

## ARBOR MEWS

Thank you for consulting us on your proposed development. We note that the drawings provided differ from those presented to the Greytown Heritage Trust (GHT) of which Gina is a Trustee. We also note that the comments from the GHT are that *'agree that the development of the mid-century modern style buildings is best developed along these lines – rather than that suggested in the design guide contained in the district plan'*. The GHT has not commented on other aspects of the district plan and has not seen this application.

### Drawings

The drawings remain very difficult to understand, could we please request that the units are individually numbered and labelled at the plans. We assume those notated 'TO ceiling joists' are Level 2 – it would be useful to rename these using usual drawing conventions to avoid confusion. Similarly, the unit numbers should be noted on the elevations, there is also confusion where the notations change from say South West to West.

The unit numbers are confusing and misleading – for instance Units 1-4 (presumably as exiting) have an additional 3 units added above them – making 7 in total. It would greatly aid understanding if these were more clearly labelled.

It would be useful to clearly indicate the outdoor living spaces.

As commented by the GHT previously, we would like to see the midrails to door removed and manifestations used in their place. We also reiterate the concerns expressed by the GHT regarding the window sizes and the size of the joinery – some of the windows will be very heavy to open the manner shown, and there is an inconsistency and lack of rhythm to them. It would be useful to indicate which are existing windows – we assume those on the South west elevation of A201.1 are existing. We would be concerned about the solar gain to the units and the amount of available ventilation.

We disagree with the comments that this is well designed.

We note that the GHT were previously advised that the cladding would be timber. We would be concerned with a thin cladding (and lack of shadowing) or a metal cladding being used.

### Signs (5.5.2 (h))

We disagree that the sign is covered by the existing use rights. The GHT have contacted the SWDC on at least two occasions re this sign. More recently when the current signs were added. We do not see why anything other than a complying sign should be used, with the existing frame removed.

### Number of dwellings 5.5.2 (f)

As Gina was looking at the proposals for the development the number of units grew substantially over time. The initial proposal was to build on top of the existing single storey motel units only. We believe that this is an appropriate density for the site. We are most concerned about the density and the precedent this would set.

In the GHT's recent submission for the spatial plan density they commented that *"The trust is concerned about the extent of the residential infill and the current minimum section sizes. There are now no remaining one-acre blocks left of Main Street. Subdivision is threatening the remaining half*

*and quarter acre blocks. The trust would like to see a quarter acre minimum lot size for Main Street. The typical residential pattern for early Greytown was low density, with space for orchards, large vegetable gardens, the keeping of hens. The early survey pattern of one acre lots was underlying and over-time these lots have been developed or subdivided typically down to quarter acre sections. Even with the considerable increase in density, a sense of spaciousness remains. The streets are a major contributor. This feeling of space or low density is extremely important to the character of Main Street and is highly vulnerable with the current District Plan rules.’ We are most concerned that we understand a change of use from Motel Accommodation to Residential has been previously approved and the implications on site density and that this change was made without affected parties having the opportunity to comment.*

#### Roads, access, parking etc. 5.5.2 (i)

##### Parking and Traffic

We are concerned about the substantial increase in the number of vehicles and movements. In recent years there has been a large increase in traffic movement along Main St (SH2) – from our property opposite, there are numerous occasions where we need to wait for a considerable period before being able to exit the property and then we can often only turn left. We have also witnessed, on several occasions, people reversing out of the property across both lanes of SH 2. This is not safe. This morning (at 7.30am on a Sunday) there were three vehicles parked outside the Arbor – vehicles parked on Main Street make it difficult to see to exit the driveway meaning one needs to pull out into the traffic lane to be able to see. We note that there are often large trucks, sometimes parked overnight, in this location (they sometimes also park in front of our house) which makes vision impossible. GHT in their spatial plan submission are proposing street planting (single trunks like the town square) to make this type of parking impossible.



##### Reverse Sensitivity/Noise

We note the comments regarding the ‘Greytown Hotel has measures in place to manage and reduce noise from patrons and music’. We comment that this does not appear to be correct – we have on numerous occasions, since the current pub operators have been there, called noise control regarding pub noise. We are unable to have our windows open at night, and often we will hear pub noise over the top of the movie we may be watching – to the extent we can make out the songs! Over the years there seems to have been no attempt to mitigate this. We are concerned that there will be ‘screaming’ matches with the tenants and the pub patrons regarding noise. There are already enough screaming matches between drunken pub patrons (and not to mention pub litter that makes its way to our garden).

Under the previous owners, the pub was much quieter, Gina’s parent stayed at the Arbor when visiting, they started to use the rear unit when the noise from the at the front ones became too

much. The stopped using the Arbor since the current pub operators have been there due to noise issues.

### Landscaping

The recent additions (to create courtyards?) detract from the mid-century modern lines of the existing building and provide a disparate look. The materials used do not reflect the mid-century nature of the buildings and the complex is starting to look a bit like a 'ramshackle'. We hope that this is an interim situation until the development is completed.



The drawings provided do not indicate which trees are removed and which remain – e.g., the Site Plan A101 appears to show large trees remaining but the Floor Plan A102 shows clotheslines and bins in that location. Similarly, fences are not clear as to their location. From the site plan Carpark 13 does not appear to have sufficient space to maneuver. The drawings lack labelling as to what various elements are. We would like to see (and this was requested by the GHT) a comprehensive site and landscaping plan with fences and other substantial elements identified and also shown on the 3D renders, e.g. A100.1 does not appear to show any outdoor areas/courtyards, yet A102 appears to show some elements there.

