

Morena – I'm Iris Weber.

I live at 63 Hogans Gully Road with my partner Dave Gibson. We have owned our home for 15 years and I have been enjoying rural life in this area for the last 30 years.

We are surrounded on three sides by either the Hills Resort or Boxer Hill Trust.

It's important to note: We enjoy a very good neighbourly relationship and are grateful for all the time Emma Hill & Rebecca Wolt have given us and the progress that has been made after our submission.

Our concerns raised today are as effected neighbours but also from a wider public point of view.

We remain positive towards the Plan Change, but would like the hearing panel to give clarifications or make amendments considering the potential for ownership changes and the reality that any district plan changes are also the blueprint for future resorts and subdivisions.

We would like the hearing panel to consider four matters:

1. **To close the loop hole that allows future house site owners to apply for more height under restricted discretion at building consent stage.**

Submitters 13 & 20 were pacified by the new reduced heights for the HS9-16.

only to find out that there is a two stepped height rule. See paragraph 50 in Yvonne Pfluger's landscape submission & Jeff Brown evidence 3.12 & 3.16. He points out the inefficiency in the three-pronged rule framework for building heights on the house sites, additional consenting costs/ which are also costs to all ratepayers.

Future owners of the house sites are likely to want the extra height and will simply apply under Restricted Discretionary.

We, as neighbours, won't have any say at that stage either - as per 47.6 Non-Notification of Applications. Nor will the wider Public.

*(Any application for resource consent for controlled activities or restricted discretionary activities shall not require the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified)*

Why not just fix it at the new reduced height that is more sympathetic to the landscape?

This eliminates Ms Gilberts concerns of "**rural living development sprawl**" as per her evidence. Experts from both sides have looked at the poles and made recommendations. Why not use the expertise and knowledge that has already been gathered?

Poles would seem to be essential to make an accurate assessment, as one can only see how much the sites do stack up and height adding to a cumulative effect.

Ms Gilbert stressed the importance of carefully managing the visibility of the built form of each HS.

We would like the panel to consider removing the discretion option for future height increases or at the very least require the council to notify neighbours as part of the building consent process (if extra height is requested).

## 2. Lighting

We would like the hearing panel to recommend measures that will see overall light pollution to be minimised – at least on the Speargrass Valley/ Hogans Gully side.

THRL sits, I believe, within or next to the Rural Amenity Zone which has light management rules including the degraded view of the night sky.

The night sky is an amenity that is under extreme threat in our rural area. None of the experts have evaluated the proposed plan change with that in mind. The houses and the associated roading will turn this large dark area into a Christmas tree at night. Fairy lights strung across. The impact on the landscape doesn't just happen during the day.

Our understanding from Rebecca Wolt is that streetlighting is not permitted under the Resort rules, but low bollard lighting could be used for associated roading.

We are not aware of any existing home sites on Hogans Gully Road that have their access road lit up by bollard lighting.

We would like to see an amendment RULE 47.5.13 to relive our concerns. Motion sensors would seem to be a possible solution.

Can we also ask the hearing panel to amend the plan to ensure there is **no street lighting** on Hogans Gully Entrance to the housing sites (entrance design) – in keeping with other properties on Hogans Gully Rd

Plan Changes are a time to make things better for the Districts Future. This is an opportunity for the Panel to make a recommendation with big impact.

Reducing the overall glow of the resort would bring the plan into the 21<sup>st</sup> century and enhance amenity values of the wider environment.

## 3. Clarification required: Associated roading to the Hogans Gully 8 house sites.

There has been a misunderstanding when it comes to noise minimisation ie. road surface in our original submission.

This is not in regards to Hogans Gully Rd as per Craig Barr's Statement – our request was that any surface on the internal roads leading to the new homesites should have noise reducing surface treatment. This would mitigate the higher number of car movements that the visitor accommodation will create.

Rule 47.5.21 about Vehicle accesses and walkways/cycleway states that they should be

*formed in exposed aggregate concrete, concrete with charcoal oxide (6.0kg/m<sup>3</sup>), asphalt / chipseal with flush edging (of a material noted in this list), locally sourced natural stone, locally sourced gravel, timber, or dark/earth-toned unit*

However - Craig Barr notes under 10.19 & 10.20 of his Evidence Statement *that, the proposed eastern Hogans Gully Road access is limited to serve not more than 7 residential units (HSs 9-16) which means that the associated design of this access should be of a rural nature and not be required to be built to high specifications.*

Can the Hearing Panel please clarify that the roads to the homes should be made of?

#### 4) Clarification/ Request: BIKE TRAIL

QTT and Craig Barr/QLDC keep pushing for the trail to go through the Boxer Trust land to connect with Ayrburn which could mean the trail might be extended (in the future) on The Hill Resort Zone side behind our house.

Our current understanding is that the Trail ends at the future Hogans Gully entrance to the new house sites.

We have been verbally assured that the trail will not show up on the THRZ land next to either of the two sides of our property as part of this Plan Change from THRZ , but of course can't predict the outcome of this hearing and feel that none of the parties might have to consult with us if they reach a different agreement - now or at a later stage.

*We note that 47.2.1.4. Requires the provision of walkway and cycleway access through the Zone that connects Hogans Gully Road and McDonnell Road in the locations generally shown on the Structure Plan contained in Section 47.7, in a manner that maintains privacy of nearby properties*

Could this be extended to 63 Hogans Gully Rd in case, in the future, there is a bike trail extension on THRZ land behind us, that connected to the Boxer Hill trust property?

Thank you for listening, I'm happy to answer any questions you might have ...