

SUBMISSION ON NOTIFIED APPLICATION CONCERNING RESOURCE CONSENT

1 Dunorling Street
PO Box 122, Alexandra 9340
New Zealand

03 440 0056

@codc.govt.nz
w.codc.govt.nz



(Form 13)

Section 95A (public) Resource Management Act 1991

To: The Chief Executive
Central Otago District Council
PO Box 122
Alexandra 9340
resource.consent@codc.govt.nz

DETAILS OF SUBMITTER

Full name: ALEXA ANNE + ROSS ANDERSON WALLACE

Contact person (if applicable):
Alexa Wallace

Electronic address for service of submitter: ra.aawallace@gmail.com

Telephone: 027 23 27 694

Postal address (or alternative method of service under [section 352](#) of the Act):
18 Terrace Street,
Bannockburn R.D.2
Cromwell 9384

This is a submission on the following resource consent application: RC No: **230398**

Applicant: **D J Jones & N R Searell Family Trust** Valuation No: **2844104500**

Location of Site: **88 Terrace Street, Bannockburn**

Submissions Close 08 August 2024

Brief Description of Application: **Subdivision Consent for 20 Lot Residential Development including construction of an internal access road and rights of way, recreation reserve and balance lots.**

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:
(give details, attach on separate page if necessary)

The entire resource consent application
Please see attached document

This submission is: (attach on separate page if necessary)

Include:

- whether you support or oppose the specific parts of the application or wish to have them amended; and
- the reasons for your views.

Please see attached document

I/We seek the following decision from the consent authority:
(give precise details, including the general nature of any conditions sought)

The entire resource consent application
rejected

I ~~support~~ oppose the application OR neither support or oppose (select one)

I wish / do not wish to be heard in support of this submission (select one)

I am/am not* a trade competitor for the purposes of [section 308B](#) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (select one)

~~*I/We am/am not (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:~~

~~(a) adversely affects the environment; and~~

~~(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.~~

~~*Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor.~~

~~*I/We will consider presenting a joint case if others make a similar submission~~

~~*Delete this paragraph if not applicable.~~

I ~~request~~/do not request (select one), pursuant to [section 100A](#) of the Act, that you delegate your functions, powers, and duties to hear and decide the application to 1 or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority. "See [note 4](#) below as you may incur costs relating to this request."

Ad Wallace R B Wallace

Signature

(to be signed by submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Date

7/8/2024

In lodging this submission, I understand that my submission, including contact details, are considered public information, and will be made available and published as part of this process.

Notes to submitter

1. If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use [form 16B](#).

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

2. You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as is reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the consent authority.
3. If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in [Part 11A](#) of the Resource Management Act 1991.
4. If you make a request under [section 100A](#) of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you will be liable to meet the additional costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners, compared to our hearing panel. Typically these costs range from \$3,000 - \$10,000.
5. Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):
 - it is frivolous or vexatious:
 - it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
 - it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
 - it contains offensive language:

it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

RC 230398 Submission - Ross and Alexa Wallace

We oppose the application in its entirety. We feel that there are too many parts of the application that can not be remediated with any alterations of the application during the consent process.

Specifically

1. The zoning of the area allows a minimum size of 1500 sq.m with an average of 2000 sq.m. The average of the proposed lot sizes is 1696.4 sq.m. – which is well below the standard. The balance lots 40, 50 and 51 should be excluded as there is no restriction on further subdivision
2. The area is under a Building Line Restriction (BLR) to restrict the edge of the Bannockburn Township and preserve the character and history of the area, and acknowledged “significant landscape amenities”
8 lots (13 – 20) are fully within the BLR
4 lots (4 – 6, 12) are largely within the BLR
3 lots (2,10,11) are partly within the BLR
The loop road (lot 100) and part of the main service road (lot 101) are also in the BLR
Houses, roads, and infrastructure will be highly visible from many places both in daytime and nighttime and these breaches cannot be mitigated.
We already have examples where the care of “significant landscape character of Bannockburn has NOT been preserved- new houses on Gibson Road among the sluicings, and Templar hill are highly visible from many places – so the owners get a “good view” and everyone else is ignored??

We require this application to be rejected.

3. The application breaches the CODC standards for roading – the maximum number of lots for “dead-end streets” is 20. There are already 19 residences on Terrace Street and the proposal would take the number to 39 - - nearly double the desired maximum. Terrace Street is narrow with no public footpaths or centre line, especially on the “blind” hill down to Bannockburn Road. At present we have a mown strip on one side, courtesy of Graeme Stewart who mowed a lot of Bannockburn as he “liked to see things tidy”. Unfortunately Graeme died in April so what happens now? – there are not many ride- on mowers with generous public minded drivers around!
Terrace Street also has a “tricky” T intersection with Bannockburn Road- with no safe crossing point for Pedestrians, especially for children , prams, and elderly. Vehicles come quickly over the hill and you have to walk on the side of the road (no footpaths or level ground) to cross the road.
The proposed “doubling” of the number of residences will have a BIG impact on the safety, noise, dust of our street .

These adverse effects cannot be mitigated, therefore the consent should be declined.

4. The visual impact of the proposed development has not been really investigated in spite of the BLR over a large part of the proposal. It ignores the special land resource and historic heritage resource in this BLR - of "water race Hill" and Bannockburn's character. The steepness of many of the lots will need significant earthworks for foundations and the roading will also be very visible from many places – and then the impact of building (some two storey?) , fences, plantings, will completely alter the existing landscape – in an area that has been designated a Building Line Restriction? The BLR is intended to maintain the area for future generations and his proposal certainly will NOT fit in this category. This cannot be remediated and the entire application should be rejected.

5. From the maps and information it is extremely difficult to ascertain whether there will still be continued public access to the point and down to the walkway down to the lake which is used by many , as some of the ground is very steep and where are the boundary lines of the lots. Good overlays would have been very helpful instead of vague photos. Public access to our treasured amenities is valuable and important to the community and not enough consideration is given by some developers eg Lawrence St, Short St, (both Mr Jones developments) Terrace St, Lynn Lane, Many places do have such walkways and they are easy to plan for in the original plans but much more difficult to do later!

We see many areas where the applicant has not mitigated the CODC Standards breaches, and desire that the entire application should be rejected

Alexa and Ross Wallace
18 Terrace Street
Bannockburn