



2842117303
RC250298

19 March 2026

Lakeside Christian Centre
60 Lowburn Valley Road
RD 2
Cromwell 9384

Via email: jake@jakewoodward.co.nz

Dear Lakeside Christian Centre

DECISION NOTIFICATION: RC 250298 – LAKESIDE CHRISTIAN CENTRE – 60 LOWBURN VALLEY ROAD

I enclose a copy of the Council's decision on the above application as required by section 114(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991.

The Panel has granted consent to the application with conditions. The assessment of the application, including the reasons for the decision, is set out in the decision attached to this letter. The consent certificate is attached to the rear of this letter.

The consent certificate outlines the conditions that apply to the proposal. Please ensure that you have read and understand all of the consent conditions.

I also draw your attention to Section 120 of the Act which provides for the right to appeal a decision, or part of a decision, under certain circumstances. Please note that there is no right of appeal against the whole or any part of a decision to the extent that the decision relates to a boundary activity unless the boundary activity is a non-complying activity.

Appeals must be lodged with the Environment Court and served on the consent authority within 15 working days of notice of the decision being received in accordance with Section 121 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Yours faithfully



Tarryn Lines
Team Leader Planning Support

CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL
DECISION OF HEARINGS PANEL

APPLICATION	RC 250298
APPLICANT	LAKESIDE CHRISTIAN CENTRE
ADDRESS	60 LOWBURN VALLEY ROAD
LEGAL DESCRIPTION	SECTION 2 SO 22525 (HELD IN RECORD OF TITLE OT12B/85).
ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	SUBDIVISION CONSENT FOR A THREE LOT SUBDIVISION AND LAND USE CONSENT TO ESTABLISH TWO RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PLATFORMS BREACHING SETBACK STANDARDS IN THE RURAL RESOURCE AREA
ACTIVITY STATUS	NON-COMPLYING

NOTIFICATION AND HEARING OF APPLICATION

The application was publicly notified. Seven submissions were received. One was in support of the proposal, one supported with caveats, and the remainder opposed. Concerns raised included the adequacy of service provision, effects on rural character, the density of the proposal and the possibility of setting a precedent. We have had regard to the contents of both submissions in full when considering the application.

The application was heard on 10 February 2026. At the hearing, the applicant proposed a change to the area of one of the building platforms in their right of reply. The panel issued a minute (Minute One) instructing the applicant to provide an updated plan showing the change and inviting comments from the submitters. The applicant provided their response on 17 February 2026. No comments were received from submitters. The panel has given consideration to the information provided in support of the application, the Section 42A report of Council's reporting officer, Mr Adam Vincent, expert planning evidence provided by Mr Jake Woodward on behalf of the applicant and oral submissions from Bruce Wast, the applicant, Mr Sheldon Barnett, submitter and the applicant's response to Minute One.

DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITY

At the time of the hearing, the application was to subdivide Section 2 SO 22525 into two allotments. Proposed Lots 1 and 2 would have areas of approximately 3,000-3,001m². They are proposed to contain residential building platforms. Lot 3 would have an area of 2,101m², and would contain the existing church building and grounds. Proposed Lots 1 and 2 would each contain a residential building platform, with dimensions of 20x35m (700m²). In their reply at the hearing, the applicant amended their proposal to reduce the size of the building platform on Lot 1 to 30x20m (600m²). The effect of this would be to increase the setback between the platform and the lot's boundary with 76 Lowburn Valley Road from 13m to 18m. We understand that this amended plan is what we are now considering.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site subject to the application has an area of 8,102m² and consists of mostly flat land in the base of the Lowburn Valley, along the north-eastern side of Lowburn Valley Road. The Low Burn runs on adjoining land to the north east of the site. The site is identified in the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory as containing LUC 3 soils.

REASONS FOR APPLICATION

Central Otago District Plan

The subject site is located within the Rural Resource Area of the Central Otago District Plan (the District Plan). There are no other annotations for the site in the District Plan. Regional scale mapping on the Otago Regional Council's Natural Hazards Database indicates that the site is within a floodwater dominated alluvial fan.

