



FORM 5

SUBMISSION ON A PUBLICLY NOTIFIED
PLAN CHANGE/ VARIATION

CLAUSE 6 OF FIRST SCHEDULE
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

To: Mackenzie District Council
PO Box 52
FAIRLIE 7949

Full name of submitter: DAVID CROW
Address for service: 20 NORTH WEST ARCH
P.O. Box A
TWIZEL
Telephone: 03 435 0133
Fax/email: DAVECROW@MAC.COM
Contact person: _____

(name and designation, if applicable)

This is a submission on:

**Proposed Plan Change 15 (Twizel) and/or Variation 1 to Plan Change 13,
Mackenzie District Plan**

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:
(give details)

PLAN CHANGE 15 RESIDENTIAL/RURAL RE ZONING OF
NORTH-WEST ARCH - FROM RURAL TO RESIDENTIAL
SECTIONS 6, 7, 8
THREE EXCLUSIONS

My submission is:

(include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended and the reasons for your views)

I OPPOSE THE SPECIFIC RE-ZONING OF NORTH-WEST
ARCH FROM RURAL TO RES 4 AND QUESTION

THE REASONING/RATIONAL OF THIS AND OTHER ADJACENT AREAS
TO EITHER RES 4 OR RR1, RR2.
I REFER YOU TO PREVIOUS SUBMISSIONS MADE BY
MYSELF & OTHER RESIDENTS (SEE ATTACHED). I ALSO
REFER YOU TO YOUR STATEMENT'S INTRODUCTION, SECTION
8, 8-1; OBJECTIVES & POLICES SECTION 8, 8-1
I FURTHER REFER YOU TO THE DENSEM REPORT COMPILED
BY THE MDC PAR 4.9, 5.5, 5.6 & 6.31
I PUT TO YOU THAT REZONING IN THE WAY PROPOSED WORKS
AGAINST THE PRINCIPLES DISCUSSED IN THE DENSEM REPORT
AS WELL AS IGNORES THE SUBMITTED WISHES OF RATEPAYERS WHO
PURCHASED WITH A LEGITIMATE EXPECTATION TO ACQUIRE & USE
THEIR LAND UNDER THE PROVISION OF RURAL ZONING.

I seek the following decision from the Mackenzie District Council:
(give precise details)

TO MAINTAIN THE LEGITIMATE EXPECTATION OF RURAL FOR
NORTH-WEST BACH WITH A CLASSIFICATION OF RR2.
TO REVERSE THE RATIONAL OF REZONING OF OTHER LANDS TO
THE NORTH & WEST.
TO TAKE EUROPEAN BACH OFF THE EXCLUDED TREE LIST.
TO ADD ROWAN TREES TO THE EXCLUDED " " "

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

(tick one box)

If others make a similar submission I ~~would~~ would not (delete one) be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.

Signature of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter
(A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.)

Date 12/11/10

If you have any queries about this form or the proposed plan change or variation, please contact Nathan Hole, Planning Manager, Mackenzie District Council on (03) 685 9019.

North West Arch Rate payer Collective – submission/feedback to MDC proposed re-zoning of NW Arch and adjacent – June 07;

Verbal submission time 3pm Saturday 10 mins allocated

Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our perspective on the prospective changes to zoning. We understand this is not yet a formal process and so appreciate the time MDC has set aside today listen to our feedback.

The NW Arch rate payer collective currently represents 15 individual households comprising a population of 40 - 45

This collective feedback does not negate feedback submitted individually.

process

The MDC Process to date has been informal however we note there is no reference within the documentation provided outlining the change process and the relation to the relevant sections of the RMA and LGA;

There is no indication as to the MDC intent with respect to the operation of the consultation process. A deadline has been set with respect to public submissions. However, there is no information regarding how the MDC will assess the submissions, how the public will be informed of the content of submissions, how the answers to questions will be made, nor the timing of such events.

Moreover, there is no information regarding the public's ability to contest the proposed changes through the Environment Court if the response from the MDC is not satisfactory.

The lack of information regarding how the consultation will be run questions the legal compliance of the existing consultation and the appropriateness of the information published with the proposal.

The MDC should make available all submission's made during this part of the process and provide a detailed explanation of the process to be undertaken and the options available to the public regarding their legal rights;

We also ask now that when the formal process of public notification of changes to the District Plan follows, the MDC also provides this group with a copy of the Section 32 assessment .

North West Arch Rate payer Collective – submission/feedback to MDC proposed re-zoning of NW Arch and adjacent – June 07;

Here is our feedback to the prospective changes as they relate to NW Arch

NW Arch in the big picture, Essential character of Twizel

As a group we are very aware that NW Arch is part of the bigger picture of Twizel and the District. The things dear to us have also been identified by the wider Twizel community as dear to them, such as;

- Strong community values
- Open spaces
- Pedestrian walkways
- Parkland arboreta
- Tree belt buffers
- Loop track parkland
- An urban town with rural character and values.

