

(Form 13) Submission on Notified Application Concerning Resource Consent

Section 95A (public) Resource Management Act 1991

To: The Chief Executive

Central Otago District Council

PO Box 122

Alexandra 9340

Resource.consents@codc.govt.nz

SUBMISSION ON AO MARAMA Subdivision of Lot 1 DP 590633

1. Submitter: Panmure Orchards Ltd

Contact person: Jeremy Clifford Hiscock.

Address for service is 214 Strode Road, RD1, Alexandra.

Email: Jeremy@panmureorchards.co.nz

Phone 021 762 731

Description of Activity:

Subdivision of Lot 1 DP 590633 for a resource consent and division
into 7 additional titles including construction of house lots

Trade Competition; I am not a trade competitor

My submission relates to: The whole application

My submission is: I oppose the application.

I am a Managing Director of Panmure Orchards Ltd (POL), which owns land adjoining the northern boundary. I reside on our company's land at 214 Strode Road.

Panmure Orchards Ltd is directly affected as a neighbouring landowner in relation to the Ao Marama application, including the proposed subdivision, buildings, associated infrastructure, earthworks, and drainage.

2. Our Position

We oppose the application for subdivision.

This is a **non-complying activity**.

The proposed subdivision is not appropriate in this location. It will:

- Cause unacceptable adverse effects on the landscape and visual amenity of the wider area (particularly within a Significant Amenity Landscape);
- Create cumulative effects through further fragmentation of rural land;
- Adversely affect the ability of Panmure Orchards Ltd to operate as a productive horticultural business;
- Introduce reverse sensitivity effects for Panmure Orchards Ltd that are not properly addressed.

It is light on definitive detail for what are fundamental subdivision-level requirements—including building platforms, drainage, septic systems, potable water, reverse sensitivity and firefighting access.

In short, it relies too heavily on future stages to resolve issues that should be addressed now, as required under the RMA and the subdivision assessment matters of the District Plan.

3. My Reasons

3.1 Consultation with Affected Landowners

The application states that consultation has occurred with affected parties, including Panmure Orchards Ltd.

This is not correct. There has been no meaningful consultation.

What has occurred is limited to:

- **April 2025:** My wife was handed an application and asked to get me to sign a Form 8A. This was followed by an email with additional documents, including a draft subdivision report stating that consultation had occurred.
- **Late 2025:** I met briefly with the applicant, Mr Phil Murray in my driveway, who again asked me to sign a Form 8A. I declined due to lack of detail and unresolved effects on POL.

That is not consultation in any meaningful sense.

This matters because under the CODC District Plan Council is required to consider effects on adjoining landowners and the extent of consultation.

At present, the application overstates engagement and understates effects.

3.2 The Proposal is Conceptual Where it Should be Definitive

A common theme throughout the application is lack of detail.

Key elements that are either missing or pushed out to later stages that will affect Panmure Orchards Ltd are:

- Building platform locations and design controls;
- Wastewater and septic feasibility;
- Drainage and soakage;
- Potable water supply;
- Firefighting water and access.
- Reverse sensitivity on neighbouring properties

These are not minor details—they are core determinants of whether subdivision is appropriate at all, particularly in a Significant Amenity Landscape and with proximity to Panmure Orchards Ltd commercial horticultural operation.

Deferring them to building consent is inappropriate and inconsistent with:

RMA (assessment of actual and potential effects);

District Plan Section 4.4 (which anticipates certainty at subdivision stage).

There is a clear tension in the application:

It claims to protect the landscape, while at the same time subdividing it into smaller residential titles.

3.3 Landscape and Visual Effects

The fractured titles of Lots 2–4 (5000m² each) do not sit comfortably with the intent of the District Plan for Significant Amenity Landscapes.

The Plan's objectives and policies seek to:

- Maintain open space and rural character;
- Avoid inappropriate subdivision;
- Prevent cumulative degradation of landscape values.

This proposal goes the other way.

Specific concerns:

- Lots 2–4 are pushed up against the northern boundary, directly adjoining POL;
- Their primary outlook is across productive orchard land;
- The siting appears driven by subdivision yield rather than landscape logic;
- The application pushes landscape effects forward to building consent stage.
- Light Pollution of a rural dark sky environment.

