

Further Submission from Josh Billings and Ann Barton

1. We have read carefully the report by Patricia Harte on the various Twizel submissions regarding Proposed Plan Change 13.
2. We do not believe our particular concerns have been addressed - especially our comments in Section B - Site Specific Relief in our original submission. We would reiterate the validity of our arguments in this section.
3. We are not developers. We bought in Hocken Lane because we wanted peace and quiet and not to be surrounded by quarter acre sections and houses.
4. But we are not farmers either. We are concerned that by owning 19 ha which could get to be underutilised we could be promoting the inefficient use of land. We bought with the idea of being able to subdivide one or two sections if necessary in the future. If we are not permitted to do this, we believe that that is markedly unfair as everyone around us has already been able to subdivide into smaller sections. We bought with the knowledge that further subdivision was legally possible. The council has changed the rules after the event which materially affects the value of our land.
5. We agree that the water supply for Twizel should be adequately protected but we are not convinced that the science has been adequately done to prove that our land is at risk of causing contamination of the Twizel water supply wells. If anybody was at risk according to their suggestions, it should be ourselves from our own very sophisticated sewerage system contaminating our own well!
6. We continue to support the arguments put forward by the Hocken Lane Land Owners Association.