

LURP Review May 2015 Submission #25

Eric Woods, Managing Director,

MindSpace Solutions Limited

Cell: +64 (0)21 051 4804

Web: www.MindSpaceSolutions.com I would like to submit comments for the LURP review.

Please see below.

Our comments below relate to the following outcomes:

Outcome 4: "...enabling...developments to go ahead without unnecessary impediments..."

Outcome 5: "...enabling...investor confidence to obtain the best outcomes...from the resources expended..."

Outcome 8: "...enabling neighbourhood centres..."

We would like to establish a new camping ground. Almost all existing camping grounds in the WDC, SDC and CCC areas have been established on rural zoned land as it is cheaper, resulting in lower fees for campers, and it is closer to nature, which is a large factor in why campers want to go camping. We have approached WDC, SDC and CCC and all three councils have informed us that they cannot support the establishment of a new camping ground on rural zoned land, solely because the LURP prevents development outside of residential zoning.

Establishing a new camping ground on residential land is prohibitive for the reasons outlined above (prohibitively expensive, and prohibitively offputting for campers wanting to be close to nature)."

The camping ground industry will be hugely impeded for the next 10 to 15 years if the LURP is not amended to accommodate the activities they need.

The LURP provides an unfair advantage to existing camping grounds, who have already been granted resource consents in rural zoning. It is impossible for a new camping ground to compete if they need to pay prohibitively higher prices for residential land, need to pay higher annual rates, and are excluded from the possibility of using their own services (water and sewerage, etc), and they are unable to target the majority of campers, who want to be close to nature).

Even existing camping grounds are finding the constraints of the LURP to be severely limiting their activities. For example:

- Camping grounds are not able to increase the number of camp sites,

- In some situations camping grounds are facing severe difficulties in moving camp sites to land that more stable regarding earthquakes effects,
- Upgrading existing services (water, sewer, etc), including switching from septic tanks to council services, is also difficult, as it may be considered to be development of land that is outside of infrastructure boundaries.

While the LURP is providing a lot of ability to increase housing capacity, it is effectively preventing any increase in camping ground capacity for the next 10 to 15 years. To make matters worse, some camping grounds have been converted into temporary workers accomodation (e.g. Workotel), resulting in even fewer camping options, and evicting longer term residents that were in the relocatable home park. This does not seem to be a practical, considerate, or sustainable approach.

Christchurch is already experiencing some results related to this limitation, in the form of Freedom camping. Freedom campers are unable to find affordable camping sites (partly because increased demand and constrained supply has driven up prices), and so they are resorting to camping in parking spaces around the city, which is not ideal for many reasons: it is putting an increased load on services (e.g. public toilets and rubbish disposal) that the council are not responding to (e.g. many overflowing rubbish bins, resulting in litter and pollution), it is irritating to other citizens who are visiting these areas for their intended purposes (e.g. a walk on the beach, surfing, etc), it is not a very comfortable experience for the campers as the areas they use are not adhering to the Camping Ground act of 1984, and it is resulting in lost revenue that could be being captured by camping ground businesses that are keen to provide the required services for a reasonable fee.

If the LURP allowed new camping grounds in rural areas, freedom camping would reduce, and could even be banned (as there would be viable alternatives to use), which would resolve all of the four problems listed above.

Christchurch could dearly benefit from increased tourism, as tourism took a hard hit with the earthquakes. People are only going to visit Christchurch if they have viable options for accomodation. While hotel accomodation is available, those looking for cheaper accommodation like camping grounds (tents, motor homes, caravans, or cabins) have very few options, so the options that exist can be too expensive, or over booked. This is resulting in a segment of the market avoiding Christchurch, which is hurting Christchurch tourism.

Many thanks,

Eric