

63
#38

PC19 Hearing Panel Oral Submission from Julene Anderson, read by Lyall Hopcroft

I refer to the following recommendations of Liz White's Section 42A Report – Report on Submissions and further Submission (Part 2 – Zoning requests).

a. **I support** the recommendation made at page 67 of the report:

“Amending LRZ-R1.1 so that it refers to one residential unit per site, not two, on the basis that this was a drafting error and was not intended.”

This drafting error caused a lot of consternation when it was proposed in CODC's original Plan Change document, because it applied to the recommended miniscule 500 sqm sections (LRZ) proposed in some areas of the original RRA6 area in North Cromwell. It would have meant a 4000 sqm section could be subdivided into 8 x 500 sqm sections, with each one comprised of 2 residential units on a 500 sqm site. This would have effectively converted what should be a 4000sqm LLRZ area into a defacto MRZ area.

(b) **I support** her comments at paragraph 159 that there is no justification for the RRA6 area to be split into LLRZ and LRZ.

It was noted by the writer at paragraph 153 that I originally submitted that the Spatial Plan never envisaged the current RRA6 area being split further into LLRZ and LLZ. I am still at a loss as to why PC19 proposes 2 different zones, based on flimsy assertions re visual clutter from recreational lakeside users, proximity to a nohonga site and stated promises of land swaps with developers.

(c) **I do not support** the writer's comments in Paragraph 158 that she considers that *“it is reasonable to expect that amenity values and character of areas will change over time.”* The Spatial Plan doesn't support this assertion and many residents bought specifically in the RRA6 area because of the amenity values and character of the area. As there is already projected by Council to be an oversupply of available properties in Cromwell, as a result of PC19, then I cannot see why the RRA6 area should be sacrificed to add to this oversupply.

(d) **I do support** her recommendations at paragraph 163 (retaining a single zone) and 164 (a) that the Hearing Panel needs to take notice of the retention of the values that were originally enshrined in the current District Plan. The number of submitters that want the area

retained at 4000 sqm per site, far outweighs those who want to reduced site size down to LRZ and MRZ. This area is the only one in urban Cromwell that allows the larger lot size of 4000sqm and sections of that size sell from \$750,000 upwards.

(e) **I do not support** her recommendation at paragraph 164 (d) for *“application of an alternate density (e.g. somewhere between LRZ and LLRZ) to some or all of this area. The pros and cons would be somewhere inbetween/relative to those identified above.”*

This recommendation is totally flawed, especially following on from her previous 3 recommendations in paragraph 164 and I ask the Hearing Panel to reject it completely. It solves no purpose in meeting any of the objectives of PC19. The whole area should be the same, preferably retention of 4000sqm sites, or in a worse case scenario, a reduction to 2000 sqm sites (LLRZ zoning). I note that there was no consideration given in my original submission to give Precinct Status to RRA6 to retain the 4000 sqm sites, yet Lowburn was given Precinct Status to retain 3000 sqm sites. There was no recommendation made to consider this within paragraph 164 and I'm still at a loss to know why Lowburn gained protection of the status quo in PC19 while north Cromwell appears to be ignored.

- special plan.
- Inland

There are other areas in Cromwell subject to PC19 zoning changes that could offset a reduction in yield by maintaining the current status quo of RRA6. (Waenga Drive, Freeway, Gair Ave)

In conclusion, I thank Lyall for reading this oral submission to the Hearing Panel, and for the Hearing Panel agreeing to sit in Cromwell to allow local's voices to be heard.