

Resource Management Act 1991

FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO SUBMISSION ON NOTIFIED PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT PLAN

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

(FORM 6)

RECEIVED
20/12/2022
CODC

19/241

To: The Chief Executive
Central Otago District Council
PO Box 122
Alexandra 9340

Name of person making further submission

Name: **One Five Five Developments LP** _____

Postal address: 8 Park Street, PO Box 263, Ashburton 7740 _____
(Or alternative method of service under [section 352](#) of the Act)

Phone: 021 414 664 _____

Email: shanon.garden@gmail.com _____

Contact person: Shanon Garden, director _____
(Name & designation, if applicable)

This is a further submission in support of (or in opposition to) a submission on Proposed Plan Change 19 to the Central Otago District Plan.

I am:

A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has, the grounds for saying this being:

One Five Five Developments LP is the contracted owner of 155 Dunstan Road, being a property that is subject to proposed rezoning under PC19 to LLRZ and which could be directly or indirectly impacted by the submissions identified in the table attached.

I support (or oppose) the submission of:

Those parties listed in the table attached

..... on Plan Change 19
(Please state the name and address of original submitter and submission number and submission point number of the original submission)

The reasons for my support (or opposition) are:

All submissions identified in the table of Further Submissions, attached, impact on how our property on Dunstan Road might be rezoned.

.....
.....
.....
(Please give reasons and continue on an additional page if necessary)

I seek that the whole (or part [describe part]) of the submission be allowed (or disallowed):

Those parts set out in the table attached

.....
(Please give precise details)

I wish ~~(or do not wish)~~ to be hearing in support of my further submission.

(Please strike out as applicable)

If others make a similar submission , I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

(Please delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case)



.....
Signature of person making Further Submission

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making further submission)

(A signature is not required if you make a submission by electronic means)

Date: 19 December 2022

Email: shanon.garden@gmail.com.....

Telephone No: 021 414 664

Postal Address: 8 Park Street, PO Box 263, Ashburton 7740.....

Contact Person: Shanon Garden

(name & designation, if applicable)

Submissions close at 4pm on Tuesday 20 December 2022

Submissions can be emailed to districtplan@codc.govt.nz

Note to person making submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.

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.

One Five Five Developments LP

Table of Further Submissions – To accompany Form 6

Dec 20, 2022

Submitter (ref number and name)	Support/ Oppose	In whole or in part	How we are affected to a greater extent than the general public	Reasons/Details
19/7: Russell Ibbotson	Support	In whole	Submission includes comment on how our property could be re- zoned.	Mr Ibbotson is a proponent of the LLRZ zoning along Dunstan Road, with a landholding further to the west, towards Waldron Rd. Mr Ibbotson makes note in his submission that he supports more intensive development along Dunstan Road, closer to the existing township. We support this submission.
19/09: Waka Kotahi	Support	In part	Dunstan Road is a key transport link, providing vehicle, biking and walking access – which multi-modal transport is the subject of this submission. Our property is accessed along this route.	WK notes, at their Para 5, that land use change has a significant, long-term impact on transport. “Changes in land use can affect the demand for travel, creating both pressures, and opportunities for investment in transport infrastructure []. For these reasons, WK seeks to enable development in the most accessible urban areas.” It further states “Provision for multi-modal transport, particularly walking and cycling, is of increasing importance” noting policies in the proposed plan that recognise the need for residential development to be well connected (Para 16). Reflecting on the proposed LLRZ zoning along Dunstan Road, we note: - Dunstan Road offers an excellent (safe, easy and pleasant) walking and cycling access back towards town. Where this amenity exists, and at travel distances where people will walk and bike back to town, it is entirely appropriate that a reasonable level of density be enabled. This speaks to adopting a higher density than the proposed LLRZ from 155 Dunstan Rd back towards the township. - Looking into the future it is conceivable that Dunstan Rd act as a feeder for public transport (buses) into the centre of Alexandra. A Clyde-Alexandra service, for example, could utilise this route. Appropriate density should therefore be enabled on both sides of Dunstan Road.
19/12 Te Whata Ora	Support / Oppose	In part	Submission on LLRZ, potentially impacting our property.	Section 3 of TWO’s submission states that “Public health action aims to create environments and conditions that prevent harm and support health and wellbeing.” Further intensifying the town end of Dunstan Road is an outcome that achieves this

