

Darryll Rogers  
14 Sam John Place  
Lake Hawea RD2 9382

17<sup>th</sup> May 2017

**Attention – Chair Stream 12 Upper Clutha Mapping**

**Re: Request to provide response to QLDC rebuttal to Hearing members prior to the 25<sup>th</sup> May Hearing**

**Original Submitter: Jude Battson (Lake Hawea, Wanaka, New Zealand, 9382)(Submitter No. 460) Original Point: 460.1 22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Dear Trevor Robinson

I would like to lodge a reply to the QLDC rebuttal's in relation to the above submission prior to the Stream 12 Lake Hawea hearing to be held on the 25<sup>th</sup> of May to ensure that it as constructive as possible and that attendees can consider these items well prior to the meeting.

It is necessary to respond to the rebuttals put forward by Mr Craig Barr on behalf of the QLDC as they are factual incorrect, logically inconsistent, strawmen arguments and are in direct conflict with the strategic aims of the QLDC. This would lead to an outcome that is far from optimal.

Prior to addressing Mr Barr's rebuttals, it is important to highlight that the QLDC did not attempt to address the following arguments in my submission, as such the QLDC has conceded these points:

- The proposal is in line and fulfils the Hawea Community Plan and its 2020 vision.
- The proposal is in line with multiple QLDC strategic goals, objectives & policies
- It will provide much needed land stock to relieve price pressures and increase competition in the market
- It offers greater flexibility in building options so that sustainable and recycled material can be used
- 800m2 minimum lot sizes gives low income owners wider options than small lot sizes within the Wanaka township
- Allows optimal utilisation of existing infrastructure
- Land-owner's homes have already been positioned with the expectation of future re-zoning
- Reduces and delays the need for the development of greenfield sites
- Landowners are under no compulsion to subdivide their own properties and can continue to enjoy the quiet enjoyment of their large properties.

## **Reply to 7.2 - 11.10 and 11.11 of section 42A Group 1 A Wanaka Urban and Lake Hawea evidence**

### **Traffic:**

**100 km/h speed limit** – There are 29 driveways and intersections along the Domain Road/Cemetery Road border of Lake Hawea. These include the river cycling track and also the Hawea Flat Primary School cycling track. In addition there are also two permanent school bus stops. Notwithstanding the proposed re-zoning, this speed limit should be reduced to 70km/h similar to that of Muir Road that has only one driveway and the entrance to Lichen Lane. Rezoning of the proposed area will be a welcome impetus for reducing this speed limit resulting in much greater road safety for local residents.

**Road Widening** – The following intersections do not currently have right hand turn bays, so there is no local precedent that one would be required for Sam John Place:

- Cemetery Road and Muir Road (100km/h)
- Cemetery Road and Domain Road (100km/h)
- Cemetery Road and Grandview Place (100k/h) (soon to have town zoned traffic exiting/entering this intersection)
- Domain Road and Noema Terrace (50km/h)
- Domain Road and Timsfield Drive (50km/h)
- Domain Road and Cappell Avenue (50km/h)

**Widening Sam John Place** – Sam John Place is 5.6 metres wide. This compares favourably to roads that service much higher density living. Take for example Kirimoko Crescent in Wanaka which is only 5 metres wide. As such there is no need to widen these streets given that housing density would be much lower than that contained in this area of Wanaka. Also it must be noted that the higher density Grandview development also links to the existing Grandview Place which is also a similar width than Sam John Place.

Ms Banks concedes that roading is sufficient for the reduction of minimum lot sizes to 2000m<sup>2</sup>

**Infrastructure** – Appropriate analysis needs of a town zone has not been adequately conducted to make an informed decision. Mr Glasner can only state that infrastructure “may” require substantial upgrades – this is entirely insufficient with no quantifiable evidence presented by the QLDC.

Mr Glasner did concede that additional lots at a larger 2000m<sup>2</sup> would not have a significant impact on infrastructure, and thus concedes that infrastructure is sufficient for the reduction of minimum lot sizes to 2000m<sup>2</sup>

At the very least, roading and services infrastructure in this area are underutilised by at least 50%. This is a very poor use of resources, considering that greenfields developments are being constructed at great cost.

### **Ecology and Environment:**

Mr Davis concedes that rezoning would be appropriate from an ecological perspective

## Summary:

Despite QLDC's own evidence that existing infrastructure is at least 50% underutilised and environmental concerns are absent, Mr Barr is unable to find any "identifiable benefit" for rezoning.

To re-iterate what is summarised above and outlined in detail in my original submission, the following identifiably benefits of rezoning include, but are not limited to:

- The proposal is in line and fulfils the Hawea Community Plan and its 2020 vision.
- The proposal is in line with multiple QLDC strategic goals, objectives & policies
- It will provide much needed land stock to relieve price pressures and increase competition in the market
- It offers greater flexibility in building options so that sustainable and recycled material can be used
- 800m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot sizes gives low income owners wider options than small lot sizes within the Wanaka township
- Allows optimal utilisation of existing infrastructure
- Land-owner's homes have already been positioned with the expectation of future re-zoning
- Reduces and delays the need for the development of greenfield sites
- Landowners are under no compulsion to subdivide their own properties and can continue to enjoy the quiet enjoyment of their large properties.

