# BEFORE THE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER

Plan Change 19 to the Operative Central Otago District Plan

# STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF CAMPBELL RONALD HILLS ON BEHALF OF MARK MITCHELL (Submitter #113)

# SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

16 May 2023

# **CONTENTS:**

		PAGE
1.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.	INTRODUCTION	3
3.	SCOPE OF EVIDENCE	6
4.	BACKGROUND TO THE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION	7
5.	REASONING FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION	8
6.	ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL YIELD AND ASSOCIATED IMPACTS	8
7.	MATTERS RAISED IN THE S42A REPORT	12

# **ATTACHMENTS:**

**Appendix A**: Plans of Potential Additional North Cromwell Allotments at 2000m<sup>2</sup> Minimum

**Appendix B**: Plans of Potential Additional North Cromwell Allotments at 1500m<sup>2</sup> Minimum

Appendix C: Spreadsheet of North Cromwell Potential Additional Allotments

#### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY<sup>1</sup>

- 1.1 With reference to my evidence, it is my opinion that the proposed zoning of an area of North Cromwell, as requested by **the Submitter** (Mark Mitchell), is appropriate from a subdivision feasibility and yield perspective.
- 1.2 Since the original submission was prepared, and following review of other related submissions, and further review of the PC19 provisions, the Submitter has re-considered the proposed zoning for North Cromwell.
- 1.3 The primary relief now sought (the proposal) is consistent and uniform zoning, with a minimum lot size of 1500 square metres, for all North Cromwell residential areas accessed from Shortcut Road or Bell Avenue.
- 1.4 The Submitter requested I (and my staff) prepare an assessment of North Cromwell subdivision potential and associated impacts at various densities, to determine appropriate density of development achieving suitable yield while minimising impact on overall character and amenity.
- 1.5 The assessment was completed through the overlay of approximate LINZ title boundaries and the most recent LINZ ortho-rectified aerial imagery, with theoretical approximate/indicative lot boundaries then drawn using CAD software, and with checks against the latest Google imagery.
- **1.6** The main outcomes with respect to a 2000m² lot size assessment were:
  - (a) A baseline number of 80 additional allotments from the 96 sampled;
  - (b) 20 further possible allotments were identified, but these were difficult and not considered desirable/feasible;
  - (c) 18 of the sampled properties were not considered subdividable;
  - (d) the results suggested that a 2000m² minimum lot size is not efficient, particularly as it might encourage inappropriate subdivision.
- 1.7 Consideration was given to the feasibility and appropriateness of the 1000m² minimum lot size option, as per the original submission. This was a more efficient option in terms of total potential yield, but it also encouraged questionable lot shapes in order to maximise subdivision potential. Properties could typically be subdividable into three lots, and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> My executive summary can be also taken as the optional summary statement which may accompany briefs of evidence as directed in Minutes 1 and 3 by the Hearings Panel.

sometimes four, but the layouts were often awkward. The 1000m² option was discarded, with site coverage being a key factor, as the PC19 notified standard for LLRZ (P1) was 40% as compared to the 30% for LLRZ. It was considered that this increased site coverage, together with a smaller lot size, would compromise the character and amenity of North Cromwell.

- **1.8** The main outcomes with respect to a 1500m² lot size assessment were:
  - (a) A baseline number of 117 additional allotments from 96 sampled;
  - (b) only 1 additional allotment identified as being possible but difficult and less feasible;
  - (c) total yield increased by 18% compared to the 2000m² option, which is considered significant enough to be worthwhile, but also unlikely to be easily noticeable;
  - (d) properties with no subdivision potential reduced from 18 to 14.
- 1.9 Overall, a 1500m² minimum lot size option is considered most appropriate and compatible with the established North Cromwell area. This is considered to maximise yield in a manner that will also minimise the likelihood of undesirable subdivision or adverse effects with respect to character and amenity. Of particular relevance, a 1500m² minimum lot size is also considered to remain compatible with the 30% site/building coverage for LLRZ; particularly as this will enable a total building footprint of 450m² as a permitted activity, and this is considered to be in keeping with the typical scale of built form on properties in North Cromwell.
- 1.10 Regardless of the specific density that is applied in relation to North Cromwell, there are not expected to be any significant or easily noticeable impacts on the Lakefront.
- 1.11 It is recommended that either the LLRZ minimum lot size is reduced from 2000m² to 1500m² or that an additional Large Lot Residential Precinct is added to Proposed District Plan standard LLRZ-S1.
- **1.12** Acknowledging the clear intent of the Cromwell Spatial Plan with respect to North Cromwell, the proposed/requested zoning is well justified.
- 1.13 The assessment associated with this evidence sought to achieve a balance between demand for infill development in North Cromwell a need to maintain character and amenity.

