

Before the Central Otago District Council

In the matter of The Resource Management Act 1991

And A requested change to the Central Otago District Council's
Operative District Plan – Plan Change 13 (PC13)

**THIRD SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JEFFREY ANDREW
BROWN – PLANNING**

for

River Terrace Developments Limited

Dated 15 July 2019

Counsel:
Warwick Goldsmith
Barrister
PO Box 2366, Wakatipu 9349
m + 64 021 220 8824

- 1 My full name is Jeffrey Andrew Brown.
- 2 My qualifications and experience are as detailed in my primary evidence prepared for this hearing.
- 3 I have complied with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note 2014. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on another person, and I have not omitted to consider any material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.
- 4 This supplementary evidence provides some further evaluation, under s32 of the Act. I evaluate three options in the context of the PC13 River Terrace Resource Area objectives. The three options are those that I described in paragraph 14 of my first supplementary statement of evidence dated 21 June 2019, being:
- Option A:** The River Terrace Resource Area provisions;
- Option B:** Includes the greenfield residentially zoned locations, Top 10 Park and Wooing Tree land; the Town Centre Area sites; the settlements; and the Freeway Orchard;
- Option C:** The Golf Course and the Racecourse land.
- 5 This further evaluation is in **Attachment A**.

J A Brown

15 July 2019

Further Section 32 evaluation of Options A, B and C in the context of the RTRA Objectives 20.3.1 – 20.3.11 (as at 21 June 2019)

Note: the options are from the J Brown supplementary evidence dated 21 June 2019, being:

Option A: The River Terrace Resource Area provisions;

Option B: Includes the greenfield residentially zoned locations, Top 10 Park and Woong Tree land; the Town Centre Area sites; the settlements; and the Freeway Orchard;

Option C: The Golf Course and the Racecourse land.

20.3.1 Objective – Diversity of housing product and housing affordability						
Increased short term (within 3 years) and medium term (within 10 years) housing supply, variety and choice by creating a well-designed residential development comprising a range of housing densities and typologies to enable a range of affordable price options available as soon as possible.						
Option	s32(2)(a)			s32(1)(b)(ii)		s32(1) – overall appropriateness in achieving the objective
	Costs	Benefits	Risk of acting or not acting	Efficiency	Effectiveness	
<p>Option A</p> <p><i>Note: the evaluation in this row is repeated from the J Brown supplementary evidence dated 21 June 2019</i></p>	<p>Costs of the provisions fall on the developer as a result of the need to ensure the quantum of lots / units is delivered in the short term, within the time frame, and potentially selling the first stage (200 lots and/or units) at less than the market rate.</p>	<p>Benefits include the timely delivery of a significant quantum of affordable housing in the short term. These benefits would be enjoyed by the people who purchase the lots or units in the first stage.</p> <p>The additional rezoned land would cause an oversupply of capacity relative to demand in the short to medium term, providing greater</p>	<p>There is risk to the developer that Rule 20.7.7(vii) is not achieved and that waiting for a period of time causes an opportunity cost of not being able to proceed with the subsequent stages of the RTRA development.</p> <p>An oversupply of capacity reduces the risk that some District Plan-enabled capacity is not</p>	<p>It may be inefficient for the developer to wait for Rule 20.7.7(vii) to be achieved, but not inefficient to any other person or group.</p> <p>It is efficient for land supply to exceed demand to slow the rate of property price rises and potentially reduce property prices.</p>	<p>The provisions would be effective in enabling people to enter the housing market at more affordable prices, and in doing so potentially increasing the potential for more affordable prices in other locations in Cromwell.</p> <p>Providing for additional controls, including the prohibited activity mechanism, is an effective and efficient way in forcing the developer to deliver</p>	<p>The provisions are appropriate in achieving Objective 20.3.1 because they directly focus on, and provide clear mechanisms and obligations to achieve affordability, and availability of housing product in the short term and the medium term, and (along with other provisions), diversity of product, and good design.</p>

		<p>choice of location and diversity of housing product (including lot size, unit typology).</p> <p>Benefits from more affordable product attracting more people to the Cromwell area and the overall economic benefits to the community from increased spending, increased construction activity that may not otherwise occur, and increased rates income for the District.</p> <p>Benefits to new purchasers of having the potential choice of different lot sizes, housing typologies.</p>	<p>brought to the market in a timely manner – i.e. – it reduces the impact of developers trying to control the market prices by drip-feeding product onto the market.</p> <p>Reduces the risk of the RTRA developer land-banking the RTRA land.</p>		<p>housing product, and hence for wider management of housing affordability.</p>	
<p>Option B</p> <p><i>Note: the evaluation in this row is repeated from the J Brown supplementary evidence dated 21 June 2019 with some updates arising from information received during the second week of the hearing.</i></p>	<p>Costs to prospective new entrants into the property market arising from less competition in the market and hence higher entry prices.</p> <p>Costs to the community arising from the time taken for zoned land to become development-ready, including by way of land-banking and enabling developers</p>	<p>Benefits to the developers from not having the competition caused by additional land that is zoned and development-ready.</p> <p>Benefits to existing property owners of having their property values remaining consistent or rising due to lack of competition in the market.</p> <p>Benefits to new purchasers of having</p>	<p>Risk that the less the area of zoned land available in the short term and medium term the greater the ability for existing developers to control the market by drip feeding supply.</p> <p>Risk that the zoned land will not be brought into “development-ready” state because of the potential for land-banking.</p>	<p>Less efficiency in the market arising from less land supply and the ability of developers to control the market by drip feeding supply.</p> <p>This could be avoided in the case of the Freeway land only, provided any suitable provisions were imposed at the time of any plan change.</p>	<p>No effective methods in the existing zonings to assure that any affordable housing product is released to the market in a timely manner.</p> <p>The Freeway land could contain such methods, in the forthcoming plan change application, to serve housing availability and affordability in the short to medium term.</p>	<p>The provisions are appropriate in achieving the aspects of Objective 20.3.1 in relation to design, variety and choice because of the range of potential lot sizes and housing typologies that could arise across the various zones.</p> <p>The provisions are not appropriate in achieving Objective 20.3.1 because they do not impose clear obligations on developers to achieve affordability, and availability of housing</p>