Mr Barr believes a "hard urban edge" provides a "coherent landscape buffer". This is purely an aesthetic preference and does not form part of the Urban Design Strategy. As can be seen from Appendix 1 the Hard Urban Edge at the south side of Timsfield is hardly pleasing to the eye or coherent.

The current "Rural Residential Character" that Mr Barr speaks of is sadly lacking in this development at present. Most homes are positioned at one far end of their sections (often in very close proximity to other neighbours) awaiting re-zoning with most of their properties remaining fallow with exotic grasses. Current residents do not own livestock.

Mr Barr's conclusion appears very much at odds with both the evidence brought forward by the QLDC and the strategic goals of the QLDC.

## Reply to 7.3 – Re-zoned land in multiple ownerships & infrastructure connectivity

Mr Barr's opinion on point 7.3 in relation to re-zoned land being in multiple ownerships is in direct conflict with the stated strategic aims of the QLDC.

The strategic aims of the QLDC state that:

**Policies 3.2.2.1.6 Ensure that zoning enables effective market competition through distribution of potential housing supply across a large number and range of ownerships, to reduce the incentive for land banking in order to address housing supply and affordability.**

The existing cul-de-sacs at Grandview Place, Lichen lane and Sam John Place provide the same level of roading access and connection compared to both Tim's Field stage one and the new Grandview Subdivision. Both Timsfield and Grandview developments are glorified cul de sacs that funnel traffic into a single entry/exit point to connecting roads (Domain and Cemetery roads respectively).

It is factually incorrect to state that there is insufficient walking or cycling opportunities when there are dedicated and pre-existing off road walking and cycling tracks that connect Lichen Lane, Sam John Place and Grandview Road to each other and the surrounding walking and bicycle infrastructure. (Please Refer to Appendix 2)

Prior to the recent commencement of development work at the Grandview subdivision which has temporarily closed of this area for Health and Safety considerations it was possible to walk or ride from Sam John Place and Lichen lane into central Hawea without using either Muir or Cemetery roads.

From our property, two thirds of the way up Sam John Place it takes approx. 35 Seconds to ride to the bike path along Cemetery Road, 10 Seconds to ride to the dedicated waking track to Lichen lane and 20 seconds to ride to the dedicated walking track to Grandview Drive. This is certainly not a lack of connectivity.

As mentioned above, most land owners have positioned their existing homes, not in the centre of their sections to be as far away from neighbours as possible, but very close to section edges to allow for future subdivision.

#### **Reply to 7.4 – Hawea Community Strategic Plan (2020 Vision)**

The outcomes in the Hawea 2020 document quoted by Mr Barr to support his argument relate to the surrounding landscape and not to the area proposed to be re-zoned bordered by Muir & Cemetery Roads. These outcomes should not be used as evidence to refute the rezoning as they would be in direct conflict with the first key strategy of Hawea's 2020 vision.

The Hawea 2020 document does not "suggest" that urban development "could" extend to the east up to Cemetery road as stated in the rebuttal - it defines clearly in black and white:

**The following key strategies are identified for achieving the vision.**

**4. MANAGING GROWTH Residential · The current zoning is adequate to provide for future projected growth at Hawea Flat and John's Creek. *At Lake Hawea, the Township Zone should be extended through to Cemetery Road to provide for additional growth. This is considered to be a logical and well-contained boundary to guard against future sprawl. (See Figure 2)***

#### **Reply to 7.5 – QLDC's obligation to implement community plans.**

I find Mr Barr's comment that the QLDC is not obligated to fulfil the strategic aims of the Hawea community plan perplexing and frankly alarming. This document is on the QLDC website and states in its conclusion that:

### **10. CONCLUSIONS**

**This Plan has identified the vision for Hawea, and detailed what the community wishes to see in terms of catering for and managing growth.**

**It provides the basis for future planning and management of the Hawea area. From here, the Plan will be received by the Council as the Community Plan for Hawea.**

**Following its receipt, it will feed into the – Long Term Community Plan - that Council is required to produce. The Council will produce and adopt the LTCCP by July 2004.**

I seriously question the relevance and purpose of Community Plans if their primary strategic aims can be just categorically ignored by the wider council and take well over a decade to enact.

#### **Reply to 7.6 – Restatement of prior rebuttals**

Mr Barr does not provide further arguments, he simply restates his previous rebuttals

#### **Reply to 7.7 – Cul de sac form of existing roading & connectivity**

The proposed area for re-zoning is consistent with all of the recent higher density developments bordering Cemetery Road that are also cul de sacs with a single entry/exit point. The proposed rezoning would be in keeping with the same level of connectivity

Initial development at a high density is no guarantee of an effective or attractive buffer, and similarly later infill development is more than capable of providing an attractive aesthetic – for example the former Wanaka Primary School site. The two concepts are not automatically mutually exclusive. Please refer to Appendix 1.

