

## SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED IN SUBMISSIONS ON PLAN CHANGE 7 OF THE OPERATIVE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT PLAN

Submitter Number & Name	Submission Summary	Submission Point Number	Decision Requested	
<b>PLAN CHANGE 7 : RESIDENTIAL RESOURCE AREA (13) &amp; SCHEDULED ACTIVITY 127, PISA MOORINGS</b>				
1.	G & S Archer	<u>Oppose</u> The submitters want Plan Change 7 to remain in force [sic] and not change from Rural to Residential.	1/1	Leave the land as Rural.
		The Pisa District Community Plan states that people living here enjoy the rural/vine-growing ambience of the area, which contributes to the special nature of the community. That is the reason why the submitters and the majority of people chose to live here. They didn't purchase land here to be overcrowded by high density housing.	1/2	
		Please don't allow the special nature of our community to be destroyed by changing Plan 7 [sic].	1/3	
2.	O & E Bulling	<u>Oppose</u> The submitters have raised concerns with respect to the number of sections, water availability and traffic volume.	2/1	Sections to be no smaller than 1000m <sup>2</sup>
		The submitters consider that the proposed sections are too small. The submitters would prefer sections to be no less than 1000m <sup>2</sup> .	2/2	
3.	MR Chewings	<u>Oppose</u> The submission relates to any proposed rule change for	3/1	That Plan Change 7 be rejected.

lots or sections of less than this current average area. The submitter states that all sections in the Pisa Moorings area must remain as 1000m<sup>2</sup> size. 3/2

The rural aspect of the subdivisions called "Pisa Moorings" will be dramatically altered if the average section sizes get altered. The submitter is totally opposed to this change now and in the future. 3/3

The submitter promotes that these plan changes do not go ahead so that the special character of the area can be maintained now and any time in the future. 3/4

4. J Christensen & A Bennington

Oppose

The submitters do not wish to see the designation of the 9 hectares of land described as part of Lot 1 DP 409539 (CFR 434926) changed to Residential Resource Area 13. 4/1

Retain Rural Resource Area and Residential Resource Area (11).

The submitters wish the land described above to retain its current designation. (Rural Resource Area and Residential Resource Area 11). 4/2

The submitters' reasons for supporting the status quo are:

- They value the rural aspect of Pisa Moorings and enjoy the vine-growing/orchard ambience of the area. The vineyard contributes to the special nature of the Pisa Moorings Community. 4/3

- There is a multiplicity of empty lots for sale within the existing subdivisions. There are similar subdivisions in the Lowburn Valley and adjacent to McNulty Inlet with vacant lots for sale. It is the submitters' opinion that there is currently no market for the land that would become available for purchase through the subdivision of this block. 4/4

- The submitters support the view of those people who contributed to the Pisa District Community Plan. The relevant paragraph on page 20 of the Plan reads 4/5

***“There was also interest in the size of sections. Discussion gave consideration to enforcing a minimum section size (1,000sq m), closing loopholes for subdivision and how these suggestions would impact on older folk who might prefer smaller section sizes.”*** The current tendency appears to be for everyone, including retired people, to accumulate possessions. Lots/sections need to be large enough to accommodate boats, caravans, motorhomes, additional vehicles, trailers and firewood stacks. Within Pisa Moorings these spill over into adjacent greenways/reserves/vacant land. In the submitters’ opinion, a minimum allotment area of 600m<sup>2</sup> and an average lot area of 800m<sup>2</sup> is too small.

- The submitters question the need for the provision of “community facilities and a shop”. “The Moorings” at Perriam Cove serves as a meeting place for residents. For example, for the past ten weeks twenty plus retired residents have met at 10.30am each Thursday for coffee and a chat. The Lowburn Hall, 4km distant, serves the Pisa District admirably. 4/6
- The submitters consider the meandering nature of Ferry Lane to be unsuited to a further three “roads”, over a very short distance, opening into it. The submitters are concerned that the increased volume of traffic plus the proximity of these “roads” to the existing school bus pick up/drop off point compromises children’s safety. The submitters believe the intersection of the proposed through-road with Pisa Moorings Road is unworkable because of the traffic calming hump and the proximity to the entrance to Perriam Cove. The proposal compromises the safe efficient operation of the roading network. 4/7

5. SM Copeland

Oppose

The submitter believes that the area should remain Rural and that the size of the proposed sections in the

5/1

That the plan change be refused.

subdivision is too small and that any development there will detract from the open feeling of Pisa Moorings.

6. WK Copeland

Oppose

The submitter opposes Plan Change 7 as she believes that changing from Rural to a Residential Resource Area will detract from the amenities of the Pisa Moorings area for the residents and the proposed subdivision would encourage high density housing which would inevitably mean our properties would be devalued.

6/1

That Plan Change 7 be refused.

7. M Kennedy

Oppose

The specific provisions of the proposal that the submission relates to are:

1. Changing Section 7 from Rural to provide for new Residential Resource Area.
2. Rule 7.3.3(i)(c) and minimum allotment area of 600m<sup>2</sup>
3. Rule 7.3.3(vi) to provide for multi-unit development and site area of 450m<sup>2</sup>.

7/1

That Plan Change 7 be declined; and if not declined the minimum allotment area be 1000m<sup>2</sup> and multi-unit development be prohibited.

The submitter promotes that the area not be converted to residential land and that if it is converted, that the minimum allotment area should be 1000m<sup>2</sup> and that there be no multi-unit development allowed for reasons explained below.

7/2

Changing the plan from Rural to Residential destroys the openness of the area and rural outlook that exists and the main reason we purchased a property at Pisa Moorings and the submitter expects many others also.

