

Pencarrow Estate Pongakawa

Have all the following criteria been clarified by Pencarrow Estate for residents, Councils and Commissioners

	YES	NO
Urban Environment	√	
Consistency with Future Development Strategy	√	
Consistency with the BOP RPS	√	
Consistency with NPS-UD	√	
Highly Productive Land*	√	
No Other Reasonably Practicable and Feasible Options	√	
Benefits of Re-Zoning Outweighing Costs	√	
Natural Hazards – Risk of Loss of Life due to Flood Hazard	√	
Three Waters	√	
Annual Costs at Full Development (130 houses + commercial sites)	√	
Transportation	√	

*If said Highly Productive Land has to be sold due to the subdivision not being approved the assumption is residents approve the possibility of a kiwifruit orchard being developed on said land with high artificial shelter, frost machines/helicopters operating during the night, and a raft of regular spray programs being undertaken including annual Hi Cane application.

After reading through all the strategies Pencarrow Estate have in place so this development becomes a plan for future developers to aspire to, one can only presume there are other underlying factors why both Council's have rejected this project. I would hope that both Council's have shown an open mind to this enviable asset for the community?

Neville & Jill Marsh