



Te Kaunihera o
Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta
Upper Hutt City Council

Full submissions

Private Plan Change 55

1135 MAYMORN ROAD 'GABITES BLOCK' | JUNE 2022



Submission 1

Petal just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Hugh Wiffen

Postal address of submitter

1138b maymorn road

Address for service (if different from above)

No Answer

Contact telephone

0212885028

Contact email

hughwiffen@yahoo.co.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Maymorn Road

My submission is that:

I support the development of this block however the same rules should also apply to the neighbouring blocks of land within the settlement zone.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Urgently consider the applying the same rules to the blocks of land around this development, it would be unreasonable to apply different rules to one landowner

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 2

Wayne just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Wayne Chapman

Postal address of submitter

4 Riverlea Way totara park

Address for service (if different from above)

No Answer

Contact telephone

0274221551

Contact email

wayne@magnumimports.co.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

No Answer

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Roading and lighting

My submission is that:

My only concern is that the roads that will feed this new subdivision are not adequate for the extra vehicles/ It's likely most traffic will head in/out via Plateau Road / State Highway 2. My experience from living in Johnsons Road before the increase of housing in Kakariki Way etc is that new residents expect suburban type environment with footpaths, street lighting etc

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Allocate funding or ensure developer contributes to improved roading.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 3

Debbie just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Debbie Hawinkels

Postal address of submitter

177 Mangaroa Valley Road, RD1 Upper Hutt 5371

Address for service (if different from above)

177 Mangaroa Valley Road, RD1 RD1

Contact telephone

+64273572766

Contact email

debhawinkels@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

The changing of this area from General Rural / Rural Production to Settlement Zone. The number number of units which are proposed to be built on site.

My submission is that:

I oppose the PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 55 (GABITES BLOCK). which seeks to rezone 74.5 hectares of land at Gabites Block, 1135 Maymorn Road. Loving the valley which we live, I have no problem with 5 - 10 acre block subdivisions which still allow for the character and beauty of the valley to remain. I oppose a proposed change from General Rural / Rural Production to Settlement Zone will see not only much smaller blocks but an increase in traffic entering and exiting the valley, with infrastructure which cannot support this type of development.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

I seek from the Upper Hutt City Council that this PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 55 (GABITES BLOCK) be denied. I seek that the proposed change from General Rural / Rural Production to Settlement Zone be denied. I seek that block sizes in keeping with General Rural / Rural Production be retained for the Gabites Block.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 4

Bea just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Beatrice Serrao

Postal address of submitter

13 York Ave Heretaunga

Acting agent for submitter (if applicable)

N/A

Contact email

beatriceserraomccaul@outlook.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Don't develop this beautiful wet land area. Leave it be. It's your duty as city Council to protect the environment around your city. Don't let this happen. There won't be a come back once they start building there and all that beautiful area will be lost forever!!!

My submission is that:

Don't develop this beautiful wet land area. Leave it be. It's your duty as city Council to protect the environment around your city. Don't let this happen. There won't be a come back once they start building there and all that beautiful area will be lost forever!!!

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Also, if you really want your citizen to take part of these surveys, write them in a way that everyone can understand!!!

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 5

BecksC just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Rebecca Cato

Postal address of submitter

2 Colletts road

Address for service (if different from above)

8 Franconia road London sw49nb

Contact email

becksc5@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Reduced plot size on gabbits road block

My submission is that:

Community wellbeing: support the requested changes for plot sizes to be reduced down to 400m2. Wish to have an ammendment that the developer contributes funds to community facilities within the subdivision including their ongoing maintenance. And that a full transport plan is done including

a commitment to improvement in safety and accessibility of the site. A full intensive housing community plan done to ensure a healthy living environment for the families who will move there. Eg hobsonville point urban design

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Approve the application, with conditions of providing funding for community and urban design features.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 6

Jimmy77 just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Nathan King

Postal address of submitter

89 thackeray st

Address for service (if different from above)

89 thackeray st

Contact telephone

0212540190

Contact email

naths.mancave@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

read below.

