

## **FEEDBACK FROM THE ŌRĀKEI LOCAL BOARD ON A RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION FOR 5 AITKEN AVENUE**

### **Background**

LUC60309996 was approved in February 2018 on a non-notified basis for the following: It is proposed to remove the existing building on site and construct a three-storey visitor accommodation in the form of a motel consisting of 19 units, along with an 88m<sup>2</sup> café/restaurant at ground floor level. The visitor accommodation units are all studio units and range from 18m<sup>2</sup> to 32m<sup>2</sup>.

The proposal includes three signs, being two signs for the visitor accommodation and one sign for the café. The visitor accommodation signage consists of one 1.8m<sup>2</sup> sign on the street facing façade above the motel reception and one 2.7m<sup>2</sup> vertical sign on the northern elevation. The café signage is also 1.8m<sup>2</sup> in area and is mounted on the road facing façade above the café entrance.

Two parking spaces were to be provided on site.

The approved development required resource consent in relation to the following matters:

- Establishing a Visitor accommodation
- Establishing a café under 100m<sup>2</sup> GFA
- An infringement to the standard height to boundary control. The use of Alternative height to boundary
- Establishing New buildings and vulnerable activities (including earthworks) within the 1% AEP floodplain.
- Parking shortfall
- Vehicle crossing width and the number of crossings serving one site
- Signage Council granted consent to the visitor accommodation on a non-notified basis and the development was consistent with the objectives and policies of the Mixed Housing Urban Zone.

As part of the consent application, Council reviewed and assessed the flood hazard and parking shortfall, as well as the non-residential activities (visitor accommodation and café).

A fresh new consent is required given the recent application to increase the complex by a further 7 units.

### **Residential Mixed Housing Urban**

1. OLB continue to have reservations on the construction of accommodation for 26 visitor units when under the Unitary plan rules – the threshold has been set at 10 people (under H5.4.1). If each unit were to hold 2 persons as a minimum then we are potentially faced with accommodation for 52 persons plus 5 staff.
2. We query whether the Unitary Plan had flexibility to extend the threshold by over 40 persons.
3. OLB support and encourage economic development; however, the establishment of a café is better situated in a Business – Mixed Use zone, not a Mixed Urban zone. The encroachment of zones and demarcation is becoming a challenge for local boards to assess and before time the transitory lines of distinction will become blurred due to precedent scenarios.
4. OLB note the proposed building has total height of 13.65m – with the permitted height being 11m. Again local board need to be consistent across all assessments of height proposed by developers and OLB have continued to apply these principles to recent high profile projects in the Orakei area.
5. OLB note the inconsistency of building two vehicle crossings. The activity proposed and its associated parking requirements anticipate 30 carpark spaces being provided. Only 2 are provided in this instance with a pick up and drop off shuttle service provided.



Figure 3: Identifying the existing, consented and proposed height of the building at 5 Atkin Avenue

6. OLB notes the proposed built form, height and the scale of the building will be different to the majority of homes in Aitken Avenue and will set a precedent in the visual landscape of the area.
7. The Alternative height to boundary and height standards are breached and we would envisage neighbours and Council to receive the application for a fourth story and 7 additional units as pushing the Unitary Plan thresholds beyond an acceptable level. Public notification for residents and the community of stakeholders would be a collaborative action.
8. By comparing the Business Mixed Use maximum height of 16m to the proposed building height of 13.65m as a relative mass and bulk property – is not a fair alignment. The zones are different and the OLB will be vigilant with the limits within each zone.

### Land Disturbance

9. OLB are conscious of the 1% annual exceedance probability of flooding. Mission Bay, Kohimarama and surrounding coastal beaches are constantly under threat of high tides and we would be remiss to discount the impact of this on any new developments.

### Transport

10. OLB are concerned the development requires 30 spaces according to Standard E27.6.2 and two spaces are provided, resulting in a car parking space shortfall of 28 spaces. The applicant has underestimated the effect of accommodation guests arriving with their own cars and seeking parking.
11. Mission Bay is a heavily visited tourist destination and traffic flows are intensive and cannot be predicted in any consistent manner. Aitken Avenue is one the most sought after streets for local and visitor parking.

12. The proposition that all visitors to the accommodation complex will not bring their own vehicles and utilise a shuttle bus is tenuous at best.
13. Even if half the visitors took the shuttle bus – then the other 13 units would still require a vehicle or public transport to arrive and leave the premises.
14. The shuttle service is referenced in the AEE but the detail of the operations and logistics is not apparent and clear.
15. Mission Bay is also going through a phase of assessment for 30 km. This will create complex and unwanted bottlenecks in an already crowded main trunk network route – being Tamaki Drive. Aitken Avenue is a feeder street into this main arterial.
16. There are also transport safety proposals around the Mission Bay township including raised crossings.
17. OLB sees the combination of these traffic developments together with any shortfall of parking for visitor accommodation vehicles to bring a calamitous effect on an already congested suburban route.

### **Signs**

18. OLB does not advocate large signage in a suburban street – which potentially affects the visual landscape of the area.
19. Signage is proposed as follows:
  - One 1.8m<sup>2</sup> sign on the street facing façade above the reception;
  - One 2.7m<sup>2</sup> vertical sign on the northern elevation; and
  - One 1.8m<sup>2</sup> in area mounted on the road facing façade above the café entrance

### **SUMMARY**

There are over 15 restricted discretionary activities proposed under this consent proposal. The height standards are exceeded and the transport implications in particular car parking have not been fully considered. The impacts on local neighbours and residents will be significant.

OLB advocates public notification.