The proposal creates allotments that have less than an average of 8 hectares and a minimum of 2 hectares, and is of land that may be subject to damage from inundation associated with the alluvial fan. The proposed density breaches the average allotment size standard for rural subdivisions in Rule 4.7.4.iii.b of the District Plan. Breaches of this rule are a non-complying activity under Rule 4.7.5.iii of the District Plan.

Residential building platforms in the Rural Resource Area are restricted discretionary activities under Rule 4.7.3.vii of the District Plan.

Residential buildings within 25m of internal boundaries in the Rural Resource Area breach Rule 4.7.6A(a) of the District Plan and are restricted discretionary activities under Rule 4.7.3.i of the Plan.

We record that the amendments made by the applicant to the building platform on Lot 1 result in not changes to the types of consents required by this proposal.

National Environmental Standards

The Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011 (NES-CS) came into effect on 1 January 2012. The National Environmental Standard applies to any piece of land on which an activity or industry described in the current edition of the Hazardous Activities and Industries List (HAIL) is being undertaken, has been undertaken or is more likely than not to have been undertaken. Activities on HAIL sites may need to comply with permitted activity conditions specified in the National Environmental Standard and/or might require resource consent.

The applicant has obtained a search of Preliminary Site Investigation which demonstrates that the site has not or is not likely to have had HAIL use in accordance with Regulation 5(7). We conclude that the NESCS is not triggered by this application

There are no other National Environmental Standards relevant to this application.

Overall Status

Under the particular circumstances of this case, we consider it appropriate that the bundling principle established in *Locke v Avon Motor Lodge* (1973) is applied, and that the application be considered, in the round, as a non-complying activity pursuant to sections 104 and 104B of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act').

SUBSTANTIVE DECISION ASSESSMENT

Affected Persons

No written approvals been provided in support of the application. In accordance with section 104(3)(a)(ii) of the Resource Management Act 1991, we have not disregarded effects on any party.

Effects on the Environment

Permitted Baseline

Under section 104(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991, the Panel may disregard an adverse effect of an activity on the environment may be disregarded if the plan permits an activity with that effect. That is, an application can be assessed by comparing it to the existing environment and development that could take place on the site as of right, without a resource consent, but excluding development that is fanciful.

We record that there are no permitted activity subdivisions in the Central Otago District. We will not be applying any permitted baseline to the subdivision component of the application. In terms of the proposed land uses, Mr Woodward considered that permitted tree plantings and rural sheds up to 10m from a property boundary could form a permitted baseline in relation to the proposed residential building platforms and their associated yard breaches. Mr Vincent declined to apply a permitted baseline in his s42A report. We consider that a rural shed or a row of trees may have notably different effects than the domestication and associated potential for noise or loss of a sense of open space, separation from neighbours and privacy associated with a dwelling. Given this, while we accept that a rural shed or row of trees could be established on the site as a permitted activity, we have resolved not to apply any permitted baseline associated with the effects of those activities to this proposal.

Receiving Environment

The existing and reasonably foreseeable receiving environment is made up of:

- The existing environment and associated effects from lawfully established activities;
- Effects from any consents on the subject site (not impacted by proposal) that are likely to be implemented;
- The existing environment as modified by any resource consents granted and likely to be implemented; and
- The environment as likely to be modified by activities permitted in the district plan.

For the subject site, the existing and reasonably foreseeable receiving environment comprises the existing church, along with its expansion consented under RC 240062.

For adjacent land, the existing and reasonably foreseeable receiving environment comprises predominantly residential activities at varying densities. Density is split between higher density (Circa 3,000-3,700m², with a couple of larger allotments) residential development in urban zoned land (Large Lot Residential Zone, Precinct Two) along the southwestern side of Lowburn Valley Road and lower density (More recent development between 3,800 and 48,900m² with most being over 2 hectares, but with some older allotments being as small as 1,056m²) within rural zoned land on the north eastern side of the road. The land to the southeast also includes the Lowburn Hall and Lowburn Inlet.

It is against these that the effects of the activity, must be measured.

