

FS 4-1

Proposed Plan Change G – Aokautere Urban Growth

First name	Brett
Last name	Guthrie
This is a further submission [in support of or in opposition to] a submission on Proposed Plan Change G	in support of
I am:	a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest
Please specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category	Own property and live adjacent to proposed subdivision.
My further submission is on submission number:	41
Name of original submitter	Brett Guthrie
The particular parts of the submission that I support / oppose are:	I oppose medium density, multi storey housing on the boundary with Moonshine Valley.
The reasons for my support / opposition are:	I wish to add support information that has arisen since my initial submission.
I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed / disallowed:	Whole allowed
Supporting information	Addendum to SO 41 .docx
I wish to be heard in support of my submission	No
If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing	Yes

FS 4-2

Addendum to SO 41: Plan Change G: Aokautere Growth Area 2022

The submitter emphasises continued strong objection to medium-density, multi-storey housing on the boundary with Moonshine Valley as outlined in Aokautere Plan Change-G: Promontory Clusters (p.85) and by the precedent effect of Plan Change-I: Medium Density Residential Zone.

In this plan the viability of medium-density, multi-storey housing is questioned. Firstly by Urbacity: North Village (PC-G):

"A thriving centre sets up the potential for a mixed-density housing market within a walkable distance of the centre. If the centre fails it is unlikely that a market will exist for this housing, which would affect the integrity of the Structure Plan." (p.4)

Secondly, by Submitter 58, the Woodgate developer who agrees with Urbacity's concerns and further questions potential market demand and access cost:

"The quantum of medium density needs to match a careful assessment of market demand which should have been undertaken at the outset of this project. The promontory clusters also need to be tested as to feasibility given the road access development costs to these sites." (p.4).

Addressing the criteria for the placement of medium-density, multi-storey housing:

1, Inappropriate placement on the fringes of the city: Criteria for this type of housing includes being: For example, 800m walking distance from the city centre. That is a sensible proposal, entirely opposite to "promontory clusters" on the fringes of the city.

2, 500m from a bus stop. In Aokautere the topography of these promontory locations precludes this being an "easy" walk from to the proposed shopping centre. The existing gullies and possible road layout make the distance far longer.

The area is not "*well served by public transport*" (District Plan 10.3). No business plan has been presented for the viability of an extended and regular bus service to the new areas of the subdivision. The topography makes the road layout unlike any other in Palmerston North creating difficulties for bus access, especially for the longer buses now coming into service.

FS 4-3

As outlined by a number of other submitters, this type of housing on the city fringes and poorly serviced by public transport is *"in conflict with the aim of limiting the effects of climate change by reducing travel (Eco-City Strategy 2021-31)"*

3, A critical part of the proposal is closeness to the boundary which affects:

- Visual dominance over Moonshine Valley.

- Inadequate recession planes against the close boundary, even if no house is there it should be treated as if one was.

- The *"balconies"* and *"ground level living space"* would overlook many parts of the valley and highly depend of tree growth which may not be permanent.

- With the planned layout and existing trees many units on the promontories would be in shade a great deal of the day breaking the following requirement: *"be able to receive a minimum of 3 hours continuous sunshine over at least 50% of the area on the shortest day of the year"*.

None of these issues fit *"within the character of existing neighbourhoods"* (DP 10.1). And as for Turitea Valley I emphasise *"without careful management of the interface between the two areas, can adversely affect the amenity of the Valley below (DP 10.2.12).*

4, Walking distance to schools: The well-established Global One School has restricted access and by necessity draws its pupils from a wide catchment. The state school site has remained on Ruapehu Drive. It is a highly unusual expectation for a large number of pupils to walk to school crossing State Highway 54 from the Woodgate area. However, the *"5 to 10 minute walk"* of *"800 metres"* (PC-I) is only achievable for a very small area, barely as far along Pacific Heights as the International Pacific College hostels! Certainly not from the promontary areas, the distance being three times as far.

Clearly it is an unknown factor that people who may favour this type of housing would choose to live so far from the actual city centre and workplaces. The unknowns are well highlighted by the contradictory nature of the proposal and the input from experienced professionals.