7/3

- Allowing residential lot sizes below 1,000m<sup>2</sup> or multi-unit development will create high density housing and higher population than the area was originally designed for and the submitter specifically notes the following: 7/4
- a. There is currently only one entrance/exit to the Pisa Moorings area off the main highway that is already starting to get congested as more people settle in the area. The proposed changes will increase the traffic count and thus create a higher traffic hazard than the existing roading layout appears to have been designed for. 7/5
  - b. The increased high density population will totally destroy the peaceful environment that is unique to the Pisa Moorings area and one of the main reasons we purchased a property here. 7/6
  - c. Another pleasure of living in our part of Pisa Moorings is the country feeling created by lack of footpaths and of being able to stroll along grass verges. Increasing the population will mean considerably more foot traffic and children that will be at high risk of injury or death from the increasing traffic flows. This will create a demand for safer access for foot traffic and thus footpaths that will destroy that country feel. 7/7
  - d. The Brittany Cove and Wakefield Bay inlets are excellent boating and recreational areas that already get very busy in the summer months with the existing population. Allowing the proposed changes will likely quadruple the demand on those spaces making them unsafe for children and boat owners to coexist and enjoy those areas as they do at the moment. 7/8

e. Currently there are several public access walkways to the lake that go alongside and in front of existing residents' properties. Current owners purchased these properties with expectation they would be allowed to enjoy the peace and quiet of our area with a certain amount of privacy. The proposed changes will create a considerable increased demand on those access ways that will destroy the privacy and peacefulness that was the very reason we purchased here. 7/9

f. The existing sewage pump station is adjacent to existing residential properties and the submitter is not aware of any problems with this. The submitter has real concerns that an increase in the number of properties and people that would eventuate with this plan change may overload the systems. Any expansion of this pump station will be detrimental to the surrounding properties. 7/10

8. HP Kidd

Support in Part/Oppose in Part

The specific provisions of the proposal that the submission relates to are:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>1. Change of Lot 38 from Rural to Residential. 8/1</p> <p>2. Proposal to change to new RRA(13); should be RRA(3) if anything.</p> <p>3. Some of the details and provisions of RRA(13).</p> | <p>1. Leave rural area (Lot 38) as Rural.</p> <p>2. If this fails, change to RRA(3).</p> <p>3. If this fails and RRA(13) is permitted, then make changes to RRA(13) as detailed in submission points 8/23 – 8/32.</p> |
|---|---|

The submitter **supports** the following provisions of the Proposed Plan Change

- |  |            |
|--|------------|
| <p>1. The change to a new Residential Resource Area for Lots 4-32 on the Subdivision Plan for RC 070423 dated 6 March 2008. These 29 residential sites</p> | <p>8/2</p> |
|--|------------|

have already been granted Resource Consent by RC 070423.

Reason

To change the current RRA (11) zone to a more appropriate residential zone would remove the inappropriate zoning for a concept that will never be implemented, would tidy up the zone boundaries and would give certainty of options and outcomes for the future owners of those sites. It would overcome the problems as outlined on p36 of the Plan Change proposal.

8/3

2. The Scheduled Activity notation (SA 127) on Lot 1 of the Concept Plan.

8/4

Reason

To give effect to community wishes for provision for community facilities.

8/5

**The balance of the submission relates to the land currently in the Rural Resource Area (Lot 38 on the subdivision plan for RC 070423).**

1. The submitter **opposes** the change of Lot 38 away from the Rural Resource Area. (Rural Zone).

8/6

Reasons

The submitter is the owner of Lot 69 DP 24318, which adjoins this Rural Zone. Her property would be adversely affected by any change from Rural to Residential, as the Rural land affords natural surroundings, space, amenity and privacy which would be lost under this proposal.

8/7

Explanation

The submitter made a submission in favour of the 1997 Resource Consent by which the original RRA

8/8

(3) area was to be developed as a higher density residential strip along the terrace with a vineyard to be developed on the flat area below. The basis of her submission was that the overall amenity of the area would be enhanced by the proposed development, and that the proposed vineyard area should be zoned Rural to maintain the original number of residences in the area. This Resource Consent was ultimately given effect by the current Residential 11 zone in the District Plan, with Rural land on the adjacent flat area, and the submitter was satisfied with this outcome.

When Resource Consent RC 070423 was proposed in 2007, the submitter was reassured that the Rural Resource Areas would remain, as the proposed use for Lots 44 and 38 were “to remain as vineyard”, with no suggestion that they be changed from Rural. Indeed at the hearing of submissions for the Resource Consent Mr McKay (representing Pisa Moorings Vineyard Ltd) said he accepted that these rural areas would never be changed to residential.

8/9

The applicants have been the owners of the affected land since well before 1997, knowing it was RRA (3) and that the concept plan for subdivision had 58 residential lots. The latest proposal provides for 86 residential lots in the same area of land – a 50% increase. This would be an impost on the current property owners in the Pisa Moorings area, and is hardly minor in the context of the wider Pisa community. The submitter believes that the applicants are attempting to gain an advantage over what would have been permitted if no change had ever taken place away from RRA(3), and that this was never intended in the change to RRA(11) and RA in the District Plan that arose from the 1997 resource consent application.

8/10

### **The Pisa Community Plan**

The proposal is contrary to the wishes of the community as expressed in the Pisa Community Plan. Among the visions expressed by the community are the following:

8/11

#### Vision

*We value our environment*

- *The rural aspect*
- *The vineyard and boating ambience*
- *Low density development*

*Our community*

- *Has a plan for its future*
- *Respect of people's places and spaces*

Objectives and recommendations for action were also developed in the Community Plan

#### Planning

There was concern expressed about the ad hoc nature of development, and strong emphasis on maintaining the rural aspect.

#### Objective

- *To plan for and manage the varying interests and requirements of the Pisa District.*

#### Recommendation for action

- *Create a plan for future development that realistically meets the needs and shared values of the Pisa District community.....*
- *Discuss issues in relation to section sizes and other bylaws....*

The proposed Plan Change is a further

8/12

example of the ad hoc planning that has caused such great concern in the community.

**Supporting arguments are flawed**

The reasons given by the applicant in support of the proposed change from Rural to Residential do not stand up to scrutiny.