That is not how SAL provisions are intended to work. The question at subdivision stage is whether the pattern of development is appropriate, not whether it can be softened later.

3.4 Fire Risk

There is a significant fire risk in this environment, particularly over summer.

The introduction of residential activity increases the likelihood of ignition sources. The proposed QEII area, with pest eradication and wilding pine control, has high fuel loading.

For POL, the risk is not theoretical. Smoke damage can destroy the value of a fruit crop.

The application does not adequately address:

- Water availability for firefighting (flow and storage);
- Access for fire appliances;
- Practical and timely response capability.

For us, this carries real commercial risk.

3.5 Reverse Sensitivity – Inadequate Assessment

The reverse sensitivity assessment is too brief and overly simplistic. It relies largely on distance (150–650m), which does not reflect reality.

POL operates a modern intensive export and domestic horticultural business. Activities include:

- Spraying (weather and growth-stage dependent);
- Frost fighting with frost fans (120–160 hours per season);
- Helicopters (crop drying, back up frost fighting)
- Bird control (gas cannons, lasers, firearms);
- Pest control (year-round firearm use);
- Harvest operations (65 staff, early starts, traffic, machinery).

These are normal, lawful, and essential activities.

The application does not:

- Provide enforceable reverse sensitivity covenants or consent notices;
- Require future residents and short term accommodation guests to acknowledge rural activities;
- Include buffer planting, setbacks, or layout strategies;
- Demonstrate any meaningful engagement with neighbouring operators.

This is contrary to District Plan objectives and policies that seek to protect rural activities from reverse sensitivity.

Once those titles are created, the pressure comes back on us. That risk is not addressed.

3.6 Infrastructure – Wastewater, Drainage, Water

There is a lack of definitive detail on:

- Septic system feasibility in a rocky schist environment;
- Effects of soakage on drainage patterns;
- Potable water supply quality and reliability.

There is talk of systems, but no clear supporting geotechnical or engineering evidence across all proposed lots. Effects of underground runoff and drainage on Panmure Orchards Ltd are not addressed.

These are treated as preliminary matters when they should be resolved at subdivision stage under RMA and relevant servicing provisions of the District Plan.

3.7 QEII Covenant

The QEII covenant is presented as a key benefit.

The question is not whether covenanting is beneficial in itself—it generally is. The question is whether it offsets the effects of subdivision and residential domestication.

In this case:

- Restoration work has largely already been undertaken;
- There is no guarantee of covenant acceptance;
- It does not offset the effects of title fragmentation, access, servicing, lighting, increased fire risk and ongoing residential use.

It is being given more weight than it deserves in the overall planning balance.

4. Conclusion

We request that the application be **declined**, or at minimum returned for substantial further information.

The proposal:

- Is contrary to the objectives and policies of the Central Otago District Plan, particularly for Significant Amenity Landscapes;
- Is contrary to the RMA
- Defers fundamental matters to later stages;
- Understates reverse sensitivity and infrastructure risks;
- Relies on future controls to justify an intensive subdivision pattern.
- Creates cumulative effects through further fragmentation of rural land

There is:

- No meaningful consultation;
- No robust reverse sensitivity framework;
- No clear mitigation for effects on productive rural land;
- Significant commercial risk to an established horticultural operation.

The very values identified in the application are the reasons to be cautious about further residential fragmentation in this landscape.

Relief Sought

That the application be **declined**.

Alternatively, that it be deferred pending:

- Full and definitive assessment of infrastructure and servicing;
- A robust and enforceable reverse sensitivity framework;
- Demonstrated compliance with SAL objectives and policies;
- Genuine consultation with affected parties.

The proposal represents an intensive and inappropriate pattern of development in a rural environment where the planning framework seeks to maintain open landscape character.

The proposal will adversely affect the ability of Panmure Orchards Ltd and its peers to use its land as a productive resource and conduct activities commensurate with rural and horticultural business's that significantly contribute fiscally to the economy and character of the district.

I wish to be heard in support of my application.

I will consider a joint case at a hearing if there are other similar submissions

Signed:



Jeremy Clifford Hiscock

C.E Panmure Orchards Ltd