

DDPR_feedback_0156s	
Name	David Wigley
Organisation	
Email	██████████
Response Date	Aug 29 22
Notes	
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q4	Feedback/Comments
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q6	Feedback/Comments
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q8	Feedback/Comments
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	supporting documents?
	0
Q12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here

Mark Smith

From: J CHIARADIA <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, 29 August 2022 2:43 PM
To: Plan Review
Subject: Draft District Plan: Submission, Natural Hazards



External Email Be careful with links and attachments. Think before clicking – do I know this person and does this person's request make sense?

29August 2022

Draft Waitaki District Plan: SUBMISSION

Natural Hazards: Introduction: The Waitaki District is vulnerable to a wide range of natural hazards. All of the hazards can affect people, property, infrastructure and the wider environment. More significantly, these natural hazards can lead to a loss of human life. Therefore, it is important to recognise these hazards and to manage activities in order to limit the exposure of people, property and the environment to risk.

Oamaru water supply comes from the Ardgowan Reservoir Dam located in Glen Creek, some 3km from town.

My Submission is that very high rainfall in the Glen Creek catchment may result in flooding that exceeds the capacity of the Ardgowan Reservoir Dam and so trigger a significant flood event below the dam leading to destruction of property and putting lives at risk within Oamaru. This prospect was the finding of a 2009 study commissioned by Council:

Ref 1: " TONKIN & TAYLOR LTD July 2009 Waitaki District Council. Ardgowan Dam. Flood hydrology and dam break study."

This Study was supplied under an OIA as the most recent assessment of the risk and consequences of failure of this dam.

It is not sufficient to refer to flooding in Glen Creek in a general land use sense because it is possible that the effects of an extreme weather event will be vastly magnified by an existing structure in the natural creek bed. I therefore suggest the Plan requires coverage of "Glen Creek Catchment" as of particular importance in the section: Natural Hazards.

The consequence of extreme rainfall in the catchment and subsequent dam breach are the reasons for classification of the dam as within the "High Potential Impact Category." (Ref 1.)

The Study "Table 1 Adopted rainfall data" modelled performance of an extreme rainfall event as:

Probable Maximum Precipitation of 300mm over 12hrs and 400mm over 24hrs.

However, later in the study: "Clearly it is not realistic to revise the current operational criteria to accommodate (these) events while providing a realistic volume of raw water buffer storage."

Following my OIA request, Council advised that the Tonkin & Taylor assessment triggered a significant work program to address shortcomings in modelled performance.

A lower figure for maximum rainfall which the dam can manage subsequent to the 'significant work program' has not been disclosed.

Climate Change: “Potentially increased storm rainfall from climate change has not been taken into account.

Greater flood inflows than reported would result if storm magnitudes increase as a consequence of climate change.”
(Ref 1)

I conclude with the view that Sect5 of the RMA will not be served if the possible effect of very high rainfall in the Glen Creek catchment on property and human life are omitted from the District Plan. Planners need to be aware of the issues.

Thank you for the opportunity and also the encouragement to comment.

Ngā mihi,

David Wigley 331Ardgowan Road RD1D Oamaru 9492

DDPR_feedback_0179s	
Name	David Wigley
Organisation	
Email	
Response Date	Aug 07 22
Notes	See also Row 160, DDPR_Feedback_156
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q4	Feedback/Comments
	<p>Monday 8th August 2022 Draft</p> <p>Waitaki District Plan General Rural Zone: I agree with the proposal to increase the minimum size for subdivision from 4hA to 20hA. The proliferation of rural subdivisions in recent years has been at a cost to the environment and to our community. Regardless of the prevailing level of productivity of the land prior to subdivision, the potential for alternate forms of production is forever lost. Size of minor residential unit: Ref: RURZ-P7 Minor residential unit. Provide for a single minor residential unit on sites to facilitate residential choice and flexibility while ensuring that the minor residential unit is subservient to the primary residential unit on the site. Ref: both GRZ and RLZ: rule PER-1 The gross floor area of the minor residential unit shall be less than 80m². I suggest that the gross floor area of the minor residential unit be increased to 100m². This change seems necessary to "facilitate residential choice and flexibility" in compliance with RURZ-P7 A minor residential unit provides an opportunity for parents to remain on the property after retirement and avoid going into a retirement village, a prospect which many rural folk find daunting. Council is asked to consider what should be reasonably provided within a Minor Residential Unit when setting the gross floor area limit. e.g. Allow for mobility issues: Wheelchair access and wider passageway, a larger bathroom, one separate toilet. Two bedrooms as there is an expectation of a separate bedroom for each parent. Particularly relevant to health issues. Please also take into consideration that elderly people will spend most of their time at home. Effect: The visual effect of this small increase in floor area will be scarcely noticeable from the road. Thank you for the opportunity to give my opinion. David Wigley 331 Ardgowan Road RD1D Oamaru 9492</p>
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q6	Feedback/Comments
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q8	Feedback/Comments

Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	supporting documents?
	0
Q12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here

DDPR_feedback_0180s		
	Name	David Wigley
	Organisation	
	Email	██████████
	Response Date	Aug 06 22
	Notes	See also Rows 160 and 183, DDPR_Feedback_156 and 179
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on	
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?	
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:	
Q4	Feedback/Comments	
	<p>Draft Waitaki District Plan: General Rural Zone: Planting Trees in the General Rural Zone -thoughts? In response to your email I offer my thoughts on the matter: The Plan prescribes values of 'Natural Character, Natural Features and Landscapes ' These are not physical values measured by science and quantified by algorithm . They are values which are assessed and prescribed by the public at large through their designated representatives. Should these features be hidden from the public then their existence is in practice irrelevant and they become merely the preserve of the landowner. I believe that the Plan should introduce measures to minimize effects of development on the enjoyment of the travelling public . To safeguard the right of the Public to continue to enjoy these treasures. So that the planting of trees whether for shelter belts or forestry or whatever reason is required to comply with preserving the visual enjoyment of the travelling public. Residential areas have the Streetscape and fencing provisions, so could that concept be brought into the GRZ? Loss of views is evident around Oamaru. Superb views across to the mountains and landscape from Ardgowan Road are at risk of being further obliterated by dense planting of evergreen trees on the road boundary. Fast growing species such as Macrocarpa and Lawsonia are frequently grown. Planted ostensibly as windbreaks, these will inevitably grow to form solid barriers. For trees planted as a windbreak, research shows that a semi-permeable barrier works best. NZ Farm Forestry Assoc website: Shelterbelts with 40 per cent to 50 per cent porosity reduce wind speeds over the greatest distances as wind accelerates through gaps, around the ends of belts and over dense barriers Perhaps a sightline from 2m height at road boundary to the horizon should be mandated. Perhaps 40% visible porosity is an option. Perhaps deciduous species planted within 20m of the boundary is an option. Thank you for the opportunity to give my opinion. Ngā mihi, David Wigley 331Ardgowan Road RD1D Oamaru 9492</p>	
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:	
Q6	Feedback/Comments	
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:	
Q8	Feedback/Comments	

Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	supporting documents?
	0
Q12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here

DDPR_feedback_0190s	
Name	David Wigley
Organisation	
Email	██████████
Response Date	Jul 26 22
Notes	See also rows 160, 183, 184 and DDPR_feedback_0156, DDPR_feedback_0179 and DDPR_feedback_0180
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q4	Feedback/Comments
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q6	Feedback/Comments
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q8	Feedback/Comments
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	supporting documents?
	0
Q12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here

Draft Waitaki District Plan

General Rural Zone:

I agree with the proposal to increase the minimum size for subdivision from 4hA to 20hA.

The proliferation of rural subdivisions in recent years has been at a cost to the environment and to our community. Regardless of the prevailing level of productivity of the land prior to subdivision, the potential for alternate forms of production is forever lost.

Size of minor residential unit:

Ref: RURZ-P7 Minor residential unit. Provide for a single minor residential unit on sites to facilitate residential choice and flexibility while ensuring that the minor residential unit is subservient to the primary residential unit on the site.