My submission is that:

I OPPOSE the plan change 55 for (Gabites block) My main concern would be traffic management/Plan for the intersection on to SH2. Not one person in Upper Hutt wants a repeat of the shambolic intersection we have to deal with on SH2 and Riverstone terraces. This needs to be split level intersection (SH58 and SH2) my fear is that the intersection onto SH2 up near this subdivision will be a shambolic mess and death trap for drivers. If the subdivision goes ahead this intersection need to be upgraded to a split level on/off ramp style intersection that we have on SH2 & SH58. My second concern is the size of the smaller sections. They are far to small for this gorgeous rural suburb. absolute minimum size needs to be 1000m2. we do not want to see another mess like wallaceville estate in upper hutt.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

I would like the removal of the 400m2 section and replaced with 1000m2. I would like to see planes in place for a split level intersection onto SH2 and this must be built before the subdivision is open.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 7

Tam just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Tamara **Carson**

Postal address of submitter

14 prestige place

Contact telephone

0278192886

Contact email

tamara.carson@hotmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Opposed to the development

My submission is that:

Oppose The appeal of many buyers for the valley is the quiet lifestyle. With that being said, the roads are made for this to be a lifestyle block area. There already are far more cars on the road than we are used to seeing. There are cyclist constantly using it for biking and cars speeding down the narrow roads. With more people it means more cars. More family's meaning more children heading in the direction of the school on high speed roads with no footpaths. The school itself sits on a single lane stretch of road. I personally feel before any further developments this big are considered the reading needs to be seriously updated to accommodate this. It's not right that the roads are still as they are even now, it's getting more and more dangerous.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Oppose the development

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 8

Calima just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Lisa and Jonathan Bryant

Postal address of submitter

1095 Maymorn Road, Maymorn, Upper Hutt

Contact telephone

027 840 2042

Contact email

jon.lisabryant@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and
does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Allow for lots with a minimum area of 400msq in the north western corner of the site, with an average lot area of 600msq. Allow for lots with a minimum 1000msq on the valley flats and upper plateau.

My submission is that:

We oppose the size of the lots being proposed in the north western corner of the Gabites block. We believe the property sizes proposed are not rural, but residential which is not in keeping with the current rural setting and which is why we moved here four years ago. The impact to us if the proposal goes through would be significant and includes increased noise, lighting, traffic. Loss of privacy, loss of visual aesthetics, potential damage environmentally in terms of wildlife in the area and potential negative effects on waterways. We also oppose reducing the size of lots down to 1000msq on the valley flats and upper plateau, again this will not be in keeping with the current rural aspect of the area. Most of the properties in this area are considered lifestyle, those that are deemed residential would be at least 2000msq and is in keeping with the natural progression from residential/urban to rural as you go further into Maymorn.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

The north western corner, valley flats and upper plateau would be better suited to 2000msq+ in order to be considered settlement/rural.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 9

mangaroa just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Rob Prest

Postal address of submitter

83 Flux Road, Mangaroa 5371

Address for service (if different from above)

No Answer

Contact telephone

02040582464

Contact email

rjprest@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Density of development areas within Gabites Block

My submission is that:

- Proposed development is not consistent with the surrounding rural area - Proposed Lower Density Residential area, despite being 'north of the stream' is within the valley proper and sets a precedent for future intensification of development within Maymorn and Mangaroa. This area should be Rural Lifestyle. - Settlement Zone for the majority of the rest of Gabites Block is also not consistent with

the surrounding area, should be Rural Lifestyle to be consistent with the other side of Maymorn Rd and retain the rural feel to Maymorn and Mangaroa - Making decisions on Gabites Block now is likely to influence future PC50 decisions. The right time to make decisions on Gabites Block zoning is when considering the broader development of the Maymorn area. - In the PC50 engagement report, 67-75% of respondents opposed the density proposed for Gabites Block, and only 8% suggested amend. Given the private plan request is not materially different in terms of proposed density, there does not appear to be strong, if any, community support for the proposed Gabites development. The feedback was well summarised by the UHCC "Most respondents were opposed to the proposed extent of the development plan and proposed density. Those respondents stated that it was inconsistent with rural outcomes, that the potential for over 200 dwellings was too great, that there should be a vehicle trip generation threshold, or that density should be limited to current Rural Valley Floor density of 4ha."

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Do not approve Private Plan changes and defer any decisions on Gabites Block to the PC50 review

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 10

Sonia just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Sonia Morgan

Postal address of submitter

172 Plateau Road, Te Marua, Upper Hutt

Contact telephone

0275284101

Contact email

soniamaree@live.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

No Answer

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

The size and number of sections that is being consulted on is not suitable for the roads and rural environment that it is being proposed for.

