

HEARING

Sid McDouall, 3 Brenda Lawson Way, Richmond. TDC has identified my wife and I as affected parties.

My submission was centred around four main points. Two of them no longer apply since the access road between BLW and the care facility has been removed from the plan. I also made a comment about the lack of green space.

I am enormously relieved that the access road has gone. It was a danger to any traffic on it and would certainly have resulted in accidents at the intersection between BLW and Hill St. The coming and going of staff at all hours would have made sleep impossible to the immediate neighbours. It was a piece of design well below the expectation of this Lifestyle Village. But it has gone: well done!

That leaves me with two main concerns:

Firstly, the adverse effects caused by the height, scale and bulk of the Care Facility in an otherwise domestic/residential housing environment.

Olive's original Application included an indication of the size and weight of preparing the foundations:

...the earthworks involve digging a wedge from the existing ground level in front to approximately 5 metres in the rear, providing a footprint of approximately 4,400 square metres.

We read about..Foundations including cuts up to 5 metres deep. Then we read:

...land disturbance will not arise; it will be managed. But there were no details about how it would be managed!

This is a massive building. I am very concerned about the effects on my property and other neighbours, of moving so much dirt so close to our boundary. My boundary with Olive is 54m long and all of it faces this towering structure.

A Construction Management plan has been provided in J. Lancashire's **Recommended Variations**. Even that does not address my main concern which is the effect of earthmoving vibration on my property. My house is clad in solid plaster monolithic cladding which can crack under intense vibration. In fact all Brenda Lawson and Fawdan Way houses which adjoin the site have similar cladding, as do a huge proportion of all modern homes.

There is nothing in the plan to safeguard the neighbours against damage caused in construction. No doubt we will Safeguarding ourselves with a builder's survey of our own properties before construction starts. How much better it would be if the management plan showed an understanding and sympathy for the concerns and fears of the immediate community.

...

My second point concerned the resulting loss of residential character and the negative visual and landscape effects of the Care Facility. These tall buildings overlook the neighbours in BLW and Fawdan Way. Windows, balconies and an outside dining/sitting area all peer down into our gardens and into some of our living space. The whole of my 54m boundary is overlooked. In some areas of the building the lowest floor level of the Facility is higher than the neighbour's ceiling.

The Application discussed mitigation, which sounded woefully inadequate...

...Adjacent neighbours on BLW will be lower than the entry. Planting and landscaping can alleviate any negative views, but trees take time to grow.

At least we agree on that! But nowhere is the obvious point made that unless the trees are well above fence height when they are planted, are established early and well cared for, it will be many years before they provide any cover.

- (For reference, when I first realised what Olive was planning I planted 1.8m high evergreen micheleas on my side of the fence. Despite my best care they have have only grown about 200mm. Most transplants do not grow fast in their first two years!) And I can tell you the soil is heavy, yellow clay!

The elevations show trees that appear well grown and doing a pretty good job. But this is misleading. The drawings represent 8-10 year old trees. There is nothing to say that these are going in early, or what size they will be when transplanted. Nor is there any suggestion that the neighbours might be consulted on placement and the type of tree for particular, vulnerable spots.

Also misleading were the photographs of BLW provided by Olive, late, on Monday. Photographed at ground level they suggest that our fences provide privacy. In reality, the second floor of the care Facility buildings will provide a clear view into our gardens, bedrooms and living rooms.

Even the model is misleading! It gives a great aerial view but to really appreciate how dominant the Facility is from BLW and Fawdan Way, you need to look up at buildings. And those sponge trees...how long will they take to get so big?

A screen of trees tall enough to largely obscure the Facility from the BLW houses and vice versa is clearly required. There is no direct reference to it. I note that Hill St is to be protected by landscaping 20 days before the facility opens, but BLW and Fawdan Way do not even get a mention. **The trees need to be of sufficient size to be effective while/if the building process takes place.** This would go a long way to protecting our privacy **and the privacy of the Olive residents.** Surely, the Facility residents deserve privacy from Day One? But there is no statement of intent to do so. That is the dementia unit...

In summary I believe that this plan ignores or greatly understates the impact that the Care Facility Building would have on its neighbours. I believe Olive pride themselves on the landscaping in the village but they have failed to allow for the complete change of scale provided by the CFB.

Finally, I noted that there was a lack of identifiable public reserve. The two points I have just spoken about seem to me to be as much a matter of common sense and common decency as town planning. I take the public reserve requirement to fall into the same category as our rates; I didn't think there was an option. Failing to observe the Tasman Resource Management Plan and the Regional Policy Statement would set a precedent to other developers. The space at Iris Rd and Fairrose Drive would provide a good area for residents and the general public to enjoy.