

**SUMMARY OF SUPPLEMENTARY SUBMISSION
FOR PLAN CHANGE 48**

**On behalf of
Graeme John Duff & Marion Anne Duff
3 Ekuarangi Place, Oakura**

1st December 2019

1st December 2019

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION OF GRAEME JOHN DUFF TO PLAN CHANGE 48

On behalf of Graeme John Duff and Marion Anne Duff

3 Ekuarangi Place, Oakura

1. I presented a supplementary submission dated 13th November 2019 in response to further evidence from the applicant and its advisors. For convenience, a copy of this supplementary submission is attached.

2. My ongoing concern is that nothing that affects the Oakura community has changed. It is recognized that the new proposal is a reduction in the number of sections from the original 400 to a probable 144. With this change has come material physical changes to the original application and those changes so significant that one needs to ask the question as to whether the correct process would now be to decline the application. The proposal is now so different to the original. That is a matter that needs to be considered.

3. Putting that to one side, the proposed revised scheme does not address or change the major concerns expressed in my original submission and the supplementary submission or the concerns of the community as represented by the 470 original submitters. It does not address the landscape and visual impact, either the unacceptable damage that will be caused to the vista from State Highway 45 to the National Park, or the significant interruption that it would cause to the owners of the properties in The Paddocks subdivision, of which I am one. I drive past the subject property almost daily and the view from State Highway 45 to the Park is peaceful and rural attractive and a welcome visual entry to the beauty of the Kaitake Ranges. As was the case with the potential for an additional 400 houses, 144 houses would cause identical damage. The damage is not materially lessened by the reduction in section numbers.

4. The assessment of the impact as far as landscape and visual is concerned has had repeated shortcomings during the entire Private Plan Change process and this is well covered and concluded by Mr Evans, the Council's Landscape & Visual Advisor, and by the further evidence of Boffa Miskell dated 22 November 2019. Nothing provided by Mr Bain answers my criticism of the effect on the view to the National Park. Nothing will provide the owners of The Paddock properties the rural outlook that they presently enjoy and were assured of as a result of the earlier Paddocks consent. 144 homes can't be, and I quote, "tucked away"!!!

5. The supplementary submission from the applicant does nothing to address the fact that this subdivision is not required for the managed and wise development of Oakura over the next 30 years. There has been ample evidence presented that shows that between infill yield and that from west FUD would provide the required 247 additional dwellings in the next 30 years. I repeat, the sections from this proposed subdivision are unnecessary, unwelcome and are not in the best interests of the welfare of Oakura in the future.

6. While the reduction in the number of sections has been used as the reason to do away with the traffic interchange at the intersection of Wairau Road and State Highway 45, the suggestion as made in paragraph 20 of Mr Skerrett's further evidence that a crossing point is provided on State Highway 45 immediately to the east of the intersection just defies common sense. I use the Wairau Road/State Highway 45 intersection on numerous occasions daily and it is difficult enough to exit upper Wairau Road particularly the commonly used right hand turn to head to the school, the village or further east. To propose a further obstruction to the flow of traffic from lower Wairau Road and upper Wairau Road is just not a realistic and workable suggestion.

7. The applicant's submissions and expert evidence have been notable by the shortcomings in a number of areas which are crucial. I have already mentioned the numerous shortcomings in the attempted assessment of the landscape and visual impact. In the Boffa Miskell report of 22nd November 2019 further reference is made to incomplete evidence including water supply, night time lighting effects, Tangata Whenua matters, the lack of a social impact assessment, and environmental impact. Token attention has been given by the applicant's experts to the stormwater issues and seem to arrive at the conclusion that hydraulic neutrality can be achieved. This is what was said in the earlier Paddocks Hearing and as a resident of The Paddocks I can tell you that the engineers were wrong then and I suspect are wrong now. We witness the problems in The Paddocks anytime there is rainfall above normal. The Council is directly involved in trying to remedy these stormwater matters but these efforts are considerably hampered by the applicant's apparent refusal to attend to matters that would assist with the problem.

The applicant has been given ample opportunity by the direction of this Hearing and in my view, has failed miserably to supply the information requested or information that would indicate that a subdivision on this land is required for any reason. As I have mentioned there is ample land available for the next 30 years, Oakura does not need its residential accommodation to be further split by State Highway 45, and for all the reasons well canvassed by the opponents to this Private Plan Change it should be declined. The granting of this plan change, and the rezoning adds nothing to the Oakura township. The community has proven, over the last 100 years, it is capable of planned, balanced and considered development and expansion. It is a township which has been able to manage its social infrastructure and doesn't require a new monitoring entity simply to accommodate the commercial aspirations of the applicant. Oakura has been well represented by the Kaitake Community Board with no better illustration than the role that KCB has played in this Hearing.

The original application should be declined and rezoning refused. The same should be done to the revised proposal and the land left in its present state as was strongly indicated at the earlier Paddocks Hearing.

GRAEME DUFF