

<b>I'm an:</b>	<b>Org name:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>What are your thoughts on the proposed Special Housing Area?</b>
Individual		Krystyna Glavinovic	I strongly agree with Lake Hawea Community Association chairman Paul Cunningham in saying that the Lake Hawea Community's policy is to keep development within the town boundary until it is full and only at that time should development outside of the town boundary be considered, especially at such a large scale. There should thus be no fast-tracking of this special housing area until such a time and then it can be formally consulted and discussed with the larger Hawea community and Queenstown Lakes residents as a whole.
Individual		Graham	This will create a slum type area with all cheap housing which could increase the crime rate as this becomes a cheap place to live
Organisation	Dunvegan Trust	Ray Macleod	Special Housing Areas are subject to special legislation to circumvent normal processes where there is a housing supply issue. Housing supply issues are largely driven by a shortage of appropriately zoned land. This proposal is seeking to subvert the special housing legislation to move its land into a residential zoning area on the basis there is either a housing shortage in Wanaka or a land shortage in Wanaka. There is no shortage of houses or sections at Lake Hawea and this proposal is simply manipulation of the system for commercial gain. Gain without the checks and balances that everyone else has to endure including those who have made available and continue to make sections available within the existing township. If there are housing shortages these are in Wanaka and Queenstown, there are multiple other locations that make more sense. When the Council's actions in rejecting special housing areas in the Wakatipu could be deemed spurious this particular undertaking is easily categorized as a mix of political and commercial opportunism. The underlying thought is "lets have a crack at Lake Hawea, they won't mind, and its too hard to get something going were it is really needed". There is no question this proposal displays callous disregard for the intended purpose of Special Housing Areas. It is not wanted Lake Hawea and should not see the light of day.
Individual		Jennifer Rumore	There is a clear community plan which marks Cemetery Road as the limit for Hawea residential development AND ample inventory remaining to infill within the area the residents HAVE approved for this kind of urbanisation impact. The SHA legislation offers a tool for local community planning and will be superseded by regional and national agendas. Over 500 people thus far have signed a declaration rejecting this SHA proposal and this has been pre-emptively presented at QLDC drop-in sessions. THE COMMUNITY HAS CLEARLY COMMUNICATED A REJECTION OF THIS SHA SUBMISSION AND WE EXPECT QLDC TO IMPLEMENT OUR REQUIREMENTS ACCORDINGLY. ANYTHING TO THE CONTRARY VIOLATES LEGOIMA, DEMOCRACY AND EXPOSES QLDC TO POTENTIAL NON-COMPLIANCE PENALISATION AND CORRECTION. Please make policy that does not call us once again into the streets and newspapers with picket signs.
Individual		David Phillipson	I do not give consent
Individual		Jocelyn	I think it should be denied consent as there are still unfinished subdivisions in Hawea that should have their development completed first. Any new subdivision should be considered as part of the Hawea 2020 plan, not just ad-hoc because a developer has come up with an idea. I also do not agree that this area will actually provide affordable homes or add any value to Hawea itself.

Individual	Wendy Foote	I absolutely reject the proposal. Land zoned rural cannot be permitted to be rezoned residential while there is rural residentially zoned land available in the area that could be rezoned to residential.
Individual	Sue Rutherford	<p>After reading a lot of information about what Mr Hocking is thinking of proposing; studying the Queenstown Lakes District Council's (QLDC) own policy on special housing areas; and attending the public meeting on this subject held in Lake Hawea on Saturday, April 14, I reject the proposed development. In October 2014 Queenstown Lakes District Council (Council) and Government entered into the Queenstown-Lakes District Housing Accord (Housing Accord). The Housing Accord is intended to increase housing supply and improve housing affordability in the district by facilitating development of quality housing that meets the needs of the growing local population. Here are my key points, in response to the QLDC's Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013 Implementation Policy (HASHAA) formulated in 2013 and updated in October, 2017. Under HASHAA the Council may at any time (prior to September, 2019) recommend to the Minister of Building and Housing that one or more areas within the district be established as special housing areas, subject to meeting objectives set by the council. Below are objectives 2,3, and 4 from the policy. Special housing areas are established in appropriate locations, where there is evidence of demand for residential housing. My response: Rural land is not appropriate for an intensive housing development, and there are enough sections available in Lake Hawea to satisfy current demand through until at least 2030. The establishment of special housing areas accords with the Council's overall strategic direction for urban development in the District. My response: SHAs are designed to increase housing supply and improve housing affordability for urban development. Nowhere in the policy is mention made of rezoning rural land to fit the criteria for an SHA. Adequate infrastructure exists or is likely to exist to service qualifying developments in special housing areas. My response: Currently there is no existing infrastructure which can service an SHA in the area that Mr Hocking is thinking of proposing. However at the public meeting, he stated that the council is in the process of developing such infrastructure (sewerage, water etc) to be able handle the requirements of an SHA. The development of special housing areas will achieve high quality urban design outcomes. My response: High quality urban design outcomes in a rural farming area? Development of housing in special housing areas occurs as quickly as practicable. My response: What's the rush - " there is already plenty of sections available in Lake Hawea until at least 2030 and Allan Dippie (developer of the largest development in the current township zoning, Timsfield,) stated that they are seeing a drop-off in demand for sections.</p>

The policy then gets more interesting as the QLDC sets out proposed locations for SHAs into 3 broad categories: Category 1 includes areas that are considered suitable for establishment as special housing areas. Category 2 includes areas that may be suitable for establishment as special housing areas, subject to further assessment against this policy. Category 3 includes areas that are not considered suitable for establishment as special housing areas. Category 1, 2, and 3 areas are listed in Attachment A. Okay - so what does Attachment A state? See below and you will notice that there is no mention of Lake Hawea, only Wanaka, in either Category 2 or Category 3. I left out Category 1 as this currently only applies to areas in the Queenstown urban growth boundaries. Category 2: May be suitable for the establishment of special housing areas: Wanaka The following zoned areas within the Wanaka Urban Growth Boundary of the Proposed District Plan: Low Density Residential Zone; Medium Density Residential Zone; High Density Residential Zone; Large Lot Residential; and Business Mixed Use Zone. Category 3: Not suitable for the establishment of Special Housing Areas To be completed following further consideration by Council. My response: The three categories are clearly defined in relation to urban growth boundaries and existing zones. I notice that there is no mention of rural zoning anywhere in these locations; or in the policy at all. In fact the policy states: This includes ensuring that urban development occurs in a logical manner: to promote a compact, well designed and integrated urban form; to manage the cost of Council infrastructure; and to protect the District's rural landscapes from sporadic and sprawling development. Summary: It seems crystal clear to me that the SHA legislation introduced by the previous National Government was to fast track the development of land and building of new houses to supposedly solve supply and affordability in urban areas. Mr Hocking is trying to use this legislation to develop an SHA on rural general land he has purchased in Lake Hawea. It appears that his motive to do this is simply to make money, with little or no thought about what this would do to the environment, ambience and general beauty of our area. He is trying hard to appear as though he is an active Lake Hawea community member. You can make your own decision on that score. When questioning the QLDC's senior policy planner, Anita Van Stone, at the public meeting about some of these points, she made the comment that the lead policy statement was a "living" document. Without being specific she was alluding to the fact that the QLDC could amend the contents of the policy at any stage, presumably without public consultation.

This didn't sound correct to me and after reading the document at length I find no reference to the fact that this policy is a "living" document. In my opinion the QLDC's HASHAA lead policy makes it clear that this legislation is not designed for rural zoned land, or to rezone land to fit this purpose. If Mr Hocking decides to proceed with a formal EOI, then the three elected council representatives for the Upper Clutha region must follow their own policy and immediately turn down the EOI, since it cannot possibly meet the objectives, proposed location categories, and strategic directions set by themselves. End of story. Saves a whole lot of time, effort, and angst. If the QLDC elected representatives are foolish enough to endorse an EOI from Mr Hocking and accept his proposal as a "qualifying development" then clearly they will have a big fight on their hands. And for what purpose? Tim, Carmen and others have already shared more and different information to that which I have highlighted here. You can see this information at: [keephaweabeautiful.nz](http://keephaweabeautiful.nz) In short, this type of development is not needed or desirable. The Hawea community is making this point very clearly and their views must be upheld to Keep Hawea Beautiful.

Individual

Johnny Curin

From shotover country, to lake hayes estate to albert town, north lake and three parks and onwards there is enormous land and housing reserves in the Wanaka and Queenstown areas. Hawea is one of the remaining strong communities in this area and does not deserve to be turned into another dormitory suburb for Queenstown Lakes out of control tourism and building industries. There is an established plan for development in Hawea, there is plenty of land availability within the defined area north of Cemetery road. Growth will come to the area unfortunately that much is unchanging but let the community guide that growth and listen to our voices rather than creating another middle class slum as has been rolled out across the rest of the district to the benefit of few local communities. Community feedback from the people of Hawea has been significantly against this and other similar projects, Lane Hocking does not care about this community or any other he is out to turn a profit not to build a community. It's time you started listening to your employer's, the communities that voted you into your plush jobs.

Individual

Anne Dewar

I reject the idea of SHA development at this site

Individual

Stephen John & Maureen  
Jean Collin's

Totally disagree with this proposal. We don't need this type of overdevelopment, in our small country communities. Applications of this sort should be open to all the community to have there say, not to fly under the radar with special government legislation. Special housing ha, it's still going to be out of the reach of many first home buyer's

Individual	Richard Taal	<p>I think this proposal is absolutely un called for and is only going to benefit one person The Developer! The draft plans says no building on south side of cemetery road, Stick to the rules! and enforce this, there are still hundreds of sections due to be developed on the current north side , Your town is already struggling to keep up with the influx of residence, Our lake is stretched in the summer with boat use and the ability to launch and retrieve is limited due to the geographical lay of the lake, Our basic amenities are struggling to cope,sewage,water,waste, Traffic to and from Wanaka is already causing delays at One lane bridge in Albertown [and traffic lights will only impact on this] and the round abouts. Come one Council learn from mistakes in fast growth from queenstown, stop a problem before it starts.Special Housing in my option is just an "Umbrella" to get his foot in the door.</p>	
Individual	Russell Liddell	<p>There are existing plans that allow for a large amount of continuing housing development within Hawea. I understand this was part of a plan developed over time. Why are we deviating from this. Hawea is already experiencing huge growth. Hawea has little infrastructure to cope with this growth. The single lane bridge at Albertown copes well with existing traffic. It will not cope with suggested additional housing let alone development that is currently happening.. It would make more sense to defer this new proposed development until a new bridge has been built and the sewerage infrastructure has been built or improved. It is a rort to be using the special housing area definition as a method of circumnavigating existing protocols and plans. I challenge anybody from council to drive around Hawea witness the current speed of development under existing approval and decide that adding a new area outside of the plan is a sound policy. Hawea is a unique environment that must be treated with care. Its attraction for tourists is a function of this. We must focus on preserving as much as possible this unique environment. This requires planning and focus on its development.</p>	
Individual	Self	Liana Poole	<p>I couldn't be more opposed to this. I spoke to Lane himself on his "open days" and both him and his associate had no idea what the population of Hawea was (didn't seem to care) and although they said it's all about getting the communitit'es feedback, when I said we as a community were going to get together to talk about it I was met with very blank faces. We already have enough residential development in Hawea to last until 2033 was the last figure I heard and without an up to date community focussed Hawea 2020 plan there is no way this guy should be able to cash in on Hawea on land he sees as without value. IT'S AN ABSOLUTELY NOT FROM ME.</p>

Individual

Nick Dunckley

I believe it should be rejected. Uncontrolled Urban sprawl is not the answer. This is Rural land. A knee jerk reaction to develop this land merely because it is available is not following the best practices of Town planning. Out of sequence, unserviced and unplanned the extension of services and subsequent demand for resources would create costs and social implications that would be met in part by existing ratepayers. Lake Hawea Township is a small community not a sprawling ever expanding suburb. There is existing green field land within the township that is being developed. More greenfield land is still available. Further land would be available if a change of rules to allow for infill development such as "Comprehensive Residential Developments" were made to make better use of the existing Township area. Development of this kind would allow a better integrated more compact community at a slower rate. Requiring Affected party consultation would allow input from the community. The local school has undergone rapid expansion already, another suburb would place further stress on this resource. The commute to Wanaka is becoming more congested. The State Highway has few passing opportunities and the single lane bridge at Albert Town create bottle necks which are not easily addressed.

Individual

Andy Simmers

I am opposed to the proposal by Universal Developments. I do not believe it meets the requirements to be put through under the SHA - while affordability is obviously an issue in the area, and will continue to be whether this development goes ahead or not - the main issue the SHA was attempting to address was supply, and at present there is not a supply issue within Hawea. The plan shown on the proposal shows Timsfield as it will be once completed, however with only a third of these sections built on - there is still a large future supply of sections that is likely to take 10 years or more to complete. The latest release of Timsfield approx 6 months ago still has almost half still for sale, suggesting there is more than enough to meet current demand? There is also still other pockets of land within the current town boundaries such as recently sold on the corner of Cemetery & Muir Roads which will be developed which will add to the supply. Also a large proportion of currently sold stock in Timsfield & Sentinal Park is likely to be speculative, so will come back on the market as land or house/land further adding to the supply. All the rhetoric around "affordable housing" of around \$550k sounds good in principal ( although is \$550k truly affordable for a first home buyer? ), there is a local case in point of Bridesdale Farm which was also put through under the SHA, but has clearly failed to live up to its affordable housing sell to the QLDC, with sections originally sold at \$180k to \$260k - being on sold prior to titles being issued for over \$300k, and a basic house and land package there now being \$775k? The revised proposal to 400 sections from the original 1000 is also slightly deceptive - obviously the long term plan by Universal allows for up to 2000 sections - and it would be good to get some honesty from the developer around that by showing the full master plan. At the end of the day, Universal are not attempting this development to become community spirited white knights of housing affordability - if the full plan comes to fruition their bottom line has a lot of zeros on it, while ignoring the wishes of surely the most important people in this process - those that have actually already chosen to call Lake Hawea home.

Individual	Daniel Debono	"The land is not visually sensitive, ecologically sensitive or productive" and with that statement Lane Hocking has declared war. We need to change the way we approach our housing development projects in NZ and it starts with not allowing people who don't care or respect our environment and are only in it for a quick buck to develop in the first place.
Individual	Lisa Simmers	I am opposed to the development by Universal Developments via the Special Housing Accord submitted to Council. My understanding is that the Special Housing Accord is to boost housing supply and improve affordability to meet the growing population however, Hawea currently does not have a short supply of sections. Within the current town boundary there are three current subdivisions (Timsfield, Sentinal Park and Moraine Rise) and another subdivision planned on land recently sold on Muir Road. Timsfield currently has approx. a third of sections titled therefore a large number of sections will be released over the coming years. Sentinal Park and Moraine Rise will also have sections on sold from those initially brought which has been occurring with previous subdivision within district. House packages at \$550,000 are unfortunately not affordable to first time buyers. It is my understanding that an agreement had been made by Council that no further development would happen until supply of sections in the current town boundary had been exhausted prior to looking at development outside of this boundary. Universal Developments has revised their initial proposed of 1000 sections (and rumoured to be up to 2000 sections long term) to just 400. This feels very misleading and deceptive and a reaction to try and pacify the community. The person who gains from this development is not the community or first home buyers but the developer who, if given the go ahead will profit over the next 10 years up \$200 million and in the process ruin the feel of a close net community. I do not feel that the developer has the best interests of the community or the Queenstown Lakes District in mind. Some of the supporter letters are clearly from people who are only serving their interests.
Individual	Lindsey Schofield	I strongly disagree with this proposal and specifically its location as the area south of Cemetery Road has never been designated for development. The proposal outlines the positive comments it has received from the community at the drop in sessions but makes no reference to the hundreds of Hawea locals who are opposed to this development. I have not spoken to one person who think this is a good idea! There is no place for this type of development in Hawea
Individual	PJ Forsyth	I don't think a SHA should be allowed at this location. I am not opposed to SHAs per se. But the Lake Hawea community has been clear for many years that it wants Cemetery Rd to be the boundary of the township. Until the land north of Cemetery Rd is completely built on, there should be no relaxation of this boundary. I'm opposed to a developer driving the extent of the township - it should be a decision for the residents.

Individual	F Davison	This is outrageous that this is a non notified development. It is a blatant abuse of democratic process. If it is such a good idea let it follow due process. Who pays for the infrastructure in particular the proposed sewer pumping all the way to the airport site including the river crossing ongoing pumping costs ? Traffic ? The people who live in this community don't want it. The affordable housing aspect is a joke and does not stand serious scrutiny. Shame on you QLDC developers puppet. Ruined Queenstown , Wanaka well on the way , Lake Hawea next. Your website information looks essentially a Lane Hocking effort who are you working for? Certainly not the Lake Hawea community.
Individual	Charles Higham	I am highly distressed by this proposal. Hawea is our haven, our surviving iconic Central Otago village, following the transformation of Queenstown and the Wanaka/Albert town conurbation. I have long dreaded the arrival of the greedy get quick rich developer brigade and now one of them has arrived resolved to turn a quick buck, and enrich himself at the expense of our community. There can be no other motive. The last thing Lake Hawea needs is to become the cheap dormitory appendix to Wanaka/Albert Town. We in Hawea love our close proximity to the rural heartland of Central. Using the Special Housing route is simply a devious way of turning our community on its head. I trust most sincerely that the powers that be will take heed of the almost universal sense of dread and sadness that now pervades our special place. This is diametrically opposite to the District Plan. There is no shortage of sections already in Tlmsfield.
Individual	Robert Irwin	I disagree with this proposal. It will impact upon local environmental issues such as garbage collection, water and sewage. The area cannot sustain any more septic tanks and pumping to Project Pure is a cost that we as existing rate payers will have to cover at no benefit to us. I say no to this proposal.
Individual	Leon Joyce	I support the proposed Hawea SHA. I am builder in Wanaka who would like to get into the housing market, however at current market rates this is impossible. The proposed SHA with fixed prices at a genuine affordable level is a fantastic idea and would give me the opportunity to own a house in this District. Please think about the first home buyers and grant this SHA.
Individual		Hawea doesn't need it or want it. There are areas within the Cemetery Rd boundary for development already. There is no shortage here, sections are available as are properties.
Individual	Axel Macdougall	I think that it should not happen because Hawea is good the way it is without being too busy and easy quiet life. The sections will be too small and we don't need any more shops.
Individual	Ameila Sramek	People are using that space for other more appropriate reasons, ie: farming and food production. Food production should take priority over housing in rural general land. We need food provision locally at these times as trucking food into supermarkets is unsustainable and growing food locally on local rural general land is sustainable. We should not be destroying good farmland to create SHAs, which are not required. I do not consent to the proposed special housing area.



Individual

Kevin Capell

Lake Hawea does not need a Special Housing Area. There is an abundance of sections on the market in the Timsfield and other subdivisions that are being developed in the comprehensive residential housing area defined by the 2020 forum held in Lake Hawea several years ago. This proposed "so called special housing area" is outside the comprehensive residential area of Lake Hawea. Also, Lake Hawea also does not have the infrastructure to handle several hundred more houses built in this area, it is too much too soon.

Individual

Emma Kenny

I had a heavy heart reading about the proposed "Universal Development" in Lake Hawea. There is already an excess of sections and houses available to purchase within the Timsfield and Sentinel Park developments and the need to Fast track this proposed development is unnecessary when there is already availability. These areas currently being developed will provide enough room for growth to accommodate the need within Hawea for the foreseeable future as per the 2015 district plan. Timsfield in particular already offer affordable living options which fall under the \$550k first home buyers subsidy if built to the size house that Lane Hocking is proposing. In an area that can afford space, I do not understand the need for such small house and land packages, it has me wondering whether the only people to benefit will be the developers. The lack of affordable housing within the Wanaka district needs to be built upon within Wanaka, such as the Bright Sky EOI - which I 100% support to help with the growth of Wanaka. People are wanting to live in Wanaka or Queenstown and although Hawea does service these areas, the proposed development is not going to reduce the need for housing in Wanaka or Queenstown. I struggle to comprehend the pricing of houses in the proposed development also, as I cannot understand how Bright Sky can produce the same pricing but in such close proximity to Wanaka, when we all know there is significant difference in pricing between Wanaka and Lake Hawea. I also feel that we need to protect the rural land and eco system from rapid development, this proposed "fast track" development would impact this at an unnecessary time due to the already available houses and land. As a local I DO NOT support this proposed development.