Matters Raised in Submissions and Hearing

In terms of effects on wider rural character, including visual and landscape effects, we concur with the applicant, in particular the expert landscape evidence of Ms Snodgrass provided in support of the application, and Paragraphs 26 to 31 and 37 to 39 of Mr Vincent's s42A report that the proposal would cause more intensive development patterns to, in effect, jump Lowburn Valley Road. However, when viewed in the context of other existing residential and community oriented development along the north-eastern side of the road, we are satisfied that the adverse effects resulting from this would be minor, at most, for the reasons provided by Mr Woodward, Ms Snodgrass, and Mr Vincent.

Much attention was given to the potential effects of the proposed building platform on Lot 1 on the amenity of the Barnett's, who own 76 Lowburn Valley Road. Mr Vincent considered that the proposal would have a more than minor effect on the amenity of the Barnett's due to the potential proximity of residential buildings to their dwelling and outdoor areas. At the hearing Mr Barnett described how his sense of rural residential amenity would be affected by the proposal. In response, the applicant has agreed to reduce the size of the building platform by 5m, increasing its setback from the boundary from 13m to 18m. We did not receive comment from the Barnetts about whether this change would adequately address their concerns. Therefore, we have to come to our own conclusion. We record that Mr Vincent was tentatively happy with the original proposal, and raised no concerns with the amended proposal either.

Setting the building platform for Lot 1 further back from the boundary will have less of an effect in terms of building dominance and loss of privacy than originally proposed. It would also reduce the extent of any shading of the Barnett's property. We also note that the application was premised on a 6m maximum building height. This further reduces the effects compared to those considered by Mr Vincent, who assumed a 7.5m tall dwelling could be built. This serves to further reduce the visual dominance of buildings and reduce any potential shading of the Barnett's property in the early mornings. Considering these two factors, we are satisfied that the effects on the amenity of the Barnetts would be reduced to minor levels, at most, not more than minor as concluded by Mr Vincent. We record that we consider a 30x20m, 600m², building platform to still be sufficient area to provide a range of options for designing a reasonably sized dwelling. Overall, we are satisfied that this change will mean the effects on the Barnetts will be minor, at most and consider the change to be a reasonable compromise to address the interests of all parties involved in this application.

In his evidence, the applicant volunteered a condition (On an augier basis in response to the concerns of several submitters) to the effect that the lots not be used for commercial activity other than for a home occupation, as defined in the District Plan. After Plan Change 19, we understand that the definition of home occupation was deleted from the District Plan, despite it still having relevance to the definition of residential activity outside the district's residential zones.¹ While it is not clear why this was done. In order to minimise the potential for confusion with a consent notice referencing a definition that is not currently present in the operative district plan, we consider it appropriate to accept the condition, but include the definition of home occupation in full, in the condition. We consider this to be sufficient to avoid the potential for the lots to be used for larger scale commercial activities outside a residential context.

We note that all parties are in agreement that the proposal can be supplied with water and wastewater connections from Council's reticulated networks, and with electricity and telecommunications connections. We agree that these services can all be adequately supplied, subject to the conditions proposed by Mr Vincent and accepted by the applicant.

Some submitters raised concerns with additional vehicle crossings onto Lowburn Valley Road causing safety risks. The evidence before us from Mr Woodward, Mr Vincent and Council's land development engineers is that both Lots 1 and 2 could new accesses constructed in a way that adequately maintains the safe and efficient operation of Lowburn Valley Road. We agree with this expertise, particularly that of Council's land development engineers, and consider that the proposal will not result in a notable safety risk, provided new vehicle crossings are constructed in accordance with Council's Roding Policies 2015.

In relation to access to Lot 3 (the church), Mr Vincent recommended that the access to this lot be confirmed to be compliant with Part 29 of Council's Roding Policies 2015, or be upgraded accordingly. This is in line with Council's standards for subdivision. Mr Woodward proposes that the access to this lot remain unchanged, on the basis that traffic patterns accessing the

¹ The definition of residential activity, other than in a residential zone, includes home occupation, as defined.

church lot would not be affected by the subdivision. The access is currently across the entire site frontage, and is unlikely to comply with Part 29 of Council's Roading Policies, due to its width. With respect to this access, we are satisfied that, because the use of Lot 3 is not anticipated to change as a result of the subdivision, the patterns of vehicle movements to and from it are also unlikely to change. As such, its effects on the operation of the roading network would be unchanged. Even when viewed in conjunction with new accessways built for lots 1 and 2, we are satisfied that the construction of a compliant access on these two lots would not result in a significant cumulative effect on the operation of the road. If the use of the lot were to change in the future, we would agree with Mr Vincent that further consideration should be given to the standard of the access for Lot 3. However, for the purposes of this subdivision, we conclude that the access to this lot can remain as it currently is. No conditions need to be imposed to this effect.

