



S293 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

FEEDBACK FORM



TO // QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL ATTENTION // PLANNING POLICY TEAM



SUBMITTER DETAILS – ADDRESS FOR SERVICE

Full name of submitter(s):

Organisation (if relevant):

Email:

Postal address:

Phone (inc. area code):

Mobile:

**FEEDBACK ON THE CLUTHA s293 MUST BE RECEIVED NO LATER THAN 5.00PM ON
TUESDAY 12 OCTOBER 2021**



PRIVACY ACT 1993

Please note that submissions are public information. Information on this form including your name and submission will be accessible to the media and public as part of the decision-making process. Council is required to make this information available under the Resource Management Act 1991. Your contact details will only be used for the purpose of this S293 process. The information will be held by the Queenstown Lakes District Council. You have the right to access the information and request its correction.



MY SUBMISSION

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:



MY SUBMISSION

My submission is:

Clearly state whether you SUPPORT or OPPOSE specific parts of the proposal.

Decision sought:

Reasons for my submission:

SIGNATURE OF SUBMITTER

Signature of submitter:

Date:

Person making the submission, or authorised to sign on behalf of an organisation making the submission.



Attachment 1 – Submission by Chris Stead

The property this submission relates to is located at 171 Church Road, Luggate (legally described as Section 6 SO 489559). The site measures 1.76 hectares and lies between Church Road to the south east and the Clutha River to the north west with the historic Red Bridge located approximately 140m to the north east.

The property contained a residential dwelling for approx. 70 years. Before it was subject to a compulsory crown purchase circa 2010, and the dwelling was demolished by Contact Energy in readiness for a Hydro Electric project (which did not go ahead). The bare land was sold back to the original owners minus the house, before recently being on sold to me.

I have 2 other neighbour (both to my west) and both on significantly smaller land holdings. All three properties have been established with dwellings for over 60 years.

After 3 years of planning, I am currently in the final stages of the design of the new house that will re occupy a small portion of this property. I have given this significant thought, with great consideration of the existing landscape values. My planning has considered the exact placement of the proposed dwelling, the retention of significant trees for both landscape integrity, amenity and screening. Consideration to such has been paramount, as to will be the choices of building materials and future planting that will significantly improve the property (which has stood in a state of disregard for many years after the purchase by the crown).

One further note, in re establishing the house, I am also embarking on a significant driveway upgrade that will improve access to both my property and that of my neighbours property, providing 1 crossing point (as opposed to the present 2 crossing points) and also providing significantly better sight lines thus resulting in a much safer solution than is currently in use. I have obtained written approval from Waka Kotahi for these changes within the last 2 months.

The reason I mention both the planning of a replacement house, and the upgrading of access, is that I am on the cusp of undertaking earthworks and future building works that will be massively affected by the proposed change in classification sought by you in Chapters 21 and 25.

The proposed alteration to the landscape classification from ONL to ONF creates overly restrictive rules for earth movements which will hinder this improvement as sanctioned by Waka Kotahi.

The implementation of my rebuild will have minimal negative effects on the natural environment. On the contrary it will serve to bolster biodiversity by the accompanying landscaping and protecting the ecological integrity of the remainder of the landscape, plus that of the adjoining Red Bridge historic reserve, the road side of state highway, as well as the marginal strip of the Mata Au corridor.

As the Council have completed their mapping exercise, it would be beneficial to take a closer look at specific areas and take into consideration relevant environmental limits that should be prescribed at different levels for different circumstances and locations. We would

generally like to think the mapping assessment would have a closer look on a case-by-case basis to apply such restrictive classifications.

In this case in particular, planning for a resource consent under the proposed changes will make a significant impact on restricting the earthworks; thus disabling the current and only available planning objectives on to the property.

I acknowledge the task in managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resource. What we are working towards achieving is not relevant as an 'inappropriate subdivision or development' but an improvement in maintaining and enhancing the property and the natural environment, in a way that supports the wellbeing of our children who attend the local school and support our local communities, as we share the Kaitiakitanga with our neighbours and their tamariki, for generations to come.

Chris Stead

chris@themepro.co.nz

021 572574