

File ref: FTC000019

17 June 2021

Marc Bretherton

Via email: marc.bretherton@winton.nz

CC: warwickgoldsmith@gmail.com

Private Bag 63002
Wellington 6140, New Zealand

Level 10, Grant Thornton House
215 Lambton Quay
Wellington 6011, New Zealand

epa.govt.nz
+64 4 916 2426

Tēnā koe

Request for information from Winton Property Limited in relation to Northbrook Wanaka Retirement Village under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020

The Northbrook Wanaka Retirement Village Expert Consenting Panel (the Panel), has directed the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), to request further information from you under clause 25 of Schedule 6 of the COVID-19 Recovery Act 2020 (the Act), relating to the Northbrook Wanaka Retirement Village consent application.

As directed by the Panel, the EPA is seeking the following information:

1. The proposal is for a non-complying activity overall. The application does not include an assessment against Section 104D of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

Provide an appropriate assessment in terms of the section 104D 'gateway' tests.

2. Pages 11 and 12 of Attachment T to the application provide assessment of Northlake Special Zone (NSZ) objectives and policies, several of which deal with density (e.g. Objective 1, Policy 1.2, and Policy 1.6). The assessment appears to draw on a general New Zealand understanding of what medium density means. For instance, in relation to Objective 1, it is stated:

"The proposal is for retirement living development at a rate 37 units per hectare in Activity Area C2 and 24 units per hectare in Activity Area D1. This sort of density is generally regarded (in New Zealand) as medium density..."

The Panel would be assisted by further discussion of whether a broader New Zealand approach to the concept of medium density is an appropriate comparison in the context of the specific density provisions applying in the NSZ. Those provisions (see rule 12.34.4.2iii), appear to reflect a particular understanding of what is meant by medium density, low density, and larger lot residential development. For instance, medium density residential activities are enabled within Activity Area D1 at a density of 15 units per hectare.

3. Policy 1.7 of the NSZ is:

To provide for small scale neighbourhood retail activities including one small supermarket to serve the needs of the local community within Activity Area D1 and to avoid visitor accommodation, commercial, retail and community activities and retirement villages within Activity Areas other than within Activity Area D1.

While noting the commentary in Attachment T to the application that there is “no other particular justification in the Zone provisions, or in the Zone purpose statement, as to why the Zone does not anticipate retirement villages – a predominantly residential activity – in the parts of the Zone that otherwise anticipate residential activities””, it would be helpful to understand whether there is any further information or background documentation relating to Plan Change 53 or prior Schedule 1 processes, which might shed light on the genesis of the ‘avoidance’ aspect of policy 1.7.

4. The “concept: massing narrative” drawings at page 20 of the Architectural Design Statement at Attachment G to the application suggest that options analysis has generally focused on locating larger buildings such as the care pod to the west of the development site.

Was any consideration given to locating taller buildings within Activity Area D1 where slightly higher height is anticipated?

5. The Landscape and Urban Design Report at Attachment L to the application provides a hypothetical subdivision scheme for Activity Area C2 (AA-C2) at page 14. The scheme depicts 15 lots. The Panel understands that the 4.5 dwelling per hectare density applying to **AA-C2** (+ or – 15%) applies over the whole of AA-C2. It appears that part of AA-C2 has already been developed.

Confirm that the hypothetical scheme presented at page 14 accounts for existing development within AA-C2.

6. The Landscape and Urban Design Report at Attachment L to the application states at paragraph 4.4 that “A walkway and cycle link is to be constructed within Activity Area E2 [sic – it is assumed this should be E1] immediately south of the proposed development”. The circulation plan at Attachment S shows a 2m wide pedestrian / cycle connection in this location, whereas a 3m wide link is shown along Lindis Road.

Provide an explanation as to why a narrower pedestrian / cycle path is shown to the south of the site.

7. The architectural drawings at Attachment F to the application include ground floor plans only.

Provide 1st and 2nd floor drawings for the proposed development.

8. Provide a high resolution photograph of the site and its surrounding context taken from that part of the summit of Mount Iron (or Little Mount Iron) that provides the closest and clearest view of the site and which is from a publicly accessible place. The photograph should be at an appropriate focal length approximating the field of view of the human eye and include a version of the photograph with the site boundaries overlaid.

9. Provide a cross section through the worst-case point between Units (3-6) and/or (7-10) down and through Outlet Road. It is understood that at this point, where the road drops away, modifications to the landform are proposed that include installation of a retaining wall. No details of this, any

associated landscaping, and any associated works within the road reserve are as yet understood. This should include the existing levels on this section as well as the proposed finished levels.

10. The Panel understands that the Outlet Road retaining wall / batter and fence is intended to be a continuation of what already exists to the south-east.

Confirm the extent to which the Outlet Road retaining wall / batter and fence has been consented by way of previous bulk earthworks or other resource consents, and what is intended to be authorised as part of this current proposal.

In accordance with clause 25 of Schedule 6 of the Act Winton Property Limited must:

- a) Provide electronic copies of the information or report requested; or
- b) Advise the EPA, with reasons that you decline to provide the information or report requested.

Please provide the further information to the EPA by **1 July 2021**.

Please note, the information will be provided to the panel, the application and every person who provided comments on the application. The information will also be made available on the EPA website.

If you have any questions or further queries please don't hesitate to contact Alex Erceg on northbrookwanakafasttrack@epa.govt.nz or 027 293 6728

Nāku noā, na



Elliott Thornton
**Team Leader, Fast-track Consenting
Land and Oceans Applications**