

Submission on: 'Punakaiki Wild'

Applicant: ACG Properties Ltd

Address: C/ Daniel Thorne Town Planning Group (NZ) Limited,

PO Box 2559, Queenstown 9348

Application number: RC240079

Location: 4663 State Highway 6, Te Miko, Punakaiki

Submission from: Lee Harris, [REDACTED]

Postal address: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

I oppose the application in its current form.

I wish to speak to my submission.

## INTRODUCTION

1. I am happy to hear of new employment opportunities, and a development which promises to be respectful and mindful of the local environment and its inhabitants – human and otherwise.
2. The proposed development is slap bang in the middle of our view south towards Aoraki Mount Cook, but as the applicant is promising low rise, respectful buildings that meld into the landscape, I'm not particularly concerned that our views will be horrendously changed.
3. As the proprietor of a small accommodation business which takes in these views, there is a possibility that our guests will notice/be affected by the developments. It would be good to be able to hear more about the planned build timeframe and equipment to be used at a community meeting.
4. I appreciate the applicant's decision to request public notification, and would welcome information via community mail boxes at Punakaiki, and an invitation to

community meetings.

5. Improving the local flora's character after years of grazing is to be commended.
6. I'm interested to hear how the new development fits with the draft TTPP rules and the West Coast Regional Land and Water Plan.
7. The application as it stands lacks important and pertinent information, relying heavily on future management plans/detailed designs.

### **REASONS FOR OPPOSING:**

- An incomplete application
- Unsupported assumptions
- Factual errors
- Transport
- Other issues

### **AN INCOMPLETE APPLICATION**

#### **Approvals yet to come:**

8. Any successful application would need to include written approval from Ngāti Waewae, Waka Kotahi [NZTA, for site access], the NZ Fire Service, or DOC

#### **Detailed [or initial] designs yet to come:**

9. Stormwater management [p30], lighting pp32&84, earthworks p32, specific foundation designs [p33] topography [p85], an engineering solution to access gradient [p87], dust management [p35], a CMP to manage "dirty water" [p87], and geotechnical mapping of hazard areas [p90]. I consider consent cannot be granted without these.

#### **Helicopter transport**

10. Helicopters and drones are specifically problematic if giving regard to the neighbouring Scenically Sensitive Residential area; the biodiversity of the site and its surrounds; and the fledgling Dark Sky Project.

If the applicant hopes for a social licence to operate within the community, they need to be upfront about any possibility of helicopter use or be prepared to eliminate the possibility through conditions.

### **Emergency planning**

11. All local residents are mindful of the possibility of being isolated for up to three months in the event of the predicted AF8 earthquake along the Southern Alps. It would be useful for the applicant to note their intentions in terms of emergency planning.

### **Immediate neighbours**

12. I understand Carolyn Hewlett and Will Smith at 4655 Coast Rd are able to see much of the site, including the areas where the cabins and lodge would be established. Residents would be affected by lighting, by moving car headlights, (helicopter movements?), accessway vehicle noise, and 140 people at a function. Are there plans to mitigate effects?

### **UNSUPPORTED ASSUMPTIONS**

13. "... speeds will be lower than 100kph" p85 and "... the volume of vehicles on the road are [sic] modest" p85. The Transport Report repeats this low speed [p3], also without support. Locals familiar with the roads are known to whiz through these 100kph bends at top speed, although the more prudent would be mindful of the large numbers of ponderous tourist traffic, including large campervans and buses, in the peak of the visitor season.
14. "... the proposal will facilitate land to be used ... in meeting the needs of the community" [p129]. This is excellent news as the local group working towards getting a Punakaiki Community Facility have been looking for a suitable location for some time. We will be in touch.

### **FACTUAL ERRORS**

15. "the highway ... is not used by heavy vehicles" p85. Perhaps the applicant is unaware of the daily transit of numerous milk tankers (up to five at a time in close succession); freight trucks including truck and trailer units; tourist buses; large camper vans and the odd house being shifted to a new location.

As these vehicles are passing in front of our property some 8km north, it's more than likely they will be passing the applicant's driveway.

16. In order to comply with BDC Paparoa Character Area Rule 6.3 [p45] there needs to be a plan or design for bunding the hazardous substance storage.
17. While the applicant's access might well be off a State Highway, it's a state highway with no cycle trails or walkways linking the area from Charleston to Punakaiki, and south to Greymouth. Locals and tourists cycle and walk these areas regularly, particularly in the summer.

It would be good to see some sort of system to warn walkers, cyclists and passing vehicles if a vehicle was about to emerge on to the State Highway. At the very least, it would be useful to warn visitors about the known times of day when processions of milk tankers are likely to be roaring up or down the road.

18. "The access is to remain in the same location ... therefore will have no additional effects on the amenity and safety of neighbouring properties" [p86], except in my 11 years living on the Coast I've never encountered one vehicle entering or exiting this driveway, let alone dozens a day. The new development will have different effects on all of us using the State Highway several times a week.

## **TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT – Conveyance Consulting**

### **Dubious premises and assertions**

19. "remote place ... their extent of trip-making will be reduced" [p7]. As the operator of a small accommodation unit in a remote place, with magnificent Coastal views to Aoraki Mount Cook, our experience and those of most of the bespoke visitor accommodation locally has been that we spend some time talking about the various trails, tracks and local activities and experiences people might be interested in. This location will be a very different experience for the applicant's guests from their very remote Lindis Pass facility.
20. Individual homeowners up and down the Coast Road have had to go through hoops, and sometimes have been refused, State Highway access because of visibility. Short of removing truckloads of roadside native bush (much of which is surely not on the applicant's land), and re-engineering some of the curves in the road, it's hard to see how this accessway would be a shoe in ("not expected that there are any reasons why sight distances that are appropriate for the prevailing operating speed [100kph] of the highway could not be achieved").

21. It will require a lot of thought/work, including the mitigation for the initial steeper section of the access. Locals might not be experts, but we have a lot of experience with steep driveways, pitfalls, rescuing tourists who regularly get stuck. Just ask... plus of course show us your intentions.
22. While we might not have traditional “public transport”, there are daily buses both ways run by the East West Shuttle and Intercity. Not to mention the numerous seasonal tourist buses.

## **OTHER ISSUES**

### **Lighting**

23. We need specific details about lighting. Having spent many months working through improving resource consent conditions for a new mining operator south of Punakaiki, we are aware of the impact lighting can have on our local wildlife heroes, the Westland petrel, whose mainland nesting site is just south of Punakaiki.
24. As part of the Westland Petrel Patrol, we know of grounded petrels being found on the State Highway just to the north of the applicant’s access way. Plus there are other bird colonies adjacent. Site lighting must be minimised and avoid light spill. This needs to be spelled out.

### **Punakaiki water supply**

25. The applicant expects to use the vulnerable Punakaiki water supply, and is perhaps unaware of ongoing sabotage events resulting in frequent boil water notices. That, and the need to have emergency water supplies in the event of a major earthquake event, mean it would be prudent to rethink or at least come up with on-site mitigation measures.

### **Benefits to local or regional economy**

26. New employment opportunities, and flow on effects to suppliers and local businesses are to be applauded. Just a caution to the applicant not to amplify numbers unnecessarily as locals have heard this sort of thing before and have come to view such hyperbole with cynicism and distrust.

## **CONCLUSION**

For the above reasons, I oppose the application in its current form and therefore wish for consent to be declined. I look forward to presenting in more detail at a hearing.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit.

Lee Harris