Ref: both GRZ and RLZ: rule PER-1

The gross floor area of the minor residential unit shall be less than 80m².

I recommend the gross floor area of the minor residential unit be increased to 100m².

This change is necessary to "facilitate residential choice and flexibility" in compliance with RURZ-P7

A minor residential unit provides an opportunity for elderly parents to remain on the property.

Difficulties can arise if there are mobility issues. Wheelchair access, wider passageway and larger bathroom need to be provided.

There is also an expectation of separate bedrooms for each parent.

Please take into consideration that elderly people will spend most of their time at home.

Effect: The visual effect of this change will be scarcely noticeable from the road.

Trees blocking view from the road.... both GRZ and RLZ:

trees planted along the road boundary can eventually block the view from the road. Species such as Macrocarpa and Lawsonia, will entirely block out the view. When trimmed their form becomes more dense and as they are never trimmed below 2m height, the loss of view from the road is total.

Examples can be seen along Ardgowan Road, one in particular I observed planted and contrary to a previous rule change. It is trimmed only to comply with clearance from the power lines. Even this operation causes closure of the lane to traffic for several hours.

I recommend "visual permeability from the road" be introduced as a defined requirement for both GRZ and RLZ

RLZ Policies RLZ-P1 Rural Lifestyle Zone character and amenity values

Maintain the qualities, character and amenity values of the Rural Lifestyle Zone by:

4. retaining the open character and outlook from sites to rural areas through managing boundary fences, including height, visual permeability and materials; and

David Wigley p [REDACTED]

Reasons being:

windbreak permeability

Farms: very seldom planted along road boundaries

British bedding legislation to prevent roadside planting in recent years.

[Handwritten signature]

DDPR_feedback_0205s	
Name	David Wigley
Organisation	
Email	██████████
Response Date	May 06 22
Notes	See also rows 160, 183, 184 and 194, DDPR_feedbacks_0154, 0179, 0180 and 0190
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q4	Feedback/Comments
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q6	Feedback/Comments
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q8	Feedback/Comments
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	supporting documents?
	0
Q12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here

David Wigley, 331Ardgowan Road RD1D OAMARU 9492, p [REDACTED], 6May2022

Annual Plan 2022-2023 Feedback

I apologise for this late submission, for which the closure date was 4May.

Reserve Land: Future Management.

I would like to raise with Council the possibility of a more effective way to manage Reserve land within the Oamaru area.

From my experience of planting many trees in Glen Eden Reserve it is clear there is an uphill battle to maintain, let alone improve, this Reserve. The 2015 Reserves Management Plan is but a dream.

Both here and in Warren Res, there are walking tracks which verge on being dangerous to the unwary. Weed control is problematic. African Boxthorn is established and proliferating. Classified as poisonous and dangerous within New South Wales*, it is difficult and costly to eradicate.

I walk both these Reserves and am aware of a decline in utilization. Notably fewer dog walkers in the Glen.

There is no appetite to list the maintenance work required and to estimate the costs. Raising matters with Council staff is largely a waste of time, as little or nothing gets done through lack of funds. There is no transparency.

Please consider the 3 lesser used reserves - Warren Res, Glen Eden Res, Forrester Heights – as one asset group for operations and development.

An example of what could be achieved is partial development on the 23 hA Warren Res**, with long term leases to lock in funding for maintenance and development of reserve land, also for recreational facilities.

Consider the potential of say 5hA of new mixed use long lease housing with walking and cycling access to town, use expert landscape architect design.

An income stream is sorely needed otherwise these reserves will fall further into neglect.

I therefore ask Council to please agree to the formation of an Oamaru Reserves Trust in this 2022-2023 Annual Plan.

Notes:

*<https://weeds.dpi.nsw.gov.au/Weeds/AfricanBoxthorn>

**Warren Reserve is currently grazed by cattle and sheep, with electric fencing alongside walking tracks.

My details: I would like to speak to Council on this. Age 65yrs+. I am a ratepayer and a resident for 20years.

David M Wigley