1) *That the current zoning of the site is specific to a development proposed in 1997 that will never be realised.*

The submitter agrees that the duplex-type housing provided for by the Residential Resource Area 11 is unlikely to be realised, but the shortcomings of the zoning have been overcome in practice through the provisions of RC 070423, which has permitted 38 residential allotments of more standard type and size partly by some encroachment into the Rural Resource Areas. This can be overcome by changing the residential sites provided for in RC 070423 to a new residential zone which reflects the new boundaries.

8/13

Conversely, the original establishment of the Rural Zone had a twofold purpose: to provide the vineyard for the proposed development at that time, **and** to ensure that the overall number of residential sites did not exceed the number originally provided for in the 1994(?) concept plan. This second purpose is still relevant.

2) *That the Rural Area is “landlocked”.*

This is not the case, as access is available from a long length of Ferry Lane.

8/14

3) *That the vineyard was developed solely to provide for the 1997 proposed development.*

This is not correct, as it was developed in conjunction with a further 7ha of vines on the top level of the terrace which is entirely outside the current proposal and which is still being used as a

8/15

vineyard.

4) *The site is low-lying frost prone hollow with poor frost drainage.*

In the 13 years the submitter has been living adjacent to this vineyard the submitter has seen extensive frost damage in only one year, with lesser damage in one or two other years.

8/16

5) *Close to the water table, encouraging excessive vegetative growth.*

The vineyard is still extensively irrigated and fertilized. Why? The quality of the wine is obviously not an issue, as the submitter believes it has won several awards.

8/17

6) *Not a commercial success.*

In this it would not be alone, but in itself this is not a reason to develop as residential.

8/18

7) *That the land is "derelict"*

It does not need to be and this is not a reason to develop as residential.

8/19

*Remedy*

Leave Lot 38 in the Rural Area.

2) **Should the Rural Area be changed to a residential zone, the submitter opposes** change to a Residential (13) Zone as described, (except as already provided for by RC 070423).

8/20

*Reasons*

Such a change would permit the development of 49 sites in what is now the Rural Zone, and 86 overall. This is 50% greater than the original proposal for 58 sites. It is this increase in site numbers and density of development that the Rural Zone was intended to prevent. **The submitter therefore submits** that if a change away from Rural Zone is permitted that only sufficient area be changed to permit the subdivision of 20 more residential sites, and that these would be developed as part of the RRA (3) thus giving

8/21

effect to the original 58 sites provided for in the subdivision concept for Section 67 (1994? Date illegible). This would restore the original intent.

Should the above submission not be accepted, **the submitter submits** that the Rural Zone revert to RRA(3) not the new RRA (13) Zone. This would be in keeping with existing development in the area, which is valued by the community as keeping an open feel to the subdivision. 8/22

**3) The proposed Residential (13) Zone**

Should the change from the Rural Zone to RRA(13) be approved, then the submitter wishes to make submissions with respect to the detail of the subdivision proposal and the planning provisions of the proposed RRA (13) area. 8/23

**The submitter strongly opposes** the site layout of that part of the subdivision plan that lies immediately to the north west of her property, namely proposed Lots 75 - 83. 8/24

*Reasons*

As an owner of immediately adjoining land and one of those more directly affected by the whole proposal, the submitter feels that more consideration should have been given to maintaining a sense of space to those properties adjoining the new zone which are most directly affected by the change. Currently we have the sense of space and being uncrowded which comes from having a rural area over the back fence. We believed that the Rural Resource Area zoning would protect this sense of space into the future, and in this we were reassured by Mr McKay's comments at the hearing for RC 070423 that he accepted that this land would "never be subdivided for residential development". Barely two years later plans are proposed to change this area to residential. 8/25

We feel badly let down, particularly as absolutely no concession to space or privacy has been accorded to the 8/26

people most affected. To the contrary, the area adjacent to these lots has the highest density in the whole of the proposed subdivision, with the average lot size of the 9 lots being only 685m<sup>2</sup>. Combined with a proposed side yard of only 1.8m, this would create a significant loss of open space, landscape, natural character and amenity. Neither do these lots meet the applicant's stated objective of providing wider squarer lots. Quite the opposite in this case, with Lots 75 – 80 being very narrow – probably the narrowest in the whole proposed subdivision.

*Remedy*

The submitter submits that lots in this area be reduced in number from 9 to 6, and that a side yard of 5m be imposed where the lots adjoin a property in RRA (3) in order to afford some space to the current property owners. 8/27

**The submitter oppose** the minimum lot size of 600m<sup>2</sup> 8/28

*Reason*

In that part of the new RRA(13) area not covered by RC 070423 there are only 10 lots under 700m<sup>2</sup>, 8 of these being those already objected to above (Lots 75-82). 8/29

*Remedy*

The submitter submits that lots in the RRA(13) area have a minimum size of 700m<sup>2</sup>. 8/30

**The submitter opposes** any provision for multi-unit development. 8/31

*Reason*

Increase the housing density of the area. Implications for traffic flows etc. 8/32

9. SW Kidd

Oppose

The submitter opposes the whole plan change but more 9/1 Decline change to Residential; if not

particularly the change proposed from Rural to Residential.

declined further input should be sought from affected parties.

The submitter opposes the change in status of Lot 38 from Rural Resource Area to Residential in any form. Although the submitter realises a schematic plan has to accompany an application for land use change, the proposal from what it is to what they envisage goes too far and consequently is pushing things too fast. The detail of the proposal is so intense and has been developed by the proposers over a period of more than twelve months. To expect the residents to absorb and analyse its content in little more than a month is an imposition too great. If indeed the Council finds in favour of the plan change then the submitter would suggest further time is allowed for interpretation and consideration of what is intended to be forced on the residents.