Individual

Willoughby Kenny

My wife and I had a heavy heart reading about the proposed "Universal Development" in Lake Hawea. There is already an excess of sections and houses available to purchase within the Timsfield and Sentinel Park developments and the need to Fast track this proposed development is unnecessary when there is already availability. These areas currently being developed will provide enough room for growth to accomodate the need within Hawea for the foreseeable future. In an area that can afford space, I do not understand the need for such small house and land packages, will this only benefit the developers?! The lack of affordable housing within the Wanaka district needs to be built upon within Wanaka, such as the Bright Sky EOI - which will help support the growth of Wanaka. People are wanting to live in Wanaka or Queenstown and although Hawea does service these areas, the proposed development is not going to reduce the need for housing in Wanaka or Queenstown. I struggle to comprehend the pricing of houses in the proposed development also, as I cannot understand how Bright Sky can produce the same pricing but in such close proximity to Wanaka, when we all know there is significant difference in pricing between Wanaka and Lake Hawea. I also feel that we need to protect the rural land and eco system from rapid development, this proposed "fast track" development would impact this at an unnecessary time due to the already available houses and land. I DO NOT support this proposed fast track development and believe it should be reconsidered in the future.

Individual

Amelia Crofut-  
Brittingham

Good day, I am writing to express that I do not support the Universal Developments proposed Special Housing Area in Hawea. I believe that the addition of 400 sections to our town will be detrimental to the character and resources of the community. With the recent and significant development in Sentinel Park and Timsfield already in progress, I feel that the council has a responsibility to slow down and take time to understand and analyse the impact that this growth has before moving forward with another massive increase. Building homes on all the new residential sections developed in Hawea over the last two years will take time. As families move into these and the community comes together, we will be able to better understand what it means to grow the population of our community by such significant margins so quickly. It would be irresponsible to jump into developing a further 400 sections based on the understanding of current supply and demand when in fact the supply is about to change markedly. Where will these children go to school? Where will families grocery shop? How long will it be appropriate to access town by a one way bridge? Growth is positive, but development and growth are not the same. I believe that this proposal is far more motivated by greed and ambition than by interest in helping the community. Developers stand to make enormous amounts of money by pushing something like this through. Universal Developments is using the SHA legislation to rush a project which otherwise would never be considered. It is the responsibility of the council to ensure that the planning for our community and our landscape is thoughtfully applied, and I believe this would be a huge mistake for both the Hawea Community and the greater Wanaka area. I oppose this development. I urge our council to stand up to Companies looking to explode the populations of our towns to make a profit. We must slow down and understand what impact the changes already approved will have before rushing ahead with more.

Individual	Brent and Erica Allen	We do not support this as we believe Hawea township needs to stay withing Haweas boundaries as currently exist. We also believe that currently there is enough stock of sections available within this area. Hawea does not have the infrastructure to support an even greater numbers of residents.
Individual	simon barber	My wife and i were lucky enough to get into the housing market in wanaka a few years back for under \$450k. Without special housing areas like this we run the risk of losing skilled workers to cheaper and more affordable areas in the not to distant future. It is very hard now for first home buyers to get into this competitive market. If the developer can do a subdivision where there will be house and land packages for under \$550k and even give some sections to the housing trust i think its a step in the right direction. Also living in hawea some sort of shop to save driving all the way into wanaka wouldn't go astray. As for those people opposing the subdivision. How many of them own their own homes i wonder. It's easy to criticise a development when you're already set up and not going through the hard yards of trying to buy your first home.
Individual	Nicky Hewson	Im very much against the proposed SHA. Timsfield is not at completion stage and still has plenty of sections available. There is not the infrastructure in Hawea to cope with a population explosion. People should not be encouraged to buy "cheap sections / Houses " then realise they cannot afford the cost of living here.
Individual	Steve Swift	There is still sections available and land to develop on the northern side of Cemetery Rd. It was agreed that this land would be developed before the town increased it's footprint. The current infrastructure cannot sustain further development. i am aware that developers contribute to infrastructure but is never enough to sustain the growth. The Albert Town bridge is a 1 lane bridge that is getting large queues of worker traffic using it without even considering the summer holiday traffic increase along with this proposed development. there is no way on Gods Earth that Mr Hocking is going to be offering a section to potential buyers that he does not make a considerable profit from. If he was, why is he a developer?

Individual

Peter Southwick

I support the proposed Special Housing Area (SHA) for the following reasons; 1. The proposed land is a natural extension of the existing residential development in Hawea, being directly opposite existing new residential development. 2. I am a passionate supporter of affordable housing and believe that this project will provide some genuine competition for the existing developers in this area. The proposed section and house prices are well below those being offered by the existing developers in Hawea. 3. The 10% contribution of developed sites, mandated to be given to the Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust, will enable the Trust to make considerable strides towards its goal of providing 1,000 houses over the next 10 years in the region. This gift of land will make a significant impact on affordable housing in the Wanaka / Hawea district and will allow the Trust to provide 40 affordable homes and rental homes on concessional rates. 4. Hawea is close enough to Wanaka to allow residents to commute. The proposed housing and land prices are well below anything that will ever be offered in Wanaka in the future. The township provides a good location for young families. 5. Our region is growing and there is no reason Hawea should be immune from growth. 6. Hawea needs some further land for mixed use/commercial development and the subject land is large enough to accommodate some additional community facilities like a school, church site, additional shops. 7. The SHA scheme is specifically designed to defeat the inevitable community opposition to any new development. It is entirely appropriate to apply the scheme to this land which is no different in current zoning to a host of other SHAs approved in the region. 8. The subject land is perfect for development, being low quality agricultural land. It has good views, excellent sunlight and is close to existing infrastructure.

Individual

Dave Spedding

I strongly oppose the special housing area for several reasons - the development itself is out of character with the rural nature of Hawea township and there should be no development south of Cemetery Road. There is no immediate need for any further development in the area. And finally and most importantly the proposal gives no mention of the fact that the vast majority of the community are opposed to this. He says that during the community consultation several people showed interest in the development and could see its benefits - that is frankly rubbish. A recent survey from a local group showed that 92% of the Hawea population are opposed to it. Yes 92% so if that doesn't show what the community thinks then I don't know what will. Please do not support this flawed but very professionally manipulated proposal.

Individual		Tim & Megan Allan	Not convinced a SHA in Lake Hawea is the right way to address housing pressure in Wanaka. There is plenty of land around Wanaka that could more directly address Wanaka's housing pressures with much better access and connectivity to Wanaka and its amenities. Quality of development Nevertheless, a properly masterplanned development would result in a better outcome than would be achieved under a traditional development approach. The problem here is there no evidence of any master planned urban environment being created. We have been presented with a thoughtless military grid placed in a rural settling. As this SHA is not space constrained the minimum lot size should be generous i.e. greater than 500m2 as proposed by Lane Hocking during the initial consultation. The documentation is not clear on what the Community Hub is. Is it a 'clubhouse' or shops? Transport issues to address Limit vehicle connections to Cemetery Rd to Capell Ave, Sentinel Drive and Grandview Rd. Cemetery Road is a town bypass for traffic heading to the West Coast from Cromwell of Tarrus. Capell Ave would need to be formed and a safe path and crossing for the school route. Built form The 'House Designs' are inconsistent with the proposed design guidelines. Also there is no way to tell if the Affordable Homes are decent homes (i.e. fit for purpose) from the pictures supplied. The design requirements should also require an active living space to address the street as well as house forward of garage.
Organisation	Homes By Maxim	Peter Barrow	Homes by Maxim supports in principle any development that would create more affordable housing in the Upper Clutha area. Our business relies on a stable workforce who can afford to live and work in the area and make it their home. With the high cost of rentals and unaffordable house prices, this ambition is out of reach for many families. As a consequence we have a high turnover of contractors and staff, and in turn makes it difficult to attract people to the area.
Individual		Tim Pell	Does the Upper Clutha really need more housing developments?? No What it really needs is to keep its precious space that once made it a place I wanted to live in....but now it just becoming one large housing development like so many in my home country(UK). Featureless and boring with nothing to distinguish one town from another. I have been in this area for 14 years but if I was coming here now to visit and consider living here I would just turn around and go elsewhere. The whole character of the area has been destroyed by a greedy few and it should stop NOW
Individual		J L Donaldson	I feel Lake Hawea has enough empty sections available now and by the time they are all built on the inferstructure will strugel to cope let alone add more, also i would think Haweas current boundries as they are now are sufficent
Individual		Barbara Chinn	I suspect that Lane Hocking is trying to circumvent the RMA by proposing a Special Housing Area. Such properties can be onsold after 3 years, I understand, at current market prices, and I suspect this will happen. Besides,there are several developments taking place on the north side of Cemetery Road, and they should fill the need for housing sections for some years to come. There has been no consultation of the Lake Hawea community about the proposal, and the community association called a public meeting to discuss the proposal; almost everyone at the meeting disagreed with the need for yet another development, and this one in a place where the community agreed (at the 2020 meeting in 2002) that there should be no development.

Individual		Helen Clarke	I am opposed to this proposal. The Community have consistently asked that Cemetery Rd is to be the Southern boundary for urban development. There is significant land still available for housing within this boundary.
Individual		Genny Parker	I am totally opposed to Universal Developments SHA proposal for Cemetery Rd. Until such time that ALL available land for housing WITHIN the current town boundary has been developed then NO further expansion into rural land should be approved. The developer of Timsfield at the recent HCA open meeting 21st April outlined his challenges to successfully market all sections he was offering, therefore I don't agree with Universal that there are "issues" of housing supply in Hawea. I dispute strongly that this parcel of land is "unproductive". Hawea Flats has historically been highly productive and you only have to view the summer fields of grain to understand this. How much pressure would this proposed urban sprawl put on our already under threat water tables. As although the proposal has been scaled down from 1000 to 400, I have no doubt that the projected balance of 600 would just be a matter of time. I am not opposed to development and am actually a supporter of making the best use of land for sensible housing development. But what Universal Developments are proposing would totally destroy the Hawea community as we know it. Thank you for the opportunity to express my view and I urge the Council to respect the Hawea community and turn down Universal Developments proposal.
Individual		Fran Partridge	I am against the proposed special housing area. I think that council needs to hear what this community wants and take notice. I strongly feel that council is at risk of losing the confidence and trust of the community, at a time when we need to be cohesive to withstand the onslaught of tourism, and rapid development.
Individual		Jason Kelly	As someone who is currently living in Queenstown with a partner in Wanaka we have been keeping an eye out for something that we can buy that fits under the kiwi build criteria.. how long will we wait? Forever it seems. This housing scheme shows light at the end of the tunnel for two people who enjoy their careers but which dont afford them the luxury to save enough for a huge deposit on a house that is overpriced by tens of thousands of dollars.
Individual		Claudia Gibson	While there is a lot of land available within the town boundaries, there is no need to spread out into rural areas. I don't want to stop people from moving here to become a part of our lovely community, but it would be sad to see investors take the money and families still can't afford to live here. Why not encourage Allan Dippie to allocate sections for families and first home buyers?
Individual	n/a	I M Turnbull	In common with many in the Lake Hawea community, I would prefer to see all the available sections occupied inside the boundaries set by the Community in previous planning exercises, before even contemplating this exercise. I note that the SHA is described as "unproductive" land - alongside identical land described as "productive". That's called "spin". No matter how well dressed, this SHA is called "urban sprawl". There is an implied assumption that housing demand is never-ending. Such a mindset ignores the realities of the physical world. Peak oil, climate change - these factors will impinge on "growth at any cost" over the next decades, and may make granting this SHA yet another planning error in the Upper Clutha district.

Individual		Marlene Laureys	There is no need for it at this stage. There are still sections available in Hawea, no shortage of housing nor land. If more development is needed in the future it should go through the normal consent process, by public consultation. Furthermore there is absolutely no infra structure in place, nor do we necessarily want more.
Individual		Irwin Handley	Any development that allows Local young people or families to get a foot into the housing market in the Lakes area is a good thing. Is there a way of making sure these houses don't just go to developers and that first time or Local buyers have the first opportunity to purchase?
Individual		Mark George	I'm in favour of the development as it lowers the entry level for first home buyers in the region who have been forced to seek affordable accommodation outside of the district
Individual		Phil Gilchrist	I am in full support of the Special Housing Area proposed development which I see will help people who want to stay in this region enter the marketplace and secure their own home. I hear especially the younger ones being frustrated by being shut out of the market as a first home buyer due to the cost of housing and them considering moving to an area with housing they can afford. I also hear people who would like to move their family to this region, however the cost of entry level housing is above their budget. The more we can do to try and accommodate the younger ones who are our future and are a big portion of the labour force building our town to remain here the better. I see this development as being very positive for our future by offering True Affordable Housing.
Individual	TechDirect	Jason Barnett	I am against this proposal. Firstly because Hawea is not part of the SHA and was never even thought of as part of it at any time as far as I know. This is a land grab and a profit driven initiative that does not solve the affordable housing problem. Of the 10% so called affordable houses they will still be too expensive. The land is not zoned for residential. We as residents dont want this. No one ive spoken to wants this. Is the QLDC the public servant of the citizens of Hawea or are you working for corporate interests? What are the conflicts of interest and relationship of Jim Boulton to Lane Hawking? This whole thing stinks quite frankly. Also Ive heard that the UN feels that the SHA policy is illegal and contravenes basic human rights and is racist. So in a nutshell.. no I dont support this proposal in the slightest. Thank you for your time. I think its also fair to say that we as a group of residents in the hawea region (that i dont speak for) will not take this lying down. And we will not take a yes decision as acceptable. The policy is illegal and poorly executed. Its ending this year and Lane is trying his best to get this through before then. Not impressed.
Individual		Jess Clark	I dont think the 'town planning' is appropriate or fitting for the area. Currently it shows all straight through roads The planner was talking about avoiding dead end roads, but these do have benefits, depending on how the area is going to be used.
Individual		Renee Walden	I wish to oppose the proposed Special Housing Area. I would like the council to obide by the Hawea 2020 plan where the town limit is confined by Muir and Cememtry Roads with no development spreading into rural land until infill is complete. I would like the council to provide time, support and money to the Hawea community to develop a new plan in the next 2 years to determine the vision of our town for the 20 years following 2020. Until this new plan is developed, the current 2020 plan should be upheld.

Individual		David Walden	I oppose the development. I believe it is unethical and unlawful. I feel the QLDC is not looking after the best interests of my town. I am strongly disappointed in the QLDC for even allowing the proposal to have gone this far.
	Golden Egg	Lauren Gibson	
Individual		Sally Irwin	Locals overwhelmed by present development, without facilities. Too soon to even consider changes of zoning when so much development is already unfinished and overwhelming for a tiny community. Locals have to wear the huge changes to community - already noticing far more dog shit, look at the shambles at the waste station - usually bad at Xmas but all the extra junk now from people without much community spirit. Needs time to gradually develop.
Individual		Barbara Chinn	At the 2020 planning meeting held by the community it was agreed that there be no development south of Cemetery Road, which should remain as the southern boundary of the township. A green belt was agreed, between Hawea Flat and the township of Lake Hawea. There are several developments taking place at present, on the northern side of Cemetery Road, and not all of these sections have yet been sold, so I consider that there is plenty of potential housing capacity yet unfilled. I do not wish to see the township growing any bigger than these developments will allow for, as the increase in the need for services, and the increase in noise and movement around the township will be difficult to endure, as it stands, without the extra provided by the planned SHA south of Cemetery Road. I feel that the developer of the SHA is using the legislation in order to circumvent complying with the RMA, and his motive is profit, rather than the provision of affordable housing. Anyway, I understand that potential housing can be unsold within four years at current market prices. I do not wish the planned development to go ahead.
Organisation	First National Real Estate Wanaka	Kelly Gooch	I have lived in Wanaka for 17 years and worked in the real estate for 10 years so I have seen the expansive growth and demand on are region over this time. We absolutely need more affordable housing due to a number of clients that just cant buy at an entry level range due to being young families or first home buyers. With an ever increasing population jump year on year this has lead to a shortage of just normal homes required to meet the demand for ordinary New Zealanders needing housing for living. Future Sub-divisions are really important to support future pressures that we know will naturally come in time. I would like to see a when a property has been vetted to be sold to the qualified affordable housing buyer that when the houses on sell to the next affordable home owner that there are capital percentage gains ie; say you can only on sell that property say at a yearly capped rate of no more than 4% per annum or inflationary rate. My concern is that the first seller then becomes a capitalist leaving nothing in it for the next affordable buyer. So create a "On Selling" Caveat in this zone even if other neighbouring suburbs continue to sky rocket ahead. We are not like a city where we have city type jobs like major manufacturing or distribution businesses. Our local jobs are limited unless people have online jobs that can be based anywhere. I'm sure sensibility will prevail what's best for the community and environment.



Individual	Infinity First National Wanaka Ltd	Lynette Winsloe	I am in favour of the subdivision. First Home buyers are struggling to find affordable property to live in and this SHA will help alleviate this problem. We need to consider the people who have been priced out of Wanaka, who want to live in this area. This includes young families who are looking to purchase their first home, essential workers for our local businesses, families from out of town who might come from a town where lower house prices are the norm, and older people who could be looking for a lifestyle change. All of these people (and more) deserve to have the opportunity to settle in the Upper Clutha area and these affordable sections will cater for them.
Individual		Sean Cusworth	This development is a great step forward for the township of Lake Hawea and the surrounding area. As I lived in the local area from 2006 through to 2010 I found that during the peak times that the shopping, facilities and support infrastructure was stretched to the max. Now with my family owning property in Lake Hawea it would be great to see this development go ahead. It seems that this developer is open and is working or has put thought to consider other developments going in and around this one. I agree totally with this development and so should the whole community (Renters, Landlords, Ratepayers and Holiday Makers).
Individual		John Fisher	Totally supportive
Individual		Victoria Fisher	I am for the proposal
Individual		Sebastian Dossett	My main concern in regards to the special housing area is how additional people living in the Hawea area will affect water quality and usage. My understanding is that water is currently paid annually regardless of usage and I feel this incentivises using water all through the heat of summer to keep lawns green. I see my neighbours using water all day over summer in this fashion and feel that this is a non-sustainable use of our local resources if even more people use it in this fashion. A change to more sustainable water usage rules is something that I would like considered if a change in zoning is required.
Individual		Mike Horne	I have spent a lot of time in Hawea growing up and we still have land in the area. Hawea, and the wider Wanaka area, has really battled for affordable housing and the type of opportunities I had growing up are no longer accessible for most. The proposed development focusing on addressing the affordability issue, but doing so in a way that can enhance community infrastructure and remove the absolute speculation drivers is a huge step and one I would like to see being embraced.
Individual		Darlene and Chris Thomson	We oppose the development. We believe that Hawea is special because of its smallness (intimacy) and we do not want to grow like Wanaka. There are still lots of available sections in Hawea so we don't need to rush these through. There is not the infrastructure to cater for so many more homes. We already have water issues with the number of people here now and the school is not set up to cater for more children that would come with special housing. We don't have enough roads in and out of Hawea for the extra traffic nor do we want this extra traffic for as it is now the roads are relatively safe for pedestrians and cyclists. (which we have many of) People moved here for the rural lifestyle and not for the rural areas to be urbanised. Can we not learn from the overgrowth of both Wanaka and Queenstown and leave some rural areas small and rural where neighbours generally know and care for each other? We urge you to oppose this development.

Individual

The special housing area is a good idea so long as the sections given to the council for cheap housing is kept cheap by the council keeping ownership of the land and the owners own only the dwelling they build. They then pay a modest lease and this way when they sell they only sell the house and not land. Hence the price is a lot cheaper. Land sold in these areas should have to be built on before selling and they can't sell within a minimum time otherwise they face harsh penalties unless extreme circumstances.

