

# Submission to Plan Change 13

DEFERRED SUBMISSION RELATING TO TWIZEL

Prepared by Frank Hocken (SID 89 & 90)

## 1. Twizel Boundary with Mackenzie Basin Subzone.

Whilst the legality of PC 13 remains questionable (see my submission dated 2 Sep 08) it is pleasing to see that the Planning Officer has taken note of the many concerns raised by submitters regarding the original proposed town boundary. In the Planning Officers report dated 15 October 2008 the Sub Zone has been pushed back and this will now allow for future growth.

Many section owners surrounding Twizel have individual titles to their land but as these lots lie within the overly restrictive subzone there was no guaranteeing that a house could be built. This concept was absurd as in order to be subdivided all Council subdivision criteria had been met, with services such as reticulated water and sewer provided for. To then be told there was no guarantee a house could exist on such a section beggar's belief.

I am pleased to see logic has prevailed but why must landowners have to go through this? Why cannot Council see the most logical and equitable scenario from day one?

## 2. Hocken Lane Inclusion in the Sub Zone.

The reasons given for maintaining Hocken Lane within the subzone have nothing to do with the motivation behind PC 13 ie: Objective 3A The Protection of Outstanding Landscapes.

It is acknowledged in both the Landscape Report and Planning Officers report that the level of ONL exhibited by Hocken Lane and its surrounds is considered low. Mr Densem even goes on to say that there would only be a minor effect on landscape values if a separate Lifestyle Subdivision Zone were given to Hocken Lane.

The area known as Hocken Lane is not open dry tussock land but is more similar to the landscape surrounding Fairlie and other low country environs. The use of PC 13 to stop further development is grossly misleading.

The reasons given by the Planning Officer to keep Hocken Lane within the subzone are access, flood risk, and protection of the Twizel water supply.

### **(a) Access**

After reading the Planning Officers report you would think the road servicing Hocken Lane was nothing more than a goat track. Yes it is unsealed but so are approximately 500 kms of Council controlled legal roads within the district. Yes it is windy but so are many other roads including parts of SH 8 between Geraldine and Fairlie. Yes it is narrow in places, down to 3.9m but other Council controlled roads in the district are narrower eg: the road to Glen Lyon Station gets down to 3m in places. Hocken Lane does have many opportunities for cars to pass one another without needing to leave the road.

Finally the Planning Officer in her report says the bridges servicing Hocken Lane do not have certification as to the standard they are built. This is totally incorrect. Council building consents were required when the original subdivision of Hocken Lane was completed. Original Ministry of Works bridge plans were used and an Engineer's report on the quality of the completed bridges was provided to Council.

**The Planning Officer in the future should do more homework with the Council she is working on behalf before making rash comments about quality standards. In doing so she would have seen that the bridges have Council approval and have been endorsed by a qualified engineer.**

The reason many residents have requested Hocken Lane be taken over by Council is because there are a few miserable Hocken Lane residents who would prefer not to pay a measly \$200 a year road maintenance fund and instead squabble over who uses the road the most. Therefore little action on upgrading the road has occurred. The Residents Association is investigating the option of using a Body Corporate structure which would then enforce compliance with the road fund and ensure the standard of the road is maintained.

It is also investigating options to widen the road and create passing bays at various points along the lane. There are many examples of small quaint villages in England which have narrow windy roads and tall hedges either side which service entire villages, not just a measly 22 possible dwellings.

### **(b) Flood Risk**

We accept that Hocken Lane lies within a flood risk area not so much caused by excessive waters passing through the three rivers and streams, but more due to the potential for a canal break along the Pukaki canal. If the risk of flooding was the only determinant used in assessing whether development should occur or not then Fairlie should have a moratorium placed upon it effective immediately. The whole town lies within a flood risk area.

There are many localities where buildings can be placed within a low flood risk zone and comply with the current Rural zone rules ie: 150mm minimum floor height above probable floodwaters in a 0.2% AEP. Careful thought and placement of dwellings will ensure this area can overcome any flood risk to houses caused by a canal breach.

### **(c) Twizel Water Supply Protection Zone**

The Planning Officer has overlooked the fact that many septic tanks are now so advanced that human waste can be transformed into a near drinkable condition. Council should be more concerned about nitrates from fertiliser and animal excrement leaching into the waterways and contaminating the drinking supply than with approved septic tanks installed to service approved dwellings.

Council could control the type of septic tank used for a dwelling via the Building Consent process. This would ensure the quality of water supply within the catchment area is maintained.

Furthermore Council should be looking at better ways to protect its water supply than by excluding development within an arbitrary catchment area. They have discussed the option of sourcing the town's water supply from Mt Ostler. If such an option is taken up presumably the water protection zone preventing development of Hocken Lane will be lifted as will the need to have houses connect to a reticulated sewage system.

### **3. Private Vehicle Access**

Section 8.7 limits the number of allotments able to use an existing right of way and also requires turning circles. Surely each case should be judged on its own merits taking into account potential traffic volumes and sight distances? Passing bays or road widening can allow more than the proposed maximum of 6 lots using one right of way, as is the case in many countries around the world.

Body Corporate structures could also be used with developments such as Hocken Lane. These would benefit Council in that they would be responsible for resolving commonly shared issues such as the road quality.

### **4. Relief Sought**

**(a) Council must adopt the proposed Twizel / Sub zone boundary as shown in the Planning officers report dated 15 October 2008.**

**(b) It must also look to include Hocken Lane within the township which has benefitted from extensive development and control future development by other means and not by inclusion within the Sub Zone.**

Nov 3 2008

**(c)The concept of only allowing 6 allotments access off a private right of way needs to be dropped completely.**