We are of the strong belief that the zoning changes proposed for NW Arch and the adjacent areas is not in keeping with the wishes of the community. These values were clearly defined in the MDC's "Long Term Council Community Plan Statement of Outcomes – draft, nov 2005.

We are of the view that the proposal is focused on high density infill housing with a total disregard to quality urban/rural design elements.

We challenge the view expressed in the Feb 07 'landscape values of the Mackenzie Basin', that

1. contain development within a hardedge and
2. suggests the land area to the west of Twizel thru to the Ben Ohau's is the best suited for future urban development – because of limited visual impact from the highway.

While we do not necessary believe the proposed zone changes are done with this document in mind, it is clear to us that much more work need to be done by MDC to get a better understanding of existing interactions between people and the Mackenzie landscape.

Residents on North West Arch, particularly those running rural businesses are affected landowners.

We ask the MDC to explain why it appears to have limited consultation on this document.

North West Arch Rate payer Collective – submission/feedback to MDC proposed re-zoning of NW Arch and adjacent – June 07;

Zone changes & NW Arch

The unanimous view of this group is ***to maintain the current status quo of rural zoning for all of North West Arch (from Ohau Road to Glen Lyon Road), as well as maintain existing zoning on land directly adjacent to NW Arch which includes the land know as the Pony Club***, as any zone changes here will impact negatively on current NW Arch land usage.

A core group has owned property on NW Arch from the outset, they have invested and made a commitment here going back 10 to 15 years or more, many have worked through yrs of hardship to establish boutique businesses and/or have developed their properties to enhance the park-like and tranquil setting the town is now famous for. This is ultimately assisting the economic and demographic growth of the town and region.

Further, this collective have individually purchased property in NW arch because of the open space and rural land use opportunities.

To quote 3;

"we purchased because of the zoning not in spite of it. We chose the arch because we wanted a piece of the Mackenzie country that offered a degree of privacy."

"I bought a section in North West Arch in 2005. Before purchasing my solicitor undertook a search of the MDC District Plan and other published town development literature. They concluded that the land I would purchase (and the near surrounding district) was not identified as an area for future development. Thus I bought land with the knowledge that this was the case"

"15 years ago NW arch was developed as a rural subdivision and we were able to purchase a suitable amount of land on which to build a base for our growing business, prior to this it was difficult to purchase the right amount of land from which to establish a rural business. The choice was either a small town section or a large high country station. Back in those early years sections on NW arch did not seem very popular however the 'pioneers' built beautiful houses and developed their sections and business's, thus creating an authentically pleasing rural area which has greatly enhanced the region."

We note there are at least 5 B&B's, a firewood merchant, nursery, beekeeper, butcher and various trades people on NW Arch. It provides a balanced buffer between the urban residential area and the public recreation area on the western edge. Visitor's to these premises frequently comment on the natural quiet and

North West Arch Rate payer Collective – submission/feedback to MDC proposed re-zoning of NW Arch and adjacent – June 07;

feeling of seclusion provided under the current mix. The western edge recreation area and the area known as the Pony Club is very popular with a variety of users, the feeling of seclusion, open space and natural quiet these strip's currently provides is enhanced with current land use and associated activity of NW Arch.

Any zoning changes now will cause associated changes to current land use as defined within the District Plan, the impact this will have on existing rate payers is very substantial, it threatens established businesses and greatly diminishes the use of land values we currently enjoy. Its impact is likely to spread to other rate payers and visitors who also seek, from the NW Arch area and the western recreational strip, these same values.

Any such change would amount to a reversal of land use and show a complete lack of sensitivity to the now well established livelihoods and values of users and visitors alike.

Once again we thank you for the opportunity to submit our feedback

North West Arch Rate Payer Collective

Pete & Ali Bell
Crow Household
Mark & Moya Duncan
Feasey Household
Steve Fuller & Sue Keith
Grant Gillespie & Helen Rylie
Adriane and Allan Grant,
Henderson Household
Margraret & Peter Hands
Matt Gunn & Emily Sancha
Jay Household
Graham & Ilene Jackson,
Ursula & Nordahl Paul
Squeak Household
Jan & Bob Wilson

Proposed Twizel re-zonings – march 2007, have your say, response sheet

From the council Conclusion previous "have your say" consultation document. *"While some strong themes emerged from the, there is still a bit of work required to refine the views of the Twizel community. It is fair to say that the views of the rural residential development issues and options is more straightforward than the redevelopment of Market Place and enhancement of Twizel greenways and town belt. Further in-depth analysis of this information is required.*

*Council received a total of **43** (that's less than 4% of rate payers) responses to the "have your say" questionnaire. Some people replied to all questions on the form while others choose to be selective in providing feedback. A number of views were expressed on the topics provided,"*

The public meetings held gave quite a different message, for e.g. their was a very clear message from the meeting not to encourage residential development to the west of the town belt, and to preserve and enhance current green spaces and town belt.