	<p>to control the market prices by drip-feeding product onto the market.</p> <p>Costs of plan change for the Freeway land.</p>	<p>the potential choice of different lot sizes, housing typologies.</p> <p>Potential benefit of imposing similar provisions for affordability and availability on the Freeway land, if its zone were to change.</p>	<p>Risk that the Freeway land may not be rezoned or rezoned in a manner that serves Objective 20.3.1.</p>			<p>product in the short term and the medium term.</p> <p>This could be remedied in the case of the Freeway land, but there is no certainty about that.</p> <p>The provisions are, overall, not the most appropriate in achieving Objective 20.3.1.</p>
Option C	<p>Costs of waiting for these land areas to become available for development (assuming that the designated half of the golf course would not be treated separately from the remaining Rural zoned half by having the designation uplifted and the land subsequently developed in accordance with underlying zone).</p> <p>Costs of planning procedures, although these would be minor in the case of designation upliftings (as discussed in Mr Whitney's reply in relation to the golf course) but would not be minor in relation to the half</p>	<p>Benefits of this option are very limited, bearing in mind this option is essentially not a <i>reasonably practicable option</i> because it is very questionable as to whether the land could be available in the short – mid-term for housing.</p> <p>If it were available, then there would be benefit in contributing to the diversity of housing product and affordability, depending on how it is developed.</p>	<p>No risk of acting or not acting in relation to this objective, as the Option is not particularly relevant to the objective as discussed in the columns to the left.</p>	<p>Not efficient or effective for achieving the objective because it is doubtful if Option C land could contribute to housing in the short and medium-term.</p> <p>If available in the short and medium-term then the manner in which it is developed would determine whether it could efficiently and effectively contribute to achieving the objective.</p>		<p>The Option C would not be appropriate for achieving the objective because there is significant uncertainty in whether the land could be available for housing in the time frame anticipated by the objective.</p>

	<p>of the golf course that is zoned Rural.</p> <p>Costs of providing replacement facilities, including land identification, purchase and development for golf course and racecourse.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--

Conclusion: Option A is the most appropriate option for achieving Objective 20.3.1 because it better focuses on, and provides clear mechanisms and obligations to achieve affordability, and availability of housing product in the short term and the medium term.

20.3.2 Objective – Efficient, co-ordinated, integrated greenfields development
Efficient greenfields development that is co-ordinated by way of a Structure Plan to achieve an integrated, connected, high quality residential neighbourhood.

Option	s32(2)(a)			s32(1)(b)(ii)		s32(1) – overall appropriateness in achieving the objective
	Costs	Benefits	Risk of acting or not acting	Efficiency	Effectiveness	
<p>Option A</p> <p><i>The relevant provisions include the Structure Plan, Movement Plan, Development Parcel Plan, roading cross-section plans, and related provisions for the implementation of these plans.</i></p>	<p>Cost of the loss of opportunity for rural residential and rural uses of the land (as per the status quo zonings).</p> <p>Cost of the location of the RTRA being some distance from the Cromwell centre (including costs of additional travel, distance for walking and cycling).</p>	<p>Benefit of the carefully masterplanned spatial layout of activities so that the RTRA is internally integrated.</p> <p>Benefit of methods providing for subdivision and building design controls throughout the RTRA.</p> <p>Benefit from the Structure Plan guiding an efficient and practical layout of activities throughout the RTRA, and</p>	<p>No risk of acting in developing RTRA to make efficient use of finite land resources for urban development, in respect of spatial layout of activities within the RTRA.</p> <p>Risk that the residential amenity values will be affected by the nearby noise-generating activities, as discussed in Objectives 20.3.10 and 20.3.11 below.</p>	<p>The provisions would be efficient in delivering an integrated connected and high quality neighbourhood, as discussed in the master-planning report and by Mr Ray.</p> <p>Less efficient to locate residential activities where their amenity values could be adversely affected by nearby activities and to require measures for avoiding or mitigating these effects, and for</p>	<p>The provisions would be effective in achieving an internally integrated community and would integrate with other urban areas of Cromwell by provisions requiring walkway and cycleways linkage(s).</p> <p>The provisions would be effective in achieving the objective by ensuring a well-designed built environment that provides for and</p>	<p>The Structure Plan and related plans and plan provisions enable an internally integrated, co-ordinated development and will integrate as far as practicable with other parts of Cromwell through roading and other linkages.</p> <p>The methods are appropriate in achieving the objective.</p>