				objective. It is, and will remain, some of the safest walking and cycling routes within urban Alexandra. Reasonable density will promote this desired activity. We support the sentiment set out in Page 1 of the Schedule to the TWO submission relating to <i>Planning Maps</i> that “We support the concept of medium density residential zoning close to the commercially zoned centre of the towns of [] Alexandra. This provides an environment that supports active transport and social interaction within this zone.” TWO then seek a decision that the distribution of zones in PC19 be retained in their current form. We oppose this element of the TWO submission. We further Support the TWO submission set out in Page 2 of the Schedule to the TWO submission relating to <i>Objective of LLRZ as amended by 31 6.2.6</i> in that the LLRZ zoning is, in proximity to the Alexandra township, unduly large for “public Health” and “Sustainability” reasons. They state “Our concerns relate to inefficient land use, the need for vehicles to access work or services as well as the disincentive towards active transport or social interaction.” “Should PC19 be confirmed, the land set aside for this [LLRZ] zoning needs to be kept to the absolute minimum.”
19/14: Paul and Angela Jacobson	Support / Oppose	In part	We are a direct neighbour to this submitter.	The submission notes, and we agree, that “LLRZ is large for an urban setting”. We are unclear as to any benefit from adopting the recommendation to apply a different name to the proposed LLRZ zone of Large Lot Urban Zone (“LLUZ”). So at this time, without further information/consideration, we would oppose that suggestion. We support the statement: “There is little logic given for the size of lots under this Plan Change. From a planning and sustainability perspective, the density of lots and people should be highest near the centre of Alexandra to allow walking rather than car access to schools, businesses and services. The PC19 proposes a uniform density of 2000m2 all the way to Waldren Road rather than a gradation of density. This is not considered in the Section 32 Analysis.” The submitter also provides background on the local wine industry and the benefits of retaining productive land, specifically for wine making. This is acknowledged. However, the proposed LLRZ along the north side of Dunstan Road with an average lot size of <5Ha and a predominance of residential activity, is not the place to focus on preserving the Central Otago wine industry. Accordingly, we oppose the notion of applying a zone that referencing viticulture to this land.

19/16: John Lister	Support	In part	We are a neighbour (across Dunstan Road) to the large block of CODC and Ngai Tahu owned land proposed to be zoned MRZ. This large area of relatively high-density housing would appear to underpin Council's determination that the published PC19 adequately provisions for Alexandra's future growth. We seek there be some further consideration of whether this influences Council's view that the land north of Dunstan Road, where our property is located, does not therefore need to be used in a more efficient manner. To this extent, this submission indirectly impacts our property.	Mr Lister submits in his Section 1 a range of reasons why the MRZ zoning, with a minimum lot size of 200m2 is too small. We support this aspect of Mr Lister's submission, with specific reference to the ~30Ha of Council/NTL Developments land on the south side of Dunstan Road, extending through to SH8.
19/26: Fulton Hogan	Support	In part	The submitter makes submissions on land in close proximity to our block, and over which we have made submissions on.	The submitter opposes the proposed overlay of residential zoning across designated reserves in the vicinity of Dunstan Road, specifically Molyneux Park and the CODC-owned town belt area behind and above Fulton Hogan. We support this specific recognition/preservation of that reserve status. The submitter also raises the potential issue of reverse sensitivity by incoming residents living in close proximity to its industrial activities on Dunstan Road. We support providing some planning mechanism, such as a no build zone or other buffer, immediately adjacent to the industrial activities at 113-127 Dunstan Rd.
19/32: Molyneaux Lifestyle Village	Support	In part	Submission on LLRZ, potentially impacting our property.	We support the proposed variation to LLRZ-R10 Excavation, removing the volumetric limit and applying a meaningful area limit that enables multi-lot development. We support the 2500m2 figure proposed by the submitter.

