

SUBMISSION 187

To whom it may concern

I wish to be heard in support of my submission.

I do not stand to make any commercial gain from my submission.

I question why the Section 32 Evaluation has DRAFT printed through it? It makes me wonder if what i am reading is correct.

I do not agree with the changes suggested to minimum requirements for subdivision. whilst there are still a number of larger properties in the valley, many have already been divided up into areas of around 4ha, even though the ownership may have remained the same. It seems unfair to make the average lot size 16ha for Rural Production and 20ha for General Rural. Indeed there are few properties that could fall into this category.

In the Section 32 Evaluation it is stated that these lot sizes will keep a high degree of Rural Character and highly productive land. I say that this will only devalue the few remaining properties that have larger lot sizes.

I also highly disagree with the creation of Berketts Farm precinct.

Once again it is unfair to create a precedent within the area of what size subdivision may be done.

The southern hills of Berketts Farm area is 100% vegetation (half native, half pines) How can it be relieving the land from farming to replace this with 36 properties and 10% vegetation?

The increase in traffic on an already overloaded roads and one way bridges is unacceptable. There will be increased accidents as the roads are narrow, and approaches to the one way bridges (at least three) have poor visibility from either side. We do not have the infrastructure to support this increase. The road maintenance team can't even manage to properly repair a pot hole on Mangaroa Valley Road. And let's not forget the several months of road closure when the mangaroa valley road bridge was damaged in flood water.

I do not want the Berketts Farm Precinct created.

There are a number of references to retaining rural character. I do not believe that this plan will protect our Valley's rural character. Introducing more housing and smaller lots just increases the number of traffic movements on unsuitable roads. It will also increase the risk of non rural activities and reverse sensitivity within the area.

The valley has been my home for most of my life, and has always been a retreat for myself and the wider population of Upper Hutt. Many people cycle and run or ride their horses along the roads and trails It would be terrible to see the roads so congested that it was no longer safe to do so. The safety of the roads are already questionable with many not wide enough for two way traffic let alone large logging trucks.

The bird that stands proud on the Upper Hutt City Council's coat of arms is the Karearea. This Falcon nests on Mt Clymie and relies on our valley for its survival. Increased population in the valley would jeopardise this birds survival in the area. I would like to see its habitat protected from increased population.

I would like that discrete properties are rezoned depending on their physical characteristics and location, and by application from the land owners.

I would like a fairer system to govern zoning and subdivision.

I am absolutely mind blown by councils complete disregard for their own rules and regulations and their willingness to bend as soon as a big player comes along. Had any other valley resident wanted to subdivide into this monstrosity it would have been a straight no due to zoning (and rightly so) Greedy property developers and land banking Americans need to be regulated. Our Upper Hutt community should be of upmost importance. This is money making in its purest form.

This one rule for the masses and one for the elite attitude must be stopped and those responsible for enabling it held accountable.

Thank you

Sarah Woodfield

Sez.woodfield@gmail.com