

Presentation to the Plan Change 52 Hearing – July 11th 2017

Good afternoon my name is Ian Leslie and the submission I made is number 52/05.

I own the property at 6 Gin and Raspberry Lane, which is immediately adjacent to Mount Cardrona Station and shares 450m of Boundary with the zone. A number of my neighbours have also made submissions but unfortunately are unable to be here today so I will do my best to represent their views as well.

Apart from the Cardrona Lodge which is below the escarpment on the south east corner of the zone, ours are the only inhabited properties which adjoin the Plan Change area.

My submission concerns two main aspects of the plan change.

Activity Area 6 on the Southern Boundary, and Water - its demand and usage in the zone, and the impact of this on Pringles Creek.

Part 1

The primary concern of myself and my neighbours with the zone is what happens on or near our boundary, as this will have greatest impact on the rural amenity we currently enjoy. It has the potential to affect our outlook and privacy, and also bring noise and light into close proximity to our properties. As you'll know from your site visit it is currently a wonderfully quiet and peaceful location.

The Village Zone is operational and if it is to go ahead, clearly there will be significant change to the area.

With Plan Change 18 and the operational plan that came from it, the area that runs parallel to our boundary has variously been described as a mitigation zone, a buffer zone, a 100 metre set back, part of the open space network, one of the green space fingers, and one of the overland flow channels. In Plan Change 18 a lot was put in store of these features - the open space network, and the presence of the flow channels. I queried the planner of the day on their significance and was told that they are fundamental to the design concept.

The Urbansimplus Conceptual Development Plan which was part of the Plan Change 18 analysis, went so far to describe this particular areas as such: A 100 metre landscaped set-back zone along the southern boundary shall be provided to reduce effects when viewed from the south through well designed landscaping. No buildings or structures will be erected in this buffer zone. Instead the zone will incorporate high quality landscaping and informal low maintenance vegetation.

In the zone rules, this area is described as Activity Area 6 : Commonage - which provides for formal and informal recreation activities. It provides communal open-space through the zone. It restricts buildings in this area other than those associated with the

functioning of the village, provision of gas storage facilities, a recycling station, and the provision of small-scale buildings associated with a potential sports field.

So the area on the Southern Boundary has been variously identified as a mitigation zone, but being part also of the Commonage network there is the provision for some built form of an infrastructural nature. That's not to say these activities must occur there - simply that there is provision for them as a discretionary activity. They could easily be absorbed into the greater urban areas and one would assume given the emphasis throughout the plan on open-space values, doing so would be the preferred option. It is also reasonable to assume infrastructure would be aligned with areas that reflect their use. For example recycling facilities are a community activity so a logical place is within the community precinct. Similarly gas storage requires heavy vehicle movement so would need good access. If reticulated one would expect it to be near the major users such as the commercial area. So while there is provision for infrastructure on any of the Commonage there is no indication that it must specifically occur in these areas. Apart from the sports field that is, which is aligned to the education precinct in the current plan.

So in summary:

- In the existing structure plan, although there is provision for infrastructure to occur in any of the Activity Area 6's, there is nothing to suggest it needs to occur in these areas.
- Apart from the Sports Field there has been no indication of any of this other infrastructure, on any of the publicly available Structure Plans either existing or proposed, that have been available in the plan change process.
- Built areas are dispersed and occur across the development and have the ability to absorb such activities.
- The open-space network has been identified as a valuable feature, intrinsic to the zone.

In my initial submission I suggested that it seemed a contradiction that the area of most concern to us - Activity Area 6 on the Southern Boundary is considered a mitigation zone, but also has the capacity for some infrastructure - some that has been specifically identified, and some that is only implied. While the zone rules allow for this - in the existing structure plan there are opportunities for these activities to exist elsewhere, and there is no indication that any of these activities need locate to the area adjacent to the southern boundary.

However I consider that the new development, as set out in Plan Change 52, makes it far less likely for such activities to be absorbed elsewhere and in fact, may make them unable to occur in any other area.

The comment was made, that "infrastructure will locate where it is most optimal." This is precisely my concern. I believe the changes in Plan Change 52 effect the ability for such activities to occur anywhere else so that it would now be most optimal for infrastructure to be located adjacent to the southern boundary. While this is

permissible, my neighbors and I don't think it is a desirable outcome.

There are several factors that have led me to this conclusion.