# 2. INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 My name is Campbell Ronald Hills. I am a Licensed Cadastral Surveyor and Director of C Hughes & Associates Limited, and I specialise in the design, consenting, construction administration/supervision, surveying, and general project management associated with residential and rural subdivision development.
- 2.2 I have been engaged by Mark Mitchell (Submitter 113) to provide subdivision and land development evidence in relation to his North Cromwell re-zoning submission, under Plan Change 19 (PC19) to the operative Central Otago District Plan (District Plan).
- 2.3 I hold a Bachelor of Surveying (Hons) degree from the University of Otago.
  I am a Voting Member of Survey and Spatial New Zealand (S+SNZ) and a member of the Consulting Surveyors division of S+SNZ.
- 2.1 I have been practising as a land surveyor and subdivision development consultant since I began working for C Hughes and Associates in 2014. Prior to this I worked in a similar role for a large multi-disciplinary land development and management company in Australia, following my graduation from the University of Otago in 2012.
- 2.2 During the course of my career at C Hughes in Associates (based in Cromwell), I have been heavily involved in various aspects of residential and rural subdivision in the Central Otago and Queenstown Lakes districts, including:
  - (a) initial subdivision potential investigations and feasibility assessments;
  - (b) conceptual and detailed designs of subdivision layouts;
  - (c) preparation of resource consents for subdivision and associated land use;
  - (d) detailed designs of subdivision infrastructure, including three waters and roading/access;
  - (e) administration and supervision of subdivision construction projects;
  - (f) surveys for set-out and as-built of subdivision infrastructure and title boundaries:

(g) project management throughout full subdivision processes, from initial investigations through to issue of new titles and defects liability, including regular collaboration with other consultants.

# Code of conduct for expert witnesses

2.1 While this is not an Environment Court hearing, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023, and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise.

# Summary of relief sought relevant to this evidence

- 2.2 The original submission by Mark Mitchell sought Large Lot Residential Precinct 1 (LLRZ P1) zoning to establish a minimum lot size of 1,000m² for all Bell Avenue, Scott Terrace, Stout Terrace and eastern Lakeview Terrace properties. The submission also requested that the interface/boundary between LLRZ and LRZ (Low Density Residential zone) be moved to align with the north-south greenway/reserve that passes through the cul-de-sac end of Bell Avenue, and along the southern extent of the Scott Terrace properties.
- 2.3 Since the original submission was prepared, and following review of other related submissions, the submitter has re-considered the proposed zoning for North Cromwell.
- 2.4 The primary relief now sought (the proposal) is consistent and uniform zoning, with a minimum lot size of 1500 square metres, for all North Cromwell residential areas accessed from Shortcut Road or Bell Avenue; being the area bound by the Wooing Tree site, State Highway 8B, Lake Dunstan and McNulty Inlet, and the 20 metre wide strip of Crown Land running between the McNulty Inlet Rotary Glen NZMCA campground and the western end of Shortcut Road. For clarification, this includes the Lakefield Estate residential area immediately north of Wooing Tree simply for completeness given the established nature of this area, and consideration is not currently given to the residential areas accessible off State Highway 6 and Thelma Place; primarily due to the scope of the

original submission, but also due to the existing Operative District Plan split zoning in this area. This is not to say that the same zoning is not appropriate for the areas accessed of State Highway 6 and Thelma Place, just that these areas do not form part of this assessment and the Submitter's proposal.

