



P.O. Box 169 Greytown 5712
greytownheritagetrust@gmail.com
www.greytownheritagetrust.co.nz

5 August 2019

Proposed development 189-191 Main Street, Greytown

This proposal shows a blatant disregard for the South Wairarapa Town Centres Design Guide. The Greytown Heritage Trust supports the strengthening of these guidelines within the district plan framework (that is a discussion for another day). It appears that the assessment of effects of the new dwellings has been written to justify the designs provided, rather than the designs attempting to work to the guidelines.

The Greytown Heritage Trust believes that the proposal will impact negatively on the overall heritage of Greytown's Main St and does nothing to either maintain or enhance the neighbourhood character. We have commented on the proposal against each of the relevant guidelines for the Greytown Residential Extension Historic Heritage Precinct.

1.1 (a) Main building (house)

The roof forms are complex, following the style of many developer driven houses. The roof forms do not reflect the appropriate roof forms of a high pitch with either simple gable or hip forms. The roofs illustrated are a complex mix of relatively low pitch multiple hips and gables – rather than a simple, cohesive form. No attempt has been made to address the Design Guide.

Windows and doors do not reflect traditional proportions of tall rather than wide, and they do not follow historic precedent (e.g. there are large areas of oversized windows/doors, symmetry and rhythm are not considered). There are sliding doors to both dwellings. In addition to not having traditional proportions, windows are grouped together in non-traditional configurations.

1.2 (a) Garage

The garage to Lot 1 is at the front of the house and connected to the house rather than being a separate element. It is located right at the front of the house. No information has been provided regarding colours. No attempt has been made to address the Design Guide.

Lot 2 does not have a garage which is unusual for a three bedroomed house. There is no ancillary storage provided (e.g. where would a bicycle or wheelchair be stored, garden equipment etc).

1.3(a) Building Materials and Colours

A full list of external materials and colours has not been provided.

2.1(a) Driveway and parking area

Two new vehicle crossings (a total of three for the subdivision) are proposed. With careful planning just one driveway could be provided which would provide a safer environment for pedestrians, and would be visually less obtrusive.

No information is provided on the surface of the driveways. It is noted that the carparking to Lot 2 is proposed to be concrete. The surfaces should be a dark coloured surface that will have the tendency to visually merge rather than be dominant. The driveways to the brick and tile houses at

27a, 44 and 44a Main St are an example of a light reflective concrete surface which becomes visually dominant, which is NOT desirable.

Neither of the proposed houses have the front door as a dominant element which was important in traditional Main Street homes. The focus is on vehicles rather than pedestrians.

Both the onsite parking and turning area are conspicuous from the street, there has been no attempt to mitigate the effects of these.

The vehicle crossings are each single – it is noted that the vehicle crossing to Lot 2 will be in asphalt, there is no description for Lot 1. A better result would be to have one driveway serving both properties.

2.2(b) Front and side boundaries

The proposed front fence is 50% higher than the height suggested in the design guide. The neighbouring property has an approx. 1m high picket fence which would be a more appropriate height. There is no description of the planting. It is assumed that the existing tree at the NW corner of the property will remain (as shown on the drawings) and that the driveway location and materials will allow this tree to survive (this conflicts with the Lot 2 drawing). A description of the planting (and initial sizes) along the boundary should be provided (the hedges shown on the street elevation appear to be 75% higher than the 1.5m high fence shown – this would be useful in disguising the building beyond given the number of negative attributes the building has and good to have from day one. The opening in the fence on the drawing appears to be wider than a single width driveway for Lot 1.

The site plan for Lot 2 differs from the site plan for Lot 1. This needs to be clarified as to what is correct and how the access around Lot 2 works or whether the orientation of the house alters.

No attempt has been made to screen the buildings at the long driveway (no landscaping information provided).

2.3(a) Garden Trees

It appears that a large tree has been removed in preparation for this consent (refer to aerial photos provided in the application), this erodes the overall amenity and natural values of the Greytown Village. There is no landscaping shown which mitigates this (or mitigates the design of the proposed buildings), nor any information as to how the landscaping will mature over time. (See additional note below).

The Greytown Heritage Trust does NOT support this proposal in its current form.

Addendum

Trees are an integral part of the cultural character/identity of Greytown. The decline of urban canopy cover along Main St is of significant concern, as is the lack of provisions for trees within new developments. There is no Council street berm along the majority of Main St, and therefore canopy coverage can only be provided for on private properties. If there is no provision to protect or enhance the urban canopy coverage, then there is no incentive for a developer to maintain these important values. The trees that remain along Main street are up to, or over, a century old. If Greytown is to preserve its cultural identity, careful planning and policy to protect and provide successive canopy coverage along this street is needed. Main St is the main arterial route and offers significant passive exposure to trees, and therefore provides an important connection to nature and place for local and the wider community. Removal of emerging urban canopy will be detrimental to local amenity values and provides little protection for Greytown's green infrastructure.