My submission is that:

I COMPLETELY OPPOSE THIS SUBMISSION - IT APPEARS TO BE A MONEY MAKING VENTURE FOR THE DEVELOPER AND COUNCIL WITHOUT DUE CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL, SAFETY OR

SUPPORT STRUCTURES The roads and services in Plateau, Maymorn and surrounding areas do not support this type of development. There is currently one dairy and one school. The Maidstone Intermediate school bus route has already had to split into two and my daughter is now on a public route rather than a school bus route due to overcrowding. The Intermediate classes in Upper Hutt are too large, it is impossible to get into a new medical practice and the traffic is heavy especially at the top end of upper hutt with the Rimutakas - this will further increase the number of accidents and fatalities

I seek the following decision from local authority:

I would like a decision to not go ahead with this proposal However, I suspect that the decision to proceed has already been made. Therefore, in that instance I would like a decision that there should be no section smaller than two acres on the Gabites Block to maintain the rural feeling of this area . If this decision does go ahead I submit that the Council needs to consider roading, schooling, school bus services, dental and health services in Upper Hutt. There may be a need to consider the safety of the intersection of Plateau Road and the Main Highway.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 11

SUBMISSION FORM (FORM 5)

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT PLAN: PROPOSED PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 55- REZONING OF
GABITES BLOCK AT 1135 MATMORN ROAD



Te Kaunihera o
Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta
Upper Hutt City Council

To: Upper Hutt City Council

File Number: 355/13-011
Submission Number:
(for office use only)

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Submissions can be:

Delivered to: Level 1 Reception, Civic Administration Building, 838-842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt
Posted to: Proposed Private Plan Change 51, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt
Emailed to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

The closing date for submissions is Wednesday 13 April 2022 at 5pm

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz

DETAILS OF SUBMITTER

Name of submitter	Gérard Bourke and Trish Coley		
Postal address of submitter	51 Flux Road Mangaroa Rd 1 Upper Hutt		
Agent acting for submitter (if applicable)			
Address for service (if different from above)			
Contact phone / email	Teleph0274434537one:		Email: Gerard.Trish1@gmail.com
I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (Please tick one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	Only answer this question if you ticked YES: I am not (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	YES	

DETAILS OF SUBMISSION

The specific provisions of the proposed private Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

We do not want this land rezoned to allow this development. It should be left under the existing zone classification.

(Please use additional sheets if necessary)

My submission is that:

Refer to submission word document already sent

(Please state in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons. Please use additional sheets if necessary)

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

Leave the land zoning as it is and allow any future development for the Gabities block to fall within the guidelines of the existing zoning of the land in that area.

(Please give precise details and use additional sheets if necessary)

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	Yes
	I do not 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 wish to make a joint case	Yes
	I do not wish to make a joint case	

SIGNATURE AND DATE

Gerard Bourke and Trish Coley

Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making submission

Date: 28th March 2022

(Note: A signature is not required if you are making your submission by electronic means)

Terms of making a submission - Upper Hutt City Council collects contact information on this form as part of the consultation process. Your personal information will be securely stored at Upper Hutt City Council and only accessed by Council officers for the intended purpose. You can request that your personal information be corrected at any time. Submission of this form is deemed as your agreement to these terms.

Submission to Private Plan Change 55 Gabites Block from General Rural and Rural Production to Settlement Zone.

From Gerard Bourke and Trish Coley 51 Flux Road Mangaroa.

We strongly oppose the above proposal to change the zoning on the Gabites block to Settlement Zoning to allow the proposed urban sprawl into the Maymorn end of the Mangaroa Valley. The development proposed of 170 to 200 dwellings on the 74.5 hectare site would be a disaster for the existing local residents who have moved out there to live in a rural setting.

The breaking up of the Gabities block into 170 to 200 extra dwellings will put huge pressure on the existing roading infrastructure at both the TeMarua intersection to State Highway 2 leading to another Malcohm Gillies' death trap like the one at Riverstone. Parks Line Road heading south towards the Mangaroa Hill Road via the Dip by McLaren Street and the One Way Bridge at the bottom of the Mangaroa Hill will also become serious issues with the significant increase in traffic volumes on a road that it was not designed for.

You would have to have "Rocks in your Head" if you think public transport in and out of the area would be a viable option. The reality is every one of the proposed properties will be running a least 2 to 3 vehicles many of which will be used to do multiple trips in and out of the area on a daily basis placing huge pressure on both entry and exit points to the area.

We are also very concerned with the urbanisation of the area creating issues with more domestic dogs and cats coming into the area leading to roaming dogs worrying stock in the neighbouring properties and native wildlife being destroyed by the increase in cat numbers - domestic turning feral, preying on the local wildlife.

Rural residents currently in this area, if this development is allowed to go ahead, are likely to have issues with people complaining about the noise their roster may make, or the noise their cows make when they come on heat, by someone expecting this area to be like the urban environment.

Drainage and run off will also likely become an issue with the decrease in permeable area due to the land development.

Surrounding rural lifestyle properties will likely have more stock issues around Guy Fawkes with people letting off fireworks as they would in a normal urban area which causes issues with live stock in a rural environment.

The local community made it quite clear to the UHCC a few years back, they did not want the zoning in the area changed for the Maymorn Development Plan. Nothing has changed, the local community do not want the zoning changed allowing this sort of development in the area.

