

Tena Koutou katou

I have lived in Aotearoa for 30 years always here in NP.

I have been involved in education and the helping professions all my working life. I taught at NPGHS and at Spotswood College for nearly 20 years.

MITIGATE = less harsh or severe (Collins dictionary)

Reduce severity (Oxford Concise)

I am opposed on the following points

Building's Height is Overwhelming

The building is out of character both for the CBD area and New Plymouth

Pedestrian Safety on already busy Brougham Street /Powderham Crossing

Underground Car parking for only 7 vehicles

Highway Distraction

Height

I oppose this application for a 6 storey building on the grounds, it does not have "Good urban manners" pg 43 Lennard," Principles of True Urbanism."

"It is not on a human scale, meaning it is not fundamentally human in nature. People will not be able to relate their own physical size to the architecture."

"Will we be able to recognise a face in a window and wave and call up to someone." (Pg 39,49 Lennard, Principles of True Urbanism)

Call me old fashioned. The building does not sit well with me.

Kyle Ramsey 2014 Investigation into the New Plymouth Central Area and Building Heights

*"One's assumption is that if any new tall buildings are proposed for New Plymouth in the future they will more than likely be of a **residential nature**."*

This is not the reason for having 6 storeys here.

According to the applicant, "The main reason for the proposal's extra height is because the building is designed as a sustainable eco-building, as discussed in the application and evidence of Mr Bhaskar. Any reduction in size of the building would mean that it would not be viable to build as an eco-building as proposed." Applicant.

Is a sustainable building sufficient reason to have a 6 storey building?

Richard Bain - Principal Landscape Architect, Bluemarble says in his Initial Peer Review

...". However, I **don't** consider that the over-height portion will have only a 'slight adverse' effect on the continuity of the street's buildings, considering it is so demonstrably tall

compared to its neighbours. In my view, the LVIA's description of the area as being dominated by low-quality environment doesn't fully identify the **potential adverse effects of the proposal**. I agree that there are positive effects of a new building on the site, **but the building is considerably taller than the permitted limit of 14m. The LVIA states that effects can be offset by its positive design characteristics.**" Richard Bain Architect initial Peer Review July 2020

After some changes Mr Bain's subsequent Peer Review of February 2021 concludes:

"In summary,**but also risks creating potential adverse effects on the character and amenity of the area and Victoria Road viewshaft.** I consider that the **redesign** of the top-level apartment **reduces effects** compared to the original design and that the proposed mitigation measure would further reduce potential effects, **albeit to a limited extent.**"

that adverse effects can only be reduced
Note the words "to a limited extent"

What can change the actual a height of a 25.5 metre building? I keep asking.

Out of Character

I feel that the Heritage Buildings in this area will be overwhelmed

Mr Cullen (Heritage) suggests that... "The glazed façade also will, to **some extent**, literally reflect the adjacent heritage buildings, to "include" them as part of the new building; in a similar way that the Len Lye Centre does relative to the White Hart Hotel."

What does, "to some extent" mean???

Mr Cullen continues ...(TAFT) - The proposed building is approximately 3 times the height but is on the opposite side of the street. This all makes the issue of height / being overwhelmed reduced by separation. As noted above, the exterior appearance of the proposed building will help mitigate the issue of bulkWhile the proposed building is approximately 3 times the height, it considerably separated as noted above. ***This all makes the issue of height / being overwhelmed considerably diminished, to the point of it not being an issue.....*** While the Design Guide asks that: "... New buildings in the heritage character area **should aim to be no more than one storey above the height of adjoining buildings when viewed from the street...**"; in this case, the glazed façade mitigates the effect of scale difference by being "lightweight" in appearance and feel.

I cannot accept that the issues of height and being overwhelmed by a building 3 times its height are "considerably diminished to the point of not being an issue" by being separated by "two 3.0 m wide traffic lanes with 2.0m shoulders marked for parking and taxis.

