

SUBMISSION 197

Submission on PC50

By email to:

planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Name and contact details of submitter:

Tim Moody

55 TVL Road
RD1
Upper Hutt 5371

moody.tim@gmail.com

Declaration:

I do not stand to gain commercial advantage from my submission.

Submission:

1. The Council has failed to consult the community on aspects of PC50, and in particular, the development proposed at 'Berkett's Farm' (BF dev). Consultation is required by legislation.
2. PC50 is very difficult to navigate and understand. Given the gravity and far-reaching impact of the BF dev, this should be flagged clearly, and in plain English, openly consulted with the community.
3. I feel totally blindsided by the proposed BF dev.
4. The volume of traffic, on already busy and deteriorated roads (Blue Mountains Rd, Whitemans Valley Rd, Johnsons Rd, and their minor feeders) is already large. BF dev will overload these roads with traffic – heavy and light construction traffic and eventually likely hundreds of additional private vehicles. The roads are not suited to the volume of traffic that will be generated by BF dev.
5. There is likely to be excessive mess from construction on roads and surrounds. Especially mud, dust, run-off, and noise.
6. The noise of construction, and the eventual 100+ homes, and the associated traffic, will drastically impact on the greater area of quiet Whitemans Valley and Blue Mountains. The peace and tranquillity of Whitemans Valley is one of the jewels in Whitemans Valley's crown. The BF dev will destroy this.
7. Safety of pedestrians, cyclists, horse-riders, etc, will be significantly impacted by excessive traffic. These are narrow roads without footpaths. Children will be especially vulnerable – in particular at school bus pick-up/drop-off times where currently there is a significant volume of traffic rushing around. BF dev will make these traffic safety issues many times worse with zero mitigations.
8. The entire purpose of moving to the Blue Mountains/Whitemans Valley area is to be away from the built-up, crowded, and urbanised environment. I grew-up in the area. Have had the privilege of being able to raise my children here too. This area should be safeguarded for further generations to come; not turned into another urbanised suburb. Each has their place – but the place for urban is not Blue Mountains and Whitemans Valley.
9. PC50 notes that the BF dev will *"Enable a higher level of development than the underlying zones and therefore a higher return from development"* and *"Increase economic return when compared*

with farming". The economic benefit to a private business of subdivision and construction, compared to farming, should not be of concern to Council.

10. PC50 notes that the BF dev will "PC50 notes that the BF dev will *"Supports rural social infrastructure such as schools"*. This assertion cannot stand without supporting evidence. Given points 1-9 above, BF dev is the antithesis of 'supporting rural social infrastructure.
11. Blue Mountains and Whitemans Valley are a toanga and the Council, as well as residents have a duty and responsibility to be guardians of its special nature and characteristics for now, and generations to come. BF dev is the antithesis of guardianship. We must work together to protect the special character of Whitemans Valley and Blue Mountains. Not drive bulldozers through vast tracts of native bush and overload a special resource with traffic and pollution.

I am seeking the following relief:

The proposal of the development at 'Berkett's Farm' should be withdrawn and subjected to the level of community consultation that is appropriate for a development of this size. Given the nature of the proposal and its potential impact on the community at large Council should remove itself from the process and place the proposal – once fully consulted – before Independent Commissioners.

I wish to be heard in support of my submission.