

BRDI Verbal submission:

Domain Road Vineyard:

- 1) Effects on the community of changing the vineyard to infill housing has not been properly considered or consulted. If the conversion was undertaken using a normal RC process wider consultation with the affected parties would have been required and the effects more widely considered, particularly the use of suitably qualified experts. This is effectively acknowledged by the planner in s124 of the 42A report where the lack of in depth community consultation is acknowledged.
- 2) Only have a planners take on the effects and not experts – traffic, infrastructure (power, potable water, wastewater, stormwater), pedestrian, landscape evidence has not been properly considered and in the BRDI opinion insufficient evidence has been presented to enable the commissioners to properly consider effects (both technical and on neighbours).
- 3) Has been an orchard for many years and a vineyard for over 20 years. When I managed the property we had no issues with neighbours – spray drift, noise (wind machines/tractors/staff) being the key issues. Highly productive land (LUC3) will be lost forever. Where is the evidence that being boxed in on 3 sides has actually resulted in complaints – nothing proffered from the CODC or the land owner.
- 4) I believe that the NPS-HPL does apply. The exemption in 3.5.7.c.ii applies to a council initiated or adopted notified plan change to rezone it from general rural to urban. The key point here is council initiated – in this case it was the landowner who initiated the inclusion within PC19.
- 5) Additionally, the CODC has not complied with clauses 3.6, 3.8 and 3.9 of the NPS as part of this process. There has been no consideration or analysis of the requirements under the NPS regarding the preservation of the HPL as required by the NPS. This is also acknowledged by the planner in s124 of their evidence.
- 6) The Cromwell spatial plan considered the boundaries of the satellite towns and specifically identified that densification of Cromwell was appropriate but that the boundaries of other communities needed to be hardened up – including Bannockburn. Why does there need to be growth? Ruins productive land and dilutes the character of the communities.
- 7) Seen as an opportunity to square up the boundary and planner actually acknowledges that the boundaries of outlying communities need to be retained. Its been this way for many years and is part of the character of Bannockburn – not much of an impetus for change.
- 8) Bannockburn has been the subject of a heritage review (Bannockburn Heritage Landscape Study – Science for Conservation: Janet Stephenson, Heather Bauchop, and Peter Petchey). Planner has not reviewed this report as part of this process (once over lightly).
- 9) In Clause 81 planner does not consider that the RMA requires protection of the amenity derived from the current use of the site. This is counter to my experience, particularly in the landscape planning area, where this is a front and centre consideration.
- 10) There is better land that is more suitable for development to the south of Bannockburn (that is not Highly Productive) if the need to meet demand requirements is seen as a key paradigm, although I would support further densification in Cromwell where there is already infrastructure capacity. This should be prioritised to comply with the requirements of the NPS for HPL.
- 11) The planner acknowledges that there are visual effects on the houses that look upon the Domain Rd vineyard – the most effective solution is not the develop the vineyard at all. She has rejected the 3000m2 as an alternative, leading to an increase in effects. Weirdly,

although there is apparently no requirement to do so the planner is recommending a building line restriction to deal with visual effects, again without the provision of sufficient evidence of effects and whether this is sufficient. This is not good process and I do not believe the commissioners have sufficient evidence to base their decision.

- 12) There are no requirements placed on the addition of the vineyard to traffic, lighting, green space, parking – again indicative of the ill thought through and improperly considered effects of the inclusion of the Domain Road vineyard in the sub-division due to the lack of expert evidence proffered and considered. You have a planner making recommendations without the proper suite of evidence, so is kicking the can down the road on these but still feeling entitled to make recommendations which could have a material effect. I recommend taking this out of the PC19 process and subjecting it to the proper rigour of a resource consent.

North East Bannockburn

1. We support the recommendation that the LLRZ zoning of the area in the North East of the Bannockburn township and believe the proposed MRZ zoning is ^{not} applicable to the township of Bannockburn as the fundamental nature of the community is different to more densely populated areas in the district. The proposal is made solely to increase the yield from their proposed sub-division and is not in keeping with the shape of the township of Bannockburn.
2. We strongly support the retention of the Building Line Restriction. This applies not only to the impact on infrastructure but also the amenity impacts on the Bannockburn Inlet and the surrounding community.
3. The existence of the BRDI with over 60 members is indicative of the strength of feeling in this space – the community has expressed a VERY strong desire not to see houses in this area beyond the size of sections nor outside the building line restriction and we support the proposed retention of the building line restriction and the retention of the proposed 2000m2 minimum section size.

South and West of Bannockburn

1. Some of the land in this area that is not considered to be highly productive and I support the expansion of the town boundaries in this area. Where it is highly productive then the NPS-HPL must be applied unless one of the constraints identified in the NPS applies. Non HPL land effects on of residents is much less and impactful on other residents compared to the Domain Road extension.
2. The full analysis required of the CODC with regards to the NPS-HPL should be undertaken and where there are any questions in this space we encourage the commissioners to defer a decision until this work is completed and additional clarifications on the application of the NPS-HPL become clear.
3. Additional analysis is required on the impact on infrastructure is required – however there may be an opportunity for quick wins here where the scoping undertaken by Julie Muir is applied to an equivalent area here rather than the Domain Road vineyard.
4. We do not support the reduction of section size below the 2000m2 in this new location however, due to the impact it will have on the character of developments.

Footprint of Bannockburn

1. We believe additional analysis of the reserves and footpaths is required – its what helps define the communities of Central Otago and proper consideration and analysis is required. We request the commissioners make recommendations in this space that the CODC start additional analysis in this space.

Building Line Restriction

1. We support the retention of the current building line restrictions and that the commissioners give strong consideration to recommendations to that effect as a clear signal to potential developers seeking to expand outside the areas subject to these restrictions.