2.5 The proposal is depicted/annotated in red on the below Council GIS PC19

Zone Mapping image for ease of understanding.



**Figure 1:** Proposed Change to PC19 Zone Mapping (LLRZ for the area enclosed in red, with an associated minimum lot size of 1500m², noting that this is shown including roads and reserves purely for ease of understanding)

## 3. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- **3.1** My evidence addresses the following matters:
  - (a) Background to the original submission
  - (b) Reasoning for reconsideration of the original submission
  - (c) Assessment of potential yield and associated impacts
  - (d) Discussion of the relevant key matters raised in the Council Stage 1 and 2 Section 42A Reports prepared by Ms Liz White, being:
    - (i) Density in LLRZ (LLRZ-S1)
    - (ii) Summary of zoning submissions
    - (iii) Cromwell Spatial Plan
    - (iv) Character and amenity
- **3.2** I attach the following appendices to my evidence:
  - (a) **Appendix A**: Plans of Potential Additional North Cromwell Allotments at 2000m<sup>2</sup> Minimum
  - (b) **Appendix B**: Plans of Potential Additional North Cromwell Allotments at 1500m<sup>2</sup> Minimum
  - (c) **Appendix C**: Spreadsheet of North Cromwell Potential Additional Allotments
- 3.3 In preparing this evidence, I have read and considered the following documents:
  - (a) The Plan Change 19 documentation including the notified text and zone maps;
  - (b) The Cromwell Spatial Plan;
  - (c) The Council Stage 1 Section 42A report on the Plan Change 19 text, prepared by Ms Liz White;
  - (d) The Council Stage 2 Section 42A report on the Plan Change 19 zoning, prepared by Ms Liz White;
  - (e) The Council Stage 2 Section 42A report on water and wastewater servicing matters, prepared by Ms Julie Muir;
  - (f) The submission document lodged by the Submitter;
  - (g) The draft evidence prepared by the Submitter.

#### 4. BACKGROUND TO THE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION

- **4.1** As outlined in the original submission:
  - (a) the Submitter has owned three properties in North Cromwell over the last 15 to 25 years, consisting of 16 Bell Avenue and two on Scott Terrace (numbers 3A and 9), with number 3A being established as an orchard site.
  - (b) The Submitter has a strong connection with North Cromwell, along with a well-established understanding of how this area has developed in the last 25 years.
  - (c) The Submitter purchased the above-noted properties as part of a retirement plan, and has invested significantly in these properties over the years (particularly in the establishment of the 3A Scott Terrace orchard), and he has now reached retirement age so he intends to build his retirement home on part of the 3A Scott Terrace orchard site, and complete a subdivision development of this site given that he is no longer able to manage the orchard.
  - (d) The Submitter deemed it quite appropriate to file a submission on PC19 with respect to the zoning of North Cromwell, especially given his long history with the area, and his desire to ensure that this area (where he has chosen to retire) is carefully managed and remains a desirable place to live.
  - (e) The original submission was prepared on the basis of the Cromwell Spatial Plan direction, in terms of the identified demand for growth and infill development (particularly within close proximity to the centre of town). The submission balanced this need for growth/development against a what would be considered a logical and desirable outcome for the established North Cromwell area.
  - (f) The submission proposed LLRZ (P1) zoning with the associated 1000m² minimum lot size in place of the LLRZ zoning (2000m² minimum) as notified. This was considered to provide a better transition from the adjoining LRZ area and, more importantly, better achieve the objectives of the Cromwell Spatial Plan given a recognised difficulty with achieving subdivision into 2000m² lots for many sites.
  - (g) The submission also proposed an adjustment to the boundary between LLRZ and LRZ, primarily to provide a more logical and uniform pattern of zoning/development, but also to reduce traffic volumes at the Bell Avenue / State Highway 6 intersection.