We are concerned about the amount of useable outdoor living area to the units – particularly the upper-level ones which will get very little sun.

We are not convinced that the proposed lime chip is appropriate.

We are also concerned that the newish white fence at the front does not relate to the rest of the complex and that the colour is far too bright and glarey. We do not know what the purpose of the recess to Main Street is for.

Given the number of small units proposed we are concerned about who will be responsible for the maintenance of the properties, grounds and watercourse. Particularly since no indication of ongoing ownership is given. We would not like to see the units being able to be sold off individually and would like to see a Resource Consent condition that this property stays in one title ownership.

### Plant and equipment

We note that the bathroom windows do not appear to be opening. We are concerned about the plant and equipment which may be added external to the building and believe that these should be shown on plans and elevations. Other external plant and equipment should also be shown, e.g., the FF bedrooms don't seem to have HWC so we assume these must then be external units.

### Heritage

Has an archeological authority been sought/obtained for the at the new works?

We, and the GHT, are concerned about the new unit partly obscuring the Greytown Hotel. We have not seen any images which show the impact of the new units at the street on this. We would not like to see the Hotel obscured from the road/footpath. We also haven't seen images of how the new units relate to the hotel. The GHT had requested these images previously.

### Rubbish

The rubbish location seems a very long way from the units to be practical. We are concerned that there will be visible bins etc. outside each unit.

Gina Jones and Malcolm Fleming

27 January 2021

c.c. GHT, Russell Hooper, SWDC



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

## ARBOR MEWS

Thank you for consulting us on your proposed development. Note that, Gina is a Trustee of the Greytown Heritage Trust (GHT) who is making a separate submission as a neighbour and part of our submission replicates that.

### Number of Units 5.5.2(f)

We support the comment in Gina Jones and Malcolm Fleming's submission.

At 15, the number of units is well in excess of the number allowable on the site (4 allowed). The units themselves are small when compared to even small workers cottages. Given this, the concept of being able to combine 5 of the upper units with those below makes sense. So that original managers accommodation (we note that this is now two units), plus the original four motel units. So, 10 (or 11) units makes sense. We believe the additional four units create a density which is not appropriate for the site and we oppose this. In addition, there are several locations where rooms look into each other which we do not believe to be appropriate, especially for such small dwellings and in our rural town setting (compared to say apartments in Wellington). We are also concerned about the precedent that this would set.

In our recent submission for the spatial plan density, we commented that *"The trust is concerned about the extent of the residential infill and the current minimum section sizes. There are now no remaining one-acre blocks left on Main Street. Subdivision is threatening the remaining half and quarter acre blocks. The trust would like to see a quarter acre minimum lot size for Main Street [i.e. no further subdivision]. The typical residential pattern for early Greytown was low density, with space for orchards, large vegetable gardens, the keeping of hens. The early survey pattern of one acre lots was underlying and over-time these lots have been developed or subdivided typically down to quarter acre sections [or recently smaller]. Even with the considerable increase in density, a sense of spaciousness remains. The streets are a major contributor. This feeling of space or low density is extremely important to the character of Main Street and is highly vulnerable with the current District Plan rules.'* We are most concerned that a change of use from Motel Accommodation to Residential has been previously approved, without consultation with affected parties, given the site density implications of the change of use.

### Roads, access, parking and traffic 5.5.2(i)

We are concerned about the substantial increase in the number of vehicles and movements. In recent years there has been a large increase in traffic movement along Main St (SH2). We support the comment in Gina Jones and Malcolm Fleming's submission.

### Landscaping

We support the comment in Gina Jones and Malcolm Fleming's submission.

We are pleased to see that most of the existing conical shaped conifers and cherry trees are being retained. We would like to see the cherry trees that are near the front of the site also be retained (we note that this would require an adjustment to the planning which could be done by reducing the number of units).

The white stones are an appropriate mid-century modern material to be using, but they definitely need the buffer to contain them at the footpath.

The change to the front fence is acknowledged, although the application notes this as concrete block, the renders give it the appearance of plastered and painted concrete. This should be clarified, as should the look of the letterboxes. We would like to see the front fence rendered and to have a creeper planted to grow over it, such as Ficus or Boston Ivy, to soften it.

The change to the fencing at the ground floor unit courtyards is acknowledged. We would like to see the fencing (which does not seem to relate to the other building materials or mid-century modern) changed to black painted steel slat privacy frames which are similar to those at the stair.

We would like to see exterior lighting comply with the International Dark-Sky Association lighting standards.

#### Signs (5.5.2 (h))

We support the comment in Gina Jones and Malcolm Fleming's submission.

We disagree that the sign was legally established. The GHT have contacted the SWDC on at least two occasions re this sign. Most recently when the current signs were added. The sign as detailed in the current proposal is acceptable to us.

#### Plant and equipment

We support the comment in Gina Jones and Malcolm Fleming's submission.

It would be useful to see which windows are opening. We note that the bathroom windows do not appear to be opening. We are concerned about the plant and equipment which may be added external to the building and believe that these should be shown on plans and elevations (eg heat-pump condenser units, extract fan cowl, aerials, etc.). Other external plant and equipment should also be shown, e.g., the FF bedrooms don't seem to have HWC, so we assume these must then be external units. With the roof lines it is important that these are not disturbed by external plant and equipment.

Frank Minehan

Acting Convenor Greytown Heritage Trust

23 April 2021