

SUBMISSION 236

Submission for Plan Change 50/32

Friday 17 November 2023

My name is Nicola Boland. I have been a resident ratepayer in Whitemans Valley for 22 years. I wish to be consulted and I wish to be heard on Proposed Plan Change 50/32.

There are 4 main areas that raise questions and concerns for me. These are listed below. The **remedy I'm seeking for each concern** is:

- that the proposed development known as Berkett Precinct is stopped immediately
- that questions and concerns from the wider community and current resident landowners in Whitemans Valley about future developments are remedied to their satisfaction and published in a transparent process
- that council at the next opportunity pass bylaws to the effect that any future development is led by the requirement that it will preserve and protect the existing rural, natural environment and lifestyle that currently exists
- that council pass bylaws at the next opportunity to restrict all future development to sub-divide land into blocks of 4 hectares or greater within Whitemans Valley
- that any future plan changes will not degrade or devalue the existing right of residents to enjoy a peaceful rural environment as befits the rural classification in the titles of our properties
- that council does not change the rules to fit the Berkett Precinct or any other proposed development.

Note: The UHCC "Lets Korero" verification process to send this submission failed this afternoon. I have been told to send this submission by email and that it will be accepted by email up until midnight tonight, 17 November 2023.

Questions and areas of concern:

1. The proposed "Berkett Precinct" will radically and negatively impact Whitemans valley residents quality of life, property valuation and health and safety of all residents and users of the valley
 - a. At the Johnsons Road end of the valley, current residents purchased blocks of 4 hectares or larger in good faith on the understanding that the area was and would remain classified as rural or semi-rural. One of the reasons for buying in a rural/semi-rural area is the ability to walk, run and ride (bikes and horses) on our roads. An intensive development, such as the proposed Berkett development will lead to a population explosion, significant increase in traffic volumes and significant increase in heavy and trade traffic for many years. This would make our roads this too dangerous to use.
 - b. Noise and light pollution created by significant population and building increases would significantly reduce existing quality of life and property value. Significant numbers of small properties will inevitably increase light pollution, there is no way to prevent this in intensive development areas.

- c. Does the council agree the proposed development would take many years to complete? Meaning there will be a constant stream of tradespeople, earthworks, infrastructure work etc. over many years?
2. The process for Plan 50/32 has not been sufficiently consultative or transparent
 - a. I understand that previous documents relating to the proposed development are significantly different in content, tone and intent, making all previous consultation irrelevant and insufficient.
 - b. Residents in the Johnsons Road, and J Road extension known as Rovale, and Kakariki Way areas have never been consulted. The proposed development will push traffic onto Blue Mountains Road, we all use this road every day, we will be impacted.
 - c. Residents from all parts of the valley will be impacted by significant increase in traffic on our rural roads, regardless of the actual development boundary. Blue Mountains Road is under pressure already. The number of accidents and near miss incidents is rising rapidly on an almost daily basis. Any further increase in traffic volume would have potentially tragic and catastrophic impact.
 - d. The map, using the term loosely, in the document does not have any reference points, road names or geographical points to identify exactly which properties are impacted and included. Why is this critical information glossed over?
 - e. How many new roads will be created, paper roads extended and existing roads made wider, to allow access to and from the proposed development?
 - f. Where, using map references, do the developers plan to place these roads?
 - g. Where, exactly using map references are the boundaries of the proposed Berkett development?
 - h. Does the council confirm the Berkett Precinct has already been sold to a developer?
 - i. Please declare (i.e. list) all agreements, contracts, negotiations that have already taken place between the developer and the council?
 - j. What has the developer been promised?
 - k. Has the developer paid any monies to the council in relation to the proposed development? If yes, for what?
 - l. Is the council planning to retro-fit the existing rules and bylaws to allow the Berkett Precinct to go through?
 - m. Does the council have knowledge of any other proposed developments waiting in the wings for the Berkett precinct to set a precedent and allow further intensive development?
 3. The natural landscape would be negatively and irretrievably damaged and degraded by subdividing the land into blocks smaller than 4 hectare
 - a. How does council plan to manage infrastructure needs that are already insufficient for the existing population? Drinking Water, Waste Water and Roading specifically are failing today.
 - b. When the Johnsons Road, Johnsons Road extension and Kakariki Road subdivision occurred we were led to believe an amount of \$5000/new title from each development was to be used to upgrade and improve Blue Mountains Road. Is that correct? If yes, what work was completed? How much (\$s) were committed?

- c. Water run-off systems are currently insufficient and frequently overwhelmed. What solutions, and when does the council plan to put in place remedies to address existing problems and ensure any future development does not contribute further to the problem?
 - d. Does the “Average” size of block approach allow for multiple blocks smaller than 2 hectares? Meaning there could be multiple small blocks of less than 2 hectares provided there are sufficient large blocs to meet the “average” test?
 - e. How many, in actual numbers, sections of land will be permitted in the proposed developed?
4. Poor financial management, poor planning and lack of infrastructure investment over many years, does not now give the council a mandate to create multiple unsupportable suburbs and intensive developments in our beautiful rural environment.
- a. What studies, investigations, research and/or reports (please list) did the UHCC undertake to inform their planning and help to manage the Berkett Preccint proposal?
 - b. What environmental impact reports have been undertaken?
 - c. What expert advice was sought and which recommendations have been adopted in the council consideration of this proposal?

I wish to be consulted and I wish to be heard on the proposed changes in Plan 50/32.

Nicola Boland

027 3909379