Overall comment,

Basic assumption being made is projected demand for residential land (seemingly defined as small urban lots).

Actual demand appears to be a mix with those that have invested in larger (1 hectare or greater) blocks doing so for lifestyle and town/country aesthetic values they wish to retain. Subdivision of these current blocks (to less than 1 hectare) is more a result of loose controls enabling speculation.

While it is commendable council is endeavouring to plan for the future, to project for likely demand (and also assume values) for 50 years hence in the current climate is very bold, what are the 50 year projections based on? And why 50 years as opposed to say 25 years?

Some thoughts to the current proposal,

Aspects of it have a degree of sense, much does not and in general does not pave the way for harmonious linking of existing and future development. If growth does occur as predicted the proposed zone changes will inevitably result in one large but disconnected sprawl of high density housing. The existing green belt will be the soul recreational land but it too will be more disconnect and pressured than what it currently is.

Q – what land is set aside for the cemetery to cater for forecast population changes 50 yrs hence?

What amenity, landscaping and access linkages to the community are proposed for cemetery if rezoned to R1.

Increasing land available for industrial makes sense as does the proposed rezoning. This is still a relatively small area. Given the projected growth this will not be anywhere near enough industrial land to support the industry that will be here to support the predicted population (look to the southern lakes towns as an example). The council rezoned to

residential much of the current industrial land, the batcher block is one area that is ideally positioned (and suited) to be used for industrial and/or tourist.

There seems to be very little land now available for tourist zoning, why is that?

Tourism is a significant aspect of this region and town and should feature very strongly in any proposals. Parts of Twizel offer unique and stunning views to Aoraki/Mt Cook and the main divide, as well as to other major mountain ranges in the basin. The department of conservation has had a long presence in the town that is likely to increase with the need to service growing amounts of significant high country conservation estate, much of this is highly valued recreational mountain land, Town planning should capitalise on this including any changes to the market place. For e.g. the focal point in the market place could be (and perhaps should be) the view to Aoraki.

Zone boundaries and size

Location and boundaries – no the proposals do not make sense in terms of current land use, natural features or accessibility. Nor do the changes necessarily reflect contemporary town & country planning.

Ostler fault

To this observer it makes no sense what so ever to encourage urban development near a fault line of such significance (particularly down slope of the canal), council should be taking leadership on this issue. Despite a minority expressing a desire to see the town expand to the east this is the most logical space to utilise. Not only due to the fault but also because of air drainage (off the Ben Ohau's into the hollow the town is sited in), and aesthetics' (views to the main divide).

Manuka tce zoning – see below

It seems to me that this is a special case and in part is a problem of the councils own making. Rezoning is not necessarily a solution. Given the proximity to the Ben Ohau Mountains and conservation estate, the siting of the eastern part of the development on top of the Ostler uplift zone, the western area on flood prone land and the overall hazard from wind storms great care needs to be taken in this area.

Residential 3 proposals.

Current occupiers bought into the areas proposed to be rezoned R3 because of the open space and rural zoning land use opportunities. The current areas, particularly north west arch are developing and attracting a unique boutique land use that works well with the town. For e.g. North West Arch has at least 5 B&B's, a firewood merchant, nursery, beekeeper and various trades people. It provides a balanced buffer between the residential area and the town belt. The proposed changes point to increasing urbanisation and eventual residential 1 zoning, They further limit current occupiers developing their businesses and thus forcing current usage out. This would be a shame as current usage provides a pleasant mix to the town, encouraging diversity and economic growth that may otherwise be stifled. The road (NW arch) also is the main arterial route (for many) from the north to south of the town. This currently works with the low residential development and current mix of land use but will become an issue if residential numbers increase to the extent proposed.

Lot size/density

Decreased lot sizes should not be encouraged, see above.

Structure Plans

Yes, new areas should have structure plans, these should conform to the original design concepts of the town and existing linkages etc should be improved/upgraded to reflect this as well. This town's biggest single asset is its open spaces, original linkages and green spaces. Its high time these were improved, better protected and maintained.

Tree belt.

In general this form of shelter and protection should be encouraged and planned for, however council can not even maintain let alone enhance its current belts, so before developing new ones how about getting on top of the existing ones. Maintenance and development plans of these belts have been in existence for years.

If council is serious regarding wind protection from such belts it should be allowing for a number of belts, perhaps 1 every 1km down wind. Or as with the case of the fault line, not encouraging urban development where it will receive the full force (as current Manuka tce residents know) of nature.

Green spaces

There does appear to be a case for rationalising a few of these spaces, this should go hand in hand with better protecting the other green spaces, and putting into place a robust plan for their continued upkeep including replanting, landscaping and walkways.

If the predicted growth happens these existing spaces are really all the town has in term of public garden and park.

Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment, I would be happy to speak to this submission should the opportunity be provided.

David Crow
20 North West Arch
Twizel