SUBMISSION 61

Name (Please use your full name)

Louise Gartside

Postal Address

762 Whitemans Valley Rd, Upper Hutt, 5371

Telephone number

021 180 5751

Email address

louisegartside05@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

Opposition to the entire plan, particularly Berkett's Farm Precinct proposal

My submission is that

I oppose the proposed plans and request that they are significantly revised before appropriate consultation with residents.

I seek the following decision from the local authority

I would like the local authority to reconsider their current plans after appropriate consideration with Whiteman's Valley residents. This has not happened for the current proposal.

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-productionaustralia/5a791dbfeb414fc3db3e65ac36ed4f5032519550/original/1699864728/fc0b76a5c7f677b82eb2ef7600cf90ed_Submission_from_Louise_and_Jonathan_Gartside.docx? 1699864728

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.

13/11/23 - Submission from Louise and Jonathan Gartside, 762 Whitemans Valley Rd, Upper Hutt, 5371 - Word document uploaded. Destruction of natural habitat irreversible loss of biodiversity caused by removal of native forest to clear the area for building will result in a significant decrease in numbers of taonga species due to loss of habitat. Significantly increased volume of traffic - roads in Whitemans Valley are currently too narrow to support construction vehicles and eventually an average of 2 vehicles per household, should this project go ahead. We have 3 one way bridges along WVR and there will be significant safety issues with large construction vehicles navigating Blue Mountains and Wallaceville hill. My children's school bus has previously crashed with a logging truck on Blue Mountains hill and I fear that the risk will increase with this project. There will also be a huge impact on Silversteam and Trentham with traffic queuing to get out of the valley at both ends. Silverstream is already congested with queues to join SH2 during rush hour. Lack of transparency - Most residents have found out through local community facebook pages rather than through the council. There's a really small amount of available information for a project the size of Berkett's precinct and the information isn't clear enough. We bought our property just over a year ago and wanted to live in an area of outstanding natural beauty. We're concerned that the character of the valley diveloped in the future. This will exacerbate the issues stated above and will put added pressure on our already struggling health centres, dentists and schools. Council should fully consult with residents so everyone understands what is going on and ensure that all documentation is iclear and accessible. I feel a more sensible approach would be to strengthen the infrastructure before any building takes place. At present, I don't feel this proposal will benefit current residents at all and will irreversibly damage natural surroundings, reduce safety 13/11/23 - Submission from Louise and Jonathan Gartside, 762 Whitemans Valley Rd, Upper Hutt, 5371

- <u>Destruction of natural habitat</u> irreversible loss of biodiversity caused by removal of native forest to clear the area for building will result in a significant decrease in numbers of taonga species due to loss of habitat.
- <u>Significantly increased volume of traffic</u> roads in Whitemans Valley are currently too narrow to support construction vehicles and eventually an average of 2 vehicles per household, should this project go ahead. We have 3 one way bridges along WVR and there will be significant safety issues with large construction vehicles navigating Blue Mountains and Wallaceville hill. My children's school bus has previously crashed with a logging truck on Blue Mountains hill and I fear that the risk will increase with this project. There will also be a huge impact on Silversteam and Trentham with traffic queuing to get out of the valley at both ends. Silverstream is already congested with queues to join SH2 during rush hour.
- <u>Lack of transparency</u> Most residents have found out through local community facebook pages rather than through the council. There's a really small amount of available information for a project the size of Berkett's precinct and the information isn't clear enough. We bought our property just over a year ago and wanted to live in an area of outstanding natural beauty. We're concerned that the character of the valley will be severely compromised if this proposal goes ahead.
- If this planning application is granted, it will set a precedent for other local rural areas to be extensively developed in the future. This will exacerbate the issues stated above and will put added pressure on our already struggling health centres, dentists and schools.

Council should fully consult with residents so everyone understands what is going on and ensure that all documentation is clear and accessible. I feel a more sensible approach would be to strengthen the infrastructure before any building takes place. At present, I don't feel this proposal will benefit current residents at all and will irreversibly damage natural surroundings, reduce safety on the roads and will create increased inconvenience with respect to pressuring already strained resources.