Individual	Mrs	Frances Copland	I so support this development as I have Family that this sort of development would assist in getting their own home. The whole area is unaffordable for a lot of young families who work in the area and this would give a boost. The Government and Local Government is also encouraging this type of development due to the problems in society of home ownership . I do hope this project is approved as it may encourage other developers in all of our area not only Hawea to do the same. We always have a problem with NIMBYS(Not in my backyard) in Wanaka and surrounding areas. Our space should be for everyone not just the elite. Remember it is the young Families who work and contribute to this area that need a help up. I TOTALLY SUPPORT THIS DEVELOPMENT,not only for now but for the future of a balanced society
Individual		Emma Collins	I think this is a wonderful idea, given most young family's that live in the area can not afford to buy a house let alone pay the high cost of renting a house. This would bring many more families into the community and not just the rich but every day people wanting to live and work in a beautiful part of the country.
Organisation	Otago Homes Limited	Andy Lawrence	Besides the obvious for a building company, there is a real need for affordable housing in the area. We get people coming into our office all the time with an affordability issue, saving for years and yet still cannot afford their own home. I believe Universal Developments are offering the community a very real opportunity whereby people will actually be able to own their own home and for the Hawea community, it will create real infrastructure, greenfield parks and community hubs.

Individual

WA & TM Sandston

We oppose the SHA: - it is not required given the amount of subdivision that has occurred recently. The region has a history of overdevelopment when prices surge and then vacant lots sit for years after the cyclical market subsides. Timsfield itself was an example of that, and there are many stages of that development still to be developed and sold, as well as plenty of other land to the northern side of Cemetary Road. This development appears to have a element of opportunistic use of cheaper land when properly situated and zoned land is available. -it is bad urban and social planning to concentrate low cost housing in one development. It should be "pepper potted" through out higher cost housing to prevent stigmatation of residents and undesirable social outcomes. Think of the early state housing areas which are now effectively ghettos. This is 1950's thinking. - development to the south of Cemetary Road will irresversibly change the rural/remote mountain village feel of the township. This may happen eventually but other available land to the north of the road should be developed first. Development to the south should be planned properly and coherently, as part of a larger master planned development with attractive curved roads, landscaping strips, berms and reserves, and varaition of building typologies. A rectangular development with a grid of roads is completely unimanginative and the antithesis of good urban design especially in such a lovely environment. Approval would be a low point in QLDC's planning history and would squander the opportunity to make the expansion of the Hawea township the high quality development it deserves. Affordable does not have to be ugly and boring. - if you give this some thought you must conclude that you are being asked to allow the direction of the development of Lake Hawea township to be towards a low cost, low quality, haphazardly planned dormitory town for workers in Wanaka. How could an attractive expansion be planned around this development? This would be such a waste of the potential of this beautiful area and completely unnecessary. There are many other ways to ensure affordable houses are provided, but they all involve comprehensive planning and thought, none of which is demonstrated by this proposal. Surely we have moved on from this type of developer driven, selfish, short term thinking? You have a responsibilty to the wider community to ensure the expansion of Lake Hawea town ship is coherently and appropriately planned and conducted.

Individual

Craig Myles

I write in support of the granting of the SHA applied for by Universal Development. As a father of 3 millennial children, a self employed businessman in the real estate sector and member of the Wanaka community I see the sustainability of our community as being dependant upon the deliverability of affordable housing. With an average house price in Wanaka of \$1.142m and 29% ofthe population being in their 20's or 30's (according to Q.V. stats), and 42% of the population earning between \$30-70,000 per annum gross income, it is not difficult to see that it is unrealistic for housing affordability to be created in Wanaka itself on any real scale. Taking unproductive rural land and bringing it into the SHA regime to achieve housing affordability should be supported by the QLDC in the interests of the wider community it represents. Should the QLDC chose not to support the SHA in this location, I believe it will have a detrimental outcome on the Wanaka/Hawea community in the absence of any other significant sources of affordable housing in that it will undermine the ability to recruit and retain young people into the area to fulfill the many roles a growing and vibrant small local and resort town communities require.

Individual

Rachel Brown

The current QLDC SHA Lead Policy does not identify any land in the Upper Clutha outside the Wanaka urban growth boundary as suitable for SHAs. As a critical first step, as part of their EOI, Universal Development requests "that the Lead Policy is adjusted to provide for their development site within Council's categorisation of land as a Category 2 area." The Lead Policy itself states: "Category 2 includes areas that may be suitable for establishment as special housing areas, subject to further assessment against this policy. This category can only be updated following resolution by full Council, which includes the addition and removal of areas from this category. The Council will not accept proposals or EOIs from landowners or developers to include areas on this schedule. Category 2 areas are listed in Attachment A." I do not support removing the clause "the council will not accept proposals or EOIs from landowners or developers to include areas on this schedule" On this basis alone I do not believe that council can accept the proposal from Universal Developments for a proposed Hawea SHA.

Gayle Guest

I am against the proposed development because Lake Hawea has already sustained so much development in recent years, the current developments of Tim's Field and Sentinel Park area are unfinished and will provide for many more households and the proposal goes outside the intended township zone of Cemetery Road. While the present proposal scales back from 1000 houses to 400 the future intentions of the developer to increase the number of houses is clear as the plan promises to bring forward a further 10% gifted houses to the QLC Community Housing Trust 'from a later stage'. The scaling back appears to be a ploy rather than considerate of views expressed by the Hawea community during community consultation and cannot be considered 'sympathetic to the scale and character of Hawea' as the master plan states. There are other things in the proposal which give the colour of reasonableness and care for the Hawea community which don't go much beyond waffle and are questionable. The developer claims to be creating a 'sustainable, self-sufficient township' for 'locals'. Insofar as this means anything the township is already sustainable, the people in the new houses will mostly not be locals and nothing in the proposal will make the township more self-sufficient than it already is. The same applies to the township 'becoming more sustainable, inclusive and liveable.' If this means anything where is the evidence. The business hub included in the plan will be most unlikely to reduce travel into Wanaka since it will not realistically be providing services people need regularly and will increase the number of cars on the road in the surrounding area. People living in the new houses are likely to work in Wanaka or further afield and the houses in the plan mostly have two-car garages. The developer justifies the site development partly on the grounds that the land is 'unproductive' and 'not sensitive' visually. It is not of outstanding natural beauty but it does lend the township the character of a rural township. Countryside is what makes it pleasingly rural.

Individual	Jessica Downey	I'm 25. I live in Wanaka. Ironically I sell property. Multi million dollar properties at that. "First home" properties too. That's if you can finance \$750,000 for your first home. It's ironic because the thought of being on the other side of the table purchasing a home is something that is not in my 5 year plan. It shouldn't be this way. It shouldn't be this far out of reach for hardworking singles, couples and families. I get it, Change is scary. Yes, I one hundred percent agree, let's keep Hawea beautiful, but let's also give young working professionals a chance to get their foot in the Wanaka (and surrounds) market. Let's make it affordable, but let's also do it right. Let's allow someone with a high track record, high standards and a good moral compass to make sure this happens. I believe Lane Hocking will make this happen.
Individual	Phil Wilson	I believe we need young couples in the area, currently we have an ageing population. Tourism is showing huge growth and there is a shortage in the workforce for younger people to work in that industry. Rents are very high and not affordable long term for young couple couples, the affordable houses proposed in this development will certainly help repayments in many cases will be less than renting. House prices in the area are at an all time high and you cannot purchase anything of quality in the Wanaka township for under \$750,000, the new development pricing will hopefully help to put a cap on the escalating prices in Wanaka as young couples are paying these high prices just to get a home how can they get ahead.
Individual	Nicola	Do it! We need younger people able to live in this region. Please think about what "affordable" is to us.. not you who have been working for years and earn more! Think long term not just short term pleasing developers and getting more rates.
Individual	Simon cavey	Fantastic very much needed in this area as even a long term rental is nearly impossible
Individual	Harry Briggs	I feel it should go ahead Especially as will be a benefit for first home buyers with affordable homes round the \$550000 I have family wanting to buy there first home and will leave the Area unless this sort of price level comes available
Individual	Donna Inger	Amazing - we should totally support affordable housing.
Individual	Biddi king	Think it's a good idea
Individual	Kurt Young	It's a fair and reasonable approach in a market that's currently making first homes unaffordable to so many in the area.
Individual	Dana Graham	Wonderful idea
Individual	Kevin Brosnahan	I strongly support this initiative. Price is a huge barrier to entry in the Central housing market (which is as unaffordable as anywhere in NZ) and is largely driven by availability (or lack thereof). The Kiwi dream is to work hard, raise a family, own - and eventually pay off - a home. Home ownership (and the resultant security) is unattainable for most ordinary hard-working Kiwis in Central Otago, and this deters many from settling and/or staying in the area, which must have a negative flow-on effect for businesses and the regional economy. The pricing levels proposed in the Expression of Interest would provide a market entry-point which just doesn't presently exist in Central, and would allow some lucky people to finally realise the dream of living, working and raising a family in the area while owning their own home and thereby securing their future.

Individual		Stew Burt	I am totally opposed to this area being used as a special housing area for the following reasons. 1. It is so far away from where most jobs & high school will be available. 2. This project should be done as a normal notifiable resource consent. 3. Lake Hawea township should stay inside the present boundaries set out. 4. Why sacrifice another wonderful lake area the way Queenstown and Wanaka have to crate another set of problems that they have. 5. Has anyone done a study on what would be the ultimate size of Lake Hawea to fit the most cost effective infrastructure? 6. In my view special housing should be done by local or national Govt. Not wealthy developers who will make money out of it and not worry what happens to house pricing after first round of sales.
Individual		Mandy Myles	I think this is a fantastic initiative that would change the lives for so many people. Buying your first home in Central Otago is such an unobtainable feat for the average 'living wage' earner who would be unlikely to ever get into a home in the area. It is so hard to buy your first home full stop for my generation and if we don't support these sorts of developments then we will be buying our first homes in our 40's and 50's where we should be focusing on creating nest eggs for retirement. This development is also a great incentive for living wage earners to want to stay in the community because they can afford to settle and not struggle with the high rent prices.
Individual	First National Wanaka	Graeme Sinclair	The majority of our young people can not afford to buy houses in Wanaka now so it is urgent and important that the council acts immediately to address this issue. I support the idea of having a well planned development with facilities for young families. I would like to see it planned with a small shopping area and open spaces that could be play areas for children and meeting areas for local people to run village markets and other gatherings. I am confident a development like this would strengthen what is already a very strong community.
Individual		Lynda Duff	I am in support of this proposal going ahead. I believe it will provide people within the Wanaka area and also for others outside of this region the opportunity to purchase a home, especially, first home buyers. The very reasonable set price land/house packages outlined by the developer will provide an affordable home for many who have found the current market beyond their means. On a personal note my son and daughter have both expressed a wish to move to Central Otago in order to be closer to family and to give their children the outdoor life experiences that they themselves enjoyed. Unfortunately, they have not been in a position to buy in at the current prices but this development would give them the chance to do so. I think by having more people being able to buy their own homes it will release some pressure off the rental market as well. I'm aware there is some local resistance to further development in Hawea but I feel this is rather selfish on the part of these people. They are established and well set up but are reluctant to let others have the chance to do the same. I can not see that a well planned and well designed sub division in the area mooted would have a detrimental affect on the township or lakefront. Instead it promises to provide extra services and amenities that will be of benefit to all.

Individual	Sam Paardekooper	I support the proposed SHA. It is a logical place for Hawea to grow whilst the proposal will also greatly assist housing affordability. Pricing under 550k has not been seen in central for many years. It will give many families the opportunity to buy and settle in the region, which is very challenging if not impossible at present. I also think the Wanaka region needs greater competition with too many existing zoned areas owned by only a few developers keeping the price up and limiting supply (drip feeding it). This is forcing people to leave the region. It is good to see competition in the market which can only be good for the people of the region
Individual	Stephen Guest	There are many aspects of Lane Hocking's proposal I don't like, in particular, plot size, the nonsense about enhancement of "community", his dismissal of the visual quality of the Hawea plain, and the suggested price for the "affordable" housing. But there are two aspects of the proposal that really jar: 1. Hawea in less than a decade has more or less doubled its residential area even though half of the buildings for this extra area are yet to be constructed. In this light, in my view, Hocking's proposal for additional houses cannot be regarded as appropriate, or fair to Hawea. 2. Hocking provides as one prominent reason for granting permission for 400 houses that his original intention was to apply for 1000. This is in fact not a reason at all (otherwise, it would be a reason to assault a person whom you originally intended to kill). In my view, this suggests a disingenuousness about the proposal in general.
Individual	Clare Rehill	My partner and I are a young couple living and working in the area with a baby on the way. Renting in Queenstown is a struggle and super expensive. Ideally we would love to have our own house, but prices are just astronomical and even with us both working, it would take years to form a realistic deposit as prices are constantly rising. We love this area and it is the perfect place to raise a child, we really don't want to leave, but if things continue the way they are with housing here, we will have no choice but to eventually leave.
Individual	Lillian McHugh	I am very keen for it, as I am trying to buy a house in Central Otago, but can find anything that suits my needs or is within my price range.
Individual	Janet Brosnahan	I am absolutely in favour of the development. There is simply not a significant pool of "affordable" housing available in the area for rental or purchase, and the prospect of a house and land ownership package at around 550k offers an incredibly exciting opportunity. If Government promises about affordable housing mean anything, this proposal deserves support, both from the area itself and from Wellington.

Individual	Laura and Jan Solbak	<p>The Master Plan' concept written by the developer, seeks to create a subdivision fast tracked under the Special Housing Act (SHA) and thereby circumventing the RMA process. Therefore the Lake Hawea community will be unable to put in objections. At a well attended public meeting held on April 21st 2018, the community clearly indicated that it did not support the development of a SHA at this stage. At this meeting the developer stated the reason he was using the SHA was that it is a 'mechanism to speed things up'. If the developer's objective is to assist the delivery of, in his words,"vibrant communities, connected to employment opportunities and high quality amenities", why use the SHA process rather than a traditional application? It would appear the company's main driver is 'speed' than creating a 'vibrant community'. By having residential development south of Cemetery Rd, an urban sprawl will be initiated at a time when there are ample sections available north of Cemetery Rd. The revised Hawea Community Plan of 2015 Plan strongly indicated that the town boundary was to be Cemetery Rd. This subdivision will put pressure on existing water, sewerage and roading infrastructure. Accordingly we object to the EOI by Universal Developments.</p>
Individual	Grant Parker	<p>I personally support development with a centric focus on approaching the issue of affordable housing. The demand on housing in both the sales and rental market has been fierce in recent years with upwards pressure on prices still evident. With the current and forecasted population growth, our town is facing critical issues surrounding accommodating a workforce and their families in warm, healthy, affordable homes. I manage a real estate sales agency with an attached property management agency in Wanaka, so I often get to meet, or hear of, new families settling in Wanaka and it surrounding areas. I'm always delighted to hear of a new family arriving in our beautiful location, full of energy and so much optimism with the reality of making this wonderful place their home. On the flipside, I am often disappointed with gaining the knowledge that another family is leaving, disappointed and sometimes even demoralised as their modest dream of a future here has come to an end. Often the reason behind their exit are difficulties around accommodation and the future prospect of ever owning a home being unlikely, mainly due to high demand and a lack of supply of affordable housing. The same individuals who were intent on becoming part of our communities, regrettably decide to again uproot and move to a town where they feel home ownership is achievable. I appreciate creating affordable housing is often a confronting issue with many challenges. The local business concerns regarding the attraction and retention of staff are real and significant in successfully managing and satisfying the basic essential needs, wants and demands of a growing economy. Immediate attention to increasing housing supply alongside a sustained supply into the future is the key component needing to be addressed for the future progression of this town.</p>
Individual	Craig Reveley	<p>I support this development and think it will become an area where people can get into the housing market,which is what we need for QLD to continue to support our growth. The development seems to me to be the perfect place for housing,and would be of massive benefit to all of the public especially Hawea.</p>



Individual

Patricia Spedding

I am lodging this objection to the proposed subdivision . 1) Growing new traffic noise from the existing Timsfield subdivision dominates the environment for homeowners on the moraine escarpment in Lake Hawea township. The noise is akin to living above the motorway in Auckland now on week days (leaving for work, coming home) We don't want more of this. The low cost housing subdivision will only exacerbate this problem 2) The very nature of Lake Hawea is tranquil, natural and mountainous. Visitors comment on the unspoilt mountainous nature of the village. A subdivision such as proposed will destroy the present appreciation of the Hawea River's unspoilt environment by tourists. 3) There is no infrastructure to support this subdivision. Infrastructure would spoil the very natural essence of this area. The plan is shortsighted- look 20 years ahead visualise it- at present there are few natural places left as stunning as Lake Hawea and the countryside around it. The area is a taonga. A lake cannot be situated in the middle of a light industrial area and be considered unspoilt!

Individual	L C Merrall	Louise Merrall	<p>I object to the development of this land as a Special Housing Area for a number of reasons. Firstly, this would see and departure from the current generally accepted town boundary which was agreed to in consultation with the Hawea community in the past. There is still land which can be developed within the accepted town boundaries of Domain Rd, Cemetery Rd and Muir Rd. We moved to Lake Hawea 5 years ago to get away from the fast and undesirable (in our view) pace of development in Queenstown and Wanaka. Whilst many people say this development is also inevitable for Lake Hawea I believe that some places should be protected from this - doing so providing a choice of lifestyle within our community (an example would be the south of England where there is huge growth in towns and cities however, small villages are preserved within their boundaries - yes it doesn't necessarily lead to affordability but it does provide a choice where people do not want to live amidst urban sprawl can be). Lake Hawea has a very special community who look after each other in a way I haven't experienced in my adult life - people really look out for and after each other, this unfortunately would be sure to be lost with rapid development. Following from that, as a young family we are well aware of the need for affordability however, precedents have shown that this is not often achieved through the mechanism of a SHA - often sections or house and land packages are quickly sold on at inflated prices. Universal Developments claim to have conducted community consultation and to have changed their plans based on this. Having attended one of their drop in sessions I experienced that they were willing to manipulate the truth in order to try and get people on board - telling people things such as "this land will be developed anyway and potentially with out consultation" However, when I got in touch with a Wanaka Board member I was informed that this was not the case and a SHA was the only way it could be developed without consultation as it is currently zoned rural. I also feel their "amendment to 400 sections" in response to community feedback is deceptive. They had in fact told the community at the drop in sessions that they only planned to develop about 250 sections away from the road side as a starter - this now looks to be a stage 1 (presumed by the area marked in red on their plans) that is in fact bigger than stated and right by the road. They also said that there were no plans to do mass house and land packages on small sections - again this now looks to be the case. Also concerning is the lack of specification of section sizes but presumably they are small based on the street scape pictures in their EOI.</p>
------------	-------------	----------------	--

I also feel that from their drop in sessions and statements made since that the developers have a complete lack of understanding of what our community is about and what we already have here. With trying to promote it with things like - we could develop the domain and cricket could be played here on the weekends - shows a complete lack of research that this in fact already happens in the township. Claims that people in Lake Hawea will be pleased not to have to travel into Wanaka for things such as doctors, Supermarket etc due to their commercial hub also seem misguided as most people I know in Hawea do not want those things on their doorstep and therefore I would object to such a commercial hub being across the road from where I live now. Any further development of the township should take place with full community consultation through a long term plan and not at the will of a developer who stands to make presumably a large profit in the name of affordability. Lake Hawea is semi-rural, it has a wonderful, caring community and a sense of peace- these are things that are sure to be lost if a precedent such as allowing this SHA to progress is set.

Individual

Riki Young

I think that this is a fantastic opportunity for first home buyers to stay and buy their first home in the district. Currently, there is an absence of affordable product in this area. Many people simply cannot afford to buy a house here. Universal Development are offering house and land packages at \$550,000 and below allowing those first home buyers to use their kiwisaver to get into the housing market. There is no new product in this price range. Renting has become increasingly uncertain and difficult and therefore having a genuine chance to purchase a house given the prices proposed in the EOI will be a big relieve for them. This proposal is a fantastic initiative that would greatly assist them in having a real opportunity to ensure certainty to their future planning with the security home ownership would bring.

Individual

Quentin Landreth

It is good to see a developer is doing some planning for the future. This will be a real asset to the district.

Individual

Rachel Heather

My husband and I would like to support the proposed Hawea development. My husband has a good job in Arrowtown that we desperately want him to keep but we also have 3 children under 5 and want to get on the property ladder. We have done our research and the Hawea area is the only area still affordable for us that is in driving distance of my husbands work. We want to move there within the next year and to have more opportunities for affordable housing for young families in the area would be exactly what this area needs.

Individual

Isabella Sinclair Irwin

I participated in a great consultative process with the Council, a few years ago, on the long term plan for Lake Hawea and Hawea Flat. The agreements we reached I expected to be the Long Term Plan and be the overriding principles for all future developments. Any deviation from these principles renders the process we went through useless, null and void, lacking in integrity and honesty on the part of the Council. The proposed special housing area is outside the agreed boundary of the town THEREFORE I am not in favour of the proposed Special Housing Area and expect the Council to act with integrity in its decision, making and respect for agreements made in the past.

