supportive of the current provisions. It is therefore unclear what relief it is that they seek.

3.0 Analysis of Feedback Received

All of the feedback received is considered to be supportive of the approaches endorsed in the preferred option reports, however there were a number of minor issues raised that could have an impact on the subsequent drafting of provisions in the Proposed District Plan. These are discussed below.

3.1 Arthur’s Pass – Roof Pitch

The character and amenity assessment undertaken as part of the baseline report concluded that, overall, the building design in Arthur’s Pass does not follow a strict alpine character theme, but is more an agglomeration of styles that have some common features, being rectangular built form, pitched roofs, small footprints, painted exterior and an overall seasonal/ temporary nature. The lack of coherent design

most likely stems from the fact that a lot of the development has occurred before any design guidance was in place. As such, the current built form characteristics could be associated with any other holiday hut accommodation type, regardless of its location.

While the report noted that there are a variety of roof structure present within the village including some mono-pitch associated with newer buildings, the low scale nature of development allows the built development to integrate rather stand out within the surrounding landscape.

This issue was discussed with Council's building staff who advised that, due to the alpine location of the village, every application for building is assessed against performance standards. AS/NZS 11.70 Structure Design Actions – Wind Actions indicates that a minimum roof pitch of 20° is appropriate in this location.

Given that a steep roof pitch is not required by the Building Code and that the character and amenity assessment indicate that development within the village is varied but is predominately low scale in nature, it is recommended that the requirement for a 40° roof pitch in Arthur's Pass not be carried forward into the Proposed District Plan.

3.2 Castle Hill – Zones and Zone Boundaries

As noted above, both major landowners in Castle Hill sought to have they existing resource consents recognised within the Proposed District Plan by changes to zone boundaries or the inclusion of an overlay or precinct.

It is considered that the DPR process is an appropriate time to consider the suitability of zone boundaries, in light of development or resource consents. As such, it is considered that the location of the existing boundary between the Living 1A and Business 1A zone within the village boundary should be amended to align with the underlying subdivision consent through the DPR process.

It is not considered necessary to include an overlay or special precinct over land outside of the village for 'tourism and accommodation' as this land enjoys the benefit of a resource consent for this purpose. As the value gained by such an overlay would be outweighed by the cost of creating of it, it is recommended that this request should not be progressed further through the DPR process.

3.3 Castle Hill – Built Form Provisions

In relation to the request for additional controls over the reflectivity of materials within the village, it is considered that the existing provisions are sufficient. These provisions, in both the Living and Business Zone, require consideration of the reflectivity of both buildings and structures. It is considered that this would capture chimney flues. It is noted that staff are not aware of any complaints regarding the reflectivity of any buildings or structures in Castle Hill. As such, it is recommended that this issue does not need to be considered further through the DPR process.

As addressed above, one landowner raised concerns that the combination of the current provisions around bulk and scale, section sizes and the slope of land may result in some sections being unable to built upon with a complying dwelling. The area of the village where this may be an issue has been the subject of a recent subdivision consent which has created section sizes between 460m² and 6000m². It is unclear whether the layout of the subdivision considered the impact that the slope of the land may have on the

ability of the site to accommodate a complying dwelling, however this has now been identified by the landowner as an issue for some sites, but the number and specific location of these sites was not identified.

As the landowner has indicated that they were supportive of the current provisions, it is unclear what relief it is that they seek through the DPR process. It is noted that the resource consent process is available to any applicant proposing development that would give rise to the breach of a rule within the district plan. Therefore, it is considered that this issue does not need to be considered as part of the DPR process.

Appropriate height of buildings within Business zones is being considered as part of the broader business workstream and will likely be reflective of the scale and compatibility with surrounding activities.

4.0 Recommended Option Post Engagement

The Project Team recommends that the Preferred Option previously endorsed by DPC is amended as follows:

- That the requirement for a 40° roof pitch in Arthur's Pass not be carried forward into the Proposed District Plan;
- That the alignment of the zone boundary between Living 1A and Business 1A land in Castle Hill be amended to reflect the underlying subdivision, approved by resource consent;
- The updated Preferred Option described above progresses to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase'.