

80. From an urban form perspective, the current zoning of the site is unusual, in that it is surrounded on three sides by residentially-zoned properties. The proposed application of the LLRZ would therefore 'square up' the boundary and, in my view, would consolidate the township. I further note that while the Spatial Plan does not identify this site for growth, it does seek that outlying settlements, such as Bannockburn, are primarily retained as per their existing extent, to strengthen a compact pattern of development within existing Cromwell.²⁰ I consider the inclusion of the Domain Road Vineyard site is broadly consistent with this as while the rezoning would change the location of the existing rural/urban boundary, it consolidates or 'infills' the current urban form, rather than extending the town further north (or in any other direction) than its current extent.
81. While I accept that the zoning will impact on the current views enjoyed by other residents, I note that these views are not identified or protected in the Operative Plan. Similarly, while Bannockburn may be considered to have character derived from aspects of heritage, any 'heritage character' is not identified within the Plan, such as through a heritage precinct. It is also reasonable to expect that amenity values and character will change over time, and I do not consider that the RMA, or the District Plan requires protection of the amenity derived from the current use of the site by surrounding landowners, nor the maintenance of the existing character. I also note that development of other areas which are already zoned but not yet developed could also alter the amenity values and character of the area, as would expansion of the township in an alternate direction. I therefore do not consider this to be sufficient reason not to rezone the site.
82. Ms Muir notes that planning for upgrades to the water and wastewater network serving Bannockburn are based on providing for the yields anticipated under PC19, which includes this site. The development provided under the zoning can therefore be integrated with infrastructure and as such would be consistent with the direction in Objective 6.3.4.
83. From a supply perspective, a recent yield assessment was undertaken for the Council, to provide yield calculations for PC19, to identify whether the proposed zonings would provide sufficient capacity for the forecasted demand. This is contained in **Appendix 2** and is, in effect, an update of the Cromwell Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment, prepared in 2018 as part of the Cromwell Spatial Plan, and reflects that growth projections are now higher than they were in 2018, and that the PC19 zoning framework differs from the Spatial Plan in some instances. This recent assessment demonstrates that at a ward level, there is sufficient housing supply for the forecasted demand. However, when looking more specifically at Bannockburn Township, there is insufficient supply to meet demand. My understanding of the assessment is that the PC19 zonings are expected to provide for just over 500 dwellings, which is a shortfall of around 200 under the medium forecasted demand and 300 under the high forecasted demand. This shortfall would therefore increase if the Domain Road Vineyard is not rezoned. As noted in the yield assessment, there is a large surplus in Cromwell township, which is *"expected to cover most of the deficit seen in Bannockburn, with large housing supply driving a*

²⁰ Page 23.

shift to greater growth rates within Cromwell township." Not rezoning the Vineyard site would therefore have a further impact on the need for demand to be met within Cromwell Township instead of through additional supply within Bannockburn itself. However, this could be offset if other land in Bannockburn is rezoned instead, or greater intensification within the existing urban boundary is provided.

84. If the rezoning proposed in PC19 is approved, I note those submissions seeking additional constraints be applied. I agree with submitters that it would be appropriate to extend the Building Line Restriction across the northern portion of this site, to exclude buildings on the elevated terrace. I consider that this will assist in part in the visual effects arising from the rezoning and is consistent with the approach taken to other elevated areas within the urban boundary. I do not consider it appropriate to apply a lower density of 3000m² to this site, as this would perpetuate the existing complexity of the current District Plan, whereas the approach in PC19 is to rationalise the current differences between zones. Application of LLRZ, with a minimum density of 2000m², also ensures that development of the site is generally consistent with the existing density of development. I also do not consider it appropriate to apply a bespoke setback from Domain Road. My understanding is that the current front yard setback applying within the RRA(4) is 4.5m and therefore applying 20m to one property but continuing to apply 4.5m to others would result in an inconsistent approach to built form that I do not consider is justified by anything particular about this site.
85. With respect to traffic, I consider that whether upgrades are required is a matter that can be considered in more detail at the time of subdivision, and there are existing mechanisms in the Plan to provide for this. This is the same for the provision of green space. Provision of servicing is also a matter best considered at the time of subdivision. I also do not consider it appropriate to apply bespoke controls on lighting in relation to this site alone and consider that should restrictions be imposed this should be considered when the lighting controls in the Plan are reviewed as a whole. I also note that controls in the District Plan cannot require a landowner to alter a batter. If such work has been undertaken in contravention of the current Plan rules then this is a compliance matter and in my view not something that can be addressed through the rezoning, nor can changes to the legal boundary.
86. With respect to the property at 49 Domain Road, I note that this is currently zoned RRA(4). Application of LLRZ therefore largely aligns with the status quo. The submitter also notes that this land is protected from subdivision by a QE2 open space covenant. The zoning of the site does not override the covenant, nor does it 'require' the property to be further developed. Therefore, I do not consider a change to its zoning is required, given the LLRZ effectively supercedes the current zoning.

Recommendation

87. I recommend that the LLRZ zoning of 49 Domain Road is retained as notified.
88. Overall, I accept that there is a large amount of community concern with the rezoning of the Domain Road Vineyard site, which was not included in the Cromwell Spatial Plan. Balanced