

From: l.land@xtra.co.nz  
Sent: Saturday, 26 May 2007 17:47  
To: hgiplan  
Cc: l.land@xtra.co.nz  
Subject: District Plan submission

2364

Submitter details

---

Full name: Lesley Land  
Organisation:  
Agent:  
Address for correspondence: 63 Hamilton Road, Herne Bay, AKLD 1011 Business phone:  
Home phone:  
Email address: l.land@xtra.co.nz

The specific provision that my submission relates to is:

I / We: Support the submission of:  
AM & JM Payne, The Manhattan, 21 E 33 Tai Tam Rd, Hong Kong , Submission # 3711/1&2

I / We: Support these particular parts of the above submission:  
the entire submission

The reasons for my / our support or opposition to the above submission are:  
We have 4.2 ha in Western Landscape, Rural 2. We have resource consent for a house granted 2006 under the operative plan where there was no footprint rule and our house design of 3 bedrooms and study is 260 sq.m roof area and has a covered terrace on the north side only. The government, the building act, and BIA E2, all recommend houses should have eaves on all sides. In our case, the proposed plan footprint area limitation of 250 sq.m would make our application to add terraces non complying. As we have not yet built we had contemplated adding covered terraces on the east, west and south sides. The additional area would be 79 sq m making the total area 339 sq m. The house is on a single level because it is under the ridge line control and we wish the house to have low visual impact in the landscape. We are particularly keen to comply with the district plan which seeks to avoid the adverse affects of dominance in the landscape. More particularly my husband has restricted mobility and it is important that we have single level to avoid steps.

We note that the definition of footprint in the proposed plan "area of ground covered by a single building" is onerous, not only is it an arbitrary reduction from the area allowed of 500 sq m in the operative plan, but the definition includes terraces that cover the ground. We note also that the definition of site coverage in the proposed plan has been changed arbitrarily and without consultation or any possible logic to include the area of decks which have been previously excluded from site coverage if they were permeable to the weather.

These arbitrary and ill-considered limitations will inevitably lead to multi level houses creating greater dominance in the landscape which is surely opposite to the objectives of the HGI Proposed Plan.

It is inequitable that no other zone on Waiheke has the footprint limitation and properties can be developed to defined percentages of their land area however big it is. Why introduce a rule that requires multi level houses in a rural landscape?

We support the AM & JM Payne submission for it's common sense.

I / We seek that:  
the whole submission be allowed

I / We wish to be heard at the council planning hearing: No

I / We would be prepared to present a joint case at the hearing with any others making a similar submission: No

---

This page was generated from