Firstly. The underlying philosophy of the development has changed. What is currently designated a village; I would argue is now a resort. It is not a village with a golf club on its outskirts, the residential areas are defined by the golf course, and a hotel precinct is the focal point. There will be no dairies or petrol stations, but restaurants, bars, a pro shop, and even possibly a gondola.

Whether you agree with my view it's more resort than village, the reality is two key stakeholders dominate the new development. A hotel chain and a golf course. The criteria and priorities for the sighting of infrastructure and facilities are markedly different. A good example is the education precinct. It is gone. Educational activities can still occur elsewhere as discretionary activities, but they are referred to as market driven. The example of childcare is given, market-driven childcare is not a community attribute but a business opportunity.

Secondly. The building density in the new zone is greater, there's more dwellings on the less space, the lot sizes are smaller so physically there is less opportunity to site infrastructure amongst it. That is - there aren't the gaps. Also higher-density makes the land value higher so there is less economic rationale to put low yielding activities onto higher-value land. The lower altitude urban areas above the highway and the education precinct have been removed, and with them potentially lower demand sites, which again would've had more potential to absorb infrastructural activities.

Thirdly. There is a lot less Activity Area 6 available. Currently the Open Space Fingers run all the way down to the eastern escarpment but all this lower public open space has now been absorbed into the golf course.

The reminder of the Commonage with the exception of that on the Southern Boundary is all in highly sensitive areas. Two run through the middle of the residential areas and are fronted by dwellings, the hotel precinct and golf course, and the other two front to the main road and entranceways to the zone and ski field. In addition, all these areas are narrow as well. The Activity area 6 on the Southern Boundary is a 100m setback and by virtue of this is a sizeable chunk of land, as can be seen in comparison to the other area of Commonage.

Fourthly. The orientation of the village has changed. The Village Green has been moved up the slope to make a hotel precinct, that opens to the north across golf course, and Homestead Gulley. The other main aspects of the residential areas are west to the mountains, and east across the lower golf links.

I suggested in my submission that this effectively makes the southern Activity Area 6, the rear of the development and our boundary the "back fence. " This northerly orientation in effect makes the southern boundary a less sensitive area than the other

areas of Commonage, and as such, it would be optimal for a hotel servicing a golf course, or a residential developer, to locate unsightly infrastructure as far as away as practical from the more visually demanding and higher value areas.

It is significant too, that there is already infrastructure assigned to this area. The sports field / tennis court. Originally sited lower it has now been moved up the slope to make way for golf course. Small scale buildings are allowed in this area now, by virtue of its presence. However the topography is less than ideal in this new location. I calculated a fall of 12 m over the length of a sports field, based on the contour provided in the plan and a distinct open flow channel also occurs here. A feature, which was considered an asset originally, and plan change 18

The cumulative affect of any or all of these activities is far greater than just the structures themselves. None occur in isolation. All require various forms of interaction. All would bring traffic movement and activity into an area currently designated for mitigation with the consequences of noise and light spill. While the upward spill of light has been given due consideration, lateral spill and the effects of headlights has not. If you have seen the effect of a pair of headlights sweeping across the valley from the ski roads has, you can appreciate the impact maneuvering vehicles will have on nearby properties.

Gas storage, recycling areas, a sports field or tennis court are the activities specifically identified. In addition there is the vague term “activities associated with the functioning of the village”. Such an activity is Parking. It is also a discretionary activity in Activity Area 6.

It's not inconceivable that the hotel would want somewhere for coach parking. Where is the optimal place - between the gas storage facility and the recycling bay. The residents may want somewhere to store their boats on trailers. Where is the optimal place - between the recycling bay and the tennis courts.

Other structures or activities are not inconceivable either under the provision for : “activities associated with the functioning of the village”, and I speculated in my submission on various other possible scenarios. While these are non-complying, they are not out of the question. They just have more hoops to jump through. Given the lobbying power and resource of a hotel chain, golf club, and the Design Review Board that is certainly a possibility. We may have recourse through the consents process but the presence of existing structures in an area of commonage will no doubt lower the threshold of acceptability.

“Activities associated with the functioning of the village” and the accompanying phrase “provision of access to surrounding areas” took on a new relevance for this area of concern to the Pringles Creek residents, with the deletion of the word “precinct” in : Assessment Matters IX (9) (b) Page 12-13 bb Structures Associated With The Erection and Maintenance of a Gondola.