## 5. REASONING FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION

- 5.1 Following review of other submissions related to North Cromwell, and further review of the PC19 provisions (particularly related to site coverage), the Submitter decided to reconsider his original submission. The key trigger for this was his desire to attempt to achieve a balance between the need for growth/development in this part of Cromwell, and the strong desire expressed by a number of other submitters that the existing character and amenity should be retained.
- 5.2 The Submitter initiated an assessment of North Cromwell subdivision potential and associated impacts at various densities, with a focus on determining the appropriate density of development that achieved suitable yield whilst also minimising adverse effects on overall character and amenity. The Submitter engaged me (and my staff) to complete this investigation, and this ultimately directed the current variation to the submission/proposal.

# 6. ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL YIELD AND ASSOCIATED IMPACTS

# **Notified LLRZ Density**

- 6.1 The logical starting point for the North Cromwell subdivision potential/yield investigation was to consider the feasibility of subdivisions with a 2000m² minimum lot size, as per the PC19 notified zoning (LLRZ) for properties nearest Lake Dunstan. The area of investigation was confined to the properties with access off Shortcut Road and Bell Avenue, excluding the Wooing Tree site and the properties with access off State Highway 6 and Thelma Place. This "Area of Investigation" is contained within the red outline on Figure 1 above, and this was considered most appropriate due to connectivity to the town centre, and also due to the scope of the original submission.
- 6.2 The selected method for completing the investigation was through the overlay of approximate LINZ title boundaries and the most recent LINZ ortho-rectified aerial imagery. Theoretical approximate/indicative lot

boundaries could then be drawn in using CAD software, with checks against the latest Google Maps/Earth imagery. A simple objective analysis method was followed, whereby dwelling positions were respected, but other buildings and site features were given less consideration; particularly on the basis that these accessory buildings and features could reasonably be expected to be removed or relocated to facilitate subdivision. This method was considered most appropriate on the basis of my typical experience with infill subdivision.

- Plotting of theoretical subdivision boundaries required consideration of appropriate boundary to dwelling setbacks, and these were based on the PC19 provisions as notified and recommended through Ms White's Stage 1 Section 42A Report.<sup>2</sup> The theoretical/indicative subdivision boundaries were also kept as simple and uniform as possible during this exercise, with rear site access strips not necessarily depicted but checked as being possible (either through leg-in strips or right of way easements). Furthermore, current Council urban access design standards (based on the Council Addendum to NZS 4404:2004) were acknowledged through this process.
- As shown on the attached Appendix A plan set, and noted in the attached Appendix C spreadsheet, the feasibility/yield assessment with a 2000m² minimum lot size generated a baseline number of potential additional allotments of 80 from the 96 sampled properties. These 80 potential additional allotments were considered to be fully practical/feasible. A potential further 20 possible allotments were identified, but these were generated using awkward shapes to maintain dwelling setbacks and still achieve the 2000m² minimum; so they were considered to be difficult and less feasible.
- 6.5 The fact that 20 percent of the potential additional allotments were identified as being difficult and less feasible, and 18 of the sampled properties were not even considered potentially subdividable, suggested that a 2000m² minimum lot size was not efficient; particularly as it might encourage inappropriate subdivision that could compromise existing neighbourhood character and amenity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See the setbacks noted on the attached Appendix A and B plan sets.

# Original Submission LLRZ (P1) Density

- 6.6 Following assessment of the 2000m² minimum lot size option, consideration was given to the feasibility and appropriateness of the 1000m² minimum lot size option, as per the LLRZ (P1) zoning requested in the original submission. This was found to encourage some questionable lot shapes in order to maximise subdivision potential. Properties could typically be subdividable into three lots, and sometimes four, but the layouts were often considered awkward.
- 6.7 Upon review of an initial 1000m² layout option, and through discussion with the Submitter in relation to site coverage, the 1000m² option was discarded. Site coverage impact was a key factor in this consideration, as the PC19 notified standard for LLRZ (P1) was 40% as compared to the 30% for LLRZ. It was considered that this increased site coverage, together with a smaller average lot size, would compromise the character and amenity of North Cromwell.

