Kia ora commissioners, and thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

My name is **Phil Winter**, my wife and I moved to Waotu in 2002 and have since had the pleasure of raising our family here, I guess we can now claim to be locals! Over these years we have had a lot to do with Cambridge and so travel Horahora road regularly. Horahora road is an absolutely beautiful corridor and a treasure. The vista of the river and terracing set in a rural landscape are second to none. It truly is an Outsatnding natural landscape.

I am speaking today to strongly oppose the proposed 73-lot subdivision at **597 Horahora Road**. 1

This proposal is not a sympathetic rural development. It is effectively the creation of an entirely new, village dropped right into the heart of an **Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL)**. The sheer scale of placing **73 main dwellings**—and potentially **more**—will fundamentally destroy the open, rural vista that makes this section of the Waikato River and Lake Karapiro so significant. 1

As we travel the road we see we are already dealing with the cumulative damage of past decisions. The existing houses along this side of the river have already significantly blocked the public's ability to view, enjoy, and experience the ONL. Allowing this massive subdivision will only increase this impact. It turns what should be a protected natural treasure into a fairly private residential suburb, permanently scarring the visual character of the river corridor.

Commissioners, we do not need to guess or speculate about the severity of this destruction. We only need to look at the applicant's own technical documentation.

In Revision 4 of the **Landscape and Visual Assessment** prepared for the Tylees by **Boffa Miskell Ltd**, their own experts explicitly state, and I quote:

"There would be a major loss of some of the key elements and characteristics which make up the character of the landscape of the Site. Little of the pre-development landscape character would remain and there would be a moderate change in views from within the Site area."

They go on to admit that the effects would be **"Moderate (adverse)"**, and that the changes would be **"permanent and irreversible."**

I ask you to look closely at those admissions. If an expert assessment states that *"little of the pre-development landscape character would remain,"* that is not a "moderate" impact. By any logical planning definition, a permanent and irreversible wiping away of an area's existing character constitutes a **High impact**.

Page 17 - Earthworks will be completed over most of the development to level out river terracing

My understanding is the assessment frameworks commonly utilized in these hearings, a "High" impact is defined as a major modification or loss of most key elements and features. The applicant is attempting to downplay the severity of their project's footprint, but their own descriptions betray the reality: this is a massive, permanent scar on what is a protected landscape.

Because of this admitted, irreversible loss, this application fails to meet the statutory threshold of the **South Waikato District Plan**. Specifically, it directly breaches **Policy NFL-P4**. [1]

This Policy NFL-P4 explicitly mandates that subdivision, use, and development *should avoid, remedy, or mitigate* adverse effects on the values that contribute to an area being an Outstanding Natural Feature or Landscape. It explicitly demands the protection of these spaces by avoiding activities such as large-scale landform modification, and the construction of visually prominent structures, buildings, and earthworks. [1] - 72000 cm

If little of the pre-development character remains, then protection has **not** been achieved. Mitigation has **not** been achieved. The application fails its statutory test.

Beyond this severe, irreversible visual impact, this density poses a critical environmental threat. This area features extremely porous soils. Packing dozens of individual septic tanks and effluent field systems into this type of ground is a recipe for environmental problems. The cumulative nutrients from wastewater seapage into the Waikato River is a direct threat to water quality and freshwater ecology, the Awa is already loaded with N and P and that's exactly what septic tanks release. This number of septic tanks right on the banks of the river is quite honestly enviromently irresponsible. Lake Karapiro Algae blooms closed to users - won't have to look to far to the future May I also mention the one lane bridge nearby. It is reported that with current traffic flows this bridge was mentioned for a possible upgrade too two lanes. Thats at current traffic flows. It is also reported this subdivision would increase volumes by nearly 50%, putting pressure on an already bottleneck point forcing an upgrade and of course putting that expense on all rate payers, where it should be considered a development cost.

In conclusion, amending the proposal down to 73 lots does not change the core issue. The natural ancient terracing of the river bed and these stunning rural views belong to everyone. They are worth protecting for everyone to enjoy, and they should not be sacrificed to mass destructive recontouring for residential subdivision.

This application fails the core tests of the **Resource Management Act** and the **District Plan**. It does not protect the ONL from inappropriate subdivision, it introduces urban-style linear sprawl, ~~and it ignores the fragile nature of the local soils~~ & river nutrient loading

I urge the commission to look at the applicant's own words, acknowledge the permanent and irreversible damage this project will cause, decline this consent, and protect what remains of this beautiful landscape for todays and future generations to enjoy.

Thank you.