		avoiding the potential for ad hoc location of activities, roads and open spaces within the RTRA.		avoiding reverse sensitivity effects.	positively responds to streets and open spaces and delivers a range of site sizes to suit different needs and price options. Effective in taking into account the nearby activities in relation to sensitivity and reverse sensitivity effects, except in relation to outdoor amenity values.	
Option B	<p>No particular costs as zoned land will be developed in accordance with the existing plan provisions, while greenfields land may be developed in accordance with some form of structure planning to ensure internal and external integration.</p> <p>Cost of plan change process for the Freeway land but this would be borne by the developer.</p> <p>Cost of the loss of the Freeway orcharding operations.</p>	<p>Benefit from the location of the land areas relatively close to existing social amenities (town centre, schools), thereby reducing the potential for vehicle trips and increasing potential for walking and cycling.</p> <p>Benefit that Freeway land has the opportunity to be co-ordinated by way of a structure plan to achieve internal and external co-ordination and integration.</p> <p>Benefit, from removing the orcharding activities from the Freeway land, of avoiding the existing adverse of dwellings in close proximity (including within the recently subdivided</p>	<p>No particular risks of acting or not acting in relation to the existing zoned land; there is opportunity for any developer of zoned greenfields land to apply a structure plan process at the time of subdivision.</p> <p>Potential risk that future residential development on land on the opposite side of the state highway from the orchard north of Ripponvale Road (hereafter referred to as the Ripponvale orchard) could be susceptible to any noise effects from that orchard (such as from frost-fighting methods) and that those effects would not be mitigated by acoustic treatment of dwellings.</p>	<p>Efficient to develop zoned land which has been through a process to determine that it is suitable for urban / residential purposes.</p> <p>Inefficient to clear orchards and dismantle the infrastructure of the Freeway land but efficient to utilise this land, in this location, for urban purposes, given it is already mostly surrounded by urban activities.</p>	<p>Existing provisions for existing zones would be effective in achieving efficient, co-ordinated and integrated development, and any future provisions for up-zoning land likely to achieve these goals also. Necessity for a structure plan would depend on the circumstances of the land involved.</p>	<p>Existing provisions would be appropriate for achieving the objective, and likely any future provisions, for up-zoning land (e.g. town centre, Freeway) would similarly have a strong focus on the intent of the objective.</p>

		Top 10 land) that are not required to mitigate themselves against the effects of orcharding activities, as discussed in Objective 20.3.11 below.				
Option C	<p>If they become available, the golf course and racecourse land could be master-planned and developed in a manner that achieves the Objective. It is likely that a structure plan would be used to guide this development.</p> <p>Benefits of the golf course land being close to central Cromwell – more walking and cycling and less vehicle trips for day to day activities.</p> <p>Residential development on the racecourse land would likely either need to be set back appropriately from the nearby orchards to the north (Ripponvale) and south (45 South) or provide acoustic treatment and defence against other orcharding operations, and to avoid reverse sensitivities, to meet other objectives, as discussed in 20.3.10 and 20.3.11 below.</p>					
Conclusion: Both Options A and B are appropriate for achieving Objective 20.3.2 but Option B is the most appropriate given the advantage of proximity and better integration with existing nearby activities.						

20.3.3 Objective – Well-designed built environment						
A well-designed built environment that provides for and positively responds to roads and open spaces, provides high quality amenity for residents, and contributes to public safety.						
Option	s32(2)(a)			s32(1)(b)(ii)		s32(1) – overall appropriateness in achieving the objective
	Costs	Benefits	Risk of acting or not acting	Efficiency	Effectiveness	
Option A <i>The relevant provisions include the Structure Plan and related plans, subdivision provisions for the implementation of Structure Plan</i>	Adhering to a structure plan potentially hinders flexibility; to amend the structure plan requires a further plan change. (This potential cost is remedied by providing for some flexibility in the specific location of structure plan	Benefit from master-planning and urban design input that has contributed to the Structure Plan and the provisions to implement it effectively. Benefit from delivering a diversity of product enables a range of price options.	No risk of not achieving the design outcomes as these are, as far as necessary, enshrined in the rules. Risk of not achieving high quality outdoor amenity for residents during a noisy event nearby. This is a matter of future residents' choice and is discussed under	Efficiencies arising from the overall design of the RTRA, the mix of activities, the roading layout, the ability to absorb more residential capacity (and therefore more efficient use of the land if rezoned). Less efficient to require mitigation measures in response to activities	Effective in providing a well-designed built environment within the RTRA, enabling appropriate spatial layout of activities and the co-ordination of land uses. Effective in mitigating effects from nearby noise-generating activities except in relation to outdoor	Appropriate in achieving the objective in that the provisions enable a well-designed built environment that provides for and positively responds to roads and open spaces, and public safety. Through the design (including the open space network and parks and the relationship with dwellings), the RTRA provides high quality

<p><i>outcomes, design provisions for buildings, methods for mitigating sensitivity effects and methods for avoiding reverse sensitivity effects</i></p>	<p>features, as part of the rules package). Social cost that residential amenity values will be affected by the nearby noise-generating activities, as discussed in Objectives 20.3.10 and 20.3.11 below.</p>	<p>Benefit from consistency of public realm attributes (e.g. street cross sections, paving and lighting), providing for a neighbourhood and community feel and sense of place.</p>	<p>Objectives 20.3.10 and 20.3.11 below.</p>	<p>occurring on neighbouring land.</p>	<p>amenity values during some noisy events – no effective measures available for avoiding those effects. Effective in mitigating effects from spray drift (including additional modifications to rule for height of boundary planting so that height of planting will be higher than the nearby orchard trees)</p>	<p>visual amenity values. The location adjacent to noise-generating activities means that outdoor amenity values are less during noisy events, when compared with when noisy events are not occurring, and when compared with other locations which are not nearby noise-generating activities.</p>
<p>Option B</p>	<p>No particular costs as zoned land will be developed in accordance with the existing plan provisions, while greenfields land may be developed in accordance with some form of structure planning process to ensure internal and external integration.</p>	<p>Benefit that the existing zoning provisions would ensure a reasonable standard of amenity values in new greenfields or brownfields areas. Benefit from the location of the land areas relatively close to existing social amenities (town centre, schools), as discussed in 20.3.2 above. Benefit that Freeway land has the opportunity to be co-ordinated by way of a structure plan to achieve internal and external co-ordination and integration. Benefit, from removing the orcharding activities from the Freeway land, of</p>	<p>No particular risks of acting or not acting in relation to the existing zoned land; there is opportunity for any developer of zoned greenfields land to apply a structure plan process at the time of subdivision.</p>	<p>Imposition of existing standards would likely ensure urban / residential activities are efficient in achieving the objective.</p>	<p>Existing provisions for existing zones would be effective in achieving a well-designed built environment, and any future provisions for up-zoning land likely to achieve this goal also.</p>	<p>Existing provisions would be appropriate for achieving the objective, and likely any future provisions, for up-zoning land (e.g. town centre, Freeway) would similarly have a strong focus on the intent of the objective.</p>

