Summary of Evidence – John Elliot

- 1.1 The submitter owns the majority of the land (the Site) bound by Caulfeild Street, Dungannon Street, and Northland Street, Ranfurly and comprised in Record of Title 616666. The total area of the Site is approximately 19 hectares. There are two unformed legal roads dissecting the site in an east to west fashion, being Welles Street and Knox Street.
- 1.2 PC19 does not identify any additional growth areas for residential activities in Ranfurly. The Growth Projections (April, 2022) prepared by Rationale which informs PC19 suggests only a small amount of growth in Ranfurly over the medium to long term with the average annual rate of increase in population being around 1.4%.
- 1.3 For Ranfurly, PC19 simply seeks to reclassify the current Residential Resource Area Zone with that of the LRZ Zone. Pending the outcome of the minimum density, PC19 would increase the minimum allotment size in the residential zone from what is currently 250m², to either 400m² or 500m².
- 1.4 The Submitter's original submission on PC19 sought the extension of the LRZ to encompass the entirety of the subject site. The submitter intends to develop the land from Caulfeild Street to Knox Street for residential purposes, and to provide for a retirement village on the land north of Knox Street. The submitter detailed in their submission their support to provide for retirement villages in the LRZ under proposed Rule LRZ-R12.
- 1.5 In reviewing Ms White's recommendation, Ms White concludes by recommending the land between Caulfeild Street and Welles Street is re-zoned LRZ, while the land north of Welles Street is retained as per the current zone, being Rural Residential Resource Area, due to uncertainties pertaining to water supply. Ms White also considers reverse sensitivity effects may arise if the proposed LRZ extends too close to the Industrial Resource Area which borders the northern end of the site.
- 1.6 Accordingly, there are essentially three options presented to the Commission for consideration. These are:
 - a. Option A: The status quo being the current Central Otago District Plan zoning, being the Rural Residential Resource Area¹; or
 - b. Option B: The submitter's requested Zoning, the Low Density Residential Zone (LRZ);
 - c. Option C: In response to Ms White's assessment, a possible Option C is presented, which is premised on the basis of new information relating to servicing constraints. Option C would be the adoption of the LRZ recommendation for the land between Caulfeild Street to Welles Street and a Future Growth Overlay (**FGO**) for the land from Welles Street to the north.

¹ Noting that there is presently a thin strip of land adjoining Caulfeild Street which is Zoned Residential Resource Area under the Operative Plan.

Summary of Evidence – John Elliot

1.7 Following a thorough evaluation of the three options under s32 of the Act, I recommend Option C is adopted in that it provides for the most efficient use of the land while identifying an FGO to facilitate future growth when required. Accordingly, I recommend that the planning maps are updated as follows (the blue represents a 10 metre BLR along Northland Street):



1.8 Matters around reverse sensitivity can be managed through the provision of a BLR however this would require the implementation of an additional matter of discretion under Rule 12.7.7² to ensure reverse sensitivity is adequately captured. I recommend the amendment to those matters as follows:

Council shall restrict the exercise of its discretion to the following matters:

- 1. The effect on the natural character of water bodies and their margins.
- 2. The effect on amenity values of the neighbourhood in particular the character of the streetscape.
- 3. The effect on the safe and efficient operation of the roading network.
- 4. The effect on infrastructure.
- 5. The effect on the safety of neighbours.
- 6. The effects of noise from the operation of the roading network and compliance with AS/NZS 2107:2000.

7. Reverse sensitivity in relation to Sec 30 BLK II Town of Ranfurly

² Because the matters of discretion are currently directed towards effects on roading, rather than adjacent land uses.