# **Proposed LLRZ Density**

- 6.8 Following consideration of the 2000m² and 1000m² subdivision potential investigations, a decision was made to assess a 1500m² minimum lot size option to determine whether this might achieve a balance between yield, minimising opportunity for inappropriate subdivision, and reducing impact on existing character and amenity. The same methodology was followed for this 1500m² assessment as that for the 2000m² assessment.
- As shown on the attached Appendix B plan set, and noted in the attached Appendix C spreadsheet, the feasibility/yield assessment with a 1500m² minimum lot size generated a baseline number of potential additional allotments of 117 from the 96 sampled properties. These 117 potential additional allotments were considered to be fully practical/feasible. Furthermore, only 1 additional allotment was identified as being possible, but difficult and less feasible.
- 6.10 The fact that only 1 (less than 1%) of the potential additional allotments was identified as being difficult and less feasible (due to awkward shape), as compared to the 20% associated with a 2000m² minimum, immediately points towards the compatibility of 1500m² sites with the established North

Cromwell area. Furthermore, the total yield increased by 18%, which is considered significant enough to be worthwhile, but also unlikely to be easily noticeable. The 1500m<sup>2</sup> minimum also reduced the number of properties with no subdivision potential from 18 to 14.

6.11 Overall, the 1500m² minimum lot size option is considered to be most appropriate and compatible with the established North Cromwell area. This is considered to maximise yield in a manner that will also minimise the likelihood of undesirable subdivision or adverse effects with respect to character and amenity. Of particular relevance, a 1500m² minimum lot size is also considered to remain compatible with the 30% site/building coverage for LLRZ in the PC19 notified standard LLRZ-S4.

# Impact of Density on Lakefront

- 6.12 Regardless of the specific density that is applied in relation to North Cromwell, there are not expected to be any significant or easily noticeable impacts on the Lakefront, including on recreational usage or visual impact. The primary reason for this is that the existing built form on most lakefront properties is already aligned with, or close to, the 15-metre lakeshore boundary setback. As such, and as shown on the attached plans, there is very limited potential for additional built form between existing built form and the lakeshore. There is also clear intent through the notified PC 19 provisions for the existing 15 metre lakeshore boundary setback to remain.
- 6.13 Ms Liz White notes in her Stage 2 Section 42A Report:"I also do not consider that density is likely to have an impact on the recreational usage of the lake frontage, nor is this applied in other parts of

Cromwell adjoining the lake. I therefore tend to consider that it is more appropriate to apply a single zone in this area, regardless of the specific density..."

**6.14** On the basis of the above, the proposed single zoning (with a 1500m² minimum) is considered to be well justified.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Ms Liz White, Stage 2 Section 42A Report [paragraph 159]

#### 7. MATTERS RAISED IN THE S42A REPORT

- 7.1 Having reviewed the Stage 1 and 2 Section 42A Reports prepared by Ms Liz White (Council Consultant Planner), I consider the key issues raised which require further evaluation are:
  - (a) Density in LLRZ (LLRZ-S1)
  - (b) Summary of zoning submissions
  - (c) Cromwell Spatial Plan
  - (d) Character and amenity

# **Density in LLRZ (LLRZ-S1)**

- 7.2 Whilst the LLRZ density was specifically considered as part of the PC19 Stage 1 hearings, there is clear overlap between the PC19 provisions and zoning in terms of density, so there is considered to be clear scope for density consideration as part of the Stage 2 process.
- 7.3 Given that there is currently no zoning option with a minimum lot size of 1500m² in the PC19 standards (as notified or recommended through the Section 42A reports), it is recommended that either the LLRZ minimum lot size is reduced from 2000m² to 1500m² or that an additional Large Lot Residential Precinct is added to Proposed District Plan standard LLRZ-S1.
- As identified above, and through the assessment captured onto the attached plans and spreadsheet information (Appendices A-C), a 1500m² minimum lot size is considered to be most appropriate for North Cromwell. It is submitted that this may also be appropriate for other areas that have been zoned LLRZ through PC19 as notified; particularly including Bannockburn, where the minimum lot size established through the Operative District Plan is already 1500m² (and subdivision has typically achieved this lot sizing despite the associated 2000m² average requirement).
- 7.5 Should it not be considered appropriate to reduce the LLRZ minimum lot size to 1500m², then an additional LLRZ Precinct is considered appropriate in order to achieve the desired and logical zoning outcome for North Cromwell. This option appears to be supported by Ms White through

the recommendations in her Stage 2 Section 42A Report, where she notes:

