M Morrison -- 110 Ohariu Road Officers comments in response • The Transport Planning unit advised they do not The road land should be retained used support any proposal to create off street car Council and for parking. There is no policy for the creation of off community purpose such as playground or off street parking street parking. Parks, Sport and Recreation (formally Parks and Gardens) advise that the Northern Reserves Management Plan sets out the policies to manage parks and reserves in suburban areas such as Johnsonville over the next ten years. The policies on future acquisition of open space land in Johnsonville focus on completion of the Outer Green Belt and not the suburban parks network within residential areas. The residential areas around the proposed sale of unformed legal road on the corner of Cunliffe Street and Ohariu Road are close to Meekswood Reserve (around 100 metres) and around 3 to 400 metres from the nearest play area at Branscombe Street. There is no need for additional open space in this area for recreational purposes. There is good ecological connectivity in this area because of the proximity of the outer green belt supported by smaller reserve areas such as Ohariu Road Reserve and Sedgley Reserve. Effects if the road land is sold and

- then developed
- Issues relating to rubbish and dog control
- The proposal to stop and sell unformed legal road land adjoining 3 Cunliffe Street concerns the stopping and sale of road land only. If the proposal is successful and the road land is amalgamated with 3 Cunliffe Street, then its future use and any issues arising are governed by the rules of the operative District Plan.
- These are matters not associated with the road stopping process and should be pursued with Council's Animal Control and Litter business unit

SM&LAMacintyre -- 7 Officers comments in response **Cunliffe Street** Concerned about the The proposed small strip of land (Section 2) area described as Section 2 which looks would overlap your site. However this strip of like it over laps my boundary. land is not proposed to be sold to 3 Cunliffe Street. It is proposed to create it as an 'isolation strip', and Council would still retain ownership. The purpose of doing this is so that after Section 1 was stopped, transferred into fee simple land and amalgamated with Lot 6 DP 22043 (3 Cunliffe Street) that property would not

Height Plan bylaw. I would have thought that the height plan bylaw would still need to be adhered to, ie a 2.7m height pole straight up from his boundary peg and in from the boundary on an upwards 45 degree angle for one storey, 3m till struck, then plum bob down in a straight line – or in further if the structure is 6m high – doesn't leave a lot of space between the building and the crib wall if the strip is part of the property.

have legal road frontage at this point. So should you or any future owner of your property ever apply to purchase road land adjoining your property, then 3 Cunliffe Street could not object on the grounds that their access would be affected.

 This requirement was formally known as a 'Sunlight Access Plane', more recently changed to 'Building Recession Plane'. This requirement only relates to side and rear boundaries. It is not applicable to front boundaries, i.e. a boundary directly adjoining road land.

- Stormwater/sewage pipe, Asbestos, Carparking.
- The proposal currently being consulted on concerns the stopping and sale of road land only. If the road stopping proposal is successful and the road land is amalgamated with 3 Cunliffe Streets existing title, then the future use of that land and any issues arising such as drainage, asbestos, or carparking are governed by a completely different process, that being the rules of the operative District Plan.
- Pohutukawa trees need to be protected.
- Based on the aerial view the trunks of these trees and most of the branches are outside of the land proposed to be stopped / sold so would remain on road land. In addition Council's Parks, Sport and Recreation (formally Parks and Gardens) unit have been consulted as part of the road stopping process. They gave their approval without condition.

S M & L A Macintyre -- 7 Cunliffe Street (Continued)

Officers comments in response

- The growth spiral in this area is putting pressure on the road infrastructure and as such should not be permitted to be sold off.
- Transport Planning advise that sufficient legal width is being retained to accommodate future road requirements – existing recommendation stands. Request for conversion of area to car park not supported, and no policy for the creation of off-street parking areas.
- Concerned that when cars are parked on both sides of Cunliffe Street emergency vehicles are not
- Transport Planning advise that the existing formed carriageway is sufficient for emergency vehicles, and furthermore that in

able to pass through, suggests	additional to that carriageway additional
having painted no stopping lines.	unformed legal road land is still being
	retained.

M & F Lindsay -- 26 Cunliffe Street

different matter, but just for one

residence?

If Council was reducing the width of the whole road this would be a land in Cui

Will impact on me as I wish to put up a car port in the next couple of years and to build within a metre of the boundary.

Officers comments in response

- The proposal to reduce the width of the road land in Cunliffe Street just directly adjoining 3 Cunliffe Street resulted from the owner of that property lodging a road stopping application. After assessment Council's Transport Planning unit confirmed their support in principal. It could therefore also be assumed that Transport Planning would also support reducing the road land width down the entire street, but that can not be determined until another resident lodges their own road stopping application. It is common practise to deal with each road stopping application individually, and each has to be considered on its own merits. There are significant costs associated with the road stopping process that the property owner is responsible for in addition to the cost of the land itself, therefore other owners can not be forced to buy road land.
- While a new 1m front yard rule requirement would be triggered on your property as a result of the road stopping proposal from 3 Cunliffe Street. I further advise the following:
 - It is only that part of your property that is directly opposite 3 Cunliffe Street that is affected, the balance would remain as it is.
 - These requirements will only apply to 'new' buildings and / or additions or alterations to existing buildings within the front yard. Existing use rights are likely to apply for existing buildings already within the front yard.
 - Accessory buildings (carports, garages etc) may still be constructed within the front yard provided they have a maximum width of 6 metres.