The rules currently have the gondola aligned with the “village precinct”. Deletion of the word “precinct” gives rise to the possibility that the gondola could occur anywhere in the village. I only became aware of a dedicated gondola corridor last week and while the suggestion has been made that this location won't change there is however an equally concerning amendment regarding gondola activities - and that is from Discretionary to Controlled.

So as I understand it - if the amendments remain not only can a gondola be positioned outside the village / hotel precinct there would now no longer be any need for public notification of this matter.

Under the proposed rules there is provision for gondola activities in Activity Area 6 (and for that matter Activity Area 7). This raises the distinct possibility of the gondola being moved toward the Southern Boundary. This is not inconceivable, as the more desirable properties and outlook are to the north and the current gondola corridor is indicated on a narrow tract of Commonage in this highly desirable area.

Any of these scenarios can be dismissed as unlikely but the reality is we just can't anticipate what the future requirements may be. Six years ago no one considered a golf course as an economic necessity for the viability of the village and yet here we are today.

Neither my neighbors nor me want to be back here in future years arguing the merits of a gondola (that's if we have any say in the matter, that is) or any other structure that maybe considered necessary “for the functioning of the village”.

There is a phrase that crops up in the analysis “not more than slight”. I think if any combination of these activities were to occur in this area of commonage adjacent to the southern boundary the effects would be more than slight.

I think the plan change has the potential to take what is for all intents and purposes a landscaped mitigation zone and make it a land bank.

In Summary:

With Regards Activity Area 6 on the Southern Boundary:

- Some activities have been specified as possibly occurring here, others have been implied.
- Opportunities for these activities to occur elsewhere have been greatly reduced with the Plan Change.
- The fact that infrastructure will locate where it is most optimal, is our major concern as the criteria for this is defined by the key stakeholders of the development, and this is now markedly different.
- This is a large tract of land and there is some flexibility in the rules governing it , which allows modification beyond the purpose it was initially indicated as having.
- while most of this modification would be subject to the consents process the resources invested in a contrary view are likely to be significant and grow as the development progresses, and given the potential for a variety of activities, this could be an ongoing process over the years to come.

What my neighbors and I are advocating is that the Commonage along the southern boundary be protected from encroachment by structures and infrastructure not only to preserve some of our amenity, but also that of the residents of the Southern Neighborhood and the development as a whole.

Zone 7 above, the Heritage Zone, is protected from all but the gondola activities and Zone 9 below will remain open space by virtue of it being golf course.

Protecting Activity Area 6 on the Southern Boundary would maintain the integrity of the open-space surrounding the development and insure a clearly defined urban boundary, which has been stated as an urban design objective. It would provide separation and help delineate the development from the Pringles Creek residential area and in turn from Cardrona village itself.

There is also an opportunity to create a landscaped public space with the character between that of the manicured form of the golf course below and the pastoral nature of the Heritage area above.

Protecting this area would ensure long term peace of mind and confidence in the ongoing strategy and values of the development.

If complete protection of this area is not an option, we request further restrictions to remove the vagueness of the rules and restrict structures and encroachment.

We also would ask that the gondola remains a discretionary activity and its location remains tied to the Village Centre to provide ongoing certainty as to its location and its consent process. We think the sports field is inappropriate here and should be located on flatter terrain in a better suited location. Similarly the regular form of a tennis court makes it more appropriate to be located immediately adjacent to other built form.

Further aspects I wish to raise on behalf of my neighbors are:

They endorse the measures to protect the night sky but wish them to extend to all exterior lighting - be it residential or commercial.

There remain concerns of the paper Road status of Pringles Creek Road. I thought this was to be removed as part of Plan Change 18 but it must be still in existence and the concern is that it could be reinstated. There is only one entrance and exit to the zone, so it is conceivable that the hotel, golf club, the Design Review Board or even the NZTA could push for a secondary route in future years to come, to provide additional access. Such a road would become a shortcut and no doubt be encouraged as a delivery route to avoid the high profile Activity Areas.

I know it is outside the plan change area but perhaps there could be some clarification

on this matter and further consultation with the residents concerned.

The Pringles Creek residents also ask that mitigation planting be undertaken before any of the development commences. As identified by M4 in Structure Plan D – Mitigation Planting. Species such as the native beech identified for mitigation are slow growing so the sooner this is undertaken the better.

Part 2

The second part of my submission is with regards water, and its demand and use within the zone and the impact of this on Pringles Creek.