Individual

Ross Sinclair

I am totally against this development. It expands beyond the community agreed boundaries of Hawea. Until such time as we have 100% of the infill on the existing boundary done, it is unnecessary. This development begins an urban sprawl out from Lake Hawea Township into the countryside, the kind of thing that people move to Hawea to get away from, myself included. It also appears to be a thinly disguised way of circumventing the important protections provided by the RMA. Allowing this development to go ahead, or even for this proposal to go to the next stage, flies in the face of all the community consultation that is been done with the Hawea community so far. Furthermore, everyone in the community that I have spoken to, even those that aren't making submissions or attending meetings, are against this development.

Individual

Rae-ann Sinclair

I am totally against this development, and my main objections are: - the Hawea basin has three settlements, Lake Hawea, John creek and Hawea Flat. Within the boundaries of these three areas there is plenty of expansion space and the ability to build affordable homes. Mixed housing building designs and infill of existing approved sections will meet demand for many years to come. - the infa-structure (sewage, water, decent footpaths and roading) of the existing areas is under pressure and requires capital investment. This development adds to that pressure as does already approved developments. This is another financial burden on current rate payers. - It appears to be a thinly disguised way of circumventing the important protections provided by the RMA. - this proposed development is totally at odds with the strong views that have been expressed through community consultation that has been done with the Hawea community so far. - instead of allowing the constant spread of housing QLDC and the community need to be looking at mixed housing options and PUBLIC TRANSPORT in the Wanaka/Hawea. - I find the charm of Hawea is due to the township being in a contained area and being surrounded by countryside. This would be the beginning of the spread that is unnecessary and not required. I appreciate the opportunity to comment and would like to reiterate this development is not required, is contrary to what the community want for Hawea, is not an asset and infact adds to the burden of current ratepayers.

Individual

Nigel Williams

I am 100% against the Special Housing Area, Lake Hawea does not need this, it is a vibrant safe community because of the lack of urban sprawl. The Hawea Valley now has 3 villages - Lake Hawea, Johns Creek (Gladstone) and Hawea Flat. We have adequate space within the existing township boundaries and there are a number of low cost options available within the new sub-divisions with a number of properties on the market. The Infrastructure is inadequate for the existing sub-divisions that have been already approved without further pressure - in particular the water and waste water systems. The current roads need upgrading for safety for children and elderly - this proposed SHA would need the conversion of the Capell Ave paper road to a proper road, and significantly more investment in footpaths and cycle ways - who will pay for this? I believe the significant additional traffic (500-1000 additional cars due to no public transport at all) will represent a danger to the existing community. The Special Housing Area designation in Hawea appears to be a blatant rort on the Resource Management Act and district planning, without any evidence of why this would create opportunities for low cost housing. At the community centre meeting I was concerned by the potential for conflict of interest with QLDC councillors making decisions on this and heavily promoting the Queenstown Community Housing Trust who would be a financial beneficiary of the SHA designation. Are the QLDC councillors benefiting politically from the QCHT activities? I have yet to hear a single person who is supportive of this proposal who lives in Lake Hawea. It is a major expansion of the town boundary and existing planning consultation. Where will the jobs come from to support this development - construction jobs for more houses sounds like a ponzi scheme. QLDC needs to do a proper investigation of community costs and benefits This development proposal should be conducted through the RMA not SHA route.

Mal Robinson

I am totally opposed to any SHA in the Lake Hawea rural general zoning. It is not necessary, is developer driven, it will destroy the beauty and quiet ambience of the Hawea region, and is a cynical attempt by Universal Developments to use special legislation designed for urban issues for making money from a pristine part of rural Aotearoa-New Zealand. The QLDC's current HASHAA lead policy does not allow for any SHAs in Hawea ..... and I am asking that the councillors making the decision about the EOI abide by their own policy and immediately reject the proposal. This will save a lot of time and effort, and show the ratepayers that their elected representatives are listening and responding to the feedback from them. Virtually no-one in Hawea wants this SHA to go ahead. Do the right thing and reject Lane Hocking's greed and money driven motive to screw up our natural beauty and lifestyle. It will do nothing to increase the affordability of housing in the Upper Clutha region. Thank you for taking the time to properly consider this very important decision.

Individual

Jan Holdom

As a part-time and future full-time resident of Hawea, I am very concerned about this unsuitable proposal in my neighbourhood. I am very concerned that developers will have unfettered access to create a low-quality, urban slum in our beautiful area, and destroy the unique lifestyle that Hawea offers. I think that the urgency for the development of a SHA in Lake Hawea is unwarranted at this time. There is currently plenty of affordable land within the township and I think such development outside the current boundaries of Hawea is unnecessary. I believe that Universal Developments has specifically targeted and is taking advantage of a lack of a long term plan for our community, in the hope they can make maximum profit at our expense. This is not a city environment. The proposed small section size is totally unsuited and unnecessary to the character of this semi-rural Hawea, and almost borders on infill housing. The sheer number of sections will dramatically alter traffic flows, and add to noise and light pollution. The current infrastructure will not support such an expansive development. There is no public transport to service the development. In my opinion, Universal Developments have skewed their proposal with flawed and poor-quality research. There are no redeeming environmental or character features to their proposal. The sole basis of their proposal is to develop the maximum allowable sections of minimum size for maximum profit. They have no personal interest in protecting the beautiful character of Hawea. I urge the council to please establish a two year moratorium on development outside the current Hawea township. There must be a coherent and sustainable long-term plan developed by the Hawea community and Council, BEFORE large development be considered. Expansion of the local population is inevitable but I want to see development that keeps the treasured aspects of our current environment and lifestyle for locals and visitors.

Individual	Rebecca and Jimmy Cotter	<p>We OPPOSE the application for a proposed special housing area by Universal Developments for the following reasons: - The district plan and Hawea 20/20 was created after many community attended sessions in Lake Hawea. It was clearly voiced that no development was to take place south of Cemetery Road until the existing development was filled in. A lot of people gave up a lot of time to ensure their voices were heard. If council approves this then, who is going to want to attend these sessions in the future, knowing that they are in fact a waste of time? - I believe the application for an SHA in Hawea is a cunning way to bypass the district plan. Proper community consultation needs to take place through the appropriate channels. Lane Hocking is dangling a carrot in front of the Community Housing Trust. Based on what he is proposing he should be giving more than 10% to the trust. - Promoting this development as an affordable housing option is wrong in many ways. Sections that are nearly half the size of Sentinel Park opposite, are going to start at \$225-\$250,000. This is disgusting and by no means affordable. It is a way to make the developer a lot of money and ruin our environment. - I note a letter by the NZTA submitted with the expression of interest, that states the proposal is unlikely to have any immediate adverse effects on the safety, efficiency and functionality of the transport network. This demonstrates a lack of insight by the NZTA and the developer. We are separated from our two main service towns, by 2 one lane bridges. Traffic queues are already bad at Albert Town and the intersection at SH6 and Wanaka -Luggate highway. A development cant just happen without proper discussion on roading. When asked at the drop in sessions we were told it is not their department but actually it is as this should be looked into before such a huge development is even thought about. -Ignite Wanaka supports this based on finding affordable housing options, again this is not affordable housing and the environmental effects are going to be huge on an infrastructure that is already stretched. - Please follow the district plan, open your eyes to what this is ie a developer who is putting this proposal through not to solve the problem of affordable housing but to line his pockets.</p>
Individual	Adam Gain	<p>I write in support of the proposed Hawea development. This proposal has many benefits for the district with the main one being a supply of affordable housing for the current and future workforce living in the area. The lack of affordable housing is a real concern for local businesses looking to retain staff and expand their businesses to meet the ever increasing demand in the area.</p>
Individual	Lyn Williamson	<p>I am deeply concerned that this project is being fast tracked under the title 'affordable housing', without full investigation into long term impact on environment and community .</p>

Individual	Sam Turner	I am totally against this development, and my main objections are: - the "Hawea" basin has three settlements, Lake Hawea, John creek and Hawea Flat. Within the boundaries of these three areas there is plenty of expansion space and the ability to build affordable homes. Mixed housing building designs and infill of existing approved sections will meet demand for many years to come. - the infrastructure (sewage, water, decent footpaths and roading) of the existing areas is under pressure and requires capital investment. This development adds to that pressure as does already approved developments. This is another financial burden on current rate payers. - It appears to be a thinly disguised way of circumventing the important protections provided by the RMA. - this proposed development is totally at odds with the strong views that have been expressed through community consultation that has been done with the Hawea community so far. - instead of allowing the constant spread of housing QLDC and the community need to be looking at mixed housing options and PUBLIC TRANSPORT in the Wanaka/Hawea. - I find the charm of Hawea is due to the township being in a contained area and being surrounded by countryside. This would be the beginning of the spread that is unnecessary and not required. I appreciate the opportunity to comment and would like to reiterate this development is not required, is contrary to what the community want for Hawea, is not an asset and in fact adds to the burden of current ratepayers.
------------	------------	--

Individual	Zoe Coulson-Sinclair	I cannot support the proposed special housing area, which I believe is being applied in a cynical manner by the developer to circumvent RMA requirements, and will not actually achieve the intended benefits of an SHA - i.e. to increase affordable access to housing. Furthermore, any further housing development should increase the density of housing within the current community agreed boundaries of Hawea, rather than promoting sprawl into surrounding nature/farmland areas. Until such time as we have 100% of the infill on the existing boundary done, it is unnecessary. This development begins an urban sprawl out from Lake Hawea Township into the countryside, the kind of thing that people move to Hawea to get away from, myself included. I Allow this development to go ahead, or even for this proposal to go to the next stage, flies in the face of all the community consultation that has been done with the Hawea community so far. Furthermore, everyone in the community that I have spoken to, even those that aren't making submissions or attending meetings, are against this development.
------------	----------------------	--

Individual	Sangster Construction Ltd	Chris Sangster	Yep im all for it! Gooooood
------------	---------------------------	----------------	-----------------------------

Individual	Sarah Kivi	I support the concerns raised by the Keep Hawea Beautiful movement specifically that there is no formal community consultation required for a Special Housing Area, that SHA's are not allowed for in the QLDC plan and that the current EOI is not any kind of answer to the housing affordability problem nor does it have the support of the community.
------------	------------	--



Individual Barry Timmings

My thoughts are that the special housing area should proceed for a good number of common sense reasons: housing affordability is high on the list. This relates to a growing number of staff who need affordable housing now so they can be available to local businesses as well as providing for available and affordable housing in the longer term - it would be nice for younger families to be able to live in the area too. Property close to Wanaka is becoming prohibitively expensive. The proposed special housing area is close enough for residents to be part of the local landscape (as opposed to commuting from say Cromwell on a daily basis) while being far more accessible financially. Arguments that there is not the demand for this special housing area are baseless as we wouldn't be seeing the large increases in property prices in the wider area if demand was not ahead of supply. Regardless, this is a question for the market to answer. I don't think it is reasonable for local residents to say this special housing area is not wanted or needed based on the fact that they are in and others are not. The special housing area serves a purpose and this should be respected.

Individual Mr. Chris Barker

I am totally opposed to this area being used as a special housing area for the following reasons. 1. It is so far away from where most jobs & high school will be available. 2. This project should be done as a normal notifiable resource consent. 3. Lake Hawea township should stay inside the present boundaries set out N of Cemetery road 4. Has anyone done a study on what would be the ultimate size of Lake Hawea to fit the most cost effective infrastructure? 5. In my view special housing should be done by local or national Govt. Not wealthy developers who will make money out of it and not worry what happens to house pricing after first round of sales. There seems little controls in place for any 1st time buyers to subsequently just flick on the houses for a profit, at which point the whole concept becomes irrelevant

Individual Sheryl Alty

Every day I am confronted by conversations with young people and their families regarding how property in the Wanaka district is unaffordable, and how the property prices have a direct impact on their decision to either stay or leave the area. As the district grows in population so do the job opportunities however, QLDC has the highest house prices of any district in NZ and this translates into the growing need for affordable homes. Sectors of our business community are desperately trying to find accommodation for their workers but the lack of homes to purchase or rent means workers for our local businesses simply cannot afford to stay. Over time, this potential loss of workers will have a major impact on the businesses in our district and also on the community as it struggles to align with the continued fast growth. I believe that this proposal is a forward-thinking initiative that would greatly assist young people in our region and give them a real opportunity to ensure certainty to their future with secure home ownership. By offering house and land packages up to \$550,000 many, including my children, will have this opportunity to live the Kiwi dream rather than rely on a lifetime of uncertain rental options.

Individual Guy Alty

The Upper Clutha basin lacks affordable housing. Presenting an opportunity for people desiring to own their own home, a development of this nature provides an option for first home buyers and others to do so. The proposal has to be seriously considered as a positive move forward for the development of the region.

Individual

Liz Matheson

Lake Hawea/Hawea Flat does not have a shortage of available building space, or homes, which I believe the SHA was designed for - to reduce the consent process and fast track planning. During the past 2 ten year plan consultations with council and community, the express wish of the Community was for Cemetery road to be the southern boundary for housing. There was provision for some rural residential blocks, but not straight urban development. If these wishes and plans are ignored now, then it makes a farce of the 10 year planning and consultation with communities. Subdivision development to date has moved faster than infrastructure to cope with the rapid population growth. The growth over the past 3 census has been huge 500 in 2001, 1300 in 2006, 2300 in 2011, and no release yet of the current census. During that time, Lake Hawea has developed 2 kindergarten, and the school roll has trebled. The roads have not been upgraded, there is no more retail or sports fields now than when the population was 500. The Hawea/ Wanaka intersection, with Riverbank road thrown in, is at capacity, with no mention of improvement. Hawea does not need a further development. We do not have the ability or the will to double our population. The SHA legislation is being abused when applied to Lake Hawea.

Individual

Gaye Robertson

I object to this "Expression of Interest for a Special Housing Area" south of Cemetery Rd presented by Lane Hocking of Universal Developments for the following reasons: 1. The Hawea Community Plan of 2003, reviewed in 2013 and updated 2015 has consistently stated with input from many members of the community, taking many considered hours of discussion, by volunteers in the main, that the town boundary should remain within Cemetery Road . This is because there are already 4 subdivisions underway (in this small community) plus substantive land undeveloped that will adequately meet the needs of required homes and the current infrastructure that MAY meet the needs within the next few years. The community ie current residents, are clear on this matter. By community I also mean the caring sharing networks over many decades that have made a healthy community hub that includes a community centre, hall, library, preschools and a decile 1 primary school , playgrounds, shop and room for expansion of a commercial hub, restaurant, hotel, parks and green spaces, native reserve restoration, elder support, green waste service, firewood for the needy etc etc all manageable with the current potential population of this small Alpine village. Adding another 400+ homes would add a huge burden on this small community. We already are experiencing substantial change living on a hydro lake and rapid increase of tourism and freedom campers. 2. Special housing areas require public transport which this area has none. 3. Nowhere in the QLDC 2020 plan does it state that the Lake Hawea area is suitable for a SHA. The QLDC's own policy on SHA's requires a number of criteria to be fulfilled. Hawea is not a category 1, or 2 , therefore Universal Developments proposal is contrary to QLDC policy. 4. The points that Universal Developments make regarding letters of support, small number of developers operating in the area and an increase in property prices in the QLDC area are not accurate and do not support further development south of Cemetery Road. Already there are 4 developers in Hawea, all in VERY CLOSE proximity to each other, plus a number of private buildings being constructed outside these subdivisions. 5. Affordability: Universal Holdings do not disclose the price of land, and with current prices of basic dwelling being constructed they will not be affordable for a large number of those needing homes for their children, neither is the current design attractive because houses will be too close, of minimal quality materials. Already neighbours can hear each others' heatpumps in Timsfield. Also some of the plants suggested will not tolerate the frosts that we experience in this area. Hawea requires better than that, and affordable as well.

Connectivity in this instance will require many roads with lots of traffic passing very close to houses, bedrooms etc giving lots of through traffic a thoroughfare that will also increase emissions.

6. Consultation: I was present at the Hawea Knitting group when Lane Hocking came unannounced with a large plate of creamcakes, then proceeded to tell us what Hawea needed and what he would provide, namely 1000 houses. Again he came to a community meeting with similar ideas of what this community needs. This is not consultation-it was a platform for him to tell us what we needed, and it appeared to me that he had not considered some issues.

7. Infrastructure: I am not convinced, after the mismanagement by QLDC of the upgraded freshwater system, that it will be adequate for large scale development. Already we are missing an extra water tank on Mt Maude, plus there have been several issues with the new equipment that had they been well managed would not have occurred. Roading is in bad shape for the increased usage.

8. Public Health Issue: not one of the current developers notified the community of the time frame for this prolonged work involved in creating these 4 subdivisions. We have had to live with 6-7 days a week for over a year of substantial vibration, heavy machinery noise, massive earth movement creating dust that was inadequately dampened, constant beeping of machinery, heavy trucks not giving way at stop signs, our link footpath dug up with poor protection of pedestrians and cyclists, a large earth sieving operation close to dwellings, builders rubbish, foul language and loud music of some workers, loud power tools month after month. At no stage have we been reassured that the dust is safe for us to breathe in. has any testing been done at all? Also there is extensive flooding in front of Timsfield and Sentinel Park on Cemetery Road because the ditch has been removed therefore flooding to the edge of the tar seal has occurred. A once attractive drive has now become shabby. Burnoff of huge pine tree stumps gave off dark sticky resin in smoke that engulfed part of the township yet nothing was done to stop it. Warning signs of "heavy machinery", "trucks passing" or "mind that child" were very late in being installed where the trucks etc come and go for the Timsfield development RIGHT OPPOSITE THE CHILDRENS BIKETRACK TO HAWEA FLAT SCHOOL. These are very good reasons for this community to have an extended break from land-scraping and building and all that creating a new subdivision entails. There must be more consideration for residents' public health and healthy environments -eg some of us are living and dying with terminal illness, recovering from major surgery, have new babies and small children to get to sleep, on night duty, or working at home.

This community has had to deal with too much development all at once and it has become a burden. Adding a SHA in haste will only add to it and we don't need it. No one has made any mention in any policy regarding more housing on the public health issues for current residents, and QLDC do not appear to be monitoring this. 9. Environmental concerns: ought we be supporting urban sprawl so close to a National Park, an alpine lake with landscape of outstanding value, and an internationally renowned heritage area? This seems to be against QLDC intent. 10. Strategic Direction: is it not time for QLDC and the Hawea community including farmers, and Hawea Flat folk to have much more of a chance to take part in strategic planning in a much more creative manner rather than being at the whim of developers? Hawea community well in the future would be responsive to working with council on this matter as you are our public servants, then we take our ideas to the developers. I end with repeating that I oppose a SHA south of Cemetery Road. It is too early to contemplate further large scale development in the Hawea area. The community is clear the town boundary is within Cemetery Road. Yes there is a need for affordable housing but not on the scale that has been expressed. Why cant there be a requirement that some houses within the town boundary are to be affordable? Thankyou for the opportunity to contribute to the feedback on this issue.

Individual

Nicky Hewson

I'm very much against this proposal. This is not in the council plan, it is just a way for a developer to try and fast track into the property development. There are still sections available in Timsfield to purchase, and Sentinel park. Hawea does not have the infrastructure to cope with a large influx of sections and then people. Timsfield started out as "affordable housing" and sections were not to be on sold within two years, didnt take long for that to all be forgotten, and so called reserve land soon turned in to sections to be sold. There's no such thing as "special housing" just a way for property developers to make money. Well, they can bugger off !!

Individual

Holly

I am against this development - there remains plenty of space within the Hawea township for further building, without the need to create the urban sprawl that is destroying other peaceful towns. I worry that the existing infrastructure will not cope with a sudden housing rush, and there are other areas where Lake Hawea township could benefit from money being spent - such as a regular transport link into Wanaka. I doubt that you will find many locals support the proposed Special Housing Area, and I don't believe that this initiative came about with towns like Lake Hawea in mind. The countryside surrounding Hawea is a huge part of its appeal to locals and visitors alike - this is not what we want.