Richard Bain - Bluemarle from the same quotation as previously printed, "I agree that a tall building on an intersection will have an anchoring effect and is preferable to a mid-block tall building. However, **I don't** consider that the over-height portion will have only a **'slight adverse'** effect on the continuity of the street's buildings, considering it is so demonstrably tall compared to its neighbours. In my view, the LVIA's description of the area as being dominated by low-quality environment doesn't fully identify the **potential adverse effects**

of the proposal. I agree that there are positive effects of a new building on the site, **but the building is considerably taller than the permitted limit of 14m. The LVIA states that effects can be offset by its positive design characteristics.**" Richard Bain Architect initial Peer Review July 2020

"I would suggest that the conclusion that the overall impact will be acceptable relies on the recommended mitigation measures being able to reduce effects, **which at this point is uncertain**". July 2020 Richard Bain Peer Review

Mr Bain's subsequent Peer Review of February 2021 concludes:

"In summary, given the city's existing building pattern, and the building height parameters in the ODP and PDP, the proposal will in my opinion create potential benefits for the city centre, **but also risks creating potential adverse effects on the character and amenity of the area and Victoria Road viewshaft.** I consider that the **redesign** of the top-level apartment **reduces effects** compared to the original design and that the proposed mitigation measure would further reduce potential effects, **albeit to a limited extent.**"

I have to agree with Mr Bain that mitigation attempts are limited.

I continue to ask the same question . What can change the height of 25.5 metre ^{building} height?

Pedestrian Safety on Brougham St.

Murali Bhaskar (Architect) 7.5 acknowledges " Proximity to arterial roads The site is situated on a busy CBD corner of a main one-way street running West East through New Plymouth (Powderham Street). Access for vehicles and pedestrians is difficult and this is further exacerbated by the fall in existing ground level from Powderham Street towards the sea."

I see no way to change/mitigate this busy corner.

The proposed access to underground carpark will need to be well sign-posted and delineated for passing pedestrians on this busy street. And this is a busy street average daily traffic approx. 3000 vehicles daily. Remembering there is also a taxi rank lower down the street, a pedestrian crossing and popular café opposite and not forgetting that in 2014 a person was killed on this street getting into her car..

Underground Car Parking There were 13 carparks, all be it narrow ones, on the original plans. I see that there are now 7. Therefore 6 less parks underground, and 17 cars, which were previously parked on the site, will need to find new parking spaces together with the fact the NPDC Parking Building is closed due to earthquake regs). Mr Boon (in his submission) references the "parking building and new build" as complementing. Will the Parking Building still be there? Mr Boon also references the NPDC car park (under Section 3 Pedestrian Connectivity and laneways, " Apart from being required for egress, this access brings the building closer to the NPDC parking building which will benefit from use by the building's occupants." **(suggesting to me that 7 carparks below are not sufficient for 10 offices and an apartment)** .Remembering that there is **no drop off zone** either and that the inference has been that couriers will use the drop off bay on the opposite side of the street thus Couriers having to carry goods across the busy street.

Highway Safety

It seems that a comparison with the glass facade of the TSB Centre has been used to answer the question re visual distraction. I suggest that the **TSB building is set back some metres from the edge of Highway 45**. Unlike the proposed building which is right on its edge, and TSB building does not have a wall of glass with designs facing the oncoming traffic.

I have concerns re the Pedestrian Crossing over Powderham Street which ends at the very corner of the proposed building on a narrow footpath together with the left turning traffic.

Conclusion: I am opposed on the following points

Building's Height is Overwhelming

The building is out of character both for the CBD area and New Plymouth

Pedestrian Safety on already busy Brougham Street .Powderham Crossing

Underground Car parking for only 7 vehicles

Highway Distraction

Nhga Mihi nui

June Moseley 23/24 February 2021

I have a question re a point in Mr Boon's Conclusion

"because the applicant owns 49 Brougham st and NPDC own 33 Devon St the usual solid 4 hour FRR Boundary wall is not required allowing transparent glazed facades on four sides. If the adjoining properties were owned by others it would require an unsightly solid concrete wall."

I cannot see how the ownership of a building can change safety rules .
Have I missed something here?