Therefore as long as the width of any new carport did not exceed 6 metres, a new front yard rule requirement would not have to be considered. However if it did exceed 6 metres then dispensation could be applied for. Dispensations can not be guaranteed in advance as they need to be considered at the time a proposal to build is lodged.

M & F Lindsay -- 26 Cunliffe Street (Continued)

- Reducing the road reserve along the boundary of number 3 Cunliffe Street could impede future roading development.
- Query whether proposal to reduce the road reserve adjacent to number 3 is not part of plan to correct an illegal part of existing development. From plans supplied appears that the applicants garage has been partly built on road reserve.

Officers comments in response

- Transport Planning considered the application and supported reducing the width of the unformed legal road from the existing 20m down to 18m.
- The road stopping proposal is not part of any plan to correct an illegal part of an existing development. Furthermore I am not aware of an outstanding compliance issue relating to the applicants property, and the garage has not been built on road land.

Johnsonville Community Association Inc

• Negative effects on street scape.

- Disproportionate reduction in 'buffer' between road and residential dwellings.
- Loss of potential for community based revitalisation of a significant public space.
- Inappropriate encouragement of disproportionately dense residential development.
- Negative traffic safety outcomes, and removal of public space in which to improve traffic safety.

Officers comments in response

- In regards to what will happen to the subject land in the future, the proposal currently being consulted on concerns the stopping and sale of road land only. If the road stopping proposal is successful the land will be amalgamated into the title for 3 Cunliffe Street. Its future use and any issues arising will then be governed by a different process, that being the rules of the operative District Plan.
- The proposal does not alter the width of the existing carriageway, or its proximity to nearby residential dwellings.
- The proposal has been considered and supported by the relevant Council business units, none such as Development Planning and Compliance or Parks, Sport and Recreation (formally Parks and Gardens) required the land to be retained for a public space.
- The proposal to stop and sell unformed legal road land adjoining 3 Cunliffe Street concerns the stopping and sale of road land only. If the proposal is successful and the road land is amalgamated with 3 Cunliffe Street, then its future use and any issues arising are governed by the rules of the operative District Plan.
- The proposal has been considered and supported by the relevant Council business units. Transport Planning did not require the land to be retained to improve traffic safety.

- Negative ecologoical outcomes (removal of existing flora and (by selling off public space) abandoning the opportunity to develop an 'island' of native biodiversity.
- The proposal has been considered and supported by the relevant Council business units, Parks, Sport and Recreation (formally Parks and Gardens) did not required the land to be retained for ecological reasons.

Johnsonville Community Association Inc (Continued)

Raising the public ire by ignoring overwhelming local public opposition to the proposal.

 Propose hybrid designation for areas such as this: road reserves that keep options open for the long term future, yet which keep public recreation and biodiversity uses open in the meanwhile.

Officers comments in response

- Public opposition is not being ignored. As the subject land is situated in the middle of an established residential neighbourhood the road stopping proposal is being carried out under the Local Government Act 1974 legislation because that requires public consultation. The required public consultation was carried out in March/April/May 2013, and the objections received are in the process of being considered now.
- Referred to Council's Policy and Planning, and Parks, Sport and Recreation (formally Parks and Gardens) units.
 - Policy and Planning's position is that creating a hybrid designation would be entirely impractical.
 - o Parks, Sport and Recreation advised that The Northern Reserves Management Plan sets out the policies to manage parks and reserves in suburban areas such as Johnsonville over the next ten years. The policies on future acquisition of open space land in Johnsonville focus on completion of the Outer Green Belt and not the suburban parks network within residential areas. The residential areas around the proposed sale of road reserve on the corner of Cunliffe Street and Ohariu Road are close to Meekswood Reserve (around 100 metres) and around 3 to 400 metres from the nearest play area at Branscombe Street. There is no need for additional open space in this area for recreational purposes. There is good ecological connectivity in this area because of the proximity of the outer green belt supported by smaller reserve areas such as Ohariu Road Reserve and Sedgley Reserve.
- Large trees maintenance cost.
 Trees were clearly planted
- Parks, Sport and Recreation unit acknowledge that the hedge/trees are badly placed, but

APPENDIX 2

(illegally?) by previous owner of 3 Cunliffe St to reinforce their 'private' use of a public road reserve land. These trees are appallingly badly placed under power lines which must periodically cost WCC enormous money to trim them, in order to prevent interruption with electricity supply.

advise that there is no maintenance cost to Council. The hedge is maintained by the adjoining landowner and the trees are maintained by Wellington Electricity.