

From: [Neville Andrews](#)
To: [pdpsubmissions](#); [Village Consultation](#); maree.baker-galloway@al.nz
Subject: Jacks Point s293 Proposal
Date: Friday, 12 November 2021 10:39:22 AM

To whom it may concern.

I am a resident at Jacks point and wish to provide comments related to the s293 proposal for Jacks Point:

1. Initially I refer to appendix 4 Evaluation. My preference is option1, which does not expand the village beyond what was originally proposed. I and many others bought into Jacks Point understanding the village would be restricted to the initial site and size. This current proposal has the village footprint increasing by 28.2%.
 - o The proposed increased land coverage for the village will have a significant impact on the outlook of many Jacks Point Residents. Our views will have a dramatic increase in roof tops (and at night street and dwelling lighting). Again, not something we bought into.
 - o This is another example of the developer agreeing to a plan for the development of Jacks Point, only to then regularly erode the "agreed plan" so he can extract more "personal value" from the development. Please note a couple of detrimental changes the developer has achieved to date:
 - Removal of the original deed principle of 95% reserve space 5% built on space.
 - A significant increase in the number of Preserve Homesites (aided by the above change) again impacting the outlook of residential precinct owners.
2. I am opposed to any change to zoning related to OSG land. As we have seen with the driving range, originally OSG, then changed to Education and now an attempt to change it to village ie V(JP). It is this slow erosion of open space that I disagree with.
3. Point 7 in the summary document, in particular "*undertake realignments with the Open Space Golf Activity Area along the eastern side of Lake Tewa and an area of land immediately alongside the driving range within the current Open Space Golf Activity Area, and to include two new areas of Open Space Residential Amenity Activity Area (OSA)*" seems to be in conflict with the CDP appendix 2 Plan 1. The land referred to above seems to be included in M 6A and M 6B, i.e. 60% built on.
4. If option 2 ends up being the agreed option then I strongly believe the land should still stay zoned as Education,, as this would at least reduce the intensification I am opposed to and mentioned in point 1. Site coverage would stay at 45% and building height at 10m. This would also allow for more open space in the village of which there is currently very little planned for.
5. I now refer to Appendix 2 CDP Plan 3, which shows three open space areas in the village. It is difficult to ascertain the actual size of these, however as can be seen from the plan, this represents a very small area of true open space. And in reality the open space 2 "wetland" is really a stormwater channel. Open space is supposed to "provide benefit to the general public as an area of visual, cultural, educational and recreational amenity value." I believe significantly more land needs to be committed to true open space, be it option 1 or 2 that is selected for the CDP.
6. It will be argued that the planned R and M activity areas will have open space, because of the site coverage rules. However the residual land is privately owned and therefore not available to the general public, so it is not true open space. It is the same argument that applies to the unbuilt area on my section - it is incorrectly claimed in the 95% reserve space from the original deed, whereas it is private land.

Kind regards

Neville Andrews