		avoiding the existing adverse of dwellings in close proximity (including within the recently subdivided Top 10 land) that are not required to mitigate themselves against the effects of orcharding activities, as discussed in Objective 20.3.11 below.				
Option C	If they become available, the golf course and racecourse lands could be master-planned and developed in a manner that achieves a well-designed built environment. It is likely that a structure plan and related provisions would be used to guide this development, in the same way that the RTRA has adopted these techniques.					
Conclusion: Option A and B are appropriate for achieving Objective 20.3.3; Option A's structure plan and related provisions would provide a better overall urban design than what the Option B's existing residential provisions currently enable, while Option B has the general advantage of better outdoor amenity values given relative distance to noisy activities. Overall, Option B would be the most appropriate.						

20.3.4 Objective – Retirement living opportunities						
A variety of residential opportunities for retirement-age people, along with related services and amenities.						
Option	s32(2)(a)			s32(1)(b)(ii)		s32(1) – overall appropriateness in achieving the objective
	Costs	Benefits	Risk of acting or not acting	Efficiency	Effectiveness	
Option A <i>Provision of Retirement Living overlay on the Structure Plan, and related rules for residential and associated facilities</i>	A potential cost associated with this policy is the loss of land that could be used for other purposes. Cost of exposing retirement village residents to potential noise effects from nearby motorsport	Benefits arise from providing living options for retirement age people (a growing sector of the residential market) in an appropriate location within the RTRA, close to the amenities of the Neighbourhood	Risk of acting includes exposing residents to the sensitivity effects from nearby activities, and reverse sensitivity effects. These risks are discussed under Objectives 20.3.10 and 20.3.11 below.	The synergies of the Overlay with the Neighbourhood Centre Overlay, for co-location of services and amenities (including for example health care) is effective in achieving efficient, co-ordinated and integrated development, as	The provisions for retirement living would be effective in achieving the objectives in relation to a diversity of housing product and in relation to a variety of residential opportunities and related amenities	The RTRA provisions are appropriate in achieving Objective 20.3.4 for retirement living opportunities, and Objective 20.3.1 for diversity of housing product.

	and orcharding activities (this is addressed in more detail in Objective 20.3.11 below)	Centre Overlay, for ease of access and to contribute to how the community integrates.	Risk of not acting include the risk of not enabling affordable and available housing for a diverse range of buyers. This is discussed above under Objective 20.3.1.	sought by Objective 20.3.1. This will result in more efficient use of land and reduce travel costs.	and services for retirement age people.	
Option B <i>The existing zonings do not provide for retirement villages or other facilities directly providing residential care for retirement age / elderly people.</i>	Cost of resource consents (likely discretionary or non-complying) or plan changes to provide for residential and related facilities specifically for retirement living. (The existing provisions would allow one residential unit per property, which at minimum 250m ² is likely to be an inefficient use of land if the purpose is a retirement village which typically have much higher densities).	No particular benefits other than the availability of land for residential purposes. Benefit that if any proposal for a retirement village or rest home or other residential care facility could obtain consent then it would not be affected in relation to sensitivity or reverse sensitivity effects in the same way as the RTRA land.	Risk that any proposal for a retirement village or rest home or other residential care facility would be hindered by the lack of recognition in the existing zonings. This risk could be remedied by promoting, in any plan change such as for the Freeway land, provisions that better enable opportunities for retirement living facilities.	Not efficient in achieving the objective because the existing provisions do not provide for retirement village or rest home or other residential care facilities and resource consents for discretionary or non-complying activities would be required.	Not effective in achieving the objective because the existing provisions do not provide for retirement village or rest home or other residential care facilities.	Not appropriate in achieving the provisions for the reasons set out in the columns to the left.
Option C	If they become available, the golf course and racecourse lands could include provisions for retirement living.					
Conclusion: Option A is the most appropriate in achieving Objective 20.3.4 for retirement living opportunities, and also for Objective 20.3.1 for diversity of housing product. Option B not appropriate in this regard. Option C could contribute to achieving the objective, in time.						