Pringles Creek in conjunction with the Cardrona River are the sole sources of water for the zone. Pringles Creek in particular is a small vulnerable watercourse. It lies completely outside the zone and therefore is afforded no protection from the zone rules. The sole source of protection for the stream is the residual flow mechanism. Apart from rainfall there is no source of water within the zone. There has been no indication that well or bore water is a supplementary option.

Pringles Creek runs the length of our property and on down through the other residents. We all value it highly and we all seek to enhance its margins. Not only is it a valuable environment to us but also the greater area, supporting as it does fish and birds, flora and fauna.

I was surprised to see in the analysis supporting the plan change there was no assessment of the water requirements of the zone, it's demand, usage and storage requirements. I would have thought in this day and age a detailed water management plan would be necessary. Perhaps it is, but its just not part of this process. The only assessment in the plan change was that the consents are in place and are sufficient.

I know the water permits are the responsibility of the ORC, but it's demand and usage are all determined by the activities in the zone as defined by the structure plan and zone rules.

In my submission I queried the lack of data and analysis of this matter. The Plan Change has increased the number of dwellings and added a golf course so demand can only have increased significantly.

Not having the resources to commission my own hydrological assessment I was able to source some data from the ORC from a report prepared in 2009 for the renegotiation of the Mount Cardrona Station water Permits 2009.191 and 2009.435 and this report and its extracts have been submitted. The analysis included estimates of potential demand of 1292m3 per day (table 1), but the primary allocation for potable purposes is only 1077m3. This is old data and the dwelling numbers have increased slightly but it should

be reasonably comparable. It indicates that there isn't necessarily sufficient water available. Figure 1 & 2 show monthly average stream flow and irrigation season flow. This data was prepared with the old consent value of 56L/S and I had annotated on the new values. The primary allocation is for 15L/S above a residual flow of 15L/S. This allocation is shared with the Cardrona River. It's clear that there is insufficient water, on this data for the full allocation to be reliably sourced from Pringles Creek alone. How the burden of the allocation is to be shared is not defined. The inference is just the deficit would be required from the Cardrona River, but this may not be the case and it is unclear how this mechanism would operate. The secondary permit is for irrigation and is exclusively from Pringles Creek. A Golf Course would be likely to be a significant user of irrigation. It has residual flow of 25L/S and extraction rate of 30L/S, so on it's own would require a stream flow of it's own 55L/S, and concurrently with the primary permit in excess of 60L/S. Clearly on this data there is a significant deficit of water for the majority of the irrigation season. Possibly less than a third of it.

This is only my laypersons assessment but in the absence of any other I am yet to be reassured that there is unlikely to be any long term impact on the stream. The potential exists for long periods of maximum extraction, reducing the stream to extended periods of residual flow. Without rigorous oversight the potential for over extraction exists. Even with the measurement systems in place it could be a long time until a fault or failure was noticed during which damage to the stream environment could occur.

This report is 7yrs old. Water resources are stated as over allocated then and demand has only increased.

The zone objectives with regards sustainable water practices are little vague. Objective 7.7 to encourage sustainable water use practices.

Design guideline 3.7 – consider installing grey water irrigation.

3.9 Planting – should need minimal irrigation.

I would suggest that when 600 households see their lawns brown off in the summer that the sprinklers will be out regardless.

I suggested that the zone requirements go beyond these notional statements of merely 'encouraging, considering and educating' on sustainable practices and ensure provision for the capture and storage of all rainfall to roofs and paved surfaces to contribute to zone irrigation needs. Similarly the capture and reticulation of grey water for reuse for irrigation should be mandatory. This water can easily be passively filtered through a planted swale type mechanism. These are common. This in fact would be a good use of the open flow channel adjacent to Southern Boundary, providing riparian planting and a source of irrigation water where it exits into the golf course area below.

My point is, there is an opportunity to set a standard in sustainable water use practices far beyond just these suggestions. This is a green field development in a highly sensitive area, in a region facing long term over allocation of water resources.

In Summary

The Resource Management Act places great emphasis on the protection of waterways.

I know it falls outside of the plan change zone but:

We seek protection of the attributes of Pringles Creek that goes beyond the sole mechanism of residual flow monitoring.

We seek clarification as to what the water demand from the stream will be with regards the shared consent with the Cardrona River.

We seek the investigation of alternative water sources from within the zone such as the viability of bore water to reduce demand from outside water sources.

We seek more proactive measures for the more efficient use and recycling of water within the zone.

Ian Leslie
6 Gin & Raspberry Lane
Cardrona