

# Homeowner Submission re Ryman Development – Karori Teacher’s College site

Richard Leikis & Vanessa Porter

Presented Wednesday 14 September 2022

Lay People – on Northern Boundary

Original application and rules studied, however subsequent withdrawal and speed of new application pushed through makes it hard to keep up – ever changing landscape.

WCC Note: please improve website to allow subscriptions/notifications when changes are made, with dates and clear ability to view new documents.

Our understanding - Question appears to be whether impacts of this development are more than minor, on a non-complying proposal. Ryman can then address issues and mitigate impact of their development?

Have tried to be a constructive contributor. However, scale and bulk has increased since purchase. Negative impacts on the community risen, however plans designed seem “within the rules”. Consultation has only been one way.

We do support a village onsite, but with less impact on community. More than just infrastructure, traffic, for example, freeing up of local homes may bring near 360 children in to 4 of the most constrained primary schools in NZ.

Direct Impacts to us:

- 1930’s single level house refurbished 2010 to utilise sun and the light from northern boundary
- On east and west sides, we are 3 metres to the next structure. Have view shaft to south but no sun or solar benefits
- House and garden designed to give us privacy, protection from wind and elements, and maximise light and sunshine to the north
- We are well insulated and most of our heating in winter comes from the sun
- Natural light good in the northern half but lacking in southern end – only 150 sq m so not really two ends. But designed to let light flow right through
- We spend 90% of our active time in the last 3-4 meters of the northern end of our house.
- We have 6 large windows and 2 French doors on the northern side – approx. 80% of north facing wall is glass - enjoys sun and provides natural light for most of rest of house
- We have created an open enclave to trap sun and is protected from wind to enjoy the outdoors throughout the winter months
- Outdoor living extends from the northern side of our house towards the boundary – 4 x 9m deck, seating and lounge area for late afternoon sun as it drops below Makara hill
- We have planting across the fence to prevent cricket balls coming over, kept trimmed to prevent trampoline from decay and mould. Also clothesline that catches good sun year-round. Planting to attract and support local bird life

**No. 1 Concern - Shading** – the impact on our amenity. Extended outdoor space is our only useable area for outdoor play. Currently limited shading from single level dwellings on Eastern and Western side only

Shading diagrams from Ryman re 22 June:

On June 22 this development will create:

- 40-50% of our property will be shaded at 8:30am
- 9:00am ~ 20%,
- 9:30 ~ 15%
- 10am~ 20% - but this 20% is our entire outdoor living space
- This pretty much stays till 3pm when the shadow comes in
- By 3:30 in the afternoon – 60% of house is in shadow. There goes our natural heating.
- By 3:45 100% of our property is covered in the shadow of block B03
- 

In September the extreme shadow comes in about 4:30 in the afternoon, with the entire house covered in shadow by 5:45pm. Rules out evening BBQ's for us between March and November.

Ryman's mitigations re space between the long apartment buildings on our boundary will improve the above by 15 minutes.

Living areas are impacted most – constant shade through winter – loss of 6 months of sun. This cannot be less than minor.

While we expect the site to be developed and appreciate there will be impacts from medium density housing, this is a commercial development with solid 20m x 72m rectangular blocks, 12m above our property.

**No. 1 Equal Concern - Privacy**

Our entire house is built for active living out of the north side. Large windows for light and sun.

Render provided by Ryman from the middle of our back deck shows: Balconies opposite us will look into our living space and down on us. Only mitigation offered is a shrub hedge that would struggle to grow to an appropriate height in 10 years given the wind tunnel in this area (from experience).

Render does not demonstrate any peripheral vision - conservative estimate 18 apartments that will have a clear line of sight down into our amenities from 8m to 25m. Line of sight will include children's bedrooms. This impact is not less than minor.

We suggested that all windows with southerly outlook be small and high, but results appear inconsistent – some have changed, some not. Have council experts requested and checked designs?

We have suggested Ryman put bedrooms, rather than living areas, on the southern end of their buildings, moving residents further away and lessening impact on neighbouring amenities.

Have also suggested solid barriers on south side of balconies and protruding windows to reduce the views south (also protecting Ryman residents from the southerly).

**Our main concern here**, for the properties in the middle of the southern boundary, no effort has been made by Ryman to mitigate the effects on our privacy.

We noted in section 42 – the Urban Design assessment in paragraph 4.15

“There are several properties on Scapa Terrace where a drainage requirement will prohibit landscaping on the applicant’s site, but this would presumably not affect the ability of Scapa Terrace property owners to increase screening on their own sites if they desired.”

