

**Presentation to Hearing on RC 230398: Niall and Julie Watson, Harvey Perkins and Judith Miller.**

**Introduction: who we are**

- This summary submission is presented on behalf of Niall and Julie Watson, Harvey Perkins and Judith Miller.
- Julie and I have owned a cottage next to the Post Office in Bannockburn Road for 25 years. Harvey and Judi have owned a house in Domain Road for 12 years. We all value Bannockburn's semi-rural character, heritage and landscape amenity.
- Harvey is a geographer and a retired Professor of Urban and Rural Planning with a particular research interest in rural tourism and small-town development, and I have been involved in planning processes all my working life.

**Scope of summary of submission**

- Our overall assessment of the applicant's proposal
- The Cromwell Masterplan
- A spatial planning exercise for Bannockburn
- Critique of elements of the applicant's proposal
- Conclusion

**Our overall assessment of the applicant's proposal**

1. This resource consent application concerns a single 17.6 ha lot and seeks to subdivide it into 20 residential lots, a reserve lot, 2 road lots and 3 'balance' lots but does not provide an overall plan despite statements that one (lot 50) is earmarked for future subdivision and one (lot 40) won't be developed.
2. Our submissions oppose the whole of the application because of:
  - a. The proposed encroachment into the area protected by the Building Line Restriction and the adverse impact of that encroachment on landscape amenity in the Bannockburn Inlet area for locals and visitors alike.
  - b. The incremental nature of the subdivision of a large block of residential land in a key location in the heart of Bannockburn township without an overall plan or consideration of public access and greenspace.

**The Cromwell Masterplan**

3. Despite the recognition given in the Cromwell Masterplan to Bannockburn's important landscape, heritage, tourism and amenity values, and its semi-rural

character, the Operative District Plan's only protective mechanisms in the settlement are lot size (large lots and low density) and Building Line Restrictions. (Link for Cromwell Masterplan [e797a26d4bb4196142dfcae9f2efa444 Cromwell Spatial Framework - Stage 1 Spatial Plan Report LR.pdf](https://www.cromwell.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/e797a26d4bb4196142dfcae9f2efa444_Cromwell_Spatial_Framework_-_Stage_1_Spatial_Plan_Report_LR.pdf)).

4. While the Cromwell Masterplan is not a statutory plan, we believe considerable weight must be given to it in this consenting process as it is the result of widespread community consultation on options for residential growth in the Cromwell basin.
5. The Cromwell community was consulted on three growth options (page 23):
  - *Change focused within Cromwell Basin* (dispersed growth)
  - *Balanced town renewal and growth* (intermediate)
  - *Growth focused within Cromwell* (concentrated focus on Cromwell town)

'Growth focused within Cromwell' was the favoured option in order to '*revitalise the town centre and as a means to retain the small, localized, character of outer settlements*' [of which Bannockburn is one].

6. Bannockburn is described on page 44 of the Cromwell Master Plan. The intention of the Plan is to maintain the settlement within its existing footprint (see map). There was recognition of local issues and challenges including the lack of a central green space beside Bannockburn Road in the township's centre.

#### **A spatial planning exercise for Bannockburn**

7. The recent Plan Change 19 decision declined an expansion of the Bannockburn residential zone and promoted a spatial planning exercise for Bannockburn. Until that decision, the non-statutory Master Planning exercise, statutory planning and consenting seemed to be strangely disconnected from the Operative District Plan.
8. A spatial planning exercise is an **urgent requirement** for Bannockburn if we are to avoid planning directions being driven **only** by developers' priorities. There are three appeals on Plan Change 19, all seeking different expansions of the Bannockburn residential zone, but no clarity about how decisions on these should be made.

#### **Critique of elements of the applicant's proposal**

9. The longstanding Building Line Restriction in the proposal before us is essential in terms of landscape amenity protection. Housing spilling over the ridge towards Shepherds Creek and Bannockburn Inlet represents an unacceptable suburban intrusion into a highly valued cultural landscape important for locals and visiting domestic and international tourists. This is a key point. Bannockburn is an important element in Central Otago District's tourism destination marketing. Visitors don't

come here to look at houses, but rather to sample its hospitality offerings, engage in outdoor recreation, and marvel at our high amenity and heritage landscapes.

10. We have visited the photo point locations and agree with the already stated submissions that site selection and the landscape representations has been poor.
11. We visited Carrick vineyard on Monday morning as part of our assessment of photo points and spoke to three groups of Carrick patrons taking photos of the inlet and surrounding landscapes. We explained the proposed developments and pointed out the site poles.

One visitor of Hungarian origin said: "Oh God, you must be joking"; a couple from Auckland said: "this is awful and happening all over"; and, the couple from Midlands, UK, were just aghast.

12. Another concern about the proposal is how, if approved, built landscape provisions will be monitored and maintained in the future. This concern is heightened by our experience with another location in Bannockburn (Templars Hill) where landscape protection in a resource consent has been watered down through subsequent consent applications. (We can share documentation on this with the panel, if required).
13. Additionally, in the Jones/Searell application the focus is almost exclusively on the residential lots rather than the whole block and there is a high degree of uncertainty over what will happen on the interim balance blocks in the future. There is also the question of the future development of the adjacent 8 ha block also owned by the applicants.
14. There needs to be an overall plan for the future of the whole 17.6 ha site including pedestrian access, roading, green spaces, future monitoring of consented built landscape characteristics, and restrictions on development. The incremental nature of the proposed development is likely to limit the community benefits that might otherwise be achieved. Ideally, this site plan should be developed in the context of a Bannockburn spatial plan and be consistent with the Cromwell Master Plan.

## **Conclusion**

15. In conclusion, we strongly recommend that the application be declined pending the completion of a Bannockburn spatial plan and an overall plan for the whole Jones/Searell site. We further request that no residential development be allowed beyond the Building Line Restriction.