Multiple submitters raised concerns with the risk of inundation from the Low Burn, and the potential for the development to change flood patterns through and around the area. The application is supported by a flood hazard assessment undertaken by Mr Jordan Cathcart, Senior Civil Engineer at Meyer Cruden. Mr Cathcart concluded that a minimum floor level of any habitable building on Lot 2, set at 197.78m, would be sufficient to manage the risk of flood, by maintaining floor levels 500mm above the forecast 1% AEP flood level. Mr Vincent has recommended this requirement be imposed as a consent notice, to which the applicant has agreed. The evidence before us is that neither building platform would likely be directly inundated in a predicted 1% AEP flood event, and a minimum floor level requirement will be sufficient to lower the risk of damage from a flood further. In this context, we are satisfied that the proposal, subject to compliance with a minimum floor level for Lot 2, will be sufficient to address the risks posed by inundation on the site from the Low Burn.

The applicant provided evidence from Mr Earnscy Weaver in support of the application that the site has a range of limitations, including its size, proximity to the Lowburn residential area and lack of availability of water for irrigation that mean it is not viable to use the land in a productive manner. This evidence was accepted by Mr Vincent. Given the factors identified by the applicant and Mr Weaver, and accepted by Mr Vincent, we concur that the proposal will have minor effects on the productive capacity of the soils in the area, at most.

We agree with Mr Vincent at Paragraph 55 of his s42A report that the proposal will have minor effects on indigenous biodiversity values, at most.

We agree with Mr Vincent at Paragraph 56 of his s42A report that the proposal would have a positive social effect through the provision of additional lots intended for residential activities.

In relation to other matters raised in submissions, we concur with Mr Vincent in Paragraphs 58 and 59 of his s42A report that Ngāi Tahu Rūnaka have had sufficient opportunity to consider the cultural effects of the proposal, and that it is outside the remit of the District Plan to place limitations on the use of the sites specifically for social housing.

Effects

In accordance with section 104(1)(a) of the Resource Management Act 1991, the actual and potential adverse effects associated with the proposed activity have been assessed and outlined above. We are satisfied that the adverse effects on the environment arising from the amended proposal will be no more than minor and could be appropriately managed through adherence to conditions of consent, if consent is granted.

Offsetting or Compensation Measures

In accordance with section 104(1)(ab) of the Resource Management Act 1991, there are no offsetting or compensation measures proposed or agreed to by the applicant that need consideration.

Objectives and Policies

The planning evidence from both Mr Woodward and Mr Vincent is in agreement that the proposal is consistent with the relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan. We note that Mr Vincent identified a level of conflict between the initial proposal and Policy 4.4.8, given the relatively high levels of potential effect on the amenity of the Barnetts due to proximity of buildings on Lot 1's proposed building platform. While he ultimately concluded that the proposal would not be contrary to this policy, we consider that the amendment of the building platform would reduce the effects of the proposal on the amenity of the Barnetts to minor levels at most. This allows us to conclude that the proposal will be consistent with all relevant objectives and policies in the District Plan.

Section 104D Gateway Tests

Under Section 104D, Council must refuse a resource consent application for a non-complying activity unless it is satisfied that the proposal will either have minor effects on the environment, or the proposal will be consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan. If either of these gateway tests are met, Council can exercise its discretion under Section 104B.

In this case, we consider that the amended proposal will have no more than minor effects on the environment and is consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan. The proposal passes both gateway tests in Section 104D. We can exercise our discretion to consider the proposal under Section 104B.

