

Robert Galvin - Submission 33  
recognition regarding to him no  
is not simply agreeing to  
follow due democratic  
process

*Intro + Buildup + due diligence*

**Iconic local landscapes** feature strongly in this District, of which the Bannockburn Inlet and its contextual surrounds is one.

*The* It is unique, is 'Kiwi-cultural', it is steeped in history, steeped also in family tradition, and in terms of importance amongst everyday Kiwis and Visitors alike, including significant numbers of trail walkers and cyclists, who enjoy this picture-perfect landscape both passively, actively and artistically. The beauty and dynamics of Bannockburn Inlet and its contextual surrounds fully deserve official recognition, respect and protection, and should thus be valued within the District Plan and its Policies to be held right up-there with the regard that this Nation has for key elements of New Zealand's Maori culture.

And if that is not reason enough for preserving this unique landscape feature, then this Bannockburn Inlet and its contextual surrounds, should also be valued and protected for its strategic contribution to this district's visitor experience and therefore its vital place within this District's small but vital economic infrastructure.

The Bannockburn Inlet's importance relative to both the criteria above, cannot be measured easily in isolation - in traditional terms, - but common sense, the recognition of its value by Cycle Trail statistics, the enhancement it gives to the visitor and wine-tourist experience, clearly sends the message that District Plan PROTECTION from short term exploitation, of this unique landscape feature as an economic and cultural ASSET, is required, - and this **cannot** be over-stated.

*had the foresight & wisdom*

Amazingly, our elected and employed Council predecessors understood this.

and they introduced via the District Plan a **no-build-line** so that those with short-term

exploitation-in-mind could not denigrate this unique Natural feature.

They, as the saying goes. - **'got this'!**

*Thine intention is important & clear. Building was not to impact the landscape*

Here are two examples of short-term exploitation going unchecked:

**Port o'Fino on the West Coast of Italy.** Traditional culture; fishing. *history*  
Population was 500. *meaning confirmed into years later Plan 19. Even*

## Postcardino's

Today; ^ culture is mass tourism, 90% Real Estate owned by non-residents, Permanent population 48. Community life. - house keeping and selling trinkets.

There's brightly painted Fishing boats with picturesque coiled ropes and folded nets permanently affixed to the jetties, occupation now. - simply photo ops. *The culture destroyed. 97%*

*In the local front*

**Queenstown;** growth is unchecked; - population booming, - high proportion of non-resident property ownership, infrastructure in terms of roading and wastewater congested, [and dangerous]. Worker rental accommodation -scarce, Visitor and resident experience - is not improving.

We need to learn from mistakes of others by placing community values first and foremost within the District Plan

*effectively protected landscape is part of the*

But Applicants for Resource consents that affect landscape values will continue to earnestly declare, via their expert-witness advocates, their intentions to MITIGATE where landscape values may / could be put at risk.

*& inappropriately compensate*

Relative to landscape values there are three categories of Landscape

— Mitigation that Council can impose upon an Applicant.

ie., **Minimise** usually with plantings or a bund or two

**Reinstate** if landscape values are undermined then they must pay for reinstatement.v. - often difficult to achieve,

**Avoidance** One cannot build on a skyline or ridgeline.

Or within or immediately adjacent to that could visually interfere with a registered Landscape of Significance

*I believe that*

*" "*

**Avoidance applies** to that part of the Jones Searell application seeking to develop Sites for building along the Western ridge line relative to the Bannockburn Inlet as seen from public places, including privately owned places used by the public.

*Would like to ask room but H&S with a single lift show how one thing*

**Storm Water** The health of the inlet does not require storm water and run-off

The fact that the Applicant stated that this will be address by

*can disrupt values*

*There's also sun glare off roof & windows*

Storm Water The inlet does not need storm water over run with it  
sediment

Installing storm water systems in accordance with Specialist Engineers without naming them, must be interpreted as

'the Applicant still has no specific idea how they will address this Serious problem.

& the application  
development & S/B decline

The unacceptable visual Impositions of houses built overlooking the Bannockburn inlet include;

Visual disturbance to natural vegetation which absorbs and filters surface storm water]

Day time sun reflective glare of large windows & also low reflecting Roof paint

Night time domestic lighting disturbance to the natural dark

Elimination of the few remaining publicly accessible evening dark zones.

Domestic noise travelling over water

Domesticity and back yard on show.

Suggest that sensitive

Subdivision to be confined to the basin beyond the ridge

Access to be via Cairnmuir Road

- where suitable access to the disestablished sewage pond remains.

Terrace street and intersection with Bannockburn Rd not to be further and congested, with the safety risks involved. Should

immediately: Ave 5 uses @ on Build daily. The construction phase w/B night

1 To approve housing along this ridge

would destroy confidence  
of thinking rate payers  
on the COOC.

2 Any site approved will create precedent

3 & strongly urge COOC reject  
the application