"There is scope within the submissions for application of an alternate density (e.g. somewhere between LRZ and LLRZ) to some or all of this area." 4

# **Summary of Zoning Submissions**

7.6 As Ms White has identified in her Stage 2 Section 42A Report, the zoning of North Cromwell has attracted a large number of submissions with significant variation in terms of relief sought. The requested density of zoning varies from Medium Density Residential (MRZ), with an associated minimum lot size of 200m² as notified, through to maintaining the status quo (the Operative District Plan 4000m² minimum). The significant variation between submissions has made it difficult for any clear density recommendation to be made in the Stage 2 Section 42A Report, though I do interpret that the key matters outlined in the Report (under paragraph 164) signal towards a density that sits somewhere between LRZ (400-500m² minimum) and LLRZ (2000m² minimum).

#### **Cromwell Spatial Plan**

- 7.7 As Ms White has identified in her Stage 2 Section 42A Report, the clear intent of the Cromwell Spatial Plan is that the North Cromwell "area is 'upzoned' to provide for standard suburban residential development, reflecting that the intent of the Spatial Plan is to focus growth within the existing urban area of Cromwell. This is applied through PC19 as the Low Density Residential Zone (LRZ)." <sup>5</sup> Furthermore, "...development, including infill and redevelopment is anticipated in areas that are substantially within or nearby an 800m radius from the town centre."
- 7.8 Acknowledging the clear intent and applicability of the Cromwell Spatial Plan with respect to the North Cromwell area, which is at least partially within 800 metres of the town centre, the proposed/requested zoning is well justified.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Ms Liz White, Stage 2 Section 42A Report [paragraph 164 part d.]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Ms Liz White, Stage 2 Section 42A Report [paragraph 146]

# **Character and Amenity**

- 7.9 As clearly expressed in a number of other submissions, there is concern that zoning of North Cromwell to allow for infill development (particularly to meet growth demand and achieve the outcomes sought through the Cromwell Spatial Plan) will compromise the existing character and amenity of the area. This concern is certainly understood and acknowledged, both by me and the Submitter (who has three properties in the area, and who intends to build a dwelling on one of them for his retirement).
- 7.10 Through the PC19 submission process and the Submitter's subsequent reconsideration of his original submission, a need was identified to attempt to determine a balance between the obvious demand for infill development in North Cromwell and the similarly obvious need to maintain character and amenity as much as possible. The assessment associated with this evidence has sought to achieve this balance, and the proposed zoning is a result of this assessment.

Campbell Hills

RHAD

16 May 2023





















# Plan Change 19 Evidence North Cromwell Potential Additional Allotments

(Refer to plan sets C1783 and C1784)