Individual

Steve Moffatt

I am a rate payer at Johns Creek and have been involved with the Hawea community for the past 25 years. I am most concerned that this proposal is a threat to the values that this community cherishes - a small town surrounded by farmland, Further development outside the existing residential area is un-necessary and unwanted..It puts further strains to existing infrastructure and a further financial burden to ratepayers. I note that the proposal states "People live here because of the strong community, the landscape values, the small school, the outdoor recreation opportunities, and the slower pace that Hawea provides." I agree with this statement. The proposal goes on the state Themaster planned nature of the development provides the opportunity to ensure the proposal positively contributes to the existing Community through provision of reserves, open space and community infrastructure whilst enabling residential growth. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be complimentary to these aspirations." I strongly disagree with this statement and firmly believe the majority of the Hawea community would agree with me

Organisation Southern Land Ltd Luc Waite

Southern Land is a surveying, planning and engineering consultancy. We employ approximately 20 staff locally. As we are a service based business our staff are the most fundamental component of our business. If we are to maintain or grow our business to meet the demands of existing and new clients than access to staff with the appropriate skill set and experience is critical. Finding new staff to often necessitates recruitment from outside of the district. One of the major difficulties of enticing new staff to the district is the cost and availability of housing. Making housing affordable and accessible in the Upper Clutha is critical for developing and sustaining our local communities which in turn support our local businesses and economy. It is for these reasons that Southern Land supports the proposed Hawea Special Housing Area.

Individual

Amanda Henderson

I have many concerns about this proposed development in Hawea. These are as follows - 1. As agreed in the 2020 Community Consultation in 2003, the boundary for the township would stop on the south boundary of Cemetery Road. So far there is a large amount of land within this boundary that is to be developed. According to the Timsfield developer this may not be completed until 2030. I feel strongly as a long term Hawea resident that no further development should be considered until all land within the town boundary is used. 2. I have huge concerns about infrastructure to support such a condensed development proposed. The lake levels have been significantly lower over the last 5 years hence drinking water is becoming more precious. Increase traffic using minor roads and single lane bridges. Sending sewage out to Stevenson Road makes for an expensive exercise and at risk of breaking during an earthquake. 3. Its a concern that all the supporting documents that have been submitted to council for this development have been employed and paid for by Universal Developments. 4. All QLDC policy does not include Hawea as an area to support SHA's. The Lead Policy would have to be changed to suit the Developer which would require consultation and a review period. 5. I believe there needs to be an independent Ecological review of the proposed area at different times of the year. 6. Hawea is a unique area of outstanding beauty, and has a community that fully respects that. It is a community that is prepared to protect it, and it is very disappointing to have a developer who is there for a money making exercise who is prepared to ruin that.

Individual	Luc Waite	<p>As the population in Wanaka, Hawea and the surrounding area grows housing opportunities should be made available for a range of demographics. The region's economy is primarily centred around tourism and as such employment opportunities are largely service based. Providing affordable housing for those employed in the service sector (e.g. cafes, hotels, tourism operations etc.) is therefore a critical aspect of supporting our local economy. The proposed Lake Hawea Special Housing Area is located on the south side of Cemetery Road. It is also adjacent to Tims Field which is already recognised as a development providing affordable housing. The proposed location fits with the existing context and provides the opportunity to augment the area and allow for the establishment of community amenities and services to the benefit of the wider community. The existing landuse is low intensity lifestyle farming intermixed with small scale forestry and wilding pines. The land is of a low level of productivity and visual amenity. The use of this land for residential, community and commercial purposes would not result in a loss of visual amenity or of productive land. For the above reasons I support the proposed Special Housing Area and believe it will be a real asset to The Lake Hawea Township and the surrounding region.</p>	
Organisation	Wanaka Real Estate Ltd	Wanaka Real Estate Ltd	<p>At the Coal Face of the property market here in The Upper Clutha, we continually see young local families and couples struggling to enter the property market due to factors that not only include price, but also competition, methods of sale and availability. The majority of 'entry level' homes that come to market are sold through either Deadline Sale or Auction, where first home buyers struggle to get finance pre-approval in order to be involved, and when they do it is capped and they are normally outbid by wealthier buyers looking to gain a further foothold in the area and have the ability to push on price. This ultimately leads to a number of these first home buyers shelving their plans for home ownership, or even worse, having to leave the area because of it. Having a good steady supply, based on market demand, of affordable homes in a quality subdivision that sit under the \$550,000 Kiwisaver threshold in the region would remove a number of barriers to entry for first home buyers in the area, and would ensure the opportunity to own your own home in this region is available for all. The ability to incorporate a community hub in this specific area of Hawea, that is easily accessible, and away from the lakefront, will provide commercial facilities that the town needs in order to remove the reliance, and traffic flow, into Wanaka to service basic needs. We would also encourage significant green spaces, and environmental benefits with such a development, including the likes of partnerships around Solar Energy and Native Plantings.</p>

Individual	Jake Bootsma	I support the the proposal to establish a Special Housing Area (SHA) as it aims to provide entry level real estate in a region where this is in short supply. The development of this SHA will provide room for growth in the Hawea/Wanaka area and will enable the economy to grow as a whole as the SHA will likely house many working families. The location proposed is ideal as it is where Hawea township would naturally expand in time. The gifting of additional properties to the Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust is also a very positive step will benefit those most in need in the Lakes district. Universal Developments are locally owned and understand and respect the local community, and the reduction in the number of houses from 1000 to 400 demonstrates this well. I see no reason why this proposed SHA should be declined.
------------	--------------	--

Individual	Lea-anne Evans	District wide we need to address affordability. Finally, here is a developer who is cutting out the speculators and working directly with the building companies to offer affordable product at \$550,000 Without this sort of initiative my children will never be able to live in Central Otago. We need to be inclusive and ensure we're addressing the affordability issue.
------------	----------------	---



Organisation	Southern District Health Board	Emily Nelson	<p>Southern District Health Board (SDHB) presents this submission through its public health service, Public Health South (PHS). This Service is the principal source of expert advice within Southern DHB regarding matters concerning Public Health. Southern DHB has responsibility under the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 to improve, promote and protect the health of people and communities. Additionally there is a responsibility to promote the reduction of adverse social and environmental effects on the health of people and communities. With 4,250 staff, we are located in the lower South Island (South of the Waitaki River) and deliver health services to a population of 319,200. Public health services are offered to populations rather than individuals and are considered a 'public good'. They fall into two broad categories - health protection and health promotion. They aim to create or advocate for healthy social, physical and cultural environments. This submission is intended to provide general and specific commentary to Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) on the consultation document 'Hawea - Expressions of Interest for a Special Housing Area - Universal Developments Hawea Limited'. General Comments PHS is encouraged by the consideration of a number of important aspects for community development and health within the Universal Developments proposal. Housing Affordability PHS recognises the housing shortage and cost of accommodation in the Central-Lakes district including Wanaka and Hawea and supports the use of Special Housing Areas where appropriate. The ratio of house price to income (liveability ratio) in Queenstown-Lakes is the highest in the country at 15, compared with Auckland at 8 for this period, highlighting the considerable gap in affordability in the district. As outlined on the QLDC website, the objective of a Special Housing Area (SHA) is to boost our housing supply and improve housing affordability in the district by facilitating development that meets the needs of the growing population. This will be achieved by fast-tracking the consent process under the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013 (HASHAA). PHS supports the Universal Developments' proposal to help address housing affordability by reducing the median multiple, and therefore satisfy the criteria to be deemed a SHA. PHS is pleased to see the support by Universal Developments of the Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust within the proposal. By gifting 10% of the sections to the Trust we are further supporting the needs of the community in providing affordable housing. PHS supports the affordability for all-ages goal to create a diverse and vibrant community.</p>
--------------	--------------------------------	--------------	--

While houses must be built to a tight budget to remain affordable for the purchaser, the quality of the build structure should consider the following aspects to ensure the health of the residents: Energy efficient, including adequate insulation, ventilation, affordable clean energy sources for heating, and double-glazing. Maximise solar gain through the orientation of the sections and houses to the northA design suitable for the target - for those with a disability or elderly, families or those in a house-share. While the proposal states that a street design will ensure a predominance of east-west orientation lots to maximise solar gain, it is not clear if the sections will have the long side facing north, or if the houses can be situated to maximise north facing exposure. PHS recommends Universal Developments consults <https://www.energywise.govt.nz/at-home/building/#Siteposition> for further direction on energy efficient housing. Urban Planning and Design PHS supports the use of urban design principles that promote community cohesion and provide opportunities for healthy lifestyles. It is pleasing to note the plan included consideration for playgrounds, reserves and a community hub. As outlined in Housing New Zealand Corporation's design guidelines, urban design can positively impact health and wellbeing through good planning, place-making, public spaces, community and sustainability . Specifically, this could be demonstrated through the provision for green space, street connectivity, safe walking and cycling opportunities, public space to foster social connectivity, and increased density to limit the sprawl of Hawea town. Public walkways and roads must be designed for safety and include adequate street lighting and safe low-impact surfaces that minimise road surface noise. Progressing a development under SHA legislation should not come at the expense of good urban planning and design. Physical activity is associated with many positive health outcomes for individuals, including reducing the risk of obesity, heart disease, type 2 diabetes, cancer and helping manage depression. The design of communities which encourage walking and cycling as forms of transport can make it easier for people to be active as part of everyday life. The development must ensure access to connected green space, picnic areas/BBQs and tables, with drinking fountains in public spaces, seating areas for breastfeeding, and be accessible for elderly and those with disabilities. PHS encourages the developer to incorporate fruit trees and provide garden allotments for growing vegetables. In addition the development should have smokefree outdoor spaces and implement smokefree policy in all Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust (QLCHT) properties.

The Universal Developments proposal has clearly outlined how the development has addressed the developer's Master Plan objectives in a way that protects health and creates environments that enable people to live full and healthy lives. PHS encourages QLDC to highlight to Universal Developments the design and sustainability guidelines outlined in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Adequate Infrastructure PHS supports the acknowledgement of infrastructure needs within the development. By connecting to existing reticulated infrastructure and using filtration systems for storm-water discharge the quality of water supply will be ensured. The Community Hub is a good use of developer funding to reduce the need to drive to Wanaka for all activities and to increase the sustainability of the community and contribute to social infrastructure and cohesion. Access to public and active transport links, cycleways and walking paths suitable for buggies and kids' bikes, bike racks, and a focus on a low-speed vehicle pedestrian-centric environment should be considered. The traffic assessment provided demonstrates that the proposal will have minimal effect on the surrounding roading network. Adequate capacity exists to accommodate additional traffic within the existing network. Summary PHS thanks QLDC for the opportunity to comment on the Universal Developments Hawea Limited proposal. PHS supports the Universal Developments' expression of interest for a Special Housing Area. Through this submission PHS proposes that QLDC incorporate the following recommendations: Approve the development and use of a Special Housing Area to boost our housing supply and improve housing affordability. Proceed with the gifting of 10% of sections to the Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust. The health of the residents must be at the core of decisions relating to design and quality of the dwellings. Maximise solar gain through the orientation of the sections and houses to the north. Urban design principles using the Sustainable Development Goals should be applied to promote community cohesion and provide opportunities for healthy lifestyles, including active transport, shared outdoor spaces, and smokefree communal areas. Adhere to New Zealand Housing Corporation principles for urban design and development - planning, place-making, public spaces, community and sustainability. We do not wish to be heard on the submission.

Individual

Yeverley McCarthy

I cannot speak highly enough of the concept. After spending 40 years in this area and having sold real estate for 20 of them in particular Hawea I am very aware of the need for a solution to the chronic shortage of affordable housing! I believe that Universal Developments are looking to sensitively develop an area that is the most logical move for Hawea Township. The vistas are great, the land is non productive farmland so perfect for housing, and the area adjoins the township so is not fragmented. It also does not impact on the general mountain and lake views as it is predominantly flat. Growth is inevitable and this site and concept are going to safeguard Hawea against ad hoc development and provide a solid base for future housing... I fully support the application.

Individual

Craig Laing

Excellent idea, plenty of suitable land, access to schooling, preschool and kindy. Sewage and water in the QLDC budgets for upgrade, more homes and families to help fund and maintain the infrastructure. We as an aging group, need young energetic folk who can afford to live in the area. Don't try and squeeze them into Wanaka itself with the associated extra capital requirements.

Individual	Trendy Little Tackers	Lily Graham	I am against the SHA in Lake Hawea. I do not feel that this is required and believe it will put further stress on our community. I feel that the Council needs to listen to the voice of the community and respect the plans we already have in place as per our meetings where 10 year plans were discussed and agreed upon.
Individual	IPRU	John Langley	I am opposed to this EOI for three key reasons: 1) . The EOI does not comply with QLDC's Council Lead Policy: Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act Implementation Policy (26 October 2107). The policy says: "The Council will not accept proposals or EOIs from landowners or developers to include areas on this schedule." Since Lake Hawea is not on the schedule the EOI should be rejected. 2) Special housing areas are not needed in Lake Hawea as there the area is swamped with undeveloped sections. Moreover it makes more environmental and social sense to have SHA in Wanaka where the services and employment is. 3) There is strong community opposition to development south of Cemetery Rd as evidenced by recent community meetings and the Hawea Community Plan (July 2015)
Individual		Greg McIntosh	I am opposed to the development. It will segment the town and is going to be built outside the current ten year plan boundary. I feel the existing developing and yet to be developed areas should be built on before the eventual necessity to spread the town further south. Tiny sections built on to maximum coverage has never been the Lake Hawea way. This proposal will detract from the Hawea sense of community and form more of an accommodation block.
Individual		Deborah Apps	I don't believe that there is a shortage of suitable and affordable housing in Hawea. The Sentinel Park and Timsfield subdivisions still have available sections, there are more Timsfield subdivisions to come which are not yet sold, and they are reasonably priced. I believe the size of sections in the the current subdivisions is as small/dense as is suitable for our small rural township, and any further development at this stage, particularly with smaller sections, will ruin the look and feel of our community. I believe that putting so many residential units on the southern side of Cemetery Road would make the road dangerous, everyone living here has to drive as there is no public transport. I believe that the residents of Hawea should be invited for consultation and that any future development should be part of the overall town plan. We already have a town plan and this development would be in contravention of it.

Individual

Tracy Keen

I am a resident of Hawea and would like to state that I am opposed to this proposed subdivision for the reasons outlined below: Approval of this EOI would be a show of disrespect to the Hawea Community and the Hawea Community Plan, the focus of the plan is the greater Hawea area, including the Hawea Township, Hawea Flat, Maungawera and John's Creek - all of which are currently semi-rural . It is easy to see that the urbanisation of the township has doubled in size in recent years with the addition of the Timsfield and Sentinel Park subdivisions. Both of these subdivisions are on the north side of Cemetery Road and comply with the Hawea Community Plan which extended the Township Zone through to Cemetery Road to provide for additional growth. This was considered to be a logical and well-contained boundary to guard against future sprawl. To quote the plan, "Once zone boundaries are defined, they should be enforced so that there is a clear distinction between residential areas and the surrounding rural environment. It is suggested that there is a green belt on the southern side of Cemetery Road." While the community can make their position on this clear, it is ultimately the responsibility of QLDC to uphold the enforcement. Universal Developments are clearly aware that by and large the Hawea Community is opposed to this proposal (and would be opposed to any proposed subdivision located to the south of Cemetery Road), however have opted to proceed with the application regardless. That the developer is using the SHA legislation rather than going through the usual channels and having the opportunity to gain consent for smaller lots than the area is currently zoned for shows that this is about nothing more than profit. If Universal Developments was truly committed to providing affordable house and land packages for the district, they would have provided affordable house and land packages within its other developments. Similarly land could have been gifted to the Queenstown Lakes Housing Trust without it being forced to in order to gain consent. I have found no evidence of either of these things happening at Universal Developments current developments. Given the pricing of the 409m2 sections currently on offer at The Heights (\$349k), large profit is the primary goal. Based on this, developers and land bankers are contributing to the issue of housing affordability. It appears from Universal Developments proposal and supporting letter from the Queenstown Lakes Housing Trust that the initial stage (Stage 1) is for the full 400 lots and that Universal Developments intends to develop more stages within this area - "Universal Developments intends to will double the contribution provided in Stage 1 to 20%, by bringing forward its contribution from later stages".

This is clearly a sweetener for the Queenstown Lakes Housing Trust to support the application and for QLDC to approve this application to put a high density housing area in a rural zoned community. I have concerns that this EOI, if approved, could be amended to include additional stages to reach Universal Developments original intention of gaining consent for 1000 sections - potentially without any public consultation as the process could be considered by Council to have been completed. Universal Developments refer to wanting to make Hawea a live, work, play community, however I believe Hawea to already be a live, work, play community. There are a number of residents that work or run businesses from home and there are opportunities for play through the Hawea Community Centre, which regularly hosts local events, in addition to also being the site for the Hawea Bowling Club, Hawea Library and tennis/netball courts in the township and again at the bike park and Community Hall located in Hawea Flat. I understand that there is more zoning for these types of areas within Timsfield and Sentinel Park. We also have walking and biking tracks, the Hawea Whitewater Park, proposed Disc Golf and of course, Lake Hawea. Looking at the bigger picture, approval of this SHA application would not only impact on the Hawea semi-rural community, but also on Wanaka as a whole. There is a huge amount of development underway that, along with an increase in visitors to the area, is putting increased pressure on the area in terms of infrastructure, facilities and enjoyment of those living here. Below is a list of subdivisions currently in various stages of development in Wanaka. When combined, there are more than 3,500 sections. Approximately 10% of these would be considered 'affordable housing' (281 in Bright Sky SHA and Timsfield which has 800m2 sections priced from \$249K). ' Luggate Heights - Queensberr - Luggate Park - North Lake - Hikuwai - Sentinel Park - Three Parks - Timsfield - Bright Sky - The Heights - Orchard Road - Meadowstone - Clearview Rise - Kirimoko Park - Stackbrae - Pukerangi. I would have liked to provide an exact list of subdivisions and number of sections offered, however my request for information is currently being considered and a decision will be provided by 9 July. Hopefully Councillors needing more information in considering this EOI would be able to access it in a more timely fashion, particularly when this EOI application could be considered by Full Council just a week after the feedback closes. The additional population generated by these subdivisions is going to result in more maintenance issues that are unable to be addressed in a timely fashion by QLDC. Examples are: 'There are numerous asphalt patches at the edge of the road in both Kane Road and Camphill Road.

The worst of these have had road signs and cones by them for months (between Camphill Road and Hawea on Kane Road) and have still to be repaired. These roads also have uneven surfaces. Given that there is a quarry located on Camphill Road that has trucks accessing it all the time, this is only set to get worse. -The road repair that has sunk in Myra Street, Hawea. Another example of a sign and road cone being in place for months without a repair being completed. -Flooding along Kane Road over the summer period. There was flooding over a period of weeks that took over most of one lane. Again this was just sign posted with no sign of the issue being addressed and repaired. - Road markings in Pembroke Park not being maintained. The maintenance 'fell between the cracks' and the markings became so faint as to be almost non-existent. The arrows have recently been re-painted, however the lines defining the car parks which were also faint have yet to be repainted. -Flooding issues at the Ballantyne Road entrance to Three Parks, and intersection of Anderson and Aubrey Roads. This has been an issue for over a year and has yet to be fixed. Other issues I can foresee are: Local schools not coping with the extra students. According to Universal Developments EOI, the Ministry of Education feels that Hawea Flat School still has capacity, however the school currently has classes of up to 30 children. On a conservative estimate of 1 primary school aged child in the proposed Hawea subdivision for every 5 houses, there would be a minimum of an additional 80 children that would need to be catered for by Hawea Flat School, who are currently in a situation of fundraising for a new school hall as they have outgrown the hall that was built in 2007 when the roll was 84 students. It is expected that the school will have over 250 children enrolled by the end of this year with growth likely to continue. One could argue that Wanaka South School is planned, however this school will need to cater for the population from the 1500 sections in Three Parks and also children from Luggate who I believe will also be within its zone, however the school will not be opening its doors until 2020. There is not enough parking in the Wanaka Township throughout most of the year and at peak times there can be queues of traffic in both directions along Ardmore Street. This issue made national news last Christmas/New Year and is only set to get worse as the population increases. Wanaka has just one full sized supermarket to service it. Due to congested parking and the general busyness within the supermarket that can quickly lead to queues down the aisles, many locals are now opting to either travel to Cromwell or shop online and have their groceries delivered from Queenstown.