I understand what is indicated, but my understanding is it is up to the developer to reduce the impacts on neighbours to less than minor.

We already maintain screening to 3 metres high, and to increase that we will reduce the look and transition to bulk, but this also results in us creating massive shading and light issues for ourselves which we are unlikely to enjoy.

Ryman can easily design their site and buildings a bit differently so as not to impact the amenity and privacy for neighbours in our area.

The bulk of the buildings, with no mitigations, is problematic.

I’m not sure of the rules for bulk and allowable height of buildings. But as I read it for Building B04 outside us, the topographic survey has ground level at 166.91 on the fence line, a proposed floor level 168 and a proposed RL (roof line) 178.82. My uneducated assessment is that the building is 11.91 metres or near on 12 metres plus eaves above ground level and hence non-compliant with the new national standard. Noting this is from an already built up and raised ground level.

---

**Drainage:** there is potential to increase regularity of flooding over southern boundary, as the current field and soil absorbing water here will be gone.

- The lowest point on the southern boundary is in the middle of the site, excluding the depth of the retention pond in the southeast corner.
- I note the weir system is set at 166.4 and a scruffy dome which I assume is at a similar height or lower which will benefit us under normal rainfall.
- With the proposed floor level 168, and 175 meters along this boundary, I’m concerned about the impact of this setup should any issue or blockages occur. Noting this system in a heavy rain event needs to allow for any flooding from Scapa terrace and beyond which all flows to this point. Do the water engineers allow for this? Run off from neighbouring properties and wider areas and risk management required.
- An earlier design had an opening across the garage floor to allow for an overland water flow and hence reduce the risk of flooding to our properties. I’m not sure why this has been removed, perhaps because it was too high to be effective, but if it was thought to be required, then why is it no longer required?
- I mention the retention pond in the southeast corner, I’m concerned that the excavation around here to lower the site to proposed floor level 168, will then allow the overflow from the retention pond to flow down this boundary strip of land to pool in the middle off the site and on our properties. We had flooding on Donald Street a few weeks ago and the retention pond rose to its lip. Has this strip of land been designed so it doesn’t become a duck pond around our fence line?
- I’d like to suggest Ryman consider a few scruffy domes along this strip of land to remove water early, I’d like to see guttering at the base of the 175 metre garage wall (can’t find that in any plans), and I’d like to be sure the contour of the land down this strip of land helps water travel to the drainage system. Away from neighbour’s land.

**Final Points:**

- Parking, yes, the rules have changed, but their clients have not. Residents of Ryman apartments are upper class car drivers, and we want them to have their independence by keeping their cars for as long as possible.
- Ryman are correct, there is enough parking on the streets around the site. But this doesn't allow for the cars that use the site for Karori Kids, doesn't allow for an RSA event, sport or events at Ben Burn Park some weekdays and every weekend, Bowling tournaments, swimming competitions, regular tennis or even more cars at a tennis tournaments or club day. Let's not forget the unmarked bus waiting areas in Lower street or the pickup drop-off needs on Donald Street required to commute students to technology classes every day.
- And how many Ryman staff will come to work, park, then go and shift their vehicle onto the site once the previous shift clears the carpark. I believe some easy changes can fix parking capacity issues if Ryman were a little more flexible.

**In summary:**

- Shading is going to have a significant effect on our amenities, the areas we use the majority of the time are impacted from zero sunshine to some. In winter we are impacted in a major way, from all day sunshine to 15 minutes of sunshine in our outdoor living area. The amenity we are losing is the area we use - less weighting should be considered on the un-usable areas of our property.
- The loss of light and solar gain will impact our living significantly.
- And Ryman have made no effort to mitigate this shading impact on us.
- Our Privacy is significantly impacted, again it is more than minor because its privacy in our most used areas where we spend most of our time.
- Ryman have made no effort to mitigate this, and there are some very simple suggestions in the National Urban design guidelines like not have a living area overlooking neighbours.
- I have suggested some mitigations I think will help Ryman reduce the risk of flooding to their neighbours, but I trust the experts will progress our concerns there.
- My understanding is this development is non-complying under the WCC operational plan and its proposed district plan. It is also does not align with the new national intensification rules for homes and house, as this is a commercial development.
- Councils are rejecting the new national intensification guidelines, so it's only a matter of time before change comes for the betterment of communities like Karori. Please don't let this development be an example of a poorly planned policy slipping through the consenting process and the locals dealing with the ramifications on our amenities, flooding, infrastructure, traffic, parking, safety and environment.
- For these reasons I can't see how this development in its current form, can be approved.