20.3.5 Objective – Parks and open space network						
Parks and open spaces that cater for the recreation and amenity needs of residents, and a network of pedestrian and cycle connections and greenways that are safe and convenient and which, along with the road network, allow easy connections within and beyond the Resource Area.						
Option	s32(2)(a)			s32(1)(b)(ii)		s32(1) – overall appropriateness in achieving the objective
	Costs	Benefits	Risk of acting or not acting	Efficiency	Effectiveness	
<p>Option A</p> <p><i>The RTRA Structure Plan and associated plans, and associated subdivision rules, provide for reserve / open space network to be implemented at the time of staged subdivision.</i></p>	<p>Other than cost to the developer from using the land and works required, there are no costs to providing for open space and recreation, in the location set out on the structure plan and created and developed at the time of subdivision at a scale that supports the residential density enabled in the RTRA.</p> <p>There is cost of forming the walkway / cycleway links to other parts of Cromwell, but these costs would lie with the developer.</p>	<p>Benefits arise from providing parks and an open space network as part of the overall structure plan that enables higher densities with generally smaller lot sizes and public open spaces close to dwellings can contribute to recreational needs and overall wellbeing.</p> <p>Benefits from enabling public access links from the RTRA to other parts of Cromwell, for walking and cycling.</p>	<p>There is no risk of acting in providing for parks and open spaces in new urban residential areas, and links to other areas.</p> <p>Not acting carries risk in that the community would not be served with adequate parks and open spaces, and the RTRA community would be less connected with other parts of Cromwell.</p>	<p>The layout of parks and the open space network, as described in the masterplan document and by Mr Ray, is efficient in that it provides for the open spaces in close proximity to the residents they are intended to support, in contributing to their overall wellbeing.</p>	<p>The provisions ensure that parks and open space are located and designed in such a way that they will be effective in their role, and that passive surveillance can be easily undertaken.</p> <p>It is effective that the locations of open space are interspersed and form connections within and beyond the RTRA.</p>	<p>The provisions, including the structure plan and related plans, and the subdivision rules requiring the formation of the parks and open spaces and connection routes, are appropriate in achieving the objective.</p>
<p>Option B</p>	<p>No particular costs arising from the Option B land areas. Existing zoned areas will</p>	<p>Benefits of Option B land being closer to existing parks and open spaces (and a shorter drive or walk or</p>	<p>No risk of acting or not acting.</p>	<p>Efficiencies from developing land that is close to existing parks and public open spaces</p>	<p>Existing Council requirements for existing zoned land will be effective in ensuring that the Option B land</p>	<p>Option B is or is likely to be appropriate in achieving the objective for parks and open spaces.</p>

	either provide their own park and open space areas, and residents will use existing park and open space areas. Areas to be rezoned (such as Freeway) would typically be required to contribute to the park and open space values of the town.	cycle ride when compared with the RTRA option)		to enhance their overall use. Efficiencies from providing additional parks and open space land, where necessary, in line with the Council's existing requirements.	areas provide or adequately connect with parks and open spaces. Any zone changes would be required to ensure that parks and open spaces are provided or otherwise provide connections to existing parks and open spaces.	
Option C	If they become available, the golf course and racecourse lands could be master-planned and developed in a manner that achieves a well-designed built environment including adequate and well-located open spaces and parks, as necessary to serve the area. It is likely that a structure plan and related provisions would be used to guide this development, in the same way that the RTRA has adopted these techniques.					
Conclusion: Options A and B are equally appropriate in achieving the objective. Option C could be appropriate also, in time.						

20.3.6 Objective – Road network						
A safe and efficient road network within the Resource Area that provides for all transport modes, including walking and cycling, while also integrating with the existing transport network and possible future development in surrounding areas.						
Option	s32(2)(a)			s32(1)(b)(ii)		s32(1) – overall appropriateness in achieving the objective
	Costs	Benefits	Risk of acting or not acting	Efficiency	Effectiveness	
Option A <i>Relevant provisions include the Structure Plan and Movement Plan, and related subdivision</i>	Costs to the developer of providing the roading and other transport infrastructure, in accordance with the various subdivision standards and related provisions	Benefits from an efficient street network designed and built at the outset of the development forms a strong frame for quality development within. Benefits of connectivity within the RTRA and	There is (inevitably) safety risk from travel and intersections with highways but such risk is mitigated as far as possible by road and intersection design which is to accepted Council and NZTA standards.	The pattern of roading proposed in the Structure Plan and Movement Plan are efficient in that they promote walking and cycling within the RTRA. Less efficient for new urban land to be	The provisions will be effective in achieving a safe and efficient road network within the RTRA and integrating with adjoining roads, particularly the highway, given the triggers for intersection upgrades.	The provisions are appropriate to achieve the objective because the design of the development and related provisions supports street and block patterns, and connectedness, to create a safe and efficient

<p><i>provisions and standards for road upgrades at certain critical points in the development timeline.</i></p>	<p>for intersection upgrades and construction of walkway and cycleway linkages.</p> <p>Costs of travel, for most people, from the RTRA to and from Cromwell centre, and other areas, for shopping (other than convenience items which would be obtained from the RTRA's Neighbourhood Centre), workplace, schools, etc (noting that residents in all the Cromwell Basin's settlements, and many in Cromwell township itself, use their cars for many of these sorts of trips).</p>	<p>with other parts of Cromwell.</p>		<p>separated from other urban areas, necessitating more predominantly car journeys between RTRA and Cromwell township locations (in same manner as, say, Bannockburn and Pisa Moorings).</p>		<p>transport network for all transport modes.</p>
<p>Option B</p>	<p>No particular costs; existing zonings already served with key roading, and subdivisions will provide additional roading as required. New plan changes will provide roading as required, and developers likely to bear the costs of these works.</p>	<p>Benefits that key roading already provided, new subdivisions and Freeway plan change would link with the existing network, and the existing walkway / cycling routes.</p>	<p>No risks from Option B in relation to roading and transport.</p>	<p>Efficient to link to existing roading networks.</p> <p>Efficient to develop land in close proximity to existing social amenities (town centre, schools etc), to reduce the number of vehicle trips and the distance required for vehicle trips.</p>	<p>Option B would be effective in achieving the objective because a safe and efficient roading, walking and cycling network is already established or would be expanded in an integrated manner through future subdivisions or plan changes.</p>	<p>Option B is appropriate for achieving the objective for the reasons given in the columns to the left.</p>
<p>Option C</p>	<p>If they become available, the golf course and racecourse lands could be master-planned and developed in a manner that achieves a safe and efficient road network, including (in the case of the racecourse) new intersection(s) with the state highway.</p>					

Conclusion: Options A and B are equally appropriate in achieving Objective 20.3.6 for roading and transport. Option C could be appropriate also, if Option C land becomes available.