9/2

9/3

My wife and I purchased a property in Ferry Lane adjoining the proposed vineyard project that we supported by submission. We were lead to believe that the developers were going to quickly establish a showhome in the style anticipated on Pisa Moorings Rd. close to existing infrastructure. This was we understood to “sell” the concept to prospective purchasers. No such building was established. We consider the developers changed their minds on the proposed vineyard sharing with the surrounding landowners and waited out the consent period until it expired. They then put a proposal forward for a differing style of use of some of the land pushing the boundaries of the RMA to achieve the greatest number of sections they felt they could get away with.

9/4

At each of the hearings of these proposals residents were assured no change to the vineyard was going to happen. The developers and indeed their legal representative accepted that the vineyard land could not be changed back to residential use.

9/5

We can now see that we are unable to rely on the “guarantees” given during public hearings. The short history of the development of the Pisa Moorings Area Subdivisions shows a complete lack of forward thinking of the Councils planning dept. Your residents have invested in the area. The submitter would say with a perceived vision of the lifestyle they could anticipate and enjoy. In the past ten years it has developed into a systematic attack on the guidelines of the RMA. The incremental approach adopted on changing the status of each consent at Perriam Cove now seems to be the process to change the layout of the original Pisa Moorings subdivision. The open spaces and peacefulness of our environment is systematically being eroded until we will eventually be living in an area as closely populated as the flat area of St Kilda in Dunedin. My wife and I certainly never foresaw this eventuality as being what we were buying into. Perhaps for some years yet there are just too many sections available for building on. Already we are seeing transportable buildings such as second hand site offices etc arriving which must surely reflect on the investment value genuine residents have committed to. Is this not possibly adding to the claimed flat market for section sales in the area. Perhaps people are holding back on moving into the area until they can see what environment they are committing to.

9/6

9/7

Now turning to the developers claims as to why the only alternative use of unprofitable? vineyard land is to turn it into residential. Are all the owners of unprofitable land going to lean on residents and Council to follow suit. The developers’ representative has not shown any attempt to look at alternative rural use let alone convince us that the vineyard is as he claims. He uses expressions such as landlocked and derelict both being solely the efforts of the developer. He highlights the restrictions created by roading and reserves both of which are normal requirements of any subdivision. There was an ominous hint in resource consent RC 070423 when sections fronting onto Missy

9/8

Crescent were created long and narrow so as to necessarily encroach onto the rural zoned vineyard land. As a result the northern section of the vineyard was pulled out and the land left unkempt and over the Christmas period creating a worrying fire hazard to those bordering it. The sections shown as proposed for this area of the proposed subdivision are as a result tiny and creating a density of building that is unacceptable. It confirms my belief of a shotgun approach to planning that the developers have adopted. The developers' representative highlights some items from the Pisa Community Plan but mysteriously overlooks the discussed item under PLANNING that says "discussion gave consideration to enforcing a minimum section size of 1000sqm" so obviously there was a dilemma over the advent of smaller section size. In his attempt to appear to be adopting a consultative process he put out a questionnaire to the District. Unfortunately he failed to solicit opinion on whether the land should stay rural or be changed to residential. The suggestion in the questionnaire was that the plan change was going to happen, and individuals were asked to consider an over-zealous plan of section layout to negotiate back from. The plan provided no detail of any reserve provision and accordingly to now include reserves could be seen as an attempt at "horse trading".

9/9

9/10

As a direct result of the push for a greater number of sections in a small area a further strain on the exit of Pisa Moorings Rd. onto State Highway 6 is being created. Ten years ago some 50 residents petitioned Council on their concerns of adding Pisa Village and Pisa North to the crowding that will occur at the intersection when the combined subdivisions have been built on. Council took no notice of our concerns. We have pointed out that in their proposal for resource consent for Pisa Village the developer said that at a later date he would apply for approval to construct a road providing egress onto State Highway 6 from the north end of the subdivision. The

9/11

developer cited cost as his reason for not doing it at stage one of the subdivision. This commitment was not made a condition of the resource consent as neither was the offer to deal with the containment of dust resulting from the colossal earthworks proposed for section layout. As a resident the submitter feels let down by the Council's decision making on the district development and the perceived lack of concern for its existing ratepayers. More recently there has been an indication of a change of attitude in listening to affected residents and as a result the submitter is hopeful that Council will not rush this proposal which could also set a long lasting precedent difficult to avoid in future applications. The submitter reiterates that the complexity of what is proposed may not be realised by all who may be affected so please do not commit to a proposal as wide ranging as this and decline the application.

9/12

9/13

10. MJ Little

Oppose

The specific provisions of the proposal that the submission relates to are:

1. 7.3.3(i)(c)
2. 7.3.3(vi)
3. 7.3.5

10/1

Reject the plan change unless the section minimum is increased to 1000m<sup>2</sup> and there are no multi-unit developments. Leaving as RRA(3) is therefore preferred.

The submitter does not support the intensification/higher density housing that will become possible with these plan changes.

10/2

The submitter does not agree with the comment in 7.2.7 "...The area concerned is **considered** suitable for conventional residential subdivision at a higher density than the adjacent Residential Resource Area (3).'

10/3

**Who** has come to this conclusion? – it isn't the opinion of the majority of residents who were attracted to this Rural Residential zoned area in the first place. The recent

10/4

community feedback as per the Pisa Community Plan endorses this view and doesn't support the 'high density urbanisation' of an environment that is an 'open spaces rural village'.	
It appears only academic planners, surveyors, developers and councils after more rates, hold high density views and not the Pisa community. Financial returns being the key driver for these parties.	10/5
The more recent residential subdivisions in the Pisa Moorings area have not been supported by roading/amenity upgrades and further high density housing will escalate the problems in adjoining areas (no footpaths/kerbs, poor lighting is already a danger).	10/6
This location will be the 'gateway' to the 'Pisa Village' being first off the highway and a feeder to the northern subdivisions. The <b>first impression</b> has the potential to be another 'nappy avenue' with small sections and multi unit developments being in conflict with the existing housing density and open area concepts. Coronation Street type housing along the terrace would be allowed.	10/7
While housing quality could be addressed at subdivision consent stage, the submitter has major concerns as to what this area could look like if it mirrors some streets to the immediate north and high density housing in large towns/cities. This zone change will pave the way for the possibility of a very shabby look and ruin the 'Pisa Village' rural residential environment.	10/8
Don't keep stuffing it up and completely ruin 'Pisa Village' by approving this Proposed Plan change.	10/9
The submitter is totally opposed to the zone change unless the section size minimum is increased to 1000m2 and there	10/10

are no multi unit developments.  
Leaving it as RRA(3) is preferred therefore.