Operative and Proposed Regional Policy Statements

The Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019 (RPS 2019) was declared operative on 04 March 2024. Decisions on the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 (PRPS 2021) were notified on 30 March 2024. This decision is subject to a number of appeals. Therefore, relatively little weight should be given to the PRPS2021. We record that there was agreement between Mr Woodward and Mr Vincent that the proposal would be consistent with the provisions of both policy statements. We concur, for the reasons provided in both the evidence of Mr Woodward and the s42A report of Mr Vincent, that the proposal would be consistent with both the RPS 2019 and PRPS 2021.

National Policy Statements

There was some debate at the hearing regarding whether the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 (NPS-HPL) remains relevant to the application. At the time the application was lodged, the NPS-HPL was relevant to the application, as the site included land classified in the New Zealand Land Use Resource Inventory as LUC 3, which falls within the definition of highly productive land. During the processing of this consent, the NPS-HPL was amended. In particular, the following clause was added to Clause 3.5(7), which governs what land is considered highly productive land:

- 3.5(7) *Until a regional policy statement containing maps of highly productive land in the region is operative, each relevant territorial authority and consent authority must apply this National Policy Statement as if references to highly productive land were references to land that:*
- (b) *Is not:*
 - (iii) *subject to a resource consent application for subdivision, use or development on LUC 3 land for any activity other than rural lifestyle, where that consent has been lodged at or after the commencement date.*

Mr Vincent considered that, because the application was lodged before the amendments came into effect, the NPS-HPL remained relevant. Mr Woodward considered that the commencement date was the commencement date of the NPS-HPL as a whole and, in effect,

this cause looked backwards to see if any applications has been lodged in relation to the site before the clause was added, as well as after. Neither Mr Vincent, nor Mr Woodward gave evidence on whether they considered the proposal to be for rural lifestyle or not.

The commencement date of the NPS-HPL is provided in Clause 1.2(1), as 17 October 2022. Further “commencement date” is defined in Clause 1.3(1) as “the date on which this National Policy Statement comes into force, as identified in clause 1.2(1)”. While we acknowledge Mr Vincent’s concerns about the new Clause 3.5(7)(b)(iii) having retrospective effect in relation to resource consent applications, we consider that the clear, plain and ordinary interpretation of the text is that any application for subdivision, use or development of LUC 3 land (Other than for rural lifestyle, which we will discuss below), where the consent was lodged on or after 17 October 202 is no longer subject to the NPS-HPL.

An application for a rural lifestyle activity is still subject to the NPS-HPL, regardless of the above. Rural lifestyle is not separately defined in the NPS-HPL, or other national planning documents (Including the National Planning Standards). However, we understand that “rural lifestyle” is typically associated with primarily residential activity on large lots (For example, in the context of the Vincent and Cromwell Spatial Plans, rural lifestyle and rural residential was considered to be on lots between 0.5 and 4 hectares in size. Typically, rural lifestyle properties allow opportunities for limited small scale rural land uses (For example, running a small number of livestock, or maintaining an orchard) in association with residential activity. In this case, the proposed lots would be more similar in size to the urban zoned lots across Lowburn Valley Road, and would have very limited opportunities for the sorts of rural activities that might be expected in a more rural lifestyle oriented development. Given this, we have concluded that the proposal would not constitute “rural lifestyle” for the purposes of the NPS-HPL.

Taking into consideration the particular wording of the NPS-HPL, we conclude that it is no longer relevant to this application. However, for completeness, we also acknowledge that there was no disagreement between Mr Woodward and Mr Vincent, relying on the assessment of Mr Earnscy Weaver provided in support of the application, that the proposal would pass through the tests in Clause 3.10 of the NPS-HPL, if they were relevant.

We understand that there are no other relevant national policy statements.

Other Matters

We understand that the following development and financial contributions would be payable for the proposal, based on the creation of two additional allotments

Water Supply:	\$26,276.00
Wastewater:	\$14,938.00
Transport:	\$1,606.00
Community Infrastructure:	\$5,022.00
Reserves:	\$5,800.00

The above amounts are all inclusive of GST, and would be payable prior to the issue of Section 224(c) certification for the subdivision.

Having regard to the evidence presented to us, we are satisfied that none of the matters in Section 106(1) of the RMA warrant refusal of the application. All lots have adequate physical and legal access, and we are satisfied that there will not be a significant risk from natural hazards.

