

Submitter Evidence

1. My Name is David Andrew Bruce
2. I am a qualified Outdoor Instructor and the current Camp Manager having been in this role for a term of 7 years
3. I am here to speak on behalf of Camp Columba Charitable Trust (CCCT) with support from our consultant Hamish Weir of Southern Horizons.
4. CCCT wish to formally thank Council for their consideration of our operation in the Proposed Gore District Plan (PGDP) by way of establishing a special zone with accommodating rules. Councils' eager engagement on issues relating to the camp site has been greatly appreciated.
5. It is likely that this approach will result in considerable future savings for CCCT noting that any unnecessary cost that is incurred for regulatory process is donated funds that are no longer attributable to their intended purpose such as new buildings or outdoor education equipment.
6. We are in general agreement with the findings of the section 42a report and make the following points in respect of the referenced paragraphs (P);
7. P65 & P66 - CCCT support the recommendation to reject proposed changes requested by FENZ and agree with the officers' findings that existing provisions already address the concerns raised. The wording requested would unnecessarily cloud future processing planners assessment of activities for consent processes.
8. P75 & P76 – We agree with the officers finding that the flood hazard matters raised are not of relevance to the Camp Columba Zone.
9. P86 & P87 – We agree with the officers finding and support the minor wording alteration to include 'relocated' in reference to buildings.
10. P123 – The term 'non-complying' has potential to escalate what could be very technical and minor breaches beyond what the 'real' effects of are. We implore you to return the default status to discretionary as requested.
11. P124 – In response to the officers rebuttal, the issue is not that a consent cannot be granted for a non-complying application, rather the cost of achieving such verses a discretionary activity is usually considerably higher.
12. P128 – We provide the attached revised structure plan as requested by the Officer.
13. P129 – The plan has been decluttered removing images to make it clearer for future planning officers to assess. We have also taken the opportunity to bring the structure plan more up to

date with site development post notification of the PGDP As per our draft annotations, the legend has been updated such that it will hopefully address the matters raised by the officer.

14. P131 & P1342 – We thank the officer for their agreement on the potential for confusion with this rule and gladly support its removal.
15. Thank you for hearing our submission and we will gladly respond to any questions you might have.