Wanaka has personal grocery deliveries every day and Hawea has deliveries 3 days a week. This will be having an impact on Wanaka's economy as more locals take advantage of this service and spend what would be one of the highest weekly household expenditures in Queenstown. While there is a new supermarket in the pipeline, it is still some way off and may be too late to get locals spending their money in Wanaka again. Rubbish and recycling - increased population equals more waste. Does QLDC have processes in place to deal with this and has food composting been considered as an option? Wanaka is an environmentally aware community that is always looking for options to reduce waste going to landfill. Can our emergency services and medical centre cope with the increase in population? The recent announcement that the Central Otago After Hours is set to close on 1 July has highlighted the current pressures on medical staff in the region. There is no emergency department in Central Otago, so if the closure of this service goes ahead, local people from Alexandra to Wanaka, and visitors to the area, will be left with nowhere to turn. It is 5 hours by ambulance to Dunedin Hospital. As a resident of Hawea that travels into Wanaka for work during peak times, I can see that there are issues on SH6 that need to be highlighted to Council as they are not necessarily issues that would be apparent to someone who has not driven the road between Hawea and Wanaka during these times. All traffic accessing SH6 from the roads and driveways north of the Albert Town Bridge are dealing with joining a flow of vehicles travelling at 100km. With current traffic flows at peak times it can be difficult to get into this flow. Similar issues will be faced by vehicles getting onto SH6 south of the Albert Town Bridge, however the speed limit there is between 60km and 80km. Then there is the issue of the Albert Town Bridge itself - a one lane bridge. With the increase in population already evidenced in recent years in Hawea and more visitors accessing Wanaka via the West Coast, it needs to be upgraded to a two lane bridge. There is also going to be increased congestion at the intersection where the two branches of SH6 meet Riverbank Road. Traffic here crosses between 1 and 3 lanes of traffic depending on whether you are travelling into Wanaka or across to Riverbank Road. Traffic coming from the east comes up a rise at 80km and often seems to appear out of nowhere. Increases in the population in Wanaka, Luggate and Cromwell are likely to result in more traffic around this intersection, particularly at peak times making this intersection more difficult to get out of, and has the potential for safety to become an issue.

It is my view that there are issues that Council and Central Government need to address and get right before any more subdivisions are approved in Wanaka.

Individual	Lorne capell	This proposal is not appropriate for our area at this point in time and should not be considered for another five years.
Individual	Amie Capell	Completely unnecessary. The council has complete disregard to the preservation of Hawea, this is obvious by just driving through our Main Street. If this SHA goes ahead it would just go to further show that Hawea is just being used as a means to fund projects in Wanaka and Queenstown.



Individual

Matt Evans

I currently oppose the proposed Hawea 'Universal Developments' Special Housing Area. My opposition is not based on opposition to development itself; development is necessary for any community experiencing growth. Rather, my opposition derives from my concerns about the efficacy and fairness regarding the use of an SHA for this proposed development. Although I have not done extensive research into the effectiveness of SHAs in ameliorating housing shortages, I have asked that question and been answered with a lack of persuasive evidence (and I assume the burden of evidence should lie with those in favour of an SHA). Do SHAs actually work to solve the larger housing problem to which they are being applied? Of course, I assume SHAs will get land developed and houses built. But land will be developed and houses built even without an SHA. So is an SHA demonstrably the best answer - especially in the face of community opposition? Are there alternative, perhaps more efficacious methods for accelerating development? On the issue of fairness, my first concern is fairness to the members of the Hawea community. Approval of the proposed SHA does not seem to appropriately value past decisions made by the Hawea community regarding development, and such approval does not seem to involve the community in a transparent and meaningful way. My second concern is that it appears the proposed SHA may provide "unfair advantage" to one developer over other developers currently working within the township. Perhaps that unfairness could be justified in a crisis situation, when expediency is paramount. But is that the case here? Our community needs development. Smart development requires thoughtful planning and hard work. I have deep respect for those who dedicate their time and focus to that planning and development, and I believe those people need to be trusted by the community they are helping to build. That trust can be eroded by a lack of transparency, by the perception of deals made "behind closed doors", and by a lack of focus on fairness and efficacy.

Individual

Karen Oakes

I am opposed to the special housing area. The infrastructure and water management of Hawea is barely coping as it is, a larger population would seriously damage this. It would also make Hawea a much less desirable place to live. I believe the community would suffer and we would lose our family feel. It would be a major strain on the resources.

Individual	April Mackenzie	<p>I do not support the SHA development going ahead. I am not anti development. I would support the development of The Hawea township within the boundaries of the currently recognised town. North of cemetery rd and bounded by Muir Rd, domain rd and the lake. Infil of the current town is good for the community and the environment. The QLDC should allow more dense housing within the town limit. Allowing 550sqm sections and multi dwelling options to address affordability and availability. If the sha was to go ahead I believe that the qldc would be obligated to allow infil development north of cemetery rd so as to allow current residents the same property rights as those purchasing in the sha. The town benefits from being constrained within the existing boundaries and there is good availability for further development. Urban sprawl is not a solution that the qldc should be supporting. It is not the future for urban growth. It is argued that the land selected for the SHA is unproductive. But that presupposes that irrigated, farm land is better for the district than natural Otago landscape. The fact that prior owners of this land have not irrigated it does not mean that it's best use is property development. I support, as a resident of Lake Hawea, the development of he town within the boundaries and do not support the SHA proposal.</p>	
Individual	Ulla Reymann	<p>I completely oppose the proposal. Lake Hawea is a small, tight knit community providing great living for young and old. The 2020 plan defined the planned areas of expansion &amp; Hawea is slowly expanding within the set boundaries . The new areas of development have by far not sold out yet &amp; there is absolutely no need to breach those boundaries in the near future . A huge increase in built up area south of cemetery road would spell the end of what makes hawea a special place. There is no infrastructure to support such expansion , no plentiful supply of drinking water &amp; major problems with sewage . This is it at all a proposal that befits the area &amp; is not at all supported by the people of hawea, the people who would actually be directly affected by such an enormous incongruous development .</p>	
Individual	Lake Hawea Contracting Ltd	John David OSBORNE	<p>I am totally against this development. It is unnessesary to build out side the current boundry until such time as there is no more sections available within the boundry. I also have concerns about the pressure it would put on our town services. Also traffic congestion coming in to Wanaka.</p>

Individual

Diane Kenton

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my feedback regarding the EOI for an SHA by Universal Developments in Lake Hawea. After reviewing the EOI supporting documents and attending community meetings regarding this development, please consider this my formal opposition to the progression of the EOI lodged by Universal Developments in Lake Hawea. My objections to this development are as follows: Roothing 1. I note that this EOI has supporting documentation from Tony MacColl who advised that the proposal will not have any immediate adverse effects on the functionality of the transport network. It would be interesting to understand the definition of 'immediate'. Does this mean 1 year, 2 years, 5 years? 2. I also note that Carriageway consulting has provided documentation regarding traffic flows on Domain, Cemetery and Capell Roads. a. Neither of these proposals have indicated consideration for the existing properties that will be built in the agreed Lake Hawea Township in Alan Dippie's development and the combined traffic flows that will create and the subsequent impact on these roads. 3. More importantly is the concern regarding roading infrastructure beyond Lake Hawea. There are two businesses in Lake Hawea - Sailz and the Hotel. For the permanent residents that live in Lake Hawea, they need to commute into Wanaka and beyond into Queenstown and Central Otago to pursue employment opportunities. These commutes are made via two one-way bridges ie: Alberttown Bridge and the Luggate Bridge (a historic bridge currently undergoing much needed restoration). I would therefore urge QLDC to seek a roading report in conjunction with the NZTA, to understand the impact of the additional 400 properties proposed by Universal Developments would have on these two bridges, in addition to the already approved properties within Alan Dippies Sentinel Park development (which is within the agreed Lake Hawea District Plan), to TRULY understand roading infrastructure impacts. The QLDC can not operate in isolation of NZTA - we have seen councils do that in Auckland and it has subsequently brought that city to a complete standstill. Community Housing Trust 4. I attended the meeting at the Lake Hawea Community Centre when Julia Scott discussed the benefits of the SHA for the Trust. At the time Julia advised that there were ~ 400 families in Queenstown registered with the Trust wanting an affordable home and 100 families in Wanaka. a. I noted at the time that in the numbers that Julia provided during that presentation, there were zero families in Lake Hawea registered with the Trust and wanting a home. b. Again, her letter dated 21 May 2018 refers to the Wanaka area where there is a need- but it does not refer to the Lake Hawea area, where there is a need.

5. Julia advised at the meeting held at the LHCC, that there had been instances where land gifted to the Trust had been sold, to purchase land in other areas where there was greater need. a. I see Lake Hawea properties being sold off by the Trust to fund areas in Queenstown or Wanaka where there is a need, under the premise of 20% of the properties being gifted by Universal Developments. When it is extremely clear - there is no evidence provided by Ms Scott for Community Housing in Lake Hawea. As such, the premise of applying for this approval under a SHA or HASSHA is a complete contradiction of the intent with which the SHA/HASSHA legislation was implemented. 6. I also note with concern that Julia Scott advises that Universal Developments will double the contribution in Stage 1 to 20% by bringing forward its contribution from later stages. a. So, to ensure complete transparency with the Lake Hawea Community, I urge Universal Developments to be forthcoming in advising when later Stages are expected to be released. Everyone knows that staged release is a far more savvy move for a developer, than dropping 1000 properties on the market at the same time. 7. I attended the Open Day at the property where the planner (short guy with red coloured hair) working alongside Lane Hocking first advised me that they actually wanted to build 2,000 properties. When I asked him why he was utilising the SHA as the way to do it, instead of proper aligned consultation with the community he appeared flustered by my question and responded 'because it was faster'. There was no mention of wanting to make properties affordable or wanting to gift to a Community Trust to help those people in our community struggling to get into their own home. Which at its essence after hearing Julia Scott explain it, is really a glorified renting scheme. Owners don't own the land and can only sell their house at CPI, which is less than what they would get if they put their money in the bank ie: they are unable to sell at market appreciating rates. But, hey they get to paint the kids bedrooms pink if they want! Certainly the most amusing part of that meeting for me, on the day. 8. I object to Universal Developments utilising SHA legislation to progress the approval of their development when it is not about assisting our community members struggling to get into their own homes, when there is no evidence of a single Lake Hawea family registered with the Community Housing Trust. a. Therefore, consideration of Julia Scott's support of this development should hold no weight. 9. R A Skidmore's documentation in support of Universal Developments application advises that the purpose of the HASHAA legislation is to enhance housing affordability by facilitating an increase in land and housing supply in locations where housing has

become unaffordable for the local community. Again there were no Lake Hawea families on Julia Scott's list. There were 100 Wanaka families - there is not evidence of 400 families in Lake Hawea or even in Wanaka needing affordable homes. a. Therefore, the utilisation of HASHAA legislation to support progressing this development with no evidence of regard for the actual intent of the legislation, could not be reasonably considered as lawful. Community Hub 10. The suggestion of a mixed commercial hub within this development is interesting. Again, when visiting the site on the Open Day when the former QLDC Planner (red haired short guy) supporting this proposal with Lane Hocking was asked about this, he advised that Universal Developments were not specialists in commercial development, rather the residential side. a. Therefore, I am keen to understand: what assurances does QLDC in potentially approving this application, provide to the Lake Hawea residents of considered commercial development in our community?

Wastewater/Sewage Management 11. At the LHCC meeting Alan Dippie talked about the challenges of his development, particularly in light of wastewater and sewerage infrastructure management and this is further evidenced in Stuart Pile's documentation where he said it is a challenge for QLDC to manage, where currently QLDC have a non-compliant wastewater treatment plant that is not fit for purpose. While Stuart Pile has advised that a business case has been undertaken to convey sewage to the Project Pure WWTP timeframes around the build of the 12km pipeline and the new bridge that it is 'hoped' would be built over the Clutha River has no definitive timeframes attached to it.. it is vital when QLDC consider this application that due consideration for this wastewater and sewage infrastructure and associated timings are given. There are health and safety risks for all members of our community should this not occur. Water Supply 12. I live on Mt Maude and I am a neighbour to the Lake Hawea Water Reservoir. a. While Stuart Pile's documentation makes mention of the water supply I am keen to understand if this development in any way places further burden on this piece of aged QLDC infrastructure or whether this new development is completely dependent on the Bore Pump Station and Treatment Plant. 13. Stuart Pile indicates additional CAPEX funding in 2021 a. What happens in the interim when Universal Developments start building houses? b. What is the demand placed on our existing Water Supply infrastructure? c. What is QLDC plan to manage that in the interim? 14. Watershed have completed their assessment with an average number of people per dwelling of 3. However, it stands to reason that if this is truly affordable housing-

then that is going to appeal to young families that are not only limited to 3/home. a. Therefore, I suggest that the demand assessment submitted as part of this proposal is likely to be incorrect and needs to be reviewed prior to QLDC endorsing any proposal from Universal Developments. Infrastructure Support Southern Land 15. This document prepared by Luc Waite suggests that this land is of low landscape value. From my perspective his statement is completely flawed. a. The view from my home on Mt Maude stretches from Lake Hawea, across the township, the proposed SHA side, the Hawea Flat and through to the Pisa Ranges. The value of my home is in its view which will be completely eroded with the Universal Developments proposal. b. There is significant value in preserving the beauty of our night sky in Lake Hawea and in the two years that I have lived in my home on Mt Maude I have seen that progressively compromised with increasing development on the Hawea Flat. 16. I moved from Auckland where I had an SHA built in my back yard which subsequently wiped \$600K in value off my property. I experienced three years of mud and silt drainage onto my property from this 20 hectare SHA development in Kumeu with promised footpaths taking 3 years to be built while I navigated orange road cones and roading delays for years. So, like many others, I became an Auckland evacuee, opting to return home to live in the Mainland and to an area filled with wonderful childhood memories. I chose to live in Lake Hawea with a permanent population of less than 2,000, genuinely believing that I had got as far removed from the ill-considered SHA legislation as it was possible to get. Couldn't have got it more wrong. 17. I object to the premise that this is about creating affordable housing for residents. a. The homes that Universal Developments will build will be purchased by people wanting holiday homes or to purchase rentals in Lake Hawea. b. The advice in Williams and Co's documentation is that they will discourage speculation on bare land and a vetting system to avoid speculation. Yet no evidence of how this will be implemented has been provided - why not? Williams and Co Documentation 18. The Innovation (section 3) and Consultation and Community Feedback (section 4) are contradictory. a. Section 3 outlines the strong support to provide 10% of development for first home buyers with a further 10% of sections in stage one being gifted by bringing forward the contribution from a later stage. b. Section four says Community Consultation has been an integral component of this proposal which is why they are requesting only 400 properties where there is an area for 1,000.

c. So, that actually means that Universal Developments has full intent to progress with 1,000 properties but they will just start off with 400. That is not evidence of listening to the community at all, that is just a savvy developer with a staged release approach creating the economies of supply and demand. 19. There were two open days held on the site for ~ 5 hours on two Saturdays. a. These Open Days were not well advertised and were only put in neighbouring properties to the proposed development. It was only via the Facebook Community page that the Lake Hawea community became aware of the proposal. b. There was a further meeting held at the Lake Hawea Community Centre- not organised or facilitated by Universal Developments - but facilitated by the Hawea Community Association with QLDC attendees. c. Lane Hocking talked for approximately 3 minutes and that was to respond to a question that was put to him only. d. To say that consultation has been an integral component of this proposal is misleading on this basis. 20. In section four to state that the final form of this Expression of Interest is a reflection of community feedback is flawed. a. The community have clearly signalled to Lane Hocking that they do not want his development to progress. b. The community have said clearly to our QLDC representatives via petition and via the Hawea Community Association representing us: have consideration for the time and effort that our community elders have put into the Lake Hawea District Plan and regard for what that Plan requested in terms of the agreed Lake Hawea township boundaries. I strongly urge QLDC to start listening to the Lake Hawea Community (where for they have turned a deaf ear to community sentiment on water chlorination and our recycling centre) and reject Universal Developments proposal. The community do not want this development to progress and approval of this proposal will show a complete ongoing disregard for our community by the QLDC, were it to endorse this EOI. Thank you

Individual	Lake Hawea Contracting Ltd	Donella Osborne	I am against the proposed Special Housing Area. I am concerned about the pressure that would come on our town supply services, and roading. It concerns me that this would start a new trend of building out side our present town boundary, and the development proposed for the other end of cemetery rd, oppositse Timsfeild, which at this stage is not permitted, would also go ahead. At this stage there is still plenty of available land for building, more affordable homes in the town boundary.
Individual		Anna	Myself and my family oppose the proposed special housing accord plans and designation for Lake Hawea township on the following grounds: - Lake Hawea was not originally recognised by local and central government as a target area with housing shortage issues. - When the special housing accord was drafted, Lake Hawea township was not contemplated to be subject to the special housing accord. - Lake Hawea does not presently suffer from a housing shortage. There are many sections available on the open market which are already cheaper and available compared with towns that do indeed suffer housing shortage pressures - those which were indeed contemplated in the original housing accord. - Lake Hawea infrastructure and services are already under pressure from the current influx of new houses and population rise. - Lake Hawea township is not able to economically accommodate further section development at this stage. - Risk management and Health and safety considerations will be compromised if the proposed development is accepted by local government. - It would be ultra vires of the council to approve the proposed special housing accord for Lake Hawea.

Individual

Ella Hardman

As the population in Wanaka, Hawea and the surrounding area grows housing opportunities should be made available for a range of demographics. The region's economy is primarily centred around tourism and as such employment opportunities are largely service based. Providing affordable housing for those employed in the service sector (e.g. cafes, hotels, tourism operations etc.) is therefore a critical aspect of supporting our local economy. The proposed Lake Hawea Special Housing Area is located on the south side of Cemetery Road. It is also adjacent to Tims Field which is already recognised as a development providing affordable housing. The proposed location fits with the existing context and provides the opportunity to augment the area and allow for the establishment of community amenities and services to the benefit of the wider community. The existing landuse is low intensity lifestyle farming intermixed with small scale forestry and wilding pines. The land is of a low level of productivity and visual amenity. The use of this land for residential, community and commercial purposes would not result in a loss of visual amenity or of productive land. For the above reasons I support the proposed Special Housing Area and believe it will be a real asset to The Lake Hawea Township and the surrounding region.



Organisation Land Solutions Ltd Charlie Grant

Having read through the supporting documents we would like to record our support for what is being proposed by Universal Developments Ltd at Hawea. Having been involved in Subdivision and Land Development for over 40 years it has always been obvious that the biggest driver for increasing land values has been the artificial control on the supply of bare land suitable for development into residential sections. Where demand outstrips supply values rise. The traditional approach to rezoning in areas of high demand has always been slow to initiate, and slow to complete, with the usual outcome that the bare land involved increases significantly in value during the process and does so without any physical change to the land. The additional cost of bare land then has to be passed on to the end consumer. This proposal represents a genuine attempt to keep costs to the end consumer. The proposal is on a site that is entirely suited to residential development, which does not carry escalated bare land costs the come with the traditional, expensive and prolonged rezoning process. As the population in Wanaka, Hawea and the surrounding area inevitably grows, housing opportunities must be made available for a range of demographics. Providing affordable housing for those employed in the service sector (e.g. cafes, hotels, tourism operations etc.) is critical to support our local economy, and to maintain a balanced community. The proposed Lake Hawea Special Housing Area is located on the south side of Cemetery Road. The argument that Cemetery Road should remain the southern extent of Hawea, like it is some sort of mystical line that warrants defending at all costs, will only serve to control supply that will inevitably raise land costs elsewhere. A better approach is to consider why it should proceed rather than defend what is after all a man made line running straight across the land. The proposed site fits in with the existing context, it provides an opportunity to augment the wider area, and it can be provided with services. The existing land use is low intensity lifestyle farming intermixed with small scale forestry and wilding pines. The land is of a low level of productivity and visual amenity. The use of this land for residential, community and commercial purposes would not result in a loss of visual amenity or of productive land. This proposal represents a real opportunity for Council. The site comes unencumbered with an escalated bare land value and will be efficient to develop, the concept provides efficiencies of scale and benefits arising from master planning, and the proposal is being promoted by a Developer with the commitment and resources to deliver.

For the above reasons we support the proposed Special Housing Area and believe it will be a real asset to The Lake Hawea Township and the surrounding region.

