

SUBMISSION 227

Name (Please use your full name)

Patric John Lane

Postal Address

423 Katherine Mansfield Drive, RD 1, Whitemans Valley, Upper Hutt, 5371

Email address

pjlane@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

1) all provisions, and the consultation process 2) provisions relating to transportation and parking, subdivision, the Rural Lifestyle Zone, and the Berketts Farm Precinct

My submission is that

1) regarding all provisions, and the consultation process: The information provided by the council is extremely hard for ordinary people to understand and navigate. For proposals of this nature, it is inappropriate and inadequate to only provide two very long technical documents (of 136 and 311 pages respectively, which don't even have executive summaries) and to not provide opportunities to learn more about the draft provisions, such as via public engagement sessions. While the consultation period was extended by 2 weeks, that's irrelevant, given how hard it is understand and navigate the information.

2) regarding provisions relating to transportation and parking, subdivision, the Rural Lifestyle Zone, and the Berketts Farm Precinct: Many of the proposed provisions are confusing and/or contradictory with aims of maintaining/enhancing rural character amenity values and other important issues and objectives. For example, the volumes of traffic that are likely to be generated; the density that will be created by the proposed minimum and average lot sizes; the creation of bespoke provisions for the developers of the Berketts Farm Precinct that could set precedents etc. Other provisions are confusing or unclear. For example, would RLZ-S11 re domestic fire sprinkler systems apply to existing dwellings, or just new ones?

I seek the following decision from the local authority

1) regarding all provisions, and the consultation process: I seek that the council give residents and ratepayers of rural areas with an opportunity to make informed contributions on the PC 50 proposals. For example, provide the community with clear, concise and well structured information that's appropriate for the intended audience (ie similar to way central government agencies are required to provide information for general public under the Plain Language Act provisions) and offer genuine engagement opportunities to discuss what the proposals are and how things would change.

2) regarding provisions relating to transportation and parking, subdivision, the Rural Lifestyle Zone, and the Berketts Farm Precinct: Unless the council provides the community with informed contributions, it's difficult to specify what I'm seeking. Overall, I seek stronger measures to maintain/enhance rural character and amenity values, protect the environment, and ensure that development costs will not be borne by existing rural ratepayers. For example: - the valley's roads are already in poor condition in many places, and increasing traffic volumes will make them worse - for activities that require consent and/or conditions, stronger provisions to help ensure developers and others do not begin work until consents etc have been granted and required infrastructure is in place (eg access roads are suitable) - do not allow titles to be issued for subdivisions under bonding agreements, or at least set firm time limits for when bonded conditions must be met. For example, sealing of roads/ROW shouldn't be allowed to be done later if the developer pays a bond -- the detrimental effects of dust etc on health, the environment, etc are too great. - the proposed minimum and average lot size in the Rural Lifestyle zone are too small. I see the Section 32 report said the preferred approach is 5,000 sqm, not 3,000. And the formula for calculating average lot size should be based on the subdivision's amount of viable land (ie land that's not too steep, suitable for building platforms/septic systems/access roads, amount of native bush), not total land -- ie to reduce the risk of too much clustering. - provide more details about the Burketts Farm Precinct, including how it will be accessed, how it will enhance indigenous biodiversity, what conditions the council will impose re the roading network and traffic and pedestrian safety, etc. - For RLZ-S11 re domestic fire sprinkler systems: I seek that the requirement only apply to new dwellings. It's unfair and unreasonable to expect existing dwellings to install them.

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.

No Answer

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- 1. It is frivolous or vexatious**
- 2. It discloses no reasonable or relevant case**
- 3. It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further**
- 4. It contains offensive language**
- 5. It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.**

Please note: my submission is over 500 words. As requested at the previous step in this process, I tried to upload a Word doc version, but it would let me "save and continue", so I had to delete it to be able to proceed with this online submission. I will email the document to the planning team in case they need it. Regards, Patric