11. D & A Lyon

Oppose

Specific provisions of the proposal that the submission relates to are:

Decline the proposal and maintain the status quo.

- 7.2.7 11/1
- 7.3.3(i)(c) - too small section 11/2
- 7.3.3(vi) – Restricted activity – keep it that way. Loss of amenity values. 11/3
- 7.3.5(iii) – Enforce your own rules - not compatible activity in residential area. 11/4

The submitters oppose the proposed intensive development especially multi-unit development which history shows leads to travellers accommodation. The area wasn't designed for high density housing. 11/5

12. N McDowell

Oppose

The specific provisions of the proposal that the submission relates to are:

Reject proposed plan change.

- Section sizes below 1000m<sup>2</sup> (500m<sup>2</sup> & 600m<sup>2</sup> sections promotes tin sheds) 12/1
- Changing the original vineyard concept to residential Housing. 12/2

The submitter promotes that the local authority turn down the proposed Plan Change (promoted for purely the reasons grape prices have fallen and using that reason alone as an excuse to turn it into an intense urban settlement) as it goes against the Pisa Moorings concept. 12/3

13.	JH McGraw	<p><u>Oppose</u> The specific provisions of the proposal that the submission relates to are the minimum size of the sections.</p>	13/1	Reject the plan change from rural to urban or allow the change with a proviso with a no section be smaller than 1000m <sup>2</sup> .
		<p>The submitter vehemently opposes the subdivision being allowed if the minimum size of the sections is allowed to be less than 1000m<sup>2</sup>. The Pisa Area Community Plan has already verified that people live in the area because of its rural appeal.</p>	13/2	
14.	KD McGraw	<p><u>Oppose</u> The submitter opposes Plan Change 7 that seeks approval for subdivision of the Rural Resource Area (13) as detailed on Schedule 19.22 : Concept plan – Residential Resource Area (13).</p>	14/1	Reject Plan Change 7.
		<p><b>Submission</b> During 1997, Pisa Moorings Vineyard Limited requested, and was granted resource consent for a land use change to vineyard, Rural [sic] Resource Area (13), and subdivide the Residential Marina zoned land into 57 residential allotments averaging 460m<sup>2</sup> and one large allotment of 6.4ha for the vineyard.</p>	14/2	
		<p>The submitter submitted to, and supported those applications on the basis that they reduced the number of residential dwellings in the form of a cluster development, introducing an exciting commercial activity into the centre of a rural residential subdivision thereby increasing the open space values for the area.</p>	14/3	
		<p>The submitter remains committed to the benefits of that concept even though the applicants have failed to deliver the promised duplex apartments and vineyard share options.</p>	14/4	
		<p>The residential allotments were consented to have 24 duplex apartments erected on them and 9 single dwellings.</p>	14/5	

At that time the area was zoned Residential Marina and was part of a staged approach by the original developer Mr Dustin to development and release of residential allotments as demand for rural residential allotments in the area increased.	14/6
However, the applicants, Pisa Moorings during 1996, purchased the land from Mr Dustin and made the decision that the market for that form of development was fully satisfied.	14/7
Through the application they promoted a Mediterranean style of village/vineyard living over their balance of title, in place of the original residential subdivision proposed by Mr Dustin.	14/8
The concept detailed a fully finished 100% ownership duplex apartments in harmony with an overall design style, in conjunction with a fully planted out and operational vineyard.	14/9
It was proposed that the vineyard be owned and operated by a separate limited liability company of which each duplex owner would be a shareholder.	14/10
Land located on the south east side of Ferry Lane was to remain balance title with a proposed subdivision as per the original Dustin concept plan. That did not occur and the land was subdivided into 3 large blocks and later sold.	14/11
The District Plan's provisions for the Residential Marina Zone were formulated in 1989.	14/12
The applicants in support of their 1997 applications for land use consent and subdivision consent contended that the market for standard residential allotments had changed along with the exciting development of a viticulture industry	14/13

in Central Otago.

The present Plan Change application from Pisa Moorings Vineyard Limited is in direct opposition to those contentions. 14/14

The submitter suggests that the success of the recent Perriam Cove waterfront apartment development even in the face of difficulty property marketing times along with growing world recognition of the quality and popularity of Central Otago wines proves the vineyard/duplex apartment originally proposed by Pisa Moorings Vineyard Limited remains very viable, therefore should remain in place. 14/15

The non-complying non-deliverable nature of the plan change request with regard to the District Plan is disturbing. The submitter specifically refers to District Plan descriptions that correctly capture community wishes regarding the protection of open space concepts within Rural Settlements. 14/16

Central Otago District Plan Policy 7.2.7 is especially relevant to the submitter's submission. It sets the tone of requirements relating to subdivision and development in Residential Resource Areas (1) – (12) in ways that complements the character and amenity of those areas and provide for the protection of landscape features, where such features are present. 14/17

The policy explanation states that : *Within the Residential Resource Area specific areas have been identified where it is appropriate to apply different standards for subdivision allotment size, bulk and location or with respect to other effects of activities. In most instances the areas concerned have had specific planning provisions applied to them in the Transitional District Plan that recognises their particular characteristics.* 14/18

The area included in the Plan Change 7 request by Pisa Moorings Vineyard Limited is Residential Resource Area (11) and explained as: *The area identified as Residential Resource Area (11) is located at Pisa Moorings. This area is to be developed in accordance with a village – vineyard concept that has been the subject of previous resource consents.*

14/19

The submitter contends that the District Plan explanations contained in Policy 7.2.7 contain generic descriptions relating to the very special character of land defined as Residential Resource Areas surrounding Cromwell Township. To allow Plan Change 7 the submitter believes would undermine the integrity, intent of the plan, and community desire for Council to uphold the special considerations relating to subdivision of all Residential Resource Areas, not just (Area – 11 – Pisa Moorings).

