

**Summary: Submitter: Body Corporate 22362, Submitter Number: 389.**

1. I am Sean Mcleod, Chairperson of Body Corporate 22362 and also owner of properties outside of BC 22362. I submitted two submissions to the district plan review on a number of points. As the opinions of the 130 other owners of BC 22362 may differ to our own, I have addressed the two submissions separately.
2. BC 22362 requested the property be rezoned to MDR as one of its submissions. This is not so much to increase the density of the development, more that the size of a number of the units are outside of the proposed low-density rules and the development as a whole is already of a medium density nature.
3. Under the existing district plan the land is zoned low density residential in the medium density sub-zone and was developed as a comprehensive development.
4. Although unlikely, under the current district plan an application for redevelopment under the comprehensive development rules could be applied for allowing a density down to 200m<sup>2</sup> or 413 units. Allowing for access it would be more like 300 units opposed to the 131 units which currently exist. As notified the proposed district plan has no rules for comprehensive development and rezoning to MDR allows us to retain some of this development potential.
5. We believe the Goldfields area also meets the objectives and policies of the medium density rules better than other areas put forward by council particularly areas out at Frankton and the Ladies Mile Special Housing Area currently under discussion
6. In this evidence and rebuttal Mr Glasner opposes the submission based on the fact the water and sewage infrastructure in the existing Goldfields area is nearing capacity.
7. As stated in my original submission along with the rebuttal evidence due to the Unit Title ownership it is highly unlikely the property would be redeveloped due to the requirement to pass a special resolution requiring 75% agreement, steepness of undeveloped areas and the overall cost to develop. At the last two AGMs, the owners of two units has had their motion to add a third fail, twice. Furthermore with 131 units and insured replacement value of \$71 million plus land value, it is unlikely a developer would buy a majority of the individual units to redevelop. I therefore question the 130 additional units used in Mr Glasners estimate when it is more likely zero with no increase in demand on infrastructure if the zoning is changed from LDR to MDR.

8. To quickly address possible Infrastructure solutions. A majority of the infrastructure within BC 22362 is owned and maintained by the BC. It excludes infrastructure within the Goldfield Heights legal Road but does include a pumping station and a tank farm reservoir.
9. Wastewater from BC 22362 drains 3 ways, Quartz Rise, Woodbury Rise, Goldfield Heights. Goldfields and Woodbury combine to cross Frankton Road at Larch Hill.
10. Due to their grade, the two lines crossing Frankton Road are likely to be the constraint points as confirmed in Mr Glasners evidence for 150 – Mt Crystal Limited. 5.10 states “The wastewater model results show there is no spare capacity in parts of the downstream network along Frankton Road. Proposed network upgrades in the LTP will alleviate any problems in this area.” If the Larch Hill crossing is included in the LTP then the capacity constraint will also be reduced in that area.
11. Alternatively, close to Frankton Road the Woodbury Rise line could be diverted to an existing crossing at Goldfield Heights through Sherwood at minimal cost to QLDC.
12. Water could possibly be linked from the top of Goldfield Heights to the proposed Middleton Road Reservoir as the land in submission 336 Middleton Family Trust is developed.
13. If these solutions are not adequate then possibly the Goldfields MDR area could have a similar objective and polies as the QLDC proposed rezoning of land fronting SH6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Hill Drive ie 8.2.11.1 Intensification does not occur until adequate water supply services are available to service the development.
14. We request that the commissioners reconsider the rezoning of the area of BC 22392 from LDR to MDR.