

## Submission Summary L Yule

1. Good afternoon, Commissioner
2. My evidence today is brief in taking my original statement as read, but I wish to highlight the following;
3. Mangakuri Station like many coastal rural properties faces significant pressures. These include
  - financial viability
  - weather vagaries and
  - increased compliance costs and regulations
4. Trustees are seeking a small subdivision to fund deferred capital improvements and a change of land use and income streams.
5. We have no intention of becoming long term coastal property developers even though there are significant opportunities. This is largely out of respect for the gifting of the Station to the Trust by the late Pat Williams and our wish to run a sustainable farming business.
6. The Trust has made a significant investment in identifying sites that are within walking distance to the beach, avoid archaeological sites, avoid historic slips and that can be serviced with suitable infrastructure. Significant plantings will be added to stabilise the hill side which will assist in the protection of existing houses from erosion risk and to enhance the amenity of the whole site.
7. The Trust has taken on board feedback from homeowners around layout and set back distances.
8. The application before you seeks to fund the modernisation of the Station, enhance the landscape and provide erosion protection to existing home owners and allow 8 families to own a property in this amazing location.
9. Eight Lifestyle Lots in this single location seeks to avoid sporadic and random lifestyle subdivision across the Station and will allow the upper ridge lines to be used for farming and discreet tourism experiences including walks.
10. The Station has planned out its modernisation land use which will include Forestry, Tourism and protein production. This will be done in such a way as to avoid reverse sensitivity issues and will result in the long-term protection of the significant archaeology.

11. The capital required for this is significant and can only realistically be generated by some land development.

12. Beach Society Submission

- Point 32 is factually incorrect. The SR and BJ Williams Trust has never owned the land at 40 Okura Road. 40 Okura Road was subdivided off the Beach House Owned by Pat and Janet Williams. The former Manager was not gifted the subdivided land but purchased it at market value.
- Point 38. While 23 submissions in opposition were received these originated from only 18 of the 27 properties. Nine property owners did not submit and I have spoken to some residents who are not opposed. It is incorrect to say there is universal opposition to the application.

13. The Trust fully accepts your role as Commissioner to approve or decline this Discretionary Application, but It is important that I advise the submitters what is likely to happen if this application is declined. This is from a commercial and practical perspective, and is not intended as a threat.

- (a) Despite the opposition from some members of the community the Trustees will continue to advance some type of development in this location to fund the Station modernisation. There will be houses on this site in the future.
- (b) The Trust has invested significant resources in this site to identify at least 8 suitable building platforms.
- (c) The parent lot has no houses on it and is capable of 4 new houses plus a secondary dwelling.
- (d) The Trust has a variety of options to advance its plan via a staged planning pathway, 1 in 3 year lifestyle development, subdivision of 20ha lots or the sale of all or part of the 111.9ha subject site to a consortium of buyers who will purchase the property simply for the house sites and future development opportunity. The Trust may continue to graze the balance lot but this cannot be guaranteed.
- (e) The Trust will slow down or transfer its significant erosion and tree planting expenditure away from this site in support of other initiatives.

14. While I am not a planning expert I do wish to touch on the land fragmentation argument.

- (a) The Trust has a number of subdivision opportunities available, and this application will likely cause the lowest level of long-term land fragmentation compared with others.

- (b) The Trust has offered significant land covenants to stop future lifestyle development on Lot 11 and a 9-year covenant to prevent other lifestyle subdivision on all our land adjoining or in the Coastal Zone.
- (c) The Trust is very mindful of the PDP which makes Lifestyle Development potentially a Controlled Activity outside the Coastal Zone. If we are forced to follow a planning pathway to do this, it will result in more lifestyle sites on Mangakuri Station over time allowable under the PDP General Rural Zone rules.
- (d) I reiterate that the Trust does not wish to go down this path if it can be avoided.

15. On balancing up all the issues, restriction, opportunities and Planning Rules, I submit that this application is the best use of the land resources available and will have the least impact on the environment compared with other ownership and subdivision options available.