

July 24, 2019

Regarding the request by Oakura Farm Park Ltd for Private Plan Change NPDC PLC 18/00048; the proposed development known as Wairau Estates.

Notes prepared for the oral submission of Cam Murray in support of my earlier written submission (#61)

.....

My name is Cam Murray and I live at 1325 South Road, a short distance south of the property in question. I neighbour the Greensill farm which lies adjacent to the Oakura Farm Park.

I won't repeat the contents of my written submission as you will already have had the opportunity to look these over, but I will highlight some of my key concerns and address one or two items which arose from my reading of the various reports included in the comprehensive package of supporting documents.

I am not an expert witness; rather an informed and concerned citizen, with a little academic background in Urban and Resources Geography from Victoria University, Wellington and Simon Fraser University (British Columbia) and a lengthy involvement in citizen participation in urban planning.

While I applaud the design concept put forward by Mike McKie I can't support his application because of its size and scope and the negative impact it will have on the natural and built environments.

My submission will address three main areas:

- The overall impact of the proposal
- Key infrastructural concerns.
- Provisions for Lot 29 from a previous Environment Court hearing

1. The Oakura Structure Plan Implementation Plan (February 2006) identifies one of eight categories of action in the implementation of the plan as a "**SOP Sense of Place** which considers how the coastal

While challenging this figure Mr. Muldowney did concede their initial findings were overestimated and the lot/dwelling numbers have accordingly been reduced.

This was borne out in statements by Mr. McKie who spoke about his 'vision for each lot to provide for rainwater harvesting and onsite water storage'' and by Mr. Comber who noted that '68 residential lots and all rural lifestyle lots could have potable water supply needs met from dwelling rainwater.' These are noble ideas, but something more tangible needs to be applied. Perhaps a covenant to this effect could be part of the Commission's report.

- School – the impact on the Oakura School from a development on the scale of the one proposed will be immense. The School Board has already voiced its concerns, but as a retired teacher, with over 40 years in the classroom, I was dismayed by the apparent suggestion of the Ministry of Education that the school could comfortably handle an increase in its roll to 1000: Unbelievable!. I hope the Commissioners have visited, or will visit, the school and see for themselves the impact such an enlarged footprint would have on the character of the school. I was similarly unimpressed by Mr. ~~Mulfooney~~^{Muldowney}'s cavalier dismissal of the concern expressed regarding the traffic congestion on Donnelly Street (a cul de sac) and at its intersection with the State Highway. His comment that the congestion only occurred briefly each day is such an obvious truism, but the issue warrants addressing in a more serious manner

- 3. Lot 29 and the matter of Consent - I have consistently, in my submissions and in discussions with Mr. McKie and Mr. Comber opposed the lifting of that covenant and I urge you not to accede to Mr. ~~Mulfooney~~^{Muldowney}'s quoting the RMA in support of his desire to see it struck down. It was an integral finding of the previous RMA hearing regarding the Paddock Subdivision'

and in section 24.9 , p. 109 Ms Tobin specifically ruled that 'Lot 29 shall not be further subdivided while the land remains in the Rural Environment Area'.

This provision was put in place to ensure that open space would be retained over the balance of the allotment, and because the applicant , Mr McKie expressed the intention during the hearing of retaining this lot (29) with a 'Protected Farm Status' in the longer term, regardless of zoning.' Surely the longer term is more than eight years.

Conclusion: From the foregoing you can see I'm not in favour of the proposal as presented. I'm not convinced that the modifications presented by the applicant's team go far enough to meet my concerns – and those of others I've heard. I can't support even the scaled down conclusions of the Boffa Maskell team. 167 lots/ dwellings will still put considerable pressure on the natural and built environments, on the infrastructure and the overall well-being of the Oakura community. I also disagree with the final point (15.8, p.6) in their report pertaining to the Consent Notification in which they advocate an amended consent notice wording being prepared – a change that will overturn the important provision of the earlier RMA report.

If I was sitting at your desk – and I'm sure Mike is glad I'm not! –I'd suggest he go back to the drawing board. Despite Mr. Muldowney's dismissal of the triangular Future Urban Development segment as being unviable I'd start there: work up a residential development proposal for that piece of land, put together an equestrian community on the southern fringe, and extend the Paddock's lifestyle blocks down towards the western edge on the state highway.

Thank you.