14/20

#### **Pisa Moorings Utilities**

A further serious matter is that of existing underground water reticulation utilities that service Wakefield Bay and Pisa Moorings residents.

14/21

The proposed subdivision concept plan for Residential Resource Area (13) clearly shows that the main supply pipe line to the tank farm located at the western edge of the terrace riser, and part of the reticulation network providing supply to parts of Wakefield Bay residents would pass under new residences should the proposed subdivision proceed.

14/22

Compliance with water quality, fire fighting matters, and standard maintenance of the network would be impossible under such circumstances.

14/23

#### **The Pisa District Community Plan**

Council has recently undertaken significant community consultation with the Pisa District community culminating in

14/24

development and launch of the Pisa District Community Plan.

In participating in this important process the community expressed a very strong emphasis on maintaining the rural aspect of the Pisa District.

14/25

The size of sections for residential development, closing loopholes for any proposed development that downgrades the open space and rural aspect of the area have been, and continue to be major topics of concern.

14/26

Community aspirations with regard to the size of residential sections are that the open space and wide side yard concept promoted by the original developers and adopted by Council should remain in place. That means section size of 1,000m<sup>2</sup> is the minimum the community will generally accept.

14/27

The Plan Change request by Pisa Moorings Vineyard Limited disregards almost every community desire detailed in the Pisa District Community Plan.

14/28

If Council were to allow the Plan Change 7, such a decision would render the Pisa District Community Plan redundant.

14/29

15. NZ Transport Agency

Neither Support nor Oppose

**(1) General Comment**

The NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) is neutral in respect of the proposed Plan Change. The NZTA acknowledges that the proposal to provide for growth immediately adjacent to the existing Pisa Moorings development represents a suitable expansion of the area.

15/1

The proposed Plan Change be accepted in its entirety subject to implementing the decisions requested below, or similar outcomes.

However, the NZTA suggests that the Plan Change must provide for adequate recognition through relevant

15/2

1. Insert a rule that requires the following (or like words to similar effect):

7.3.2 Controlled Activities

objectives, policies and rules (or constraints) of reverse sensitivity and the actual and potential effect of the proposed Schedule 127 on the functionality and safety of the Pisa Moorings Road/State Highway 6 (SH6) intersection.

**(2) Reverse Sensitivity**

The Plan Change area is separated from the carriageway along this section of the State highway by rural zoned land. However, the NZTA notes that proposed Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9 are located within 80m of the State highway carriageway edge line.

The NZTA is concerned about the potential for reverse sensitivity effects arising where noise sensitive activities such as residential dwellings are located either adjacent to, or in close proximity to, State highways. The NZTA's Planning Policy Manual (Published by Transit New Zealand in 2007 and adopted by NZ Transport Agency upon its creation on 1 August 2008) sets out the Agency's concerns with respect to reverse sensitivity, including:

*One of [the NZ Transport Agency's] key planning aims is to reduce the potential for conflict between state highways and nearby land uses to:*

- (a) ensure state highways function in an optimal manner;*
- (b) ensure new developments near state highways protect future occupants from potential adverse effects such as traffic noise and vibration; and*
- (c) improve the amenity values of sensitive areas near State highways.*

15/3

15/4

7.3.2(vi) Residential Activities in Residential Resource Area (13)

Residential activities that comply with the following standards are controlled activities:

- (a) All residential dwellings located within 80 metres of the seal edge of State Highway 6 shall meet the following requirement-

- (i) *New residential buildings located within 80m of the seal edge of the State highway shall be designed and constructed to meet noise performance standards for noise from traffic on State Highway 6 that will not exceed 35dBA Leq (24hr) in bedrooms and 40dBA Leq (24hr) for other habitable rooms in accordance with the satisfactory sound levels recommended by Australian and New Zealand Standard AS/NZ2107:2000 Acoustics* –

The Planning Policy Manual includes two methods for dealing with potential reverse sensitivity effects that might arise from residential activity being established adjacent to State highways:

15/5

*Recommended design sound levels and reverberation times for building interiors.*

- An 80 metre setback from the edge of the seal of the State highway where, as is the case for this site, the adjacent State highway is a 100km/hr speed environment with traffic counts of less than 10,000 vehicles per day.
- Acoustic treatment for residential activities established within 80m of the edge of seal of the adjacent State highway, which requires the interior of habitable rooms to meet a satisfactory internal sound level, as prescribed by AS/NZS 2107:2000.

*This shall take account of any increases in noise from projected traffic growth during a period of not less than 10 years from the commencement of construction of the development.*

In this instance it is not appropriate to require consent notices be registered on the certificates of title for the above-mentioned lots as the plan change only provides a concept plan rather than definitive boundaries to the lots. The NZTA therefore suggests a rule should be added that requires residential dwellings established within 80m of the edge of seal of the adjacent State highway to be designed and constructed to meet the internal sounds levels set out in the Australian New Zealand standard AS/NZ 2107:2000. Such an approach would have the effect of future proofing the development, in the event of traffic volume and therefore noise generation increases along the adjacent stretch of State Highway 6.

