

From: Gabi Wolfer
Sent: Tuesday, 18 October 2022 1:21 pm
To: Richard Bigsby
Subject: RE: RC225714 - Springston Rolleston Road subdivision - Urban design feedback

Hi Richard,

I have reviewed above application and have provided review in three parts:

1. Review under MDRS
2. Review of provided subdivision plan
3. Review on provided exemplar housing typologies

1. The objective in the proposed MDRs zone is to provide for a variety of housing types and sizes to achieve the neighbourhoods planned character. The supporting policy enables a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities, including attached and detached residential units and low-rise apartments.

Within the proposed greenfield subdivision, above mentioned housing typologies need to be catered for. The current proposal shows allotments but needs to identify if there will be a variety provided and subsequently how at site level the standards such as outdoor living space, setbacks, height, recession planes and outlook space are met.

2. Subdivision plan
 - The subdivision plan shows section sizes between 294 and 473m², this limited variety of section sizes may translate into lack of variety of housing typologies. Sections along the interface with existing neighbourhoods and/or major roading corridors need to be appropriately scaled and a LD typology is preferred.
 - Sections along the main road corridor of Springston Rolleston Road are uniform in width and undersized, putting strain on multiple accesses of SR R- suggestion is to make these sections wider, reduce numbers and bundle vehicular access.
 - Corner sections need additional space due to dual frontages (e.g.206)- requirement across the development not met
 - Sections along boundaries need to be of a comparable density and section width
 - Lots along northern boundary (e.g. 273) need to be re-configured- 6 accessways within 170meters is not considered a best practise approach
 - Sections that are accessed from the North need to be wider to be able to accommodate private OLS to the side and not the front of sections (lots 193-216)
 - Lot 3000 local purpose reserve- purpose of this reserve and function?
 - Lot 269 has triple frontage and lacks ability for private space
 - Lots that have less than 15 metres of road frontage or lots that are less than 400m² are not suited for double garaging;
 - Lots 90, 94, 97 need to be wider to respond to access legs
 - Road alignment of intersection 18m road with 20m main north-south link

3. Exemplar review:

- Lot 10- orientation works, however as bedroom faces street limited ability for passive surveillance, also clarification needed if entire front is glazing?
- Lot 131 is good example; even better outcome if setback to the south could be extended to 1.5metres (bin storage, plus path)

- Lot 150 creates OLS at the front; not acceptable outcome for safety and privacy reasons; different design or wider section size needed that achieves OLS to the side
- All typologies are stand-alone; are there any attached and/or multi-storey units proposed for the site?

Due to the size and nature of this application I strongly recommend a meeting with the applicant where we can work through the issues presented.

Cheers,
Gabi

From: Richard Bigsby <Richard.Bigsby@selwyn.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, 14 October 2022 11:06 AM
To: Gabi Wolfer <Gabi.Wolfer@selwyn.govt.nz>
Subject: RC225714 - Springston Rolleston Road subdivision - Urban design feedback

Hi Gabi,

As discussed, here is the subdivision plan for the new application on Springston Rolleston Road (LOT 2 DP 61162). The site is currently zoned Inner Plains and is proposed to be zoned to Medium Density Residential in the notified variation to the plan. The developer (Kevler Homes) would also design and build on the created lots.

A couple things worth noting in your considerations:

- I've noted is that the variation to the Proposed plan requires a minimum MRZ lot size of 400m², and at least half of those proposed sites (150 lots) are less than 400m².
- They have supplied some example housing typologies (attached) that could comply with the MRZ requirements, although I note that the road facing glazing is quite fanciful.
- I think that the lots on the southern side of most streets are too narrow to allow for living areas to the side of the dwellings.
- Lot 500 is a future development site for a pre-school.
- I'm anticipating that only one dwelling would be built per proposed lot, although they will build prior to s224.

Let me know what you think and if you have concerns for the applicant to address?

Thanks in advance,
Richard

Richard Bigsby

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANNER
+643 3472761
