

**FURTHER COMMENTS ON OUR SUBMISSION ON PLAN CHANGE 13 BY
HOCKEN LANE LAND OWNERS ASSOCIATION**

My name is Pauline Beekhuis and I am the Secretary of the Hocken Lane Land Owners Association. As such, it has fallen upon me to speak to the Submission that we as a group prepared in response to the proposed Plan Change 13.

I am speaking on behalf of 17 land owners of property in Hocken Lane, all of whom are affected in some way by some of the proposals that Plan Change 13 puts forward. While, for many reasons, a few only of us can be present today at this hearing, the Hearing Committee should be aware that the members of our informal association feel very strongly that their concerns should be heard by you. The members of the association are as follows: (see list Attachment A)

First of all, let me say that this whole process is seen by our members as daunting and extremely complicated, with very concerning consequences for us all. Since no one in the group felt qualified to put together a submission which would cover the main concerns of the group as a whole, we decided, at our expense, to employ the services of a professional planner.

We feel our planner Clare Le Grice from Vivian+Espie has summarised our concerns very well and so I will simply reiterate the main points of that submission with some comments relating to the report from the council's consultant planner Ms Patricia Harte as appropriate..

Please refer to the submission itself starting at :

Our submission is:

1. We do not agree with classifying the Hocken Lane landscape in the same way as the open tussocky vistas characteristic of the Mackenzie Basin.

The Inclusion of the Hocken Lane Area within the Mackenzie Basin Sub-zone etc etc (refer to 2nd page of submission)

As stated, our area of Hocken Lane has been modified considerably over recent years, and is in no way typical of the Mackenzie landscapes the Plan Change is seeking to protect. Added to that, it cannot be seen from the State highway or Glen Lyon Road, so the visual impact is of low vulnerability/.

Therefore we seek as per our submission:

1. Amendments to the boundary of the Mackenzie Basin Sub-zone (or the Twizel township boundary) to exclude the Hocken lane area from the Sub-zone thereby reinstating the current (operative) rural subdivision and land use regime;

or:

2. The identification of a separate Hocken Lane Rural Residential zone, and the formulation of a land use and subdivision regime for this zone – similar to that proposed for Manuka terrace except that residential buildings be allowed as a permitted activity

within the Hocken lane Rural Residential Zone (subject to compliance with the relevant building standards)

2. We do not agree with the imposition of a 200Ha minimum allotment size in the Hocken Lane area.

The Prescribed 200 Ha minimum allotment size etc,etc (page 3 of submission)

We seek that a minimum allotment size of 2-4 hectares should apply and that this should also be available to future subdivision for current Hocken Lane owners with larger blocks.

3. We do not agree with the failure to identify the Hocken lane area as an 'existing homestead node' nor with its exclusion as a suitable 'new development node'.

The relationship of Hocken lane to 'Nodes' etc,etc (page 3 of submission)

We seek Acceptance and identification of an 'existing node' or of a 'new node' suitable for low density rural subdivision that incorporates the Hocken lane area.

4. We believe that the Hocken Lane area should be exempted from the PC13 rules relating to the Mackenzie Basin generally and should be treated in a similar fashion as the Manuka Terrace Rural Residential Zone.

Similarity with Manuka Terrace etc,etc (page 4 of submission)

We are pleased to note that in her report Patricia Harte recommends that special provision should be made for the Hocken lane area to allow buildings to be built without further resource consent on those lots that have building platforms approved, and that there is provision also for farm buildings.

5. We do not agree with the identification of the Water supply Protection Area as including part of the Hocken Lane area, nor with the PC13 conclusions as to what inclusion in the new Water Supply Protection Area would mean in relation to sewage disposal for Hocken Lane.

The identification of the Water supply Protection Area etc,etc (page 4 of submission)

We do **not** accept Patricia Harte's conclusions and recommendations regarding this matter. This proposed change will affect 8 Hocken Lane landowners (i.e. nearly 50%) and will result in **considerable and unexpected extra cost** to those landowners. Any changes in their rights to install on-site sewage treatment and disposal systems and the subsequent expectation for each landowner to hook up to the council's sewerage system

at their own expense is grossly unfair. If council continues with this change, council should bear the cost of the connections. This matter will be dealt with in more detail in a further submission from John Beekhuis.

We seek the deletion of the Twizel Water Supply Protection Area from Hocken Lane, or alternatively, council fund and install a suitable reticulated sewerage system down Hocken Lane.

6. We do not agree with the application of a new standard in relation to access as it affects the Hocken lane right of way.

The Application of Standard 12.7.b.x. in Relation to the Hocken Lane Right of Way. etc,etc (page 5 of submission)

The majority of landowners would like to retain the lane under our own control , and have set in place a plan for its maintenance to which all landowners in Hocken Lane contribute on an annual basis. We disagree with Patricia Hart's criticism of the standard of the road and the safety of the bridges. This matter will once again be dealt with in more detail by John Beekhuis in his submission.

We seek deletion of new subdivision standard 12.7.b.x regarding access; or alternatively an exemption from the application of this standard to Hocken Lane

7. We strongly object to the lack of adequate consultation with Hocken Lane landowners prior to the notification of the plan change.

The Lack of Adequate Consultation Prior to Notification etc,etc (page 5 of submission)

Actually there was NO consultation at all, and no communication with affected parties in Hocken Lane. As Secretary, once I was told about this proposed plan, I contacted the Planner Mr Craig Lyon to ask for further details. When I questioned him on some of the more draconian aspects of the plan which affected Hocken Lane land owners, his attitude was less than helpful. It was something to the effect of : "yes, it will affect some people more than others, but that's too bad"

We in the Hocken Lane Land Owners Association are appalled at that attitude from a council employee, and appeal very strongly to you on the Hearing Committee to consider the financial commitment that we, in good faith, have made in buying land at residential prices in Hocken Lane. It is land that Council gave us consent to subdivide, to build on, and to install the necessary services on for a dwelling. With this plan change proposal, council could destroy our investments and our dreams.

Signed:  (Secretary Hocken Lane Landowners Association)

Date: 2nd Nov. 2008.