#### **Reply 7.8 – Greenfields development outside of the Town border**

The rebuttal presented is a Strawman argument

In my submission I referred to the greenfield developments within the development window, rather than outside of it. Currently new infrastructure work is being done in greenfield sites that will dramatically alter the character of these areas (e.g. one site has recently had a forestry plantation removed). It is economically and environmentally inefficient to develop brand new developments (whether they are in or outside of the development window) when there is underutilised infrastructure and roading already in place.

Mr Barr's opinion that there are adequate housing choices and opportunities in Hawea is factually incorrect – especially considering the QLDC's aim to make the region more accessible and affordable.

Due to the rapid rise in house prices in Wanaka, the financial demographics of the region are causing more people to look to towns like Hawea and Luggate as close alternatives. As an illustration it took Timsfield several years to fully sell, with sections starting at \$130k and sometimes changing hands down as far as \$110k. Sections in new developments at Sentinel Park (Grandview Road) are selling for \$250k and the latest release sold out in a day. House and land packages in Hawea start at around \$600k. The median sale price at Lake Hawea has increased by \$207,500 in the last twelve

months, an increase of 49%.\* How this can be seen as adequate opportunities shows the QLDC's total lack of grasp of financial reality for residents.

\*Real Estate Institute of NZ comparison periods are Jan-Apr 2017 to Jan-Apr 2016

The small amount of developers in the region are price makers rather than price takers and trickle housing supply onto the market to maintain the illusion of short supply. It is irrelevant how much land is zoned a particular way, what is important is how many vendors are bringing sufficient sections onto the market to spur competition – currently clearly this is not the case considering the nearly 100% rise in Lake Hawea section prices in the last few years.

### **Reply 7.9 – Greenfields development & growth estimates**

This is another strawman argument.

As stated above, the reference to greenfields in my submission was not directed to the area outside of the development window, but greenfields within it

It must be noted that the QLDC has a proven history of underestimating the growth of the Central Lakes District. This is why we have multiple commercial centres in both Wanaka and Queenstown and also very high density residential developments that are further from town centres than significantly lower density zonings - e.g. Aubrey Road large lots vs high density Northlake. This proposal seeks to negate the risk of this occurring at Lake Hawea.

### **Reply 7.10 – Guarantee of new land stock.**

This argument contradicts Mr Barr's previous rebuttal about the adequate supply of township zoned land within Hawea to meet demand. There is no guarantee that *any* land owners will subdivide within Town Zones – but the more landowners that have the ability, the chance is dramatically increased – as per the council's stated strategic aims mentioned above.

Furthermore, currently due to zoning restrictions no-one in the proposed rezoning area can subdivide, so rezoning would be an almost infinite improvement to these odds.

In addition, if some land owners prefer to retain their current properties in their existing state, neighbouring properties will benefit from the mix of land density uses and there will be a greater diversity of options brought to market.

Lastly, although there is sufficient infrastructure and roading for higher density re-zoning to occur, Mr Barr's argument in this case negates his earlier concern of infrastructure pressures.

### **Conclusion**

In summary, the rebuttals brought forward do not form a cohesive argument, and do not support the conclusion that has been reached.

The QLDC's rebuttals have been demonstrated to be:

- Factually incorrect
- Logically inconsistent,
- Subjective aesthetic preferences not supported by Council strategic aims.

- Strawmen arguments, and most concerning
- In direct conflict with QLDC's own stated Strategy and Policies.

As they have not been addressed in the rebuttal, the QLDC have conceded a significant number of arguments that were presented in my submission that clearly demonstrate that this rezoning is in direct alignment to the Strategic aims of the QLDC.

Conclusions reached in the rebuttal appear to be on a subjective basis rather than on the objective Environmental, Infrastructure and Roading evidence presented by the QLDC itself. All three of these aspects have no objection to a higher density rezoning to minimum lot sizes of 2000m<sup>2</sup> whilst simultaneously providing an insufficient quantifiable basis for refuting a change to town zoning.

I urge this Hearing to carefully consider all the arguments presented in this submission. In particular the fact that the QLDC has been unable to address most of them, and the ones they have provided rebuttals for have largely not been based on fact or precedent.

If this doesn't occur the QLDC will inevitably make poor decisions that do not stand up to any kind of environmental or infrastructure utilisation scrutiny and will continue to see the region become an elite enclave where only the wealthy can reside, and a fractured community where younger generations are forced to leave due to unaffordable housing.

If you have any questions in relation to the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Warmest regards

Darryll Rogers

## Appendices

### Appendix 1 – Hard urban boundary – Timsfield southern border

#### 1.1





**Appendix 2 – Bicycle and Cycle connectivity of area to Central Lake Hawea (Blue lines outline bike and walking routes)**