Having regard to section 104(1)(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991, no other matters are considered relevant.

Part 2

Based on the findings above, we consider that the proposal would satisfy Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Granting of consent, subject to conditions, would promote the sustainable management of District's natural and physical resources.

Overall Consideration

Overall, we are satisfied that the amended proposal will reduce the effects of the proposal to be minor, at most, and will be consistent with the relevant planning documents, including the District Plan and Regional Policy Statements. We are satisfied that the amended proposal will be compatible with surrounding land uses and development patterns, with positive social effects through the provision of additional lots for residential housing. The proposal will have adequate provision of services. We conclude that we can grant this application.

DECISION

For the reasons provided above, the Panel resolves to grant consent to the proposed subdivision and land use activity, in accordance with sections 104 and 104B of the Resource Management Act 1991 subject to the conditions imposed under sections 108 and 220 of the Act listed below.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Tracy Paterson', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Tracy Paterson
Hearings Panel Chairperson

Date: 19 March 2026



Consent Type: Subdivision and Land Use Consent

Consent Number: RC 250298

Purpose: Subdivision consent for a three lot subdivision and land use consent to establish two residential building platforms breaching setback standards in the Rural Resource Area

Location of Activity: 60 Lowburn Valley Road

Legal Description: Section 2 SO 22525 (Record of Title OT12B/85).

Lapse Date: 19 March 2031 unless the consent has been given effect to before this date.

Conditions:

Subdivision:

1. The subdivision must be undertaken in general accordance with the plans and details submitted with the application for resource consent, further information received on 20 October 2025, and the plan of subdivision attached as Appendix One, as amended by the following conditions.
2. Unless modified by other conditions, all designs and approvals are to be in accordance with NZS 4404:2004 and the July 2008 CODC Addendum. Together these two documents form the Council's Code of Practice for subdivision.
3. Prior to commencement of any physical work the consent holder must apply for and receive council Engineering Acceptance (EA) via the CODC online portal at:

CODC Home > Services > Planning > Land Development and Subdivision Engineering

This EA application must include:

- Confirming who their representative is for the design and execution of the engineering work.
 - Provision of design reports, calculations, specifications, schedules, and drawings, as applicable.
4. Producer Statements/Certificates where appropriate are to be submitted as per the NZS 4404 in the form of:
 - Schedule 1A,
 - Schedule 1B,
 - Standalone Schedule 1B for 3 waters work, and

Schedule 1C.

5. As-built drawings are to be lodged with the Council in accordance with clause 1.5.10(b) of NZS 4404:2004 and must comply with Council's "Specifications for as-built drawing documentation version 3.1". The as-built drawings are to be provided in *.dxf or *12da, and in *.pdf file format. New Zealand Vertical Datum (NZVD2016) must be used.
6. Any easements required to protect access or for access to services must be duly granted or reserved. These easements must be shown on the plan provided for Section 223 certification.
7. Prior to section 224(c) certification the consent holder must install standard residential DN25mm to Lots 1 and 2 in accordance with the following:
 - a) Service connections must be located at the road frontage, outside of the property boundary.
 - b) The service connection must have an Acuflo meter, a manifold incorporating a toby valve under a blue meter box located in the road reserve, 300mm from the boundary and the supply connection must be extended a minimum of 300mm inside the boundary.
 - c) Only one service connection from the public watermain is allowed per property.
 - d) As-built drawing must be submitted in electronic format and clearly show pipe and fitting locations, dimensions and relevant details.
8. Prior to Section 224(c) certification, the consent holder must confirm whether existing fire hydrants provide full firefighting coverage of the building platforms in accordance with SNZ/PAZ 4509:2008. If full coverage is not able to be achieved, the consent holder must either construct an additional hydrant in a location that would be acceptable to Council's Three Waters Network Manager, or the following must be imposed as a consent notice on any lot without full firefighting water coverage:
 - a) *Any occupied building on the lot must either be located in a position where it will be compliant with the distances from firefighting hydrants specified in Table 2 of SNZ/PAS 4509:2008 or on-site water storage would be required. On-site water storage must consist of a standard 30,000 litre tank. Of this total capacity, a minimum of 20,000 litres must be maintained at all times as a static firefighting reserve. Alternatively an 11,000 litre firefighting reserve is to be made available to the building in association with a domestic sprinkler system installed in the building to an approved standard. A firefighting connection is to be located within 90 metres of any proposed building on the site. In order to ensure that connections are compatible with Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) equipment the fittings are to comply with the following standards:*