Individual	Claire Ironside	In an area with such high housing prices and very average wages, the reality for many young people who have grown up in the area being able to buy a house and continue to live in their home towns is not great. I think that the proposed development of good quality and affordable homes will be a very positive addition to the area and will allow many who wouldn't otherwise be able to afford it to get on to the housing ladder. Housing developments in Wanaka and the surrounding areas are going to continue to expand " if the proposed land is not developed now, it almost certainly will be in the future and will only be a matter of time.
------------	-----------------	---

Individual	H E Metz	No thanks. Plenty of sections available already. Keep within present townboundaries.
------------	----------	--

Individual	Sandra Metz	I think are still a lot sections waiting to be built on and still plenty of space available within the existing town boundary. Bigger is not always better.
Individual	Isabella Anderson	I support the application for a special housing area by Universal developments. I think it is a well designed and sensible application- there is no question that housing in the QLDC area and especially the Upper Clutha area is unaffordable for most working families. Renting is expensive and the average house price keeps rising as the demand for rentals rises. This puts a strain on the entire community and the provision for Nice well planned housing that is near to community facilities and within the budget of normal working families should be welcomed by everyone. The area is adjacent to housing areas already being built upon and is not visually out of place with the planned green space and community facilities it will be an appealing as well as affordable option for the young people within our district. The planned package land and house deals are also a very smart idea and it simplifies the process of either buying or building a new home which can be very off-putting for a young family in the QLDC area.

Organisation Hawea Community Paul Cunningham  
Association

Submission to QLDC from the Hawea Community Association 20 June 2018 The Hawea Community Association is opposed to the Lake Hawea Universal Developments (UD) Hawea Limited Expression of Interest (EOI) for a Special Housing Area (SHA) on several grounds: 1. The EOI does not comply with QLDC's Council Lead Policy: Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act Implementation Policy (26 October 2107). The QLDC policy states: "In deciding whether to recommend a special housing area to the Minister the Council will consider the statutory criteria, as well as the following matters:- One of the matters is Location. Under this heading it states: 'The Council will group areas of land in the District into three categories'. None of these categories makes any reference to land at Lake Hawea. This does not preclude Council at some future date recommending to the Minister that one or more areas within the district be established as special housing areas. BUT the policy also says: 'The Council will not accept proposals or EOIs from landowners or developers to include areas on this schedule.' On these grounds alone the application should be rejected. 2. There is strong opposition in the Hawea Community to the proposal. At a community information gathering meeting on the 21 April 2018 at Lake Hawea Community Centre there was substantial disquiet expressed about the proposal. This meeting was attended by UD and about 140 local residents. The EOI claims that "Universal has listened carefully to feedback to date from its community. As a result, it has scaled back this proposal from the 1000 sections envisaged initially" p2. This is incorrect. UD initially told the community it was planning 400 houses, then talked about the possibility of building 1000, but continued to document the intent for 400 in the EOI as if it was responding to community concerns. If UD were actually responding to clear community concerns, it would have walked away from the whole proposal. A substantial Lake Hawea community petition against the development proposed by the EOI has been presented. There is substantial negative community sentiment about the UD EOI, and this has been growing as more people learn about UD's intentions. 3. The UD EOI is inconsistent with the Hawea Community Plan (July 2015) and misrepresents the HCA. In 2015, the HCA reviewed the 2003 2020 plan that had been produced by the Lake Hawea Community. This report is titled 'Hawea Community Plan Review and Recommendations for the Upcoming District Plan Review' and was prepared for the HCA by Southern Planning. Over several months of preparation it received widespread community input and support. The plan declares Cemetery Rd as the southern town boundary limit for housing development in Lake Hawea.

In multiple places in the EOI, UD grossly misrepresents the Hawea Community Association's July 2015 report to QLDC. Many of these occur in relation to the community's clear wish for the Lake Hawea southern Town Boundary to remain as Cemetery Road. Following are some example extracts from the HCA's 2015 report: - Looking forward this will ensure long term future growth is contained within the urban boundary of Cemetery Road. - At Lake Hawea, the Township Zone should be extended through to Cemetery Road. - The objective and policy provision should limit the growth of Lake Hawea to avoid adverse effects of development on the rural environment outside of the urban boundary whilst encouraging sustainable growth within the boundary line that aligns with the character and scale of the Hawea townships. - Based on the predicted growth projections it is recommended that the urban boundary encompass the existing Township and Rural Residential Zone in Lake Hawea without encroaching into the Rural General Zone, refer to map below. (The map clearly marks the southern town boundary as Cemetery Road). The following are examples of where the UD EOI clearly contradicts and misrepresents the HCA 2015 report. For QLDC to consider these UD EOI assertions as correct would be a mistake. UD EOI: - The 2015 review also began to acknowledge the need to review the concept of a boundary and in that case suggested it move south to encompass land between Domain Road, Cemetery Road and an unformed legal road (to the west of this site). UD EOI: - The 2015 Community Association review also sought to extend the boundary south as discussed above, again acknowledging and supporting growth south of the road. UD EOI: - and as noted above already acknowledged in the Communities Review in 2015 seeking to expand the boundary south of Cemetery Road. UD EOI: - In coming to a decision to provide an urban growth boundary for Hawea the PDP Hearing Panel only received one submission on this issue from the Hawea Community Association. In that submission the Hawea Community Association sought part of the boundary be drawn south of Cemetery Road. This latter statement is again misleading and untrue, because it implies that Hawea Community Association sought to have part of the boundary drawn south of Cemetery Road. In fact this portion of land south of a small part of Cemetery Road is land already zoned and consented by QLDC many years ago. The HCA had no choice but to draw that portion of Lake Hawea's southern boundary around land already consented for Rural Residential development. This in no way detracts from the Lake Hawea communities wish that QLDC set the rest of Cemetery Road as its southern Town Boundary.

The UD EOI states that only one submission was received on the urban growth boundary. In fact it was a submission representing a large community, of several hundred residences.

4. Infrastructure inadequacy The EOI (p16) asserts that Lake Hawea infrastructure (water and waste water) is adequate to meet the requirements of the proposed development, and that QLDC identifies that 'future water and wastewater upgrades are sufficient to support your development' p16. This is a bit confusing as we understand that the QLDC HASHAA Implementation Policy requires that Council must be satisfied that adequate infrastructure already exists, or that this will be developed by the landowner or developer at its cost. We also understand that there is no doubt that both Lake Hawea water supply and wastewater infrastructure are nowhere near adequate for the UD proposed development. We also note that the Implementation Policy states: 'Infrastructure can and will be provided and funded by the landowner or developer at no cost to, and without unforeseen or adverse financial or environmental costs on the Council or other relevant infrastructure providers.' We can see no evidence in the UD EOI that the substantial infrastructure issues have been addressed or would be addressed by UD. This would also imply a failure to meet requirements of the Implementation Policy.

5. New Lake Hawea Community Hub is not needed The EOI states: 'The master plan has been specifically designed to provide the Community Hub' p21. Lake Hawea has a community hub, and we address aspects for its future in the 2015 HCA Plan. Why would we need a second community hub? Or why would we shift the existing hub? We don't need a second one and we would not shift the existing community hub - this is not a selling point for the EOI.

6. Shortage of Affordable housing? We can see no compelling evidence that the UD EOI will provide affordable housing. The EOI states: "The shortage of affordable housing across the District including Hawea is acute. This is reflected in the 70 percent jump in average house prices in Hawea over the past five years- from \$380,000 in 2013 to \$650,000 currently and \$1,000,000 District wide." P2 This statement provides no reference source, moreover it is misleading. There are 90 recently completed sections in the Sentinal Park and further 150 + in the Willowridge developments. Many of these sections are undeveloped. For example in Sentinal Park there are only 3 houses built! A number of other areas within the town boundary have unbuilt space. Quoting averages is very misleading as outliers can have a significant impact on the average. For example, a Lake Hawea house with a lake view recently sold for a record price of \$1.7m.

What should be quoted is the median price of house on the flat area behind Lakeview Tce and Capell Ave where there are no views of the lake- the area Universal Developments EOI relates to. Affordable housing is just one aspect of a low to medium income families' financial challenge. Transport costs for example can be substantial. In this respect it makes more sense for SHA's to be located in Wanaka as, for example there is minimal employment in Lake Hawea. Similarly this is where the main shopping is undertaken, the secondary school is, the GP's etc. 7. Claims the land is unproductive are misleading The EOI states: "The site is unproductive flat land" P2, "The land is pine covered and unproductive." P7 That may be true of its current state but the more pertinent issue is what the land production potential is. For example immediately east of the site is productive land. The EOI provides no evidence as to why this proposed SHA land could not be productive. It is simply described as unproductive - mainly because the previous owner chose not to farm it. 8. Ecologic Review Appendix U It appears that Appendix U was added after the EOI was submitted. There is no reference to this Appendix in main EOI. QLDC's website states it was added on 30 May 2018, presumably after the main EOI was submitted. To describe this review as Ecologic is farcical. For example there is no mention of fauna. In an area like this there will be lizards, and substantial populations of micro-fauna including small insects contributing to the local biodiversity. For the EOI to state: The site is not visually sensitive, ecologically sensitive,(P4) indicates a complete lack of appreciation of the need for an evidence base to inform good policy and decision-making. We suggest that the ecologic review (Appendix U) will add nothing to the case for the proposal and should not be considered as adequate to contribute to the QLDC consideration of the EOI. 9. Good for the Community? We note that the UD EOI makes a number of assertions about how good for the Lake Hawea community the proposed development would be. If this were compelling, we would see some evidence of community support for the EOI. Such support is absent. It is up to the Community to decide what is good for it! The Community decided sometime ago that it did not want development south of Cemetery Rd. The UD EOI has done nothing to change that view. 10. Summary The UD EOI should be rejected because: 1) It does not comply with QLDC's Council Lead Policy. 2) There is substantial opposition in the community to it. 3) It is inconsistent with the Hawea Community Plan (July 2015). 4) The existing infrastructure is inadequate to support it. 5) There is no need for a new community hub. 6) The claims of a shortage of Affordable housing is not matched by the facts.

7) Claims the land is unproductive are misleading. 8) The Ecologic Review is woefully inadequate. 9) The community should decide what is good for it not UD.

Individual

Alex Apps

I believe there is no need for more housing in Lake Hawea in view of the sections already being and soon to be released in the Sentinel Park and Timsfield areas as well as the existing remaining undeveloped land available within the urban area, for the next 2 to 5 years. Whilst there may be an argument for affordable housing in Wanaka this is not a reason to push the problem to Hawea. The argument for affordable housing needed in Hawea is disingenuous given that the demographic in Lake Hawea is approximately 40% holiday homes (empty much of the year) and the additional number of investment sections bought for profit rather than development would mean that any new subdivision would add only a very small amount of stock for local homeowners. That coupled with the proposed smaller sections (to be affordable) would result in dense housing spoiling the character and changing the nature of the town it adjoins. Importantly, there is no public transport in Hawea and there would be a massive infrastructure investment required that hasn't been planned for, or costed, and this is of significant concern should I be asked as a rate payer to fund this, particularly without consultation with the community. The proposed plan does not, in my opinion provide adequate green space for a growing area and the needs of the community have not been addressed or determined in terms of this development in any way. I feel that development made via an SHA in Hawea would be deeply unpopular with those already living here and only of benefit to real estate agents and housebuilders and ultimately would not meet the need of affordable housing that the SHA legislation was designed to assist. I would ask that QLDC honours its commitment regarding no further development until Timsfield/Streat Developments is complete and that no SHA is approved. Should development be desired longer term in the area proposed, then the normal Resource Management Act procedure should be followed in full consultation with the community.

Individual

Jo Hamilton

This special housing area is not in-keeping with the values of Hawea and its people. Many meetings and thoughts have been shared in opposition to this topic which I agree with totally. If the proposal is to go ahead then larger lot sizes should be encouraged; the same size as existing lots ie 800 sqm, Hawea is a treasured area in NZ of space, and open beauty, this is why visitors come here and why we locals live here, we don't want mass development and small lots, once this is done there is no going back. To maintain NZ's core values of love of land and space it starts in small communities. There is no need for tight lots or European style living here. As the 'Keep Hawea Beautiful' group states 'By cutting down land sizes to make a per square metre premium on "affordable" land is criminal". This proposal is not ethical. It is imperative to take action and to not go ahead with this proposal, to keep the rural beauty and heritage of Lake Hawea for the sake of looking after the land for today and the future. There are plenty of other sites still for sale in Hawea within the current zone that still needs filling. Careful consideration and mindful planning is required for the future to be a sustainable one. The current infrastructure could not cope with the SHA Policy in Hawea and nor should it have to. It is not needed. No thanks - Dont wish to see a Special housing area in this unique landscape.

Individual

Seamless  
Construction Ltd

Thomas Schattovits

I wholeheartedly support the proposed Special Housing Area. We need affordable houses in the Wanaka area RIGHT NOW. I have independently done market research for my construction company last year. We found that the market niche of small affordable houses is in gross undersupply. As a result, in December 2017, we launched a range of small affordable homes. We've not advertised much, networking and intermittent line ads in the Upper Clutha Messenger since January, but had on average 3-4 calls per week!! This is the rough percentage profile of inquiries: 80% young families with small children (primary need: affordability) 10% downsizing retirees 10% investors/relocatable/second flat on large lot Universal Developments' proposal meets the existing affordability shortage better than any other proposed or current development. It encompasses: -- VALUABLE DEVELOPER'S CONTRIBUTION to affordable housing, community integration, and price protection in direct comparison with developments such as Timsfield, Sentinel Park, or North Lake, where market forces obviously have the upper hand. For this alone the proposal merits approval. -- CAREFUL RESEARCH AND COMMUNITY CONSULTATION. -- LOGICAL CONTINUATION OF EXISTING DEVELOPMENT - development and vacant lots north of Cemetery Road are not offering anything similar, as they appear regulated purely by market forces. Due to its gravel content the proposed land is not of high agricultural value. -- MUCH NEEDED COMMUNITY FACILITIES for the accelerating population growth of Lake Hawea/Hawea Flat area. -- SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS such as solar power. My WISH LIST: -- that the developer pushes further into the direction of SUSTAINABILITY, giving builders a high benchmark with regard to passive solar design, insulation, construction waste. -- to further integrate SOLUTIONS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY USE, especially for heating, cooling and hot water, but also, foot and bicycle traffic, waste disposal and rain water harvesting. -- to showcase street frontages and facilities that follow the BEST PRACTICE OF MODERN COMMUNITY LIVING, departing from the typical New Zealand suburban streetscape. -- to remain serious about PROTECTING THE AFFORDABILITY of the housing for those who need it by implementing the right strategies. Other points to note: A community food growing initiative is still needed and can co-exist with this development. Lifestyle blocks like the adjacent consented development do not lessen the urbanization, on the contrary it is well documented that urban sprawl is produced mainly by large-lot single house development, adding to traffic, land availability and infrastructure problems. Housing development will continue in the immediate neighbourhood.

A more onerous approval process that may take 3-4 years, will only postpone the outcome, whilst the current need will not be met. I believe that this proposal helps, for future generations, to keep Hawea beautiful.

Individual

Dean Orton

I agree with the proposal for the Special Housing Area for the following reason. With the price of property in the Upper Clutha Area increasing significantly over the last few years I believe that it is important the supply of residential sections increase to ensure that demand is met or even exceeded. To restrict the number of properties available while demand is still strong will continue to put upward pressure on prices taking property ownership out of the reach of the younger members of our community.



Individual                      carmen

This has raised some serious concerns. Given that Hawea is not in category 1 or 2 of the QLDC lead housing policy for Special Housing area, this raises questions about why UD was given a greenlight to progress even as far as the eoi? Despite the councils knowledge of the HASHAA accord and that no formal consultation is required using SHA policy and that UD's eoi for a SHA in Hawea is contrary to council policy, I feel that the council has acted entirely inappropriately without giving due consideration to the impact that this proposal has created on our small community. As a result the community has been placed unfairly under duress with the knowledge that we are facing an inappropriate eoi for SHA. Consequently raising questions about the councils decision making process. I do not consent to the Universal developments eoi. And I am disheartened by the questionable actions of the council. Thank you for your time.

Individual                      Anne Moffat

I support the proposed Special housing area because there is a huge need for more affordable housing in the upper Clutha Area - I am involved in the residential rental industry and see a lot of people coming and going with no prospect to ever owning their own home, so they leave to go somewhere else affordable. It would be great if some people currently renting would have the opportunity to be able to get into their own home here. With out this, our community will be lacking in years to come.

Individual                      Lisa Prince

I support the Special Housing Area proposal, this is exactly what we need more of. I am a Property Manager and see a lot of young families unable to afford to buy/build here and end up having to leave town as renting and trying to buy/build in this market is virtually impossible to do. I see the Special Housing Area giving first home buyers hope and it will help with the growth of our community.

Individual                      John Taylor

I oppose the Universal Developments Hawea Limited Expression of Interest for a Special Housing Area. I wish to support the Submission to the Queenstown Lakes District Council from the Hawea Community Association (Inc.) of 20th June, in its ENTIRETY. I wish to re-affirm: Please listen to to our people in the community and the Hawea Community Association (Inc.). I do wish to repeat: The Universal Developments Hawea Limited Expression of Interest for a Special Housing Area should be rejected because: 1. It does not comply with the Queenstown Lakes District Council's Lead Policy. 2. There is very substantial and strongly felt opposition in the Hawea District Community to the proposal. 3. The UD EOI is inconsistent with the Hawea Community Plan (July 2015). 4. The existing infrastructure is inadequate to support it. 5. A new Lake Hawea Community Hub is not needed. 6. The claims of a shortage of Affordable housing is not matched by the facts. 7. Claims that the land is unproductive are very misleading. You only have to view the land toward the south and on the other side of Domain Road to see the potential of this land type. 8. The Ecological Review is woefully inadequate. 9. The Hawea District Community is quite capable of deciding, and should decide, what is good for it, not Universal Developments. The Hawea District Community decided sometime ago (reviewed in 2015) that it did not want development south of Cemetery Road. Please listen to our community.

Individual	Eamon Young	I work selling real estate in the Wanaka and surrounding areas. Although there is more and more land coming available through new subdivisions, the price of this land is by far exceeding the affordable price levels. The Wanaka area requires housing under the \$550,000 to give first home buyers the ability to access the additional government funding that is on offer. I see this proposal as a fantastic initiative and a real opportunity to offer the security of home ownership to a sector of the market that has disappeared from the Wanaka area. We are growing as a community but many workers are leaving to more affordable locations, the Upper Clutha community needs this for sustainability.
Individual	Errol CARR	I am strongly opposed to the proposed subdivision by Universal Developments on rural zoned land adjacent to Cemetery Road, Lake Hawea. The rural land subject to this proposal is outside the area identified as being appropriate for residential development in the Hawea District as detailed in the Hawea 2020 plan and subsequent review of that plan. That Plan and its subsequent review was prepared after comprehensive consultation within the Hawea community and was formally adopted by the QLDC at Council level. There is a plentiful supply of affordable land available for residential development in the Hawea area, already zoned for that purpose in the District Plan. Prime rural land should not be made available for residential subdivision unless there is no other suitable land available. That is not the case at Lake Hawea or the Hawea district generally. I do not believe that the SHA process should be able to be used as a device to bypass the robust process that is already available for property developers under QLDC procedures, to seek a zone change for land use.
Individual	Sandra McAuley	I do not believe there should be any further development of the Hawea area at this stage. I feel that the current development that is underway should be consolidated and any further development, if required, should not be considered until the infrastructure (roads, transport, services etc) is in place to meet the current population increase. The current proposal by Universal Developments, if accepted, will be a 'foot in the (back)door' to even more development as mooted by this company, We are seeing the destruction of the uniqueness of Queenstown-Lakes/Central Otago by very rapid development. There needs to be a balance and rejecting this current proposal will provide the overdue opportunity to look at how this can happen or if it needs to happen.

