

SUBMISSION 167

Name (Please use your full name)

Heather Blissett

Postal Address

P O Box 47 164, Trentham, Upper Hutt

Telephone number

0273515211

Email address

outdoorblissupperhutt@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

No

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows

Effects on te taiao and biodiversity roading and transport Minimum platform size clarity with some of the wording such as adverse effects on environment and significance permeable land

My submission is that

Please see my attached document noting my submission

I seek the following decision from the local authority

Upper Hutt City Council

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission (tick appropriate box)

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission.

please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission (tick appropriate box)

I do not wish to make a joint case.

If your submission is over 500 words, please upload a word document with your submission. Please provide the questions as your headers before each paragraph.

https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/172e2a38e3d9e0b85148b1c08d1fcdec03f9dd40/original/1700172791/541701c9907dece028c5514561dd92f4_Plan_Change_50_Submission.docx?1700172791

SUBMISSION 167

Plan Change 50 Submission

Ko au te whenua, ko te whenua ko au (I am the land, the land is me)

Page 30 TP-P1 *“The transport system also needs to be maintained and developed without creating significant adverse effects on the environment.”*

My concern is that the public have already had to speak up to save rākau/trees which in Te Ao Māori are considered tuakana/older siblings from being destroyed on the Katherine Mansfield Extension. If they were human beings. It would be akin to saying “you have reached your 39th year and no longer serve a purpose that we can see so time to exit this lifetime”. Ironic considering much of the traffic on our major State Highway in the Te Wai Pounamu manage to successfully negotiate a multitude of single lane bridges. That includes trucks, buses, motorhomes, motorbikes and cyclists and general vehicles.

Can we be assured that when you consider your design of the transport system that you do in fact consider the effects on te taiao and our tuakana.

Roading for increased population will require extra width for the many different users, both active and motorized. Will they require lighting which increases light pollution to the area?

Nowadays there is a vehicle for every household member of driving age. In a rural environment this would be a greater probability due to distance to town for work, shopping and recreational. An efficient public transport system would be of benefit. Buses would also mean a further extension to the width of the current roads to allow for them to pull over. How well utilized it would be given that we are time poor.

It is my understanding that roading has already destroyed the health of a peatland. What systems will be in place to monitor the effects on the environment (more than noise). If you see rākau as a resource and not a taonga then you will not see any adverse effects being created. More clarity about what adverse effects on the environment actually means.

Page 30 TP-P2 I support the vision to plan for cyclists.

Page 31 TP-P5 I support the vision to plan for active transport for both the wellbeing of te taiao and the people.

Page 31 TP-P6 I support the development of a safer and more secure environment for the community. Could the design include seating and covered spaces for those needing rest stops.

Page 32 TPS9 provides vehicle movement limits in certain areas. Figures given 100 and 350 maximum. I would assume that this means you cannot build any further housing in those areas. As mentioned above. Most households these days have a vehicle for every person of driving age. A couple would both own a vehicle in many cases especially in rural areas. Given your figures then building could not exceed 50 and 175.

Page 33 TP-MC2 Environmental impacts should be listed as number 1 not number 5. This should be the first question you ask and it is the order in which Council lists their values. Or at least number 2. I don't understand how the cost to the environment is secondary to how it looks.

Page 46 SUB-RUR-P3 Natural hazards – Reminder that the whenua is not the natural hazard. We, the people are the natural hazard. It is we that are affected by what we do. Let's shift the paradigm.

Page 47 SUB-RUR-P4 *“result in building platforms sized to maintain the character of the zone;”*

That's ambiguous given that we have been building ¼ acre homes and destroying ¼ acre sections. More clarity and a maximum build size required rather than the minimum build size that is often present in new developments.

Currently, there is little support for off-grid tiny houses. Reason being. They do not generate the same rates revenue that a 200m² dwelling would and nor does it line the pockets of property developers, etc.

Page 47 SUB-RUR-P5 And hydraulic neutrality. Limit the amount of concrete that can be poured. Consider smaller dwellings and/or piles instead of concrete.

Page 48 SUB-RUR-R1

Page 49 SUB-RUR-R2

More clarity needed here. Evidence elsewhere would suggest developers can do what they like and remove any offending trees. (just an observation as a member of the public).

Add environmental/biodiversity impacts.

Page 50 SUB-RUR WHY OH WHY do you request a minimum building platform of 200m². Is there also a minimum number of people required to live in these large dwellings.

STOP, JUST STOP. How does this solve a housing crisis or lessen our adverse impact on te taiao or reverse our effects on climate change.

Page 78 GRUZ-P2 / 2. More clarity around “significant areas of vegetation”.

Page 79 GRUZ-P4 No exceptions whether visible from the road or not.

“ensure that activities including earthworks which alter the contour of the land, avoid or mitigate run-off, contamination and erosion of soil from land and do not significantly affect rural character and amenity values, particularly where the land is visible from roads and public places.”

I would also like to tautoko Mary Beth Taylor’s submission as it aligns with my values also.