Any future development should only be done within the boundaries allowed by the current zoning of General Rural and Rural Production in this area.

Gerard Bourke and Trish Coley 51 Flux Road Mangaroa.

Submission 12

JP just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Jo Perez

Postal address of submitter

Mangaroa, Upper Hutt

Contact telephone

0274214117

Contact email

jjperez@xtra.co.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and
does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Section size and infrastructure

My submission is that:

Development of Gabites Block seems to be a natural progression for Upper Hutt effectively extending Platau and shrinking the rural character of Maymorn / Mangaroa. However I feel there are

two amendments required to the proposal: 1. Firstly, the condensed section sizes feel out of step with both Plateau and Mangaroa / Maymorn character being very intensive at 400m² sections. I suggest the minimum section size be greater to be more in keeping with the character of the surrounding community eg 2,000m² or bigger and that there are requirements for planting early in the development to prevent a very concrete community which is the visual result of the Wallaceville development - crammed housing with concrete surrounds matching central in-town living. Larger sections with immediate planting will significantly improve the character of the development and still achieve a significant profit for the developer (ie still commercially viable) and build on Upper Hutts reputation in the greater Wellington region. 2. Secondly this development will generate a significant lift in traffic through Plateau, Maymorn, Mangaroa and Wallaceville Hill roads - vehicles, cyclists and foot traffic. The verges on the side of the roads need to reclaim the crown title and safe width where fencing through the valley has encroached beyond their boundaries. Reclaiming the full width and developing cycle ways / walking spaces will significantly improve the safety and use ability of these roads. It is very rare currently to see local children biking on the roads because it is unsafe and this will become more of an issue as volumes of people increase. The commitment and design of this should be a requirement if the development is approved and the developer should at least contribute to part if it. Resistance from existing landowners to move the farm fencing back to their legal boundary is unfounded. All landowners are aware of their legal boundaries and the past use of these important strips of road verge does not mean there is a future claim on this land - especially considering the safety risks involved. Especially for the Plateau road, Parkes Line Rd, Flux Rd, Mangaroa Valley Rd, Mangaroa Hill Rd and Wallaceville Hill Rd which would all benefit from widening for cycle lanes / walking traffic. Also using / developing existing paper roads will improve the valley. Thank you for considering these amendments to the proposal.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Amendments to 1. Increase minimum section sizes and 2.widen the verges of roads for safe use by cyclists, foot traffic and horses- especially Plateau road, Parkes Line Rd, Flux Rd, Mangaroa Valley Rd, Mangaroa Hill Rd and Wallaceville Hill Rd. Also using / developing existing paper roads will improve the valley.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case
I do wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 13

Sofia just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Sofia Moers-Kennedy

Postal address of submitter

202 Akatarawa Rd. Birchville Upper Hutt

Contact telephone

0211054999

Contact email

sofia@kennedyfamily.co.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Roadside landscaping - Gabbites Block plan change request

My submission is that:

The original submission omitted considering the frequent use by equestrians of the area. Adult riders walk/ride their horses along the road to arrive at the Remutaka Rail Trail. Young rider can, and have, ridden their ponies from the valley to the pony club near the stock cars. Riders from outside the direct area occasionally park their car and float at the train station to avoid clogging up the Rail Trail Carpark to then ride to the rail trail along the road and under the rail bridge. The shared path that is mentioned is to be commended, however without a bridleway for horses and ponies the corridor that has previously been cautiously rideable will become impossible to safely navigate. Please consider amending the proposal and adding a bridleway so that the rural characteristic of the area can continue to be enjoyed safely and equestrians do not become marooned within the valley.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

That a bridleway is added along Maymorn Road and the Road leading to the rail trail in addition to the shared pathway.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 14

Jaki just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Jaki Sifflett

Postal address of submitter

206 Plateau Road Te Marua Upper Hutt 5018

Contact telephone

027 2212745

Contact email

girlracer45@hotmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Transport Infrastructure Environment

My submission is that:

As a key stakeholder, an existing resident of this area I oppose this subdivision for the following reasons: Traffic: The roads are not suitable for the volume of traffic this number of new houses would create. The intersection of Plateau Road and Maymorn Road is already hazardous with limited

visibility. Only the current low volume of traffic prevents accidents. The Plateau Road and SH2 intersection is frequently congested and difficult to exit/enter during peak hours, weekends and public holidays. UHCC do not improve roads when installing new subdivisions as already proven at Riverstone Terraces and Wallaceville Estate, where no allowances have been made for the increased traffic. It is dubious to believe a smaller, semi rural subdivision would