

R Barker & Others Response to Opposition Reasons in the Officers Hearing Report

In general we feel that the reasons given for opposition of the R Barker & Others submission are generic or, in other words, 'cut and paste' in nature and in contrast to independent advice sought, by the owners, for both PC17 and 32.

Looking at the council opposition reasons in turn, starting with point one.....

1. "low lying and flood prone" The lower flood plains is an arbitrary area and not necessarily indicative of the total area, there are many sites at the required building height level and recent significant Canterbury floods have not had adverse effect on the R Barker & Others site. Other areas supported for Rural Residential Subdivision are more susceptible to flooding,.... an example of this is the western side of Ellesmere road being more prone to flooding, as was the case during the 1986 flood.

Significant floods in 2013 and 2014 did not significantly impact on the R Barkers and others block. Of overriding importance is the ability to build to the required floor level and manage storm water.

A professional opinion was sought during the PC17 process which indicated:

- a) "Excluding an area as a preferred development site because it is within the arbitrarily defined lower flood plains area as opposed to being subject to real flood risk is not valid or appropriate".
- b) "Stormwater management can easily be achieved on the site..." Both the Ellesmere Road drain and existing drains on the properties have sufficient capacity for additional storm water generated by the new houses".
- c) "Wetland restoration will increase the capacity for onsite storage"

2. as for 1. Above

3. "There is uncertainty as to whether there is sufficient capacity in the existing drainage network..."

Our professional advice is in direct contrast to this opposition reason and in addition, wet lands will increase the capacity to mitigate any "uncertainty" regarding drainage capacity.

Are there calculations to support this "uncertainty" ?

4. "There are significant cultural values attributed to springs and water quality..."

Our point is that the cost of plantings and wetland restoration cannot be supported by farming income (the current land use) Farming is not conducive to clean waterways. Rural

Residential lots will justify the significant cost of protecting the springs and restoration of wetlands.

"Storm water inundation", the council opposition point, would be mitigated by the storm water solution, including a wetland buffer.

Our point is...Protecting the headwaters (springs) should be fundamental in any protection of downstream waterways and this is a reason to develop the site, in addition, areas of wet land could be protected by covenant.

5. ?

6. "Undermining of the visual amenity contrast between the urban form of Lincoln and surrounding rural area....." We have support from Lincoln envirotown that our planned development will actually enhance the gateway to Lincoln. Our proposal will detract from the "coalescence" of Lincoln and Tai Tapu, given the extensive native plantings, already in progress, along the road way.

Our question is why does the Rural Residential Subdivision at the Tai Tapu end not have the same "coalescence" issue.

7. "The land is already recognised as having many attributes of a Rural Residential development node...." The site is 'work in progress', in time all buildings, rural residential or existing will be screened by plantings, enhancing the Lincoln gateway and alleviating this perception. Densities are similar to many other rural 4 hectare blocks.

8. "class 2 versatile soils" the soil map included with our submission shows the bulk of the soil to be **Wakanui silt loam on sandy loam** this is the same soil as sites being utilised for residential land use, on the other side of Ellesmere road. What is the point here, is it that the land would be better used for farming? If yes then this would detract from important water quality from the springs of cultural significance?

9. "Geo technical assessments" we consider this to be a standard process rather than an opposition reason. The appropriateness of the site, for building, has been demonstrated in our submission, by way of a Geotec report, to demonstrate that the land is acceptable for building platforms. No liquefaction has occurred on the site.

10. "its unlikely waste water and reticulated water could be economically serviced" Why is this an opposition reason for this block? Our investigation indicates multiple options that can be carried out economically and at a reasonable cost per section. One example of this is combining with the Maginness block to reduce the cost per section.

11. "does not align with locations criteria" The R Barker & others block would be more appropriate for Rural Residential use given the natural springs of significant cultural importance and that farming would detract from water quality of this important headwater. Sections next to restored wetlands have proved popular in other areas providing strong

visual and recreational qualities and in fact have sold at premium prices. Being a gateway location and on the edge of residential land aligns very well with locations criteria.

12. "....the Maginness block would be the more suitable...." Based on professional advice we strongly believe that "constraints" mentioned here are subjective and are covered off in our submission. Also, there are economic benefits to be gained between the two locations Maginness and R Barker & others that would reduce should only one be supported.