Either: For flooded sources, a 70 mm Instantaneous Couplings (Female) NZS 4505 or, for suction sources, a 100 mm and 140 mm Suction Coupling (Female) NZS 4505 (hose tail is to be the same diameter as the threaded coupling e.g. 100 mm coupling has 100 mm hose tail), provided that the consent holder must provide written approval of Fire and Emergency New Zealand to confirm that the couplings are appropriate for firefighting purposes.

All connections must be capable of providing a flow rate of 25 litres per second at the connection point.

The connection must have a hardstand area adjacent to it to allow a Fire and Emergency New Zealand appliance to park on it. The hardstand area must be located at the centre of a clear working space with a minimum width of 4.5 metres. Access must be maintained at all times to the hardstand area.

Underground tanks or tanks that are partially buried (provided the tank is no more than 1 metre above ground) may be accessed by an opening in the top of the tank, removing the need for couplings.

Note: *For more information on how to comply with this Condition or on how to provide for FENZ operational requirements refer to the Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. In particular, the following should be noted:*

For more information on suction sources see Appendix B, SNZ PAS 4509:2008, Section B2.

For more information on flooded sources see Appendix B, SNZ PAS 4509:2008, Section B3.

- b) Firefighting water supply may be provided by means other than that provided for in a) if the written approval of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand is obtained for the alternative method.*
9. Prior to section 224(c) certification the consent holder must install a standard 100mm wastewater connection to Lots 1 and 2 in accordance with the following:
- a) Each connection must be capable of serving the building platform by gravity. This requirement must allow adequately graded drains within the lot, together with the depth required for gully traps. Private wastewater pumps will be accepted where gravity discharge is not feasible.
 - b) Service connections must enter each lot from the road frontage.
 - c) Private pipes must not cross property boundaries.
 - d) Each lot must be provided with a separate lateral connection.
 - e) Lay laterals at least 0.6m clear from property side boundaries, to terminate 0.3m-1m inside the net site area of the lot with an access point. End caps for Wastewater laterals will be coloured red.
 - f) Only one service connection from the public wastewater main is allowed per property.
 - g) As-built drawing must be submitted in electronic format and clearly show pipe and fitting locations, dimensions and relevant details.
10. Prior to Section 224(c) certification, operational power and telecommunication services must be provided underground to the boundary of Lots 1 and 2.
11. Prior to the issue of Section 224(c) certification, the consent holder must pay a reserves contribution of \$5,800.00 (Including GST) calculated in terms of Rule 15.6.1(1)(a)(i) of

the Operative District Plan. Payment is due upon application under the Resource Management Act 1991 for certification pursuant to Section 224(c) certification. The Council may withhold a certificate under Section 224(c) certification of the Resource Management Act 1991 if the required Development and Financial Contributions have not been paid, pursuant to section 208 of the Local Government Act 2002 and Section 15.5.1 of the Operative District Plan.

12. The following must be registered as a consent notice on Lots 1 and 2 under Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991:

- a) *All buildings must be located within the identified building platforms on the survey plan and must have a maximum height of no more than 6m.*
- b) *Prior to the construction of a dwelling on Lots 1 or 2, a new vehicle crossing must be constructed to the requirements of the Vehicle Crossing Policy set out in Part 29 of the Council's Rooding Policies dated January 2015. The consent holder or successor is required to obtain permission to construct a vehicle crossing from Council's rooding team under Part 29 of Council's Rooding Policies. It is recommended that this permission be sought prior to the lodging of building consent for any dwelling in order to allow Council to ensure the crossing will be appropriately located, having regard to the operation of Lowburn Valley Road and the proposed building work.*
- c) *Stormwater from buildings and impervious surfaces must be disposed of by soak pit within the boundary of each Lot or be stored for beneficial re-use within the lot.*
- d) *Any relocated building on Lots 1 or 2 must comply with the following:*
 - i) *Any relocated building intended for use as a dwelling (excluding previously used garages and accessory buildings) must have previously been designed, built and used as a dwelling;*
 - ii) *A building pre-inspection report shall be provided with the application for a building consent. That report is to identify all reinstatement works that are to be completed to the exterior of the building and shall include certification from the owner of the relocated building that the reinstatement work will be completed within a 12 month period;*
 - iii) *The building shall be located on permanent foundations approved by building consent no later than 2 months of the building being moved to the site; and*
 - iv) *All other reinstatement work required by the building pre-inspection report and the building consent to reinstate the exterior of any relocated dwelling shall be completed within 12 months of the building being delivered to the site. Reinstatement work is to include connections to all infrastructure services and closing in and ventilation of the foundations*
- e) *No commercial activities, other than a "home occupation", defined as follows, is permitted.*

