

As a submitter, I am against a road going through the Silverstream Spur for the following reasons

1. **Firstly, the current Flood Maps and Modelling DO NOT protect the community, as stated in GTC expert evidence. In fact the current Flood maps and modelling is potentially harmful to the environment and threatening to human life if left as they are. With the flood maps as they are - any future development on the Spur and Southern Hills will be harmful to those living in Silverstream, Pinehaven, Mangaroa, Whitmans Valley and even Stokes Valley and the flow on effect to other suburbs. There needs to be a moratorium put on any roads or development on the South Growth Area, including the Silverstream Spur proposed roading until true and accurate Flood Maps are produced for Pinehaven.**

To give an analogy, currently the hills are acting as a large sponge, absorbing and holding back water, and some of it evaporating and a certain amount of run off. Developed, they act as a rock, with hard surfaces where significantly more runoff occurs. The Flood Maps pre-development, instead of being modelled as the large sponge they are now, were modelled as the rock. In other words, the pre-development state was modelled as it was developed, and then the compared to the developed state, and guess what – little or no difference was found.

As a member of the public – I ask why Upper Hutt Council have not looked at the overwhelming evidence for themselves? Why they have not addressed the evidence submitted to them showing the Auditor they appointed mislead the public in his report. Is this all an inconvenient truth for the Council? Is individuals' status or position threatened if they do look at it? Do they already know but are not concerned?

It is INCOMPREHNDABLE that our Council who are fully aware of the concerns and anomalies in the flood mapping and modelling are not looking at it in their appointed roles.

I ask this panel not to ignore this evidence and reject any road on the Spur.

2. **It is not UHCC's land to give to be used for a road.** The Silverstream Spur was purchased as Green Belt Reserve for the benefit and enjoyment of the public.
3. **Over the years, the close relationship between Upper Hutt City Council members and GTC has been of concern to the public with the question raised of whose interests is Council prioritising and protecting? A private developers or the publics?.** An example to illustrate this, was the proposed land swap that UHCC and GTC proposed without prior public knowledge or consultation. It was for UHCC to 'swap' the Silverstream Spur land to GTC steep and unusable hillsides, covered with problematic aged pines that would incur future expense by ratepayers to deal with. SOH's brought this to the public's attention, and other community groups and members lobbied strongly against this, which eventually resulted in the withdrawal of the land swap proposal. This issue among others, highlights that the relationship between GTC and the Council and the public deserves greater transparency

from the Council about what they doing, and carry out their obligations to look after the wellbeing of the public.

**The current example of this is 72 submitters are opposed to a road on and through the Silverstream Spur, and all the further submitters [except GTC] also opposed the road through the Spur. Only GTC and two other submitters are in support of the road, and none of the further submitters supported them.** Yet, I understand the recommendation made to this Hearing Panel, by Councils s42A Report, is that all these 72 submissions, and all further submitters supporting no road on the Spur be rejected. By contrast, the s42A Report recommends accepting GTC and the other two submitters submissions for the road through the Spur. This Council has a history of making recommendations ignoring information presented to them; and writing off 100's of people who have presented petitions and submissions regarding the flood mapping and modelling and development on the Hills. Why? Furthermore, we are aware of several members of the public, including business and property owners, who find this sort of action by the Council intimidating, putting them off participating in public consultations on these sorts of issues.

I suggest, the panel consider what sort of culture is being created or upheld, and how independent and democratic are these processes? I request that panel refuse s42A Reports recommendation to reject the 72 submitters and all the further submitters views opposing the road through the Spur and apply the appropriate weight to such an overwhelming shared view expressed by these submitters and supported more widely.

4. **The Southern Growth development is not needed for Upper Hutt City Council to meet its housing needs over the next 30 years as shown by the most recent housing assessments and regional future development strategies now available. They have also been harvesting their forest for over 80 years without a road on the spur and should be able to continue to do so even as they are doing now.**

### **In Summary**

I request the panel recommends a moratorium of no road or infrastructure corridor through the spur or on the South Growth area until the Pinehaven flood maps and modelling are corrected.

The Silverstream Spur was purchased as a Greenbelt Reserve and the most appropriate way to do this is to accepted it to be zoned now as natural open space, without a road.

The Southern Growth Area is not needed for housing given that with recent changes in the law, there will be sufficient capacity within existing urban areas to meet the cities future housing needs for the next 30 years.

Therefore, I ask the panel to reject requests for a road through the Spur to open up development on the Southern Growth area.