19/36: NR Murray	Oppose	In part	Submission on LLRZ, potentially impacting our property.	We oppose the submitter's submission at Para 2 of matters concerning Alexandra, that the land along Dunstan Road be retained Dunstan Rd remain in RA-RR to protect the productivity of the soils. It is our understanding that land under consideration within this Plan Change, being a Plan Change underway when the NPS-HCS was released, is not technically subject to that National Policy Statement. We are also of the view that this aggregate area of land, north of Dunstan Road, from Fulton Hogan to Waldron Road is a well established lifestyle area, with lots well below 5H average. This land does not today have a productive use that warrants preservation. It's most efficient use, so close to town, is for housing to address population growth.
19/58: Jo Robertson	Oppose	In part	Submission on nearby property which could impact our property.	We support the general notion that land use change necessitates the consideration of access. However, the submitter seeks that CODC, through its plan change, provide a regulatory framework to make a shared driveway a vested road. Correspondingly, the submitter seeks that a right of way be widened. Both of these matters are appropriately dealt with by the land owner(s) seeking subdivision consent and ultimately arranging for the vesting of land. This is not a plan change matter. More importantly, the submitter seeks that the Plan Change enforce access obligations on neighbours, in this case William Hill, to provide access. We oppose this on the basis that it is up to those private landowners to make the necessary commercial arrangements with one another to access land their land. If such an access is necessary for the submitter to gain a benefit by developing their land, they must be prepared to pay, or compensate the party from whom they seek access. We note the obvious fact that merely because a larger area of land is rezoned for a particular land use, it does not follow that all individual titles of land within that larger area will have the necessary attributes to enable that land use change <i>on each title</i>. If an individual block is landlocked, it is not the Council's job through the District Plan, to address that. This speaks to the yield that can be expected from the LLRZ zone north of Dunstan Rd. Because of cases such as this, it is likely to be less than the 300 lots Council have predicted.

				We support efforts to promote walking access. And this is exactly what the corridor along the cycle trail beside Dunstan Road does allow for. What this submission does also speak to is the challenges posed by piecemeal and incremental intensification of land. To this end, we contend that the 2000m2 minimum lot size proposed within the LLRZ, particularly close to the township, will, within ~20 years, be seen as inefficiently large and will the subject of further rezoning. Best practice planning suggests that this ultimate yield should be provided for at the outset.
19/60: Ministry of Education	Support	In part	Submission on LLRZ, potentially impacting our property.	We support the submitter's position that the LLRZ policies and standards should enable educational facilities, in particular that LLRZ-O2 should include at (5) that the zone is "supported by the necessary infrastructure, including educational facilities." Further consideration should be given to the proximity of schooling to the LLRZ one north of Dunstan Road, and the ability of children attending school in that area to safely walk and cycle to school. This speaks to appropriate intensification of the area north of Dunstan Rd below 2000m2, as set out in our submission.
19/80: Matt & Sonya Conway	Oppose/Support	In part	Submission on nearby property which could impact our property.	For the reasons given in our further submission on 19/58 above, we oppose the notion that Council must use the Plan Change, and rules in the District Plan, to force access to individual "landlocked" titles. We oppose the suggestion that larger developments be notified. The land development process is already challenging and fraught with risk. People around these developments seldom embrace change. Making all developments notified merely because they are deemed "large" does not fit with the accepted activity status and effects-based judgements around notification. We support the suggestion of the submitter, under the heading of Leg-in Driveway, that CODC adopt a more case by case basis for imposing its roading hierarchy. Applying more flexibility in terms of how access can be enabled to various pockets of residential activity. This flexibility appears to work well in QLDC, where large developments, such as Millbrook and Jacks Point, and other smaller cases, are accessed via private roads. However, we question whether this is appropriately addressed via the Plan Change
19/89: Hort NZ	Support/Oppose	In part	Submissions on how the LLRZ zone should be given effect to, which could impact on our property.	We support the general notion of ensuring our District Plan ensures Central Otago can continue to excel in horticulture. We oppose any application of rural-type setbacks to residential zones, including LLRZ.