15/6

2. That the Concept Plan be amended to remove the access from SA 127 to Pisa Moorings Road.
3. That a rule be added that applies to the Schedule Activity notation (SA 127) that: *prohibits vehicular access from SA 127 to Pisa Moorings Road.*

**(3) Pisa Moorings/SH 6 Intersection**

Plan Change 7 applies a Scheduled Activities notation to land that has frontage to Pisa Moorings Road. The notation refers to proposed Scheduled Activity 127 (SA 127) and is to provide for 'Community Facilities' and 'Shop' as defined in Section 18 of the Operative District Plan. SA 127 appears to have direct access to Pisa Moorings Road

15/7

as well as access to a new connecting road from Pisa Moorings Road to Missy Crescent. Given the proximity of SA 127 to the Perriam Cove entrance, the NZTA would prefer that access is obtained to SA 127 from the proposed new road only. The addition of more access points to and from Pisa Moorings Road could potentially add to delays for traffic entering Pisa Moorings, which may in turn affect the functionality of the State highway intersection. The NZTA considers that this would not be an onerous alteration to the proposal.

**The reasons for this submission are:**

The NZTA's statutory objective is to carry out its functions in a way that contributes to an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable land transport system. Some of these functions relevant in this case are:

15/8

- to promote an affordable, integrated safe, responsive, and sustainable land transport system.
- to manage the State highway system in accordance with the relevant legislation; and
- to assist, advise, and co-operate with approved organisations (such as regional councils and territorial authorities).

In submitting on this Plan Change proposal, the NZTA is pursuing these objectives and functions in relation to the land transport system, and in particular the State highway system, and contributing to the objectives of the New Zealand Transport Strategy.

15/9

16. C Pagan

Oppose

The submitter strongly opposes changes from the Village Vineyard concept to a high density housing area. No written information has been provided to substantiate

16/1

Refuse proposed Plan Change 7 in its entirety.

claims of frost hollow and closeness to water table. Should this be true, why would families choose to live in this environment with wet and cold ground to build on? Why have no specific research details been made available?	
When the wine market improves will this decision to wipe out this area of grapes be regretted???	16/2
7.3.3 – The submitter totally opposes ANY section sizes being made under 800m <sup>2</sup> .	16/3
Social research is available both overseas and in New Zealand that indicates strongly of increased problems and negative attitudes to intensive populated housing. Road access issues, noise issues both animals and human, privacy and general socialisation skills decline in closer living environments.	16/4
Parking issues, children's play space and outdoor living quality as well as vegetation issues arise more frequently too.	16/5
Sewerage and water supplies will be stressed with water shortages that would need to be substantially increased to support the intensive population.	16/6
Over the past three years, there have been repeated written objections lodged showing resident's opposition to small units being built in the Pisa Subdivision. How many times do we need to repeat ourselves?	16/7
The submitter has lived in small sections and found that connections between neighbours reduce. Here in the Pisa subdivision we have chosen to live in a beautiful location and on spacious sections and an 'out of town' style living. Why would a new cramped area of housing be allowed to affect the overall settlement – except for monetary gain?	16/8

The submitter is sure with some re designing of the original plan; larger sections can be created with a minimum of 800m2 and upwards, without the loss of too many dollars for the developer. This would mean that the new area would blend in with the existing buildings and extend the wonderful area we live in.

16/9

The submitter looks forward to seeing a new plan with more spacious sections. Including more space for those living there. Most families have boats or trailers of some kind because of the location, so roading needs to allow for at least two boats to pass with ease.

16/10

If the people designing this plan could envisage what it is like to live here, accept the activities that we enjoy here and then amend their current plan slightly on more spacious lines, the submitter is sure that they could create a much better and more liveable plan.

16/11

17. IR Paterson

Supports Conditionally

The specific provisions of the proposal that the submission relates to are rural land between Lots 67 and 68 and hazardous private rural land; concept plan section sizes and building codes/restrictions; roading, kerbing and drainage; water supplies and dust control; school bus stop.

17/1

If the proposed plan change is accepted adhere to the conditions specified in the submission (see 17/6 – 17/14).

IR & SG Paterson are the owners of properties at 11 and 13 Ferry Lane, which are Lots 67 & 68 on the plan. When we shifted to 11 Ferry Lane approximately 6 years ago we enjoyed the semi-rural aspect and vineyard ambience that existed on our boundaries. Approximately two years ago the vineyard was removed from behind our properties and since then the land has been left as an overgrown fire hazard with thousands of open postholes in the ground. Last summer the fire risk on this land was extreme and we were very lucky on at least one occasion not to have a major section fire spread through the remaining vineyard on

17/2

17/3

this land. This land is not fenced but has a few private property and hazard warning signs. This does not deter the general public from walking and driving vehicles, including motorbikes, through the abandoned land that was the vineyard and through what remains of the vineyard.

The residents of Pisa Village North are also using the track from State Highway 6 through the top vineyard as the official short cut road to Missy Crescent on a daily basis. This access the submitter believes was supposed to be blocked from the Wanaka-Cromwell Highway as a condition of the last subdivision consent granted to Pisa Moorings Vineyards Ltd. It is only a matter of time before the public has an accident or cause a fire on this land, which is after all private property.

Considering the problems we see associated with this pocket of land and its existing zoning we give conditional support to a zone change to residential providing the following conditions are adhered to:

- The land between Lots 67 & 68 remains as a lane as shown on the Concept Plan. We would object if this were to become another residential section.
- We would like some existing trees that would be on road reserve between Lots 67 and 68 to be retained where practical.
- We prefer section sizes to be a minimum of 890 square metres.
- We would like the same building codes and restrictions that exist in Pisa Moorings today.
- Suitable drainage pits for stormwater where the proposed lane between Lots 67 and 68 enters Ferry Lane would be needed as flooding sometimes occurs

now with heavy rain.

