

From: [Kathryn Hooper](#)
To: [Julie Straka](#)
Subject: LUC23/48350 - Post Hearing Minute Information (Woolcombe Terrace)
Date: Tuesday, 15 April 2025 5:11:23 pm
Attachments: [PastedGraphic-4.png](#)
[PastedGraphic-7.png](#)
[PastedGraphic-5.png](#)
[PastedGraphic-8.png](#)
[clip_image005.png](#)
[KH Tracked Changes 5.a.\(ii\) Statutory Assessment - Permitted Baseline.docx](#)
[KH Tracked Changes 5.b.\(ii\) Statutory Assessment - Proposed Pergola.docx](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. To minimise cyber security risks, do not click on any links or open any attachments unless you are certain that the sender is legitimate. Please note that no legitimate sender will ever ask you for password details.

Dear Julie

Further to 5 a) (iv) and 5 b) (iv) of the Post Hearing minute for LUC23/48350 dated 28 March 2025, please find attached:

- A tracked changes word version of Mr Lawns statement in relation to the permitted baseline assessment. [5 a) (iv)]
- A tracked changes word version of Mr Lawns statement in relation to the pergola design [5 b) (iv)]

In terms of concluding comments;

PERMITTED BASELINE

In relation to the Permitted baseline, I am generally in agreement with Mr Lawn however have raised one concern in that it is not clear that the 'building footprint' calculation for the existing dwelling (House 1) has been performed correctly. The 'building footprint' on the plans provided appears to match the 'floor plan' on the property file, indicating the substantial overhanging eaves of 'House 1' have not been included in the calculations.

PERGOLA

In relation to the pergola, I disagree with Mr Lawn, and in my opinion the pergola meets the definition of a 'fence or wall' and therefore does not comply with MRZ-S10 and land use consent for the pergola would be required.

The matters of discretion if compliance with MRZ-S10 is not achieved outline the planning concerns that will arise with the proposed pergola if consent is to be sought:

- *Effect on the streetscape and planned character of the zone, especially visual dominance.*
- *The extent to which topography, site orientation and planting can mitigate the effects of the additional fence or wall height.*
- *Effect on amenity values of nearby residential properties, including outlook, privacy, shading and sense of enclosure.*
- *The extent to which the additional height is necessary due to the shape or natural and physical features of the site; or to mitigate the effects of noise, including road noise if the site is located adjacent to a noise emitting source.*
- *Whether adequate mitigation of adverse effects can be achieved through the use of planting or alternative design.*

The potential for the pergola to exacerbate the 'dominance' and 'sense of enclosure' effects that are already being considered in relation to the building that is subject to the application would be a key concern in my opinion.

The only other matter that comes to mind when reviewing the design is a practical one relating to maintenance of the vegetation on the structure if it was established. The owners/occupiers of 26

Woolcombe Terrace will not have legal access to the eastern side to trim the vegetation, and given the height, achieving trimming from 28 Woolcombe Terrace could be challenging.

I am happy to discuss further if this would be of benefit to the commissioner,

Ngā mihi
Kathryn

Kathryn Hooper
Executive Director
Mobile 027 759 2044

LANDPRO.

Landpro Ltd, 57 Vivian Street
New Plymouth 4310
New Zealand



landpro.co.nz