"Home occupation" means an occupation, craft or profession which:

- 1. Is carried on by a member of the family residing in the dwelling on the site; and*

2. *Is clearly accessory and secondary to the use of the dwelling for residential purposes; and*
3. *Conforms to the following:*
 - a. *The occupation, craft or profession shall be carried out either wholly within a principal building or within an accessory building modified for the purposes; and*
 - b. *There shall be no exterior display, no exterior sign (except as permitted under the rules for the relevant Resource Area and the general rules for signs), no exterior storage of materials, no other exterior indication of the home occupation or variation from the residential character of the principal building or the neighbourhood.*
 - c. *The occupation, craft or profession does not have characteristics that are likely to cause adverse effects in terms of noise, odour, vibration, dust or attracting significant volumes of traffic.*
 - d. *Goods produced or services offered as a part of a home occupation may be sold from the site. No other retail activity is authorised in the context of a home occupation.*
- f) *All water tanks (if required) to be coloured olive green, dark green, dark grey, or brown.*
13. The following must be registered as a consent notice on Lot 2 under Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991:
 - a) *Any building on Lot 2 must have a finished floor level of at least 197.78m (NZDV2016).*

Land use:

1. The building platforms must be no closer to any boundary than shown on the plan attached as Appendix One.
2. All buildings on Lots 1 and 2 must be located within the identified building platforms.

Advice Notes:

1. *All charges incurred by the Council relating to the administration, inspection and supervision of conditions of subdivision consent must be paid prior to Section 224(c) certification.*
2. *The following development contributions are payable pursuant to the Council's Policy on Development and Financial Contributions:*

<i>Water:</i>	<i>\$26,276.00 Inc GST</i>
<i>Wastewater:</i>	<i>\$14,938.00 Inc GST</i>
<i>Transport:</i>	<i>\$1,606.00 Inc GST</i>
<i>Community Infrastructure:</i>	<i>\$5,022.00 Inc GST</i>

Payment is due upon application under the Resource Management Act 1991 for certification pursuant to Section 224(c). The Council may withhold a certificate under Section 224(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991 if the required Development and Financial Contributions have not been paid, pursuant to section 208 of the Local Government Act 2002 and Section 15.5.1 of the Operative District Plan.

3. *Where there is a risk that sediment may enter a watercourse at any stage during the earthworks, it is advised that the Otago Regional Council be consulted before works commence, to determine if the discharge of sediment will enter any watercourse and what level of treatment and/or discharge permit, if any, may be required.*
4. *In addition to the conditions of a resource consent, the Resource Management Act 1991 establishes through sections 16 and 17 a duty for all persons to avoid unreasonable noise, and to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effect created from an activity they undertake.*
5. *Resource consents are not personal property. The ability to exercise this consent is not restricted to the party who applied and/or paid for the consent application.*
6. *It is the responsibility of any party exercising this consent to comply with any conditions imposed on the resource consent prior to and during (as applicable) exercising the resource consent. Failure to comply with the conditions may result in prosecution, the penalties for which are outlined in section 339 of the Resource Management Act 1991.*
7. *The lapse period specified above may be extended on application to the Council pursuant to section 125 of the Resource Management Act 1991.*

Issued at Central Otago on 19 March 2026



Tarryn Lines
Team Leader Planning Support

Appendix One: Approved Plan for RC 250298 (scanned image, not to scale)

