

## SUMMARY OF PLANNING EVIDENCE – Steve Davies

- 1.1 The Submitter's Site is a 16.7 hectare parcel which is located to the south and east of Lynn Lane and is legally described as Lot 50 DP 511592, Lot 51 DP 511592, Lot 5 DP 452123 and Lot 6 DP 452123 as held in Record of Title (RT) 785688. Despite being located down Lynn Lane, the site is identified as 69 Hall Road. An unformed paper road dissects the site in two.
- 1.2 PC19 as notified, sought to "downzone" parts of the Submitters land from RRA(4) to Rural Resource Area.
- 1.3 The Submitter's original submission (19/147) is phrased in two parts. It seeks to:
  - a. Rationalise the current RRA(4) boundary to encompass an area that has consent for four Lots; and
  - b. To transfer the RRA(4) Zone that presently applies to a vineyard area (and which PC19 seeks to downzone) to a comparable sized area of unproductive RU land in the eastern portion of the site, and apply an RU to the vineyard area<sup>1</sup>.
- 1.4 It appears that Ms White has not been provided with a copy of the plans that were attached to Mr Davies' submission (one of which is replicated in Figure 4 in my evidence in chief). It seems that for this reason she has not assessed the relief sought by Mr Davies, although she has assessed a relief promoted in Submission 150 which has similarities with Mr Davies' relief in so far as it seeks reinstatement of the operative RRA(4) zoning (albeit in its new, LLRZ form) over Mr Davies land. Ms Whites supports this submission, citing the existing shortfall in residential development capacity at Bannockburn and the fact that this RRA(4) zoned land is not classified as 'highly productive land' for the purposes of the NPS-HPL (a point I discuss in detail in my evidence in chief).
- 1.5 There are essentially three options before the Commission:
  - a. Option A: Removing the RRA(4) Zone from the site altogether and applying the "Rural Resource Area" zone to the site as per the notified version of the PC19 Planning Maps;
  - b. Option B: Retaining the current Zone boundaries of the Operative District Plan but renaming the RRA(4) Zone to the PC19 LLR Zone, including associated amendments to the zone provisions as per Ms White's recommendation; and
  - c. Option C: The Submitter's relief, being the transfer of the residential zoning of the vineyard area to an area of unproductive land to the east that is currently Zoned RU, and in addition, the application of the LLRZ to the Consented Area. The RU Zone would then apply to the vineyard area which is productive yet zoned for residential purposes.
- 1.6 In evaluating all three options under the statutory framework, Option C is considered superior for the following reasons:

---

<sup>1</sup> I note that the original submission references the RRA(4) zoning and seeks this zoning apply to the eastern part of the Site, however, given PC19 proposes to rename this the LLRZ, I consider it appropriate to interpret the submission as seeking and LLR zoning for this area.

## SUMMARY OF PLANNING EVIDENCE – Steve Davies

- a. With respect to Option A, downzoning the land altogether to RU, the costs include the inefficient use of a land resource that serves no benefit to the community in terms of primary production (because parts of the land is largely non-productive) and precludes any contribution to housing supply, which is the key purpose of PC19, and for which there is an identified shortfall at Bannockburn. The benefits of Option A are considered limited to the retention of productive land, but this is also achieved by Option C.
  - b. Option B, retaining the operative extent of the residentially zoned area, has the benefit of retaining development capacity. However, it does not recognise consented (residential) development, nor the existing productive use of the vineyard, which would potentially be lost under this option. It also fails to recognise the unproductive nature of the balance of the site via an appropriate zoning. This comes at the cost of a viable and highly productive vineyard. This outcome is considered to be an inefficient use of the land.
  - c. With respect to Option C - applying the operative development capacity to an unproductive part of the Site, and recognising consented (residential) development and existing productive uses (the vineyard) - there are no obvious costs in that infrastructure and servicing is available and feasible and no landscape or other adverse effects, including with respect to productive land will arise. The benefits however are obvious in terms of providing additional residential capacity and better and more efficient utilisation of the land resource through retention of the vineyard.
- 1.7 Accordingly, I consider that Option C, which seeks to “exchange” the current RRA(4) Zone which applies to productive land to a comparable size area of less productive land, represents the most efficient option in achieving the objectives of PC19 and better achieves the purpose of the Act.
- 1.8 Option C seeks to maintain the development capacity of the Site which Ms White correctly identifies is required for Bannockburn, and represents a more efficient outcome compared with Ms White’s recommendation to retain the status quo (Option B). This is because Option B continues to apply a residential zone to what has been identified as productive land whereas Option C simply seeks to realise this development potential on an area of land that is unproductive.
- 1.9 In terms of the NPS-HPL, it has been determined that the site is not “highly productive land” in the context of the NPS-HPL and therefore an evaluation of that document is not necessary. If the NPS-HPL were to apply, I consider the test under Clause 3.6(4) is met.