Individual	Kevin Duke	<p>Oppose for the following reasons: 1. Using the HASHAA by Universal Developments makes a mockery of the District Planning process, specifically its consultation and public participation. Using HASHAA for this development is in effect handing district planning over to the developer. 2. Universal Developments has applied to have its Lake Hawea area included in the HASAA, Category 2. This is against QLDC policy as the QLDC,s HASAA Policy for Category 2 locations is " This category can only be updated following resolution by full Council, which includes the addition and removal of areas from this category. The Council will not accept proposals or EOIs from landowners or developers to include areas on this schedule. Category 2 areas are listed in Attachment A. 3. There needs to be a comprehensive evaluation of the housing needs in the Wanaka Ward before allowing subdivision in locations where subdivision has already been deemed to be inappropriate. 4 The Universal Developments proposal has not considered the implication of the "natural" routes north to Capell Ave and Lakeview Tce through the roading network of the subdivisions under development of the possible opening up of the south Capell Ave paper road. This could add to the existing safety issues where these routes joint the main Capell Ave/Lakeview Tce thoroughfare.</p>
Individual	Kelly Wright	<p>I think it is too rushed, that yes development will happen but let's take time to do it sensitively and in keeping with the rural feel of the town. I feel 500m square sections are too small for the rural area - I realise not everyone wants an acre, but 500 in our area ruin any feeling of space - the main reason we moved here and not Wanaka... I agree there needs to be affordable housing, but that could easily be done with slightly bigger sections and less greed on the part of the developer. It also seems ridiculous that we own an acre that cannot be subdivided (and even when the town plan changes I've been told we'll only be able to go down to half an acre) and you could allow 500 squares directly across the road! And 800squares the other way in Sentinal Park. I have no desire to subdivide but it just seems hypocritical. Thankyou for considering all views on this.</p>
Individual	Dugald Henderson	<p>The fact that the existing infrastructure struggles to cope at peak times already is worrying, and a major upgrade of services for the existing township hasn't even been proposed as yet! We still have space available in the existing town boundaries which need to be filled in first, which was part of our 20/20 plan. There are still larger sections in Hawea , i.e. one acre etc, which could be rezoned to allow for smaller sections to help with infilling. As far as i can see, the developer is primarily trying to push through a SHA to line his own pockets, and not to help with the future of our lovely community, which has overwhelmingly spoken out against this proposal.</p>
Individual	Owen Watson	<p>We are totally opposed to this type of subdivision, There are still many sections able to be subdivided within the recognised footprint of the Lake Hawea Township,</p>

Individual	MR	Michelle De Bono	I strongly oppose this SHA. I'm not opposed to development in the area but I really want it to be done right. After all it is possible to design and build affordable housing communities that are healthy, highly energy-efficient and well connected to nature and neighbours whilst being sensitive to the outstanding beauty of our region. It is done elsewhere in the world and it CAN be achieved here. We should work together with council to establish a framework of development requirements that are based on the existing community's most cherished values. It is a very special place that most of us landowners feel privileged to be guardians of. Developers who blatantly do not care about the impact of their decisions on our people and planet should not be allowed.
Individual		Teresa	Hell Nooooo!!!!
Individual		Stephen Fraser	Great idea - proposed ideas meet the spirit of SHA guidelines that will actually help first home buyers. Other developments drip feeding section to maximise their profitability which only forces the prices up for each release.
Individual		Jackie Taylor	I feel that a Special Housing Area is absolutely NOT necessary in Hawea. There is ample land being subdivided currently, so there is no need to rush through a new subdivision. We are not against additional subdivisions in Hawea, but we feel that in such a special area with "outstanding natural landscape" ALL developments should go through the proper channels so that any developments are well considered, thought out and planned properly. There is only one beneficiary from establishing a SHA in Hawea and that is the developer. No thank you.
Individual		Charles Higham	Dear Mr Devlin My wife and I have owned our home on Flora Dora Parade, Lake Hawea, since 1989 We are totally opposed to employing special housing area legislation designed to alleviate a chronic shortage of housing in Auckland, to alter beyond recognition the character of Lake Hawea. It is a consistent nightmare to us, that a greedy developer with no interest whatever in the residents of Lake Hawea or the beauty of our small traditional Central Otago township, will try and begin the conversion of it into a new version of Queenstown or Wanaka. And now we stand at the threshold of just that. I urge you to do whatever can be done to ensure that this application is rejected.

Organisation Willowridge Allan Dippie  
Developments Ltd

Dear Mayor, CEO and Councillors, Universal Developments Special Housing Area, Hawea We write to provide feedback to the Universal Developments Hawea Ltd Expression of Interest for a Special Housing Area (SHA) on rural land bordering the township of Hawea. We believe the company behind this proposal is using this legislation in an opportunistic way to circumvent the normal planning process and that this will have an adverse outcome on the structure of the township and also the community of Hawea. This is why there has been so much local opposition to this proposal. The proposal also directly conflicts with Councils review of the District Plan which is currently underway. The proposal, should it proceed, would have a detrimental effect on the Hawea Township in terms of planning and effectively see development jump the town boundary to provide for development in the Rural Zone which does not need to occur considering the large amount of yet to be developed land within the Township and Residential zones. The proposal would also change the timing and roll out of affordable home development at Timsfield and it is important for Council to understand why this would occur and also what effect it would have on Hawea's town planning and infrastructure and why it would increase Council spending to provide and connect roading and infrastructure from the existing township to the proposed SHA. Background Timsfield is a 700 lot affordable housing subdivision which was started on a large area of Township and Rural Residential zoned land (formerly Timsfield farm and the old hydro village) in 2006. The development includes the provision of a future school, community facilities and sports fields. Willowridge is primarily a Wanaka based development company but has had a general policy since 2006 to provide one affordable section in Hawea for every less affordable section it builds in Wanaka. Since 2006 there has been a continuous supply of affordable sections to the market at Timsfield with many 1st home owners joining the project under Willowridge's Kiwi 1st Home Ownership scheme. Willowridge also constructs affordable home and land packages and has delivered many of these to 1st home owners over the years. Currently it has contracts underway with leading home builder companies to create additional affordable housing. QLDC has been very supportive of this affordable housing project and the QLDC and Willowridge presently have a development agreement which provides for Willowridge committing to an additional 200 sections over a 3 year time frame. Under this agreement 32 sections (Stage 5) were completed in 2017 and a further 76 sections (stage 6) will be titled in August with a further 67 already under construction for completion and title in 2019.

Hawea also has other active land developers and the adjacent Sentinel Park subdivision has just completed 90 sections. The combined Willowridge and Sentinel Park developments alone mean there are approximately 250+ recently completed sections in Hawea, which are yet to be built on with at least 100 more sections under construction and due for completion within 12 months. There is also ample zoned land supply in Hawea to keep increasing this healthy supply for approximately the next 10 years. The recently notified decisions on the Proposed District Plan rezones the remaining Rural Residential zoned part of Timsfield land as Lower Density Suburban Residential land. This will enable another 400 sections to be developed in stages as demand for them allows and this will complete the subdivision within a 10 year timeframe depending on demand for sections. The District Plan review would have been the appropriate forum for considering what development should occur on the Universal Developments Land so that the growth and development of Hawea could have been considered in a comprehensive way. The review of the Townships Zone has yet to be undertaken (Stream 3) and promoting the land for rezoning through the district plan review process may result in a better outcome both in planning terms and in terms of timing of land release in Hawea. Of all the Central Otago and lakes townships (including Queenstown and Wanaka) Hawea has received a much greater increase in residential land supply (in percentage terms) over the past 2 years. This growth, while beneficial, has its negative side on such a small township and caution is needed to keep the township and community in good heart. For example, during the Global Financial Crisis (2009 on) Hawea really suffered with a very weak property market. In hindsight, developers such as Willowridge probably got supply too much head of demand and it was very difficult to sell sections for many years. Unfortunately, some 1st home owners also lost their equity and some mortgagee sales occurred. If the SHA at Hawea proceeded, part of the legislation means that it would have to be rolled out in a short time frame. That roll-out, together with the large amount of sections that are available at present with construction yet to start could easily mean a very unstable market where supply is very much ahead of demand. If the SHA went ahead, Willowridge would be forced to cease the Timsfield development after the present Stage 7 is complete because if both developments rolled out together as well as other developments in Hawea the whole town would be very negatively impacted given the huge imbalance that would be created. This imbalance would be in terms of the size of the developed township verses the size of the

undeveloped township. In other words, development of the town would be occurring at too fast a rate for the township to remain sustainable. SHA's in the larger townships such as Queenstown and Wanaka do not have this problem and SHA's do not affect these townships to the same extent as the proposed Hawea SHA would. It would be much more desirable for Universal to contemplate a SHA at Wanaka for example and this would place affordable housing nearer to better infrastructure, employment and transport options. The negative effects far outweigh the benefit for Council to approve this SHA and not only would the community be adversely affected but so would the QLDC itself (and therefore ratepayers) because the SHA will place a considerable financial burden on the QLDC. It is important to understand the implications of the SHA in terms of QLDC provided infrastructure. There would be major infrastructure costs for QLDC including the construction and extension of the paper road, Capell Avenue that extends through Timsfield from the old township to Cemetery Road. The Capell Avenue extension is the major future linkage from both Sentinel Park and Timsfield and needs to be constructed to link and knit the township together. If the SHA went ahead it would be critical that this linkage be constructed. Under a normal planning environment Willowridge would construct this road at its cost as part of its future Timsfield roll-out. However, with the SHA proceeding before the last 400 sections in Timsfield that would effectively mean the QLDC was forced to create this road at its expense. There would be other infrastructure and implications for Council as well. Extending township infrastructure past developed land and into rural land is not efficient and is contrary to urban development policies in both the operative and proposed district plans. Already QLDC Engineers are struggling to keep up with the growth in Hawea in terms of water and wastewater headworks provisions and the SHA would create a situation where zoned land could not access these services because the SHA would be using that capacity. Summary 1) The SHA would not increase or add to affordable housing in Hawea. It would merely transfer the location at which this is occurring from within the township to outside the township. 2) Development outside the township boundary will have major roading and infrastructure implications for the township and for the QLDC. It would also have implications for "in-zone" development which is already adversely affected by limited water and wastewater infrastructure connections due to the townships extremely rapid growth. 3) There are presently over 400 vacant sections in Hawea that are either recently completed or under construction within the boundary of the township.

This is already a massive percentage increase in terms of a small township. Hawea is probably the best example of any township in the district of developers responding to affordable housing demand. This SHA is attempting to provide a solution to a problem for which solutions have already been found. 4) Over development of the small township of Hawea due to the SHA legislation would have devastating effects on the community and cause a real estate correction due to over-supply, which would adversely affect every residential property owner within the township. Those most adversely affected would be the large number of 1st home buyers, which have just completed, are underway or are about to commence their housing projects. 5) The SHA will have a detrimental effect on QLDC and its rate payers. A substantial paper road that would normally be created by private development would need to be fully formed with public money. The provision, extension and maintenance of infrastructure for an already fast developing town will have a negative effect on the QLDC and its ratepayers. 6) The SHA will tip sensible town planning on its head with planned development of the proposed community hub including commercial and retail development within the SHA on the edge of the town rather than within the township is not desirable. Much of this type of development would be better suited to a hub around the existing commercial and community assets in the township, which are much closer to the Lake. The SHA will also effectively leave a large hole in the township as development occurs within the SHA rather than within the zoned residential or township land. 7) Perhaps most importantly, this SHA will divide a very active and healthy community and cause resentment and unrest within that community. This is because the community is already coping with very large growth and to place growth well beyond what could reasonably be expected or contemplated has already caused alarm throughout the community. Alternative Option A positive and alternative plan of action for the QLDC to consider would be to reject this SHA and further encourage SHA applications in Wanaka which can cope with this type of development more readily. Universal will of course be allowed to participate in the normal planning processes in terms of their land at Hawea and either submit for rezoning through the Stream 3 District Plan Review, promote a private plan change or apply for a resource consent. This would provide for a more comprehensive analysis of any proposal and for more robust, long-term planning for Hawea and its residents.

Individual

Patricia Spedding

I am lodging this objection to the proposed subdivision . 1) Growing new traffic noise from the existing Timsfield subdivision dominates the environment for homeowners on the moraine escarpment in Lake Hawea township. The noise is akin to living above the motorway in Auckland now on week days (leaving for work, coming home) We don't want more of this. The low cost housing subdivision will only exacerbate this problem 2) The very nature of Lake Hawea is tranquil, natural and mountainous. Visitors comment on the unspoilt mountainous nature of the village. A subdivision such as proposed will destroy the present appreciation of the Hawea River's unspoilt environment by tourists. 3) There is no infrastructure to support this subdivision. Infrastructure would spoil the very natural essence of this area. The plan is shortsighted- look 20 years ahead visualise it- at present there are few natural places left as stunning as Lake Hawea and the countryside around it. The area is a taonga. A lake cannot be situated in the middle of a light industrial area and be considered unspoilt!



Individual

Victoria Wills

I wish to make an OBJECTION AGAINST the proposal from Universal developments for an affordable housing area planned on 32 hectares of RURAL ZONED land south of the current town boundary of cemetery road Lake Hawea This requires a District Plan Change I am a Resident. My objections are based on the following points : This development is contrary to the vision of the Lake Hawea community The development is outside the designated town boundary of Cemetery Road There are plenty of affordable sections at reasonable prices to the north of Cemetery Road There are no high schools shops or public transport systems in place at Hawea to even consider this area AFFORDABLE It is NOT affordable to have to travel daily 15km into Wanaka Lake Hawea already has a HUB beautifully situated with lake views and additional land zoned and ready for expansion beside the store If an affordable housing area is even appropriate for the Wanaka area it should be IN WANAKA where there are jobs schools and shops I hope that QLDC listens to the wishes of the Lake Hawea residents who seem to be almost unanimous in their objection to this proposal.

Organisation    KeepHaweabeautiful

Considering the eoi by Universal developments, the size, type, and concerns surrounding the limited consultation process. That it proposes major land use change, and the development itself is at odds with the district plan and the unique character and rural heritage of the Hawea district, we find the eoi severely lacking and missing comprehensive supporting data some of which is noted as a conflict of interest to the proposal and viewed as inappropriate. For the following reasons we do not consent to the eoi put forward by Universal Developments HAWEA is not listed in category one or two of the SHA Lead Policy for QLDC. This process should never have been undertaken nor allowed to have moved beyond the conversation stage. This shows a lack of consistency in QLDC planning policy. KeepHaweabeautiful finds that the EOI is missing the following: Environmental impact statement and unproductive farmland A. There is no independent data or research undertaken on the environmental impact that a development of this size and type will have on current rural zoned land, not limited to the loss of productive rural land in the Hawea district to rapid urbanisation and the river and lake systems, unique to the Hawea area. B. There is no statement from any farming group to support claims of farmland being unproductive C. Therefore the eoi statement – “the land is unproductive” is not an informed one. Comprehensive ecological audit A. The ecological review which UD paid, E3 scientific from Arrowtown to undertake, is a brief half page audit taken during the dormant season. B. Considering the major land use change, the huge impact which current property development practice such as UD’s eoi has upon the land and environment, we feel that a brief half page ecological audit is less than adequate. C. These are immensely important points which deserve a far more comprehensive audit of the unique ecology of the area, which would be better understood by a local ecologist. D. A far more comprehensive audit needs to be undertaken by a local ecologist, including mapping and identification during the spring & summer of insects, skinks, geckos, weta species of birds nesting, identification of plants growing etc. Independent audit and investigation into housing affordability issues in the QLDC A. That proves the current accepted trend and property development practice of reducing land size as yet to be confirmed but referred to, in the eoi will not contribute to affordability issues, enabling to undercut current land size of 800 sqm in Hawea. As proposed in the EOI. B. That SHA policy and its ability to rapid and fast track growth alleviates affordability. C. There is a legitimate need for an SHA or fast track development of rural land in Hawea, rather than using issues unique to the larger urban areas of Queenstown & Wanaka.

D. 540,000\$ House and land package on ~550m2 is a premium sale over a 580,000\$ section and own build on 800-900m2 of land in Timsfield or Sentinel Park. This is not affordablity at all. E. This type of development serves to create a premium on per square metre pricing. F. Independent Sustainability and Self Sufficiency assessment A. That honours the rural heritage of the land and community a development which can pioneer true affordability by offering larger parcels of land for less than what is currently available. B. Efficient land use; by offering decentralised concepts and practice for waste and water treatment. C. Development practice that has far less impact on the land & existing community hubs. D. Alternatives, to urban gridlock design which are sympathetic to the land, including infrastructure. E. An example of such design can be found at Kirimoko Park. The EOI is missing supporting Data from the contacted "public consultation" groups A. The Hawea Community Association B. The Hawea Knitting Group C. The Hawea Golf Club The EOI is missing supporting data from the "drop in sessions" A. There are no documents that show a record of this occurring. B. There are no documents showing what data was gathered at these sessions C. There are no minutes or recordings of what was said The EOI is missing a comprehensive Geo-technical Review A. The geotech review is based upon assumptions rather than actual data B. No testing has been undertaken by the company that has contributed assumptions The EOI is missing any supporting evidence that this is not proposed to be a dormitory for workers of the Wanaka Chamber of Commerce as outlined in "ignite Wanak" letter of support A. As outlined in their supporting letter, the chamber declares a need for " worker accommodation" and rental properties, not a need for, compact urban design for family living to live in Hawea. It is an entirely different issue. B. This type of accommodation is already catered for in the BrightSky SHA within Wanaka Township Zone C. This type of accommodation is better suited to urban areas, close to public transport and close to the places of work for people seeking this type of accommodation. D. This can be supported by Alexa Forbes article in CRUX which outlines a desire for seasonal workers to be closer to amenities as many don't have vehicles. E. Hawea is over 15 kms from the amenities that suit seasonal workers, for example, nightlife, which is 99.8% centered in the Wanaka Commercial Zone. F. Hawea, as it is a quiet and peaceful rural settlement that doesn't require hundreds of extra people for work The EOI has supporting data from a profit motivated Real Estate company whose motivation it is to make as much profit from sale of any given client A. The letter uses an example of a house sale in rural Hawea, a house that is known locally.

B. It is also known that the owners of this house were approached by two different local parties to see if it could be bought before auction, only to have the answer that - it was needed to go to auction to make as much money as possible, as it was a divorce settlement. C. The supporting data from a biased real estate company towards supporting the development of an SHA does not come close to an appropriate independent audit nor independent inquiry into the issues of affordability. D. This does not show support for demand for housing that is not already catered for in current consented subdivisions. E. This is a direct conflict of interest. To create a 400 section SHA for the developing of ONLY 40 of the 1000 affordable homes that the QLDC requires is an oxymoron - A. The supporting claims from QHCT, are viewed as conflicting as the creation and ongoing success of the trust is one that depends heavily on development. Therefore it is reasonable that the trust will support the eoi B. We don't view the use of the QHCT as a method for persuasion in regards to the SHA as fair. C. The QHCT would be better suited to work within a more decentralised role to meet the unique needs of each community to tackle affordability issues. D. A profit motivated development project does not have community at its heart and cannot work towards compromise and strategy over the long term with profit goal in mind. E. Hawea is over 50kms from Queenstown and therefore should not be included in district affordability issues, as these issues are localised. F. There is already support in Hawea to continue the current growth model until it is filled, around the date 2033 as stated in QLDCs own district plans. In Summary The CODC has recently committed to support the Cromwell community in leading a 2050 plan, we urge the QLDC to follow the lead of the CODC and support The Hawea community in creating a 2050 strategic plan, a plan that is created by the community to direct growth and development of our community and lands for the next thirty years. This plan is very important and has growing community support. KHB has evidential data to support the development of this type of plan, and deem this the appropriate move for council and Hawea to undertake for tackling the issues close at hand. Growth and Affordability. Please click this link to view the ongoing survey. The Hawea community also requires a moratorium on future development for two years or until such a time that the community has come up with a 2050 plan embedded and honoured into council district plan policy. Community growth is not something to be exploited or directed by property development. The eoi claims to be good for the Hawea community. Yet there is no supporting evidence in the eoi from the Hawea community for this statement.

This is a blatant attempt to dictate to our community. UD claims to have – “listened to the community” - if this were the case then Lane Hocking would have revoked the proposal. These statements imply a motive to create profit through the means of property development using loophole government legislation. The integrity and motivation of the eoi is the – ‘antithesis of community directed growth, which is strategic and directed towards community values, bringing a quadruple bottom line of environment conservation, social responsibility, regeneration of natural systems and steady state economy.’ Special Housing Areas were not intended for Hawea as stated in the QLDC lead housing policy ( 26 october 2017) nor were they intended to fast track access to rural productive land. This has raised serious concerns about the central and local government decision making process. KeepHaweaBeautiful has submitted 530 physical signatures which do not consent to the use of SHA policy in Hawea and deny this process to continue.