Prepared by C Hughes & Associates

16/05/2023

repared by e magnes a resociates		Potential	Potential		
			Allotments	Allotments	
Address No.	Street Name	Area (Ha)	2000m²	1500m²	
1	Bell Avenue	0.4166	-		-
2	Bell Avenue	0.4241	-		-
3	Bell Avenue	0.4182	-		-
4	Bell Avenue	0.4255	-		-
5	Bell Avenue	0.4712	1		2
6	Bell Avenue	0.4301	1		1
7	Bell Avenue	0.4610	-		-
8	Bell Avenue	0.4012	1		1
9	Bell Avenue	0.5117	1		1
10	Bell Avenue	0.4048	1		1
11	Bell Avenue	0.4266	1		1
12	Bell Avenue	0.4048	1		1
13	Bell Avenue	0.4481	1		1
14	Bell Avenue	0.4048	1		1
15	Bell Avenue	0.4463	1		1
16	Bell Avenue	0.4048	1		1
17	Bell Avenue	0.4222	1		1
18	Bell Avenue	0.4048	1		1
19	Bell Avenue	0.4803	1		1
20	Bell Avenue	0.4048	1		1
22	Bell Avenue	0.4306	1		1
24	Bell Avenue	0.4166	1		1
26	Bell Avenue	0.4380	1		1
28	Bell Avenue	0.4634	1		1
30	Bell Avenue	0.4717	1		1
32	Bell Avenue	0.4244	_		1
34	Bell Avenue	0.4014	1		1
36	Bell Avenue	0.4042	1		1
38	Bell Avenue	0.4057	1		1
1	Roberts Drive	0.4152	1		1
3	Roberts Drive	0.4070	1		1
5	Roberts Drive	0.4001	_		1
6	Roberts Drive	0.4027	1		1
9	Roberts Drive	0.4375	1		1
10	Roberts Drive	0.4342	1		1
11	Roberts Drive	0.4490	1		1
12	Roberts Drive	0.4039	1		1
13	Roberts Drive	0.4487	1		1

14	Roberts Drive	0.4626	1		1
15	Roberts Drive	0.5166	_		
16	Roberts Drive	0.4217	1		1
17	Roberts Drive	0.4217	·		
20	Roberts Drive	0.4903	1		1
	Fraser Court		1		1
2 3		0.4423	1		1
	Fraser Court	0.9299	3		4
4	Fraser Court	0.4439	1		1
5	Fraser Court	0.0700	-		-
6	Fraser Court	0.4682	-		-
8	Fraser Court	0.4384	1		1
1	Lakeview Terrace	0.4070	1		1
2-6	Lakeview Terrace	0.6172	1		2
3	Lakeview Terrace	0.4070	1		1
5	Lakeview Terrace	0.4300	1		1
8	Lakeview Terrace	0.1629	-		-
10	Lakeview Terrace	0.3986	1		1
11	Lakeview Terrace	0.4002	1		1
12	Lakeview Terrace	0.4003	1		1
13	Lakeview Terrace	0.4001	1		1
14	Lakeview Terrace	0.4002	-		1
15	Lakeview Terrace	0.5238	1		2
16	Lakeview Terrace	0.4000	-		-
18	Lakeview Terrace	0.3073	-		-
1	Stout Terrace	0.4001	1		1
3	Stout Terrace	0.4001	1		1
5	Stout Terrace	0.4000	1		1
7	Stout Terrace	0.4000	1		1
9	Stout Terrace	0.4124	1		1
11	Stout Terrace	0.4225	1		1
13	Stout Terrace	0.4225	1		1
15	Stout Terrace	0.4001	-		1
1	Shortcut Road	0.5659	1		2
22	Shortcut Road	0.4000	1		1
24	Shortcut Road	0.4147	1		1
26	Shortcut Road	0.4137	1		1
28	Shortcut Road	0.4004	1		1
Lot 2 DP 325235	Shortcut Road	2.3130	10		14
41	Shortcut Road	0.5265	1		2
43	Shortcut Road	0.4754	-		-
1	Partridge Road	0.4001	1		1
3	Partridge Road	0.4155	1		1
5	Partridge Road	0.4002	1		1
7	Partridge Road	0.4003	1		1
1	Scott Terrace	0.4003	1		1
2	Scott Terrace	0.4043	1		1
3	Scott Terrace	0.4005	1		1
1	· - · · <del>-</del> · · ·			1	

15	Scott Terrace	0.5136	Practical	1 <b>80</b>	Practical	1 117
13	Scott Terrace	0.4090		1		1
11	Scott Terrace	0.4037		1		1
10	Scott Terrace	0.4004		1		1
9	Scott Terrace	0.4076		1		1
8	Scott Terrace	0.4004		1		1
7	Scott Terrace	0.4003		1		1
6	Scott Terrace	0.4003		1		1
5	Scott Terrace	0.4005		1		1
4	Scott Terrace	0.4003		1		1
3A	Scott Terrace	2.8422		10		15