

**Rosalie Sampson**

**Address:** 4797 Karamea Highway

**Phone:**0273567388

**Email:** rosaliessampson@xtra.co.nz

I am making this submission as an individual, and a landowner in Karamea.

I would like to be heard in support of my submission, in person.

---

I have been living in Karamea for almost 48years, during which time I have been a district councillor for 28 years.

I am submitting with regard to the above property and in the instance of a hearing, I wish to be heard to speak on the new proposed District Plan. I have included some of my thoughts with regard to the new provisions and underlying zoning to be included within the plan, which I believe seeks to strangle development potential in Karamea through severe zoning and rules.

I note that my property which is within 1km of the town centre has been identified as a general rural property inclusive of my neighbours and surrounding properties around Karamea. My concern with this zoning is the rules in relation to subdivision and dwelling location. Under the proposed district plan this will only allow for subdivision to 4ha allotments as a Discretionary activity. The matters of discretion also include scope for planners to prevent infill housing particularly from subdivision around minor residential units, and further restrict building additional housing, which would stifle the potential of the town for this would impact upon the permitted baseline of rural zoned sites, particularly as this aspect for additional intensification scope for workers has been used in the past across the west coast to allow for infill development. Furthermore, due to the proximity of a functioning settlement the underlying zoning is not inclusive of current and future demand for growth, which is extremely disconcerting as this is the first time the plan is being reviewed since its adoption in 2000, so if this zoning is to be continued for another 20 years, any further development of Karamea would require consent, which includes scope for council to consider aspects of character and amenity, with the policies and objectives hinting for no further subdivision. I would suggest that the zoning within the immediate proximity be considered lifestyle rural zone, with the township being in the settlement zone as Karamea is identified as a settlement. Furthermore, even if the zoning is changed to lifestyle rural, it is unlikely that large farms would subdivide or fracture, with the main sites to do so being existing rural residential properties such as mine. I also note that with regard to character clustering of dwellings and 1ha allotment size still retains the open spaces aesthetic of the area, which considering settlement zones allow for 1000m<sup>2</sup> sections will appropriately retain the charm and character of the area.

Further the township of Karamea itself has been included with general rural zoning, while areas to the south of Karamea are in the general lifestyle area, which allows for greater intensification of these sites, but then is this not just a separate form of moving the settlement.

I am also upset that council has decided that areas of Karamea, inclusive of the township and built environment are part of the highly productive land which further restricts development, however this land is:

- a) Adjacent to a waterbody so any irrigation or fertilisation will leach into the waterway, which if this is the intent why not allow for upstream industrial activity...
- b) As mentioned above if this is highly productive land, modern farming techniques which are highly dependent upon chemicals are highly likely to be used, but the zoning also identifies this as

a flood susceptible and coastal hazard area, which would elevate leaching and runoff so why would you want to protect farming in the area, which if anything would make for a more suitable town location, as it would maximise views and engineering methods can be adopted to mitigate the risk of natural hazards.

I note that while Karamea is a fertile area with farming opportunities, the broad stroke zoning across the area is inappropriate with the real-world environment in the area and it is disappointing to see Council's approach to my community. Furthermore, having this restriction across the area limits any changes to the land.

I am also shocked at the flood modelling throughout Karamea, which while I note that there is an elevated rainfall in the area, this has not caused significant risk to the community. I also note that during subdivision particularly in areas such as Karamea a site suitability report is required which will include provisions for proper drainage which will not result in elevated stormwater flows beyond the boundary and that where this is not met

I would also note that in a number of these situations that s.106 of the RMA has more relevance than the above provisions and would allow for conditions of consent or considerations of similar standards in terms of raised height etc. Overall, I believe that the provisions should either be looser utilising more restricted discretionary matters, to inform developers about the scope of consideration rather than non-complying which gives far too much scope to the council to decline or control development throughout the region, where based on the preference of staff could stifle development through the township.

### **General Rules**

The general rules are also confusing, over worded and partially confounding, particularly when the rules are pretty consistent with the existing or national standards, yet the formatting of information and display make the plan difficult to understand. The plan is supposed to be easy to understand and is difficult to interpret – further some of the rules are contradictory or are difficult to determine compliance with.

The plan is supposed to be viable for someone to be able to understand and submit an application, without requiring professional help, however I would say that this is border line impossible, based on the current matters which could be required by council and the vast scope provided gives council a large range of matters to restrict development; particularly considering that NZ is undergoing a period of rapid urbanization and growth coupled with the three waters reform, which could give additional growth opportunities to the West Coast region. Having rules which restrict/delay development or make this process much more difficult seems contradictory to the national direction for supporting development.

### **Overall**

I strongly believe that for Karamea, this plan stifles growth and puts extremely arduous requirements on ratepayers and developers, who want to develop, alter or enhance their properties.

Further I don't believe that the principles of "Natural Justice" have been applied in relation to hazards - for example there are little or no restrictions in relation to development near identified fault-lines, but there are severe restrictions in relation to future supposed flooding, simply due to the recent flooding activity, even though both hazards have a similar possible return period.

S.17 Avoid, Remedy or Mitigate are the fundamentals of the RMA - Options for implementing these are very limited in this document and over all, it only seems to consider avoiding development, which in an ocean locked country on a fault line is border line impossible, and we should instead be focused on adaptability to the environment, as ultimately people need a place to live and the rules which are reflected in this plan is an example of everything that is wrong with the current iteration of the RMA which is restricting development across the country, and is why new Zealand is in such a poor position now globally with respect to immigration and quality of life.

Furthermore, for the continued growth of the West Coast, development is essential, rather than stifling communities, which this plan seems to endorse.

Lastly, I believe that the TTP Plan requires significant alterations and clarification to make the plan more usable, functional and user friendly, for both planners and the general public.