- Minimum of corner kerbing to stop drivers cutting the corners (as has been installed throughout Pisa Moorings). 17/11
- New through road from Pisa Mooring Road to Missy Crescent is desperately needed to take pressure off Ferry Lane, which is only just coping with a traffic load it was never designed for and, with the recent arrivals of lower cost relocatable houses to the area, the road surface is being broken by heavy transporters. 17/12
- There is no official School bus stop in Pisa Moorings. The bus currently stops and turns on private land on the corner of Ferry Lane and Pisa Moorings Road. The bus driveway enters the road on a corner and directly after a corner and a road hump which is dangerous and was only supposed to be a temporary arrangement. Parking cars on the roadside and private land waiting for children further compounds the problem. A bus stop needs to be provided on the new through road so that it is safer for motorists and school children who would then have a footpath to walk on. I understand this is not the CODC or developer's responsibility but it is a good opportunity to get alongside Education Services and find a long-term solution to this problem. To date no existing community group has been successful in relocating the bus stop. Perhaps opposite the proposed Walnut Tree Reserve or further down towards Missy Crescent may be a good location for a bus stop. 17/13
- We would also expect any subdivision development to have stringent dust suppression measures whilst under construction and that there would be no disruption to existing water supplies. 17/14

Whilst we would prefer to still be looking at the vineyard, 17/15

this has been partially gone for some time now and what we are left with is a hazardous area.

We suspect some will disagree but, providing that the subdivision concept takes place with some minor suggested changes, the neighbouring properties would be in a better and safer environment than they are now.

17/16

18. Pisa Moorings Utilities Society Inc.

Oppose

The specific provisions of the proposal that the submission relates to are the change from Rural Resource Area to Residential and the concept plan for subdivision if granted.

18/1

Reject proposed Plan Change 7 to the extent that it promotes a change from Rural Resource Area to Residential.

As owners of the Water Scheme supplying water to the residents of Pisa Moorings and Wakefield Bay the submitter deems it necessary to ensure protection of our infrastructure is provided for in any resource consent or Resource Area granted to the use of land above which the infrastructure is situated. At all times the submitter must have uninterrupted access to the pipework for maintenance, and accordingly any subdivision of land should leave clear space by way of a reserve passage extending 3 metres on either side of the buried pipework. Because of the nature of the substrate excavation for maintenance must allow for the unstable edge which would be exposed to be a sufficient distance from any neighbouring structure to ensure undermining cannot occur. For this reason alone it is desirable that the land subject to this application for a plan change must remain Rural. In hindsight the submitter feels that proper consideration was not applied when the most recent consent was issued for the development of the terrace behind the vineyard (RC 070423). The submitter feels that a revision of the section layout for this development should be reconsidered taking into account the siting of section boundaries and the pipeline and also sideyard distances which may have restricted the ability for machinery involved

18/2

in any maintenance activity.

The submitter requires that all costs associated with any disturbing of its pipework be covered by the developer, and such costs shall also include any cost of monitoring or analysis of the water supply for Health Dept. requirements taking into account the current requirement for drinking water suppliers to have proper registration by 2015. Before any work is started, full consultation and explanation must be provided to the submitter and/or its advisers and any associated costs in this connection shall also be borne by the developer.

18/3

One aspect of particular concern is the provision of access to Lot 44 on the upper terrace. The only access provided for is from Missy Crescent to the top of the terrace by the Pisa Village reservoir, as access from SH 6 has been expressly excluded. The proposed access crosses the area over which the submitter has an easement for the tanks and the platform on which they are sited. There is no room for a road through this point, as the space must be left for installation of further tanks should these be required in the future. The submitter would like to point out that the road constructed from Missy Crescent to the top of the terrace beside the Pisa Village Reservoir and Pumping Station has actually removed part of the extended platform provided for possible extension to the submitter's Tank farm. The submitter questions whether this road exists legally as an enquiry in writing to the planning dept some years back resulted in advice being given that no road was going to be constructed here.

18/4

At the Annual Meeting of the Society on 3<sup>rd</sup> September members present gave a unanimous indication that the land should remain Rural. In the original consent when the Vineyard development was approved it states "Mr McKay confirmed that the applicant accepted the imposition of a consent notice to ensure that the vineyard area remains

18/5

and is not subdivided or developed for residential purposes in the future.” The revised District Plan took this into account and the land was designated Rural to give effect to this provision. It should stay that way.

Failing that, it should revert to RRA3 zoning. This also reflects the visions expressed in the Pisa Community Plan that the community values the “rural aspect” the “vineyard ambience” and “low density development”. The Community Plan also suggests section sizes of at least 1000m<sup>2</sup> is the preference for future developments.

18/6

19. CF Shaw & WO Shaw

Oppose

The specific provisions of the proposal that the submission relates to are the proposal to allow high density housing development within the Pisa Moorings area.

19/1

Apply Residential Resource Area (3) to any residential rezoning of the Rural land to preserve the low density development that is valued by the community.

The submitters oppose the proposed plan change as it is not consistent with the Pisa Community Plan in which the community supported low density housing development. Although a small area of RRA(11) was previously approved, this was before the Pisa Community Plan was developed by Council and the community, and it is important that the Pisa Community Plan is considered when planning decisions are made.

19/2

20. J Shaw

Oppose

The specific provisions of the proposal that the submission relates to are Plan Change 7 to include 9 hectares of land which is currently in Rural Resource Area (11) [sic] for new residential subdivision with allotment area of 600m<sup>2</sup> (minimum) and provide for multi unit development.

20/1

Reject proposed Plan Change 7 or restrict the minimum allotment area to 1000m<sup>2</sup> with no amendment to provide for multi-unit development.

The submitter opposes the above proposal as this would allow the area to become densely populated which would detract from the semi-rural appeal of Pisa Moorings.

20/2

21. SJ Taylor

Oppose

The specific provisions of the proposal that the submission relates to are Rules 7.3.3(i)(c) and 7.3.3(vi).

21/1

Only allow the subdivision [sic] to proceed subject to a 1000m<sup>2</sup> minimum allotment size.

The submitter objects to the proposed reduction in minimum allotment sizes. Pisa Moorings is an area of relatively low housing density with generous areas of reserve. This gives the area its appealing sense of tranquillity.

21/2

To allow an adjacent subdivision with very much reduced section sizes and little provision for green reserves is totally at odds with the character of the area.

21/3