

# SUBMISSION 95

**Name (Please use your full name)**

Katherine Elizabeth Pettengell

---

**Postal Address**

941 Whitemans Valley Rd, RD 1, Upper Hutt 5371

---

**Telephone number**

021817379

---

**Email address**

ktigger26@yahoo.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**

Resource management issue TP-I2, Entire section "SUB-RUR – Subdivision in Rural Zones", Entire section "GRUZ – General Rural Zone", Entire section "RLZ –Rural Lifestyle Zone", Appendix 3 - Berketts farm precinct Structure Plan, 4.2 Summary of the key issues

---

**My submission is that**

Comments on "Proposed Provisions: Plan Change 50 – Rural Review October 2023" Resource management issue TP-I2 mentions that "Mangaroa Hill Road, Blue Mountains Road, Akatarawa Road, and parts of Moonshine Hill Road and Mount Cecil Road require major upgrading to be able to accommodate further significant development. Such upgrading may have significant adverse environmental effects." I believe Whitemans Valley Rd should be included in this list of roads that would require major upgrading to accommodate significant development. The recent widening of the road in some areas has improved safety but where the widening stopped, it is still quite narrow considering the number and size of vehicles that would be required for development. However, there are often native birds and other animals along this stretch of road which would be adversely affected by widening or other roading upgrades. Entire section "SUB-RUR – Subdivision in Rural Zones" is extremely difficult to read due to the amount of text strikeout throughout the section. I suggest that this section be re-issued in its final format without strikeout to allow for the document to be read properly so the community can understand the provisions. As it reads with the sections struck out, it appears that due consideration is not being given to address the potential for "loss of rural character, the destruction of significant areas of indigenous vegetation and areas of significant habitat for fauna, the degradation of amenity values from development and activities and competing expectations of, and demands for, rural resources." I suggest that the reasons for the strikeouts be provided along with the re-issued final format to adequately convey how all of these issues have been mitigated or addressed to allow the strikeout. Entire section "GRUZ – General Rural Zone" is extremely difficult to read due to the amount of text strikeout throughout the section. I suggest that this section be re-issued in its final format without strikeout to allow for the document to be read properly so the community can understand the provisions. Additionally, the reason for all strikeouts and additions should be provided. Entire section "RLZ –Rural Lifestyle Zone" is extremely difficult to read due to the amount of text strikeout throughout the section. I suggest that this section be re-issued in its final format without strikeout to allow for the document to be read properly so the community can understand the provisions. Additionally, the reason for all strikeouts and additions should be provided. Berketts farm precinct development areas map and zoning ARCGIS viewer – Southern Hills area contains native bush. Suggest enlarging the "no development" area to include these areas of native bush as well as the currently designated native bush area. Comments on "RMA Section 32 Evaluations Plan Change 50 – Rural Review October 2023" 4.2 Summary of the key issues includes "Creating opportunities for home enterprise - e.g. Airbnb style accommodation, working from home or selling goods from home" However the document neglects to address the internet and telecommunications infrastructure in the area. As one example, fiber cables were run to the top of Blue Mountains Rd but no further into the Valley. Having spoken with Spark/Chorus about getting fiber to other properties in Whitemans Valley, the statement was that fiber would not be made available but the current copper lines would not be upgraded either. The current usage on the copper lines makes internet on the existing infrastructure difficult and unreliable. Additional drain on these lines with the addition of 100+ dwellings would make "home enterprise" prohibitive. Suggest that the relevant telecom companies are engaged with and a plan for upgrades to the current infrastructure are made and implemented before further development occurs.

---

**I seek the following decision from the local authority**

As per my submission, I would like the local authority to consider and provide feedback on the following: Addition of Whitemans Valley Rd to list of roads requiring major upgrade prior to development. Re-issue of documents in final format without strikeout and additions and with separate list of reasons for the strikeouts and additions. Re-zone of Southern Hills as no development based on presence of native bush. Telecom upgrade plan prior to re-development.

---

**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-production-australia/d078834fb4fc4c543c503227ca0b0e75ba3f881/original/1700005676/de2a600d7b1124884f5d46bd1f664ded\\_K\\_Pettengell\\_PC50\\_Submission.docx?1700005676](https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/d078834fb4fc4c543c503227ca0b0e75ba3f881/original/1700005676/de2a600d7b1124884f5d46bd1f664ded_K_Pettengell_PC50_Submission.docx?1700005676)

## 9. My submission is that:

### Comments on “Proposed Provisions: Plan Change 50 – Rural Review October 2023”

**Resource management issue TP-I2** mentions that “Mangaroa Hill Road, Blue Mountains Road, Akatarawa Road, and parts of Moonshine Hill Road and Mount Cecil Road require major upgrading to be able to accommodate further significant development. Such upgrading may have significant adverse environmental effects.” I believe Whitemans Valley Rd should be included in this list of roads that would require major upgrading to accommodate significant development. The recent widening of the road in some areas has improved safety but where the widening stopped, it is still quite narrow considering the number and size of vehicles that would be required for development. However, there are often native birds and other animals along this stretch of road which would be adversely affected by widening or other roading upgrades.

**Entire section “SUB-RUR – Subdivision in Rural Zones”** is extremely difficult to read due to the amount of text strikeout throughout the section. I suggest that this section be re-issued in its final format without strikeout to allow for the document to be read properly so the community can understand the provisions. As it reads with the sections struck out, it appears that due consideration is not being given to address the potential for “loss of rural character, the destruction of significant areas of indigenous vegetation and areas of significant habitat for fauna, the degradation of amenity values from development and activities and competing expectations of, and demands for, rural resources.” I suggest that the reasons for the strikeouts be provided along with the re-issued final format to adequately convey how all of these issues have been mitigated or addressed to allow the strikeout.

**Entire section “GRUZ – General Rural Zone”** is extremely difficult to read due to the amount of text strikeout throughout the section. I suggest that this section be re-issued in its final format without strikeout to allow for the document to be read properly so the community can understand the provisions. Additionally, the reason for all strikeouts and additions should be provided.

**Entire section “RLZ –Rural Lifestyle Zone”** is extremely difficult to read due to the amount of text strikeout throughout the section. I suggest that this section be re-issued in its final format without strikeout to allow for the document to be read properly so the community can understand the provisions. Additionally, the reason for all strikeouts and additions should be provided.

Berketts farm precinct development areas map and zoning ARCGIS viewer – Southern Hills area contains native bush. Suggest enlarging the “no development” area to include these areas of native bush as well as the currently designated native bush area.

### Comments on “RMA Section 32 Evaluations Plan Change 50 – Rural Review October 2023”

**4.2 Summary of the key issues** includes “Creating opportunities for home enterprise - e.g. Airbnb style accommodation, working from home or selling goods from home” However the document neglects to address the internet and telecommunications infrastructure in the area. As one example, fiber cables were run to the top of Blue Mountains Rd but no further into the Valley. Having spoken with Spark/Chorus about getting fiber to other properties in Whitemans Valley, the statement was that fiber would not be made available but the current copper lines would not be upgraded either. The current usage on the copper lines makes internet on the existing infrastructure difficult and unreliable. Additional drain on these lines with the

addition of 100+ dwellings would make “home enterprise” prohibitive. Suggest that the relevant telecom companies are engaged with and a plan for upgrades to the current infrastructure are made and implemented before further development occurs.