				We support giving suitable protections to existing uses, such as horticulture, and along Dunstan Rd, to the likes of Fulton Hogan. We contend that the already well-established lifestyle land use along Dunstan Road, on parcels averaging <5Ha, cannot be claimed to have productive potential. So should not be prevented from efficient residential use merely because of the nostalgic notion that, had it remained large landholdings, it could have still been productive.
19/91: John & Judy Hamilton	Oppose	In part	Submission on nearby property which could impact our property.	For same seasons given in further submissions on 19/58 and 19/80, above.
19/98: John & Mary Fletcher	Support	In part	Submissions on how the LLRZ zone should be given effect to, which could impact on our property.	We support the submission that, in the submitters case, and in our case at 155 Dunstan Rd, a smaller allotment size than 2000m2 will maintain the amenity and character of the area and is no different in character between this precinct and other areas close by which provide for a smaller allotment size. We support the submission that site coverage in LLRZ should be >10% and that further consideration should be given to shat a suitable coverage limit should be.
19/128: Transpower	Support	In whole	Submission on neighbouring property, which could impact our property.	Transpower have made a submission noting the application of the NPS on Electricity Transmission to the Roxburgh-Islington HV line that runs adjacent to our property, through 147-149 Dunstan Road. While we have previously submitted on intensifying part of the proposed LLRZ, including 147 and 149 Dunstan Road, we acknowledge the application of the NPS on Electricity Transmission. We support any appropriate notation on District Council Planning maps to highlight this.
19/150: Landpro	Support	In part	Submission relating to LLRZ and surrounding zones which could impact the zoning of our property.	We support the submitter's submission at Para 9 that parks and reserves should not be included in area zoned as residential, as when aggregated, it may lead to an overstatement of land available for development and correspondingly overstatement of the yield that will result from development enabled by the Plan Change. We further support and share the views set out in Para 14 relating to the large (~30Ha) area of proposed Medium Density Residential (MRZ) zoning proposed north-west of the township, on land owned by Council and Ngai Tahu's land development entity, NTP Development Holdings. The submitter states: <i>"The Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) is for more intensive density of development compared to other residential zones, for the purpose of being within walking distance of commercial and community facilities. Within Alexandra, there are MDRZ at the</i>

				<i>northwestern edge of town (Part Section 88 Block VII Leaning Rock SD, Sec 1 and Sec 4-6 SO 524226). There are no associated commercial/mixed use areas near this area at present. We question whether this is an accurate reflection of what appropriate density at this location should be given, considering there are no current commercial facilities near this location. Unless progressing alongside existing commercial facilities, it would seem more appropriate that this area is zoned as Low Density Residential Zone."</i> We accept that all urban centres, Alexandra included, should have well located, appropriate-scale, and carefully executed pockets of medium density residential housing. But Alexandra is a relatively small service centre and does not need whole suburbs of medium density housing. We consider that providing for such a large tract of land at the northern extent of the township, for medium density (min 200m2 lot sizes) is not in keeping with the manner in which Alexandra should be allowed to grow. We would re-state the core thrust of our underlying submission - that the area close to town north of Dunstan Road (including our land parcel at 155 Dunstan Road), proposed to be zoned to a 2000m2 minimum, has arguably better access to amenity, to recreation, to services, to walking and cycle ways, and potentially even to public transport in the future, than some of the Council and Ngai Tahu land. We seek further consideration of whether both these proposed zonings are too extreme. The MRZ zoning being too intensive - at the proposed scale. And the LLRZ zoning north of Dunstan Road and so close to town - is inefficiently large, without clear justification or logic.
--	--	--	--	---