20.3.7 Objective – Public infrastructure						
Adequate connections to public infrastructure systems and appropriate distribution of infrastructure through the Resource Area, and an appropriate total number of dwellings within the Resource Area in line with servicing capacities.						
Option	s32(2)(a)			s32(1)(b)(ii)		s32(1) – overall appropriateness in achieving the objective
	Costs	Benefits	Risk of acting or not acting	Efficiency	Effectiveness	
Option A <i>The relevant provisions include the requirement that the development is serviced with infrastructure, to be installed at the time of subdivision.</i>	There is a large initial capital cost of ensuring new development is fully serviced. This cost is borne by the developer.	Benefits include the provision of adequate infrastructure for the RTRA. There is sufficient capacity such that development in other areas is not precluded.	No risk of acting. There is sufficient capacity such that development in other areas is not precluded. No risk of not acting.	Efficient to service development at the time of subdivision. Less efficient to extend trunk services to a new area, but the costs are borne by the developer.	The provisions will be effective in achieving the objective	The provisions are appropriate for achieving the objective because they ensure that new lots are appropriately serviced with infrastructure.
Option B	No particular costs; existing zonings likely already served with key infrastructure, and subdivisions will provide additional services as required. New plan changes will provide services as required, and developers likely to	Benefits that key reticulated services already provided, new subdivisions and Freeway plan change would link with the existing networks.	No risks from Option B in relation to servicing, provided infrastructure is constructed to required standards	Efficient to utilise existing reticulated services. New subdivisions and plan change would utilise and expand on existing networks.	Option B would be effective in achieving the objective because there would be adequate connections to the existing services.	Option B is appropriate for achieving the objective for the reasons given in the columns to the left.

	bear the costs of these works.					
Option C	It is assumed that all infrastructure would be available for any future development of the Option C areas, and that the objective would be achieved.					
Conclusion: Options A and B are equally appropriate in achieving Objective 20.3.7 for infrastructure. Option C could be appropriate also, if Option C land becomes available.						

20.3.8 Objective – Neighbourhood Centre						
A neighbourhood centre in a convenient location to provide for the day to day convenience needs of the residential neighbourhood, and to complement and not undermine the existing Cromwell retail and business centres.						
Option	s32(2)(a)			s32(1)(b)(ii)		s32(1) – overall appropriateness in achieving the objective
	Costs	Benefits	Risk of acting or not acting	Efficiency	Effectiveness	
Option A <i>Relevant provisions include the Neighbourhood Centre Overlay, on the Structure plan, and the related provisions for design within this overlay, and for ensuring that the scale of the centre is appropriate to serve the RTRA for convenience needs</i>	Cost to the developer of constructing the initial stage of the Neighbourhood Centre to ensure that there is opportunity for the Centre to serve its purpose immediately.	Benefits of directly providing a neighbourhood centre for the residents of the Resource Area, particularly the adjacent retirement living area. Access to a small neighbourhood centre within easy walking or cycling distance removes the need for people to travel in their cars for convenience items. The centre will likely form a social hub for the community.	No risk of undermining the function of Cromwell's main centre, as addressed in the Market Economics report and the evidence of Ms Hampson. The scale of the Centre is such that there is no risk of affecting residential amenity in the vicinity of the Centre. No risk of undermining the safe and efficient operation of the surrounding roading network.	Efficient to provide a centre for small scale convenience (such as a dairy, café) for local residents, in a convenient location and in a way that does not undermine other centres.	The provisions will be effective in achieving the objective for a neighbourhood centre in a convenient location to provide for day to day needs of the residents and contributes to the overall imperative of co-ordination and integration.	The Neighbourhood Centre conveniently located within the RTRA development, appropriately regulated such that it would not undermine the existing centres in Cromwell, is appropriate and achieves the objective.
Option B	No particular costs arising in relation to	No particular benefits arising in relation to	No risk of acting or not acting.	Efficient to have neighbourhood centres in strategic locations to promote walking and	Likely not relevant in an effectiveness sense because no neighbourhood centre	This objective is not particularly relevant to the existing zoned areas and the potential future zoning

	Option B fulfilling this objective.	Option B fulfilling this objective.		cycling in favour of reducing the number of vehicle trips required. However, Option B not particularly relevant to the RTRA objective, as the existing zones and Freeway area are sufficiently close to the town centre and in their own right would not require their own convenience centre.	would be necessary for the existing zonings and the potential future zoning of the Freeway land.	at Freeway because they are likely not to promote a neighbourhood centre.
Option C	If they become available, the golf course and racecourse lands could be master-planned and designed to enable the opportunity for any neighbourhood centre (or other business-type activities), to achieve the objective if that is deemed necessary at the time.					
Conclusion: Option A appropriate in achieving Objective 20.3.8. The objective less relevant to Option B areas. Option C could achieve the objective but not necessary to examine that in any detail, now.						

20.3.9 Objective – Education precinct						
Land is provided for a school or other educational facility, to cater for the needs of the immediate and wider community.						
Option	s32(2)(a)			s32(1)(b)(ii)		s32(1) – overall appropriateness in achieving the objective
	Costs	Benefits	Risk of acting or not acting	Efficiency	Effectiveness	
Option A <i>The relevant provisions include the Education Overlay within the Structure Plan, and the related provisions limiting the development of this overlay</i>	There are no costs arising from the providing land within the Resource Area for future educational facilities, i.e. within the Education Overlay, other than the cost of the loss of land available for other purposes.	Benefit of providing the opportunity for a school or other educational facility to serve the RTRA and nearby areas, should the need for such a facility arise in the future. Benefit of retaining the land as a park in the interim, linking with the open space	The availability of the land does not present any risks. Minimal risk arising from potential effects of noise, as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education overlay is on the lower terrace and therefore some distance from the noise sources, with 	Efficient to provide land for the purpose of education Efficient to co-locate educational facilities with public open space. Efficient to retain that land as an open space / park in perpetuity, for use as an educational facility if that	The provisions are effective in achieving the objective because they will preserve the land for that purpose, should the need arise in the future.	The provisions are appropriate in achieving the objective for the reasons provided in the columns to the left.

<p>area to educational facilities and open space. If the opportunity for a school is not taken up, the overlay land would remain as open space for public use as a park.</p>		<p>network. The land is required by the provisions to remain as open space, and would be used for informal, and perhaps formal, recreational activities.</p>	<p>intervening topography;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings would be acoustically treated as necessary, under Rule 20.7.7(ix); • Noisy events would typically be during the weekends and holidays (including the summer holiday period). <p>Risk of not providing land for an Educational Overlay would include the foreclosure of the opportunity in the future.</p>	<p>opportunity is taken up in the future.</p>		
<p>Option B</p>	<p>This objective not relevant to Option B given that the Option B areas are located such that they would be served by the existing schools in Cromwell. It would only be in the circumstances of expansion of urban growth into new areas that enabling the opportunity for a school, by earmarking land for that purpose, that the objective would be relevant.</p>					
<p>Option C</p>	<p>If they become available, the golf course and racecourse lands could be master-planned to provide the opportunity for an educational facility, if that is seen to be appropriate at the time.</p>					
<p>Conclusion: Option A appropriate in achieving Objective 20.3.9. The objective less relevant to Option B areas. Option C could achieve the objective but not necessary to examine that in any detail, now.</p>						

<p>20.3.10 Objective – Reverse sensitivity</p> <p>Existing activities adjacent to the Resource Area are protected from adverse reverse sensitivity effects, particularly Highlands Motorsport Park, Cromwell Speedway and horticulture activities/orcharding, so that constraints on those activities resulting from reverse sensitivity effects are avoided.</p>						
<p>Option</p>	<p>s32(2)(a)</p>			<p>s32(1)(b)(ii)</p>		<p>s32(1) – overall appropriateness in achieving the objective</p>
	<p>Costs</p>	<p>Benefits</p>	<p>Risk of acting or not acting</p>	<p>Efficiency</p>	<p>Effectiveness</p>	

<p>Option A</p> <p><i>The RTRA provisions include Rule 20.7.7(viii) which require that all lots are subject to no-complaints covenants in relation to nearby activities</i></p>	<p>Social cost to the residents from the inability to complain about any lawful noise effects from the nearby activities.</p> <p>Costs to other parties in potentially needing to address complaints, but the evidence is that there are already procedures in place for this.</p> <p>The legal advice is that the covenants will ensure that complainants have no legal recourse and the activities are not in danger of reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>Costs to the RTRA developer include the cost of the covenant formulation.</p>	<p>Benefits from identifying the effects before people choose whether to purchase within the RTRA or not.</p>	<p>Risk that some people, having bought their property in the RTRA knowing about the noise, will be irritated by the noise, and complain about it.</p> <p>This risk is avoided by the terms of the no-complaint covenants.</p> <p>No risk to the nearby noise-generating activities as the restrictive covenants which are clear in their intent that new residents are aware that they are:</p> <p>(a) coming to an environment that is, at times during the year and at times during the day and night (on some days and nights) noisy from a variety of motorsport and orcharding activities and that this may affect their outdoor living amenity; and</p> <p>(b) not able to complain about the noise; and</p>	<p>Efficient to the extent that new buyers are aware of the potential for noise from nearby activities.</p> <p>Inefficient to impose requirements for restrictive covenants on residential properties.</p>	<p>The method is effective, having been used successfully in other circumstances where a new sensitive activity locates nearby an established activity that generates noise effects that go beyond the site boundaries.</p>	<p>The surrounding area contains the highway, the Motorsports Park, the Speedway, and orcharding activities. Given the proximity of the RTRA to these activities there is the potential for reverse sensitivity effects whereby residents complain about the noise from the motorsports activities and such complaints lead to restrictions on the noise-generating activities.</p> <p>This potential is avoided through the imposition of the restrictive covenants.</p> <p>It is essential that the new residents are cognisant of and accept the potential for noise effects, and that they cannot take measures to limit the lawful activities allowed on the motorsports lands. The restrictive covenants recognise and enshrine this restriction.</p>
--	---	---	---	--	---	---

			<p>(c) not able to take any action to restrict the noise.</p> <p>No risk that there is any potential adverse health effects – no evidence presented that would indicate that any health issue would arise.</p>			
Option B	<p>No particular costs arising for Option B areas because they are generally not located close to activities that generate effects that could lead to reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>The exception is the land north and east of Waenga Drive which is on the opposite side of SH6 from the Ripponvale orchard which could potentially be affected by any frost fighting noise emanating from that orchard. Cost that there are no mitigation measures in place for addressing this potential conflict.</p> <p>(Note that the Ripponvale orchard is itself located immediately</p>	<p>Benefit that the land is not located where the noise from the motorsport activities could adversely affect the existing Option B areas, and therefore no reverse sensitivity issues arise.</p>	<p>Potential risk that residential development of the Waenga Drive land could be susceptible to noise effects from frost fighting operations on the Ripponvale orchard on the opposite side of the highway.</p> <p>No other risks.</p>	<p>Efficient to develop land where no-complaints covenants are not necessary.</p>	<p>Effective to the extent that the objective is not particularly relevant, in relation to motorsport noise. The objective is potentially relevant in the case of Waenga Drive residential land where no-complaints covenants could be a method to prevent reverse sensitivity effects on the nearby Ripponvale orcharding operations adjacent to the Ripponburn Hospital and Home. However, no existing rules to ensure that this potential outcome is effectively addressed.</p>	<p>To the extent that this objective is relevant to the Option B land, the existing District Plan provisions, in the case of Waenga Drive land near the Ripponvale orchard, may not be appropriate in achieving the objective because they could enable development that does not protect the orchard from reverse sensitivity effects.</p>

	adjacent to the Ripponburn Hospital and Home at 94 Kawarau Gorge Road – a situation that the RTRA retirement living area would emulate in respect to the Jones’ orchard west of the RTRA. Unknown if the hospital / home structures are acoustically treated or if the orchard operations are any different to the other orchards).					
Option C	Not relevant to the golf course land as it is distant from any nearby activities with the potential to cause sensitivity or reverse sensitivity effects. Depending on the final location and form or any residential development on the racecourse land, measures to avoid sensitivities (as discussed in Objective 20.3.11 below) and reverse sensitivities would likely be required, including possibly no-complaints mechanisms.					
Conclusion: While Option A achieves Objective 20.3.10 because of the methods proposed, Option B is the most appropriate for achieving the objective because (with the possible exception of the Waenga Drive land, as discussed above) there is little need for provisions to address reverse sensitivity effects. Option C could achieve the objective depending on final location and form but not necessary to examine that in any detail, now.						

20.3.11 Objective – Healthy buildings						
Construction of buildings that provide quiet and healthy internal environments that protect residents, to the extent necessary, from effects of existing activities adjacent to the Resource Area.						
Option	s32(2)(a)			s32(1)(b)(ii)		s32(1) – overall appropriateness in achieving the objective
	Costs	Benefits	Risk of acting or not acting	Efficiency	Effectiveness	
Option A <i>The provisions include the standard</i>	Costs to the developer or owner of constructing the buildings to the	Benefit of ensuring that the potential adverse sensitivity effects are addressed	Risk of not acting would allow inferior internal noise environments with	Less efficient, in dollars terms, to need to acoustically insulate dwellings to provide	The provisions will be effective in establishing internal environments that protect residents	The provisions intend that the acoustic insulation requirements are achieved by imposing

<p>20.7.7(x) requiring that buildings containing noise sensitive activities are acoustically treated, and to include a mechanical ventilation system, to avoid or mitigate the effects of the noise from nearby activities</p>	<p>standard required by the rule, and cost of installing the mechanical ventilation system into each residential unit.</p> <p>Social cost to the overall outdoor amenity values of the development by locating the RTRA where there is existing intermittent noise from other sources nearby (motorsports, orcharding operations).</p>	<p>by ensuring that residents have internal environments that protects them from the effects of the existing activities nearby.</p> <p>Benefit of ensuring that the acoustic insulation requirements are locked in, in perpetuity, by encumbrance on the title, and ensures that future residents are aware of the requirement for acoustic insulation and that the standards will be complied with.</p>	<p>potential adverse health effects arising from sleep disturbance.</p>	<p>adequate internal environments.</p> <p>Less efficient to locate sensitive activities where mitigation measures of the kind necessary to achieve the objective are required.</p>	<p>from the potential adverse effects of the noisy activities nearby.</p>	<p>non-complying consent status to depart from the requirements.</p> <p>The method is necessary and appropriate in achieving the objective.</p>
<p>Option B</p>	<p>Cost arising from the potential for Waenga Drive residential land near the Ripponvale orchard, and the Wooing Tree land, to not have sufficient acoustic insulation to mitigate the effects of the noise from the orchard / viticulture activities.</p>	<p>Benefit that dwellings in most Option B areas do not require acoustic insulation.</p> <p>Benefit that the residential development of the Freeway orchard land would remedy existing, unmitigated adverse effects arising from the proximity of the existing orchard to adjacent residential land, such as in the recent stages of the Top 10 Park subdivision.</p>	<p>No risk of acting.</p> <p>Risk of not acting, in the case of the Freeway land, of orcharding activities continuing to cause adverse effects which are unavoided and unmitigated in relation to the adjacent new residential activities.</p>	<p>Efficient to develop in areas where measures to avoid or mitigate sensitivity effects arising from potentially incompatible activities are not necessary.</p>	<p>Existing zone provisions are not effective, in relation to the Waenga Drive land opposite the Ripponvale orchard, and the Wooing Tree development, in avoiding or mitigating the effects of nearby orcharding / viticulture effects on residents.</p>	<p>The existing District Plan provisions, in the case of Waenga Drive land near the Ripponvale orchard, and the Wooing Tree land, would not be appropriate in achieving the objective because they would enable sensitive development that does not protect itself from the orchard / horticulture operations nearby these areas.</p>

		(Currently the orchard is separated from the residential property boundaries by 10m and a 1.83m fence, which (according to the evidence against PC13) would be inadequate to mitigate noise effects, and there are no requirements for the new dwellings to contain acoustic insulation or to otherwise protect themselves from the effects of the orcharding activities).				
Option C	Development on the racecourse land would likely either need to be set back appropriately from the nearby orchards to the north (Ripponvale) and south (45 South) or provide acoustic treatment and defence against other orcharding operations, to meet the objective for healthy internal environments.					
Conclusion: Option A achieves Objective 20.3.11 because of the methods proposed. Option B generally achieves the objective except that this may not be the case for some Option B areas, as discussed above, but, overall is the most appropriate in achieving the objective there is little need for provisions to address sensitivity effects. Option C could achieve the objective depending on final location and form but not necessary to examine that in any detail, now.						