

# Temple View Boundary Alteration, Plan Change 3

## Hearings 20 June 2019

### Temple view hearing submission – Crystal Mann

Good morning. My name is crystal Mann, and this submission is being read on my behalf as unfortunately I was not able to make the hearing today. The submission won't be technical, nor use much in the way of planning jargon, but it is nevertheless coming from a genuine place of concern.

I was born and raised in Temple View, and am now in turn raising my own family here. As a member of the church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and a long time resident of Temple View, the "special character" of the area described in the district plan is something that i am acutely aware of, and something that is important and significant to me. Temple View has a unique history and character in New Zealand. Since the closure of church college, many in the community have struggled with the wide spread changes and losses they have felt and witnessed. I believe that the proposed boundary alteration and plan change, and the inevitable resulting development that will follow will have a negative impact on the character of Temple View, as well as the lifestyle of residents.

Special heritage zone objective 5.2.7 is to "ensure development within the temple view character area maintains and enhances its special character". It appears that while the first lot of housing developed by the church (adjacent wade lane) were single story and in cream brick work in a nod to the traditional teacher housing, current housing being developed is nothing like this at all. Large two story duplexes on Tuhikaramea road in grey and black look completely out of place, and have no reference whatsoever to the traditional gateway that led to the temple. Notably, only one of these homes on former teacher housing sites has sold, while another sits empty during a housing shortage. The remaining land sits bare.

5.2.7c describes new structures within the former teacher corridor need to retain the existing set back established by the First House. While this may technically have been achieved (I am unaware if the duplex on Tuhikaramea Rd meets this requirement) it certainly does not feel that way. Instead of a private modest residence set back from the footpath, a large structure looms. On my evening walk recently I was able to see right into the home and observe what the owner was eating for dinner, what brand of biscuits were on the kitchen bench, and indeed what they were watching on tv.

The point of raising this one very small example of duplex housing is to demonstrate that I already feel the Church did not meet obligations of preserving or protecting the special corridor to the temple or special characteristics mentioned in council documents, particularly with relation to the Tuhikaramea Road corridor. So I doubt entirely that they will do so with new sub developments.

I am ultimately concerned that rezoning this land will result in large development and subdivision. Temple View has been a small, close knit village type community for many decades. New housing developments on this rezoned land combined with existing land owned by the church could effectively double the population of the area. The church cannot argue that such development would enhance or even not affect the character of the area. Such growth would absolutely alter the nature of the small community. It would likely seem like two different communities - old and new.

I also oppose the loss of rural zoning because of the implications for increased traffic, but I note another submitter has gone into this in more detail.

I am pragmatic enough to admit that this rezoning will likely go ahead. I would like to request that the commissioners and council think seriously about the housing density the church is proposing, as I am doubtful that large scale terraced housing/duplexes/apartments will contribute to the special character of Temple View at all. I would also like the council to notify residents as a matter of course when the Church applies for development consent so that residents are aware of the plans and have an opportunity to feedback on these. Unfortunately, it is my view as a resident and homeowner that the church has a less than stellar record of community consultation or indeed of keeping residents up to date sufficiently. I would like to know for example, if the subdivision would “provide for the recreational needs of the community” (objectives and policy, subdivision objective 23.2.2 point vi), or would the extra 1000+ residents also need to use our one small Foster Rd playground and reserve for sports? (I’m not counting legacy park playground, as this has been closed for some time and fenced off after issues with land stability. I’m no expert but could be to do with it being built on peat land. I hope the planned houses nearby fare better than the swings and slide).

I note that a response to my submission that a change to urban from rural will late the character of Temple View says “this is incorrect”. Is that not a subjective view, as arguably mine also is? I am unsure how doubling a residential population, increasing traffic, potentially adding care facilities, having largely unprecedented apartment housing, and including shops does not alter the character and lived experience for residents of a small village. The response also states that current works have improved connectivity through and across Tuhikaramea Road. How? That seems like a bit of a reach - It was a road before, it’s a road now. If anything, I miss the traffic safety islands that were removed. Improved Grb and kai hall facilities are nice, yes, but this doesn’t change the fact that the much lauded special corridor to the temple that we were promised would be preserved is nothing like the special character it once was, especially since the introduction of the two storey grey duplex housing.

As a final point, I would like to note that there were only two oppositions submitted from Temple View residents. I would like to suggest that this is not because people are ambivalent. Previous hearings around demolition of church college and other changes in Temple View attracted far more submissions and some passionate hearings. I simply think that some residents have ‘given up’ and think that there is no point submitting. After all, no one is as well resourced as the church and history suggests the outcome is usually in their favour.

Thank you for your time.  
Crystal Mann