

22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Tena Koutou

My name is Gaye ROBERTSON and I reside in Sam John Place LH. I was brought up in various places in Otago. It matters not how long I have lived here, but I do have a strong sense of place where I live due to forbears activities here, and in Otago. I am a registered nurse, latterly 17 years in hospice palliative care education Wellington, and have been a conservationist since I was about 15 years old. I am also a grandmother. I also sit on the Board of the Otago Community Hospice based in Dunedin.

I seek the following decision:

I submit that the current rural residential zoning pertaining to Lake Hawea and Hawea Flat areas remain as is i.e. unchanged. For clarity I request that the word “GENERALLY” be deleted/removed from chapter 22 under the heading zone purpose for reasons I will outline.

My submission is:

I wish to retain the current Rural Residential zoning in Lake Hawea and Hawea Flat areas. I also request an amendment to chapter 22.1 ZONE PURPOSE which states that the rural residential zone “generally” provides for the development at a density of up to one residence every 4000m². This suggests that currently subdivision under 4000m² is not a prohibited activity. Removal of the word “generally” would avoid any ambiguity which would then mean that any subdivision under 4000m² is a prohibited activity in the Rural residential zone. Reasons for maintaining the status quo are: in keeping with some QLDC policies are as follows-

- Chapter 22 Rural Residential and Rural lifestyle Objective 22.2.1 specifically states “*Maintain and enhance the district’s landscape*”**

quality, character and visual amenity values while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from those landscapes”.

- Chapter 6 ‘Landscapes’ chapter 6.3.1 states “The district contains and values Outstanding natural features, Outstanding natural landscapes and rural landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development”.
- Policy 6.3.1.5 states “*Avoid urban subdivision and development in rural zones*”. I understand this to also refer to Buffer zones.
- I strongly support the report commissioned by the Hawea Community Association in July 2015 and prepared by Ian Greaves (Southern Planning Group Resource Management Consultants). This report recommends “*the area of developed existing Rural Residential zoning should not be rezoned*”. This specifically refers to the current Rural Residential zone containing Grandview Rd, Cemetery Rd, a connecting walking track and Sam John Place and Lichen Lane (which are both private roads). This is also a zone with underground cabling therefore no street lighting protecting the night sky.
- The 2003 Hawea Community Plan’s vision for 2010 states, in part, “*people live here because of the strong community, landscape values...development is largely contained within current zoning to ensure efficient service provision, and the retention of the surrounding rural character*”. (I have attended several community workshops, informal discussions with neighbours and at block parties and this report does reflect their views).
- I also support the HCA’s submission.
- Not all available land areas designated rural residential have been utilized for housing. In the absence of any convincing well designed research studies indicating that the Rural Residential Zone requires to be rezoned Residential, nor have there been studies done to demonstrate what harm increased/intensive development would have on the environment and ecosystems. Can the current infrastructure even handle increased subdivision? Therefore this vision is still relevant for the next 10 years.

The Lake Hawea Rural residential Zone acts as a very effective buffer Zone between township and rural zoning. The area sits amidst a vast wild alpine lake area adjacent to Mt Aspiring national park. Not only are there landscape values +++ but also ecological values eg significant diversity of plants and living creatures, wilderness, peacefulness, open spaces, and the opportunity to be sustainable, support native flora and fauna (birds, insects). Further reduction in size of rural residential lots would:

- Increase traffic volume and noise
- Noisy backyard activities
- Reduce air quality with increased use of wood burners
- Increased light pollution affecting the night sky – we already are required to have downlighting, no street lights
- Limit the ability of children to enjoy open space on their own property
- Limit the ability to have sustainable food gardens

Morals and ethics of amateur and professional developers-no mention of 2020 plans, zone changes in the future. Where are the eco developers? I feel colonized/colon-ised.

Small size of section damages ecosystems, adds to stormwater that runs into the lake. Increased urbanisation in the long run outs up property prices

Bird counts monthly-increase in native birds from our properties that have a high proportion of native plants and food for them.

Economic crisis puts stress on affordability – environment in perpetuity or people-who comes first???

BUT I like to be solution focused : A compromise/defuser for me would be the permissible allowance of small buildings eg granny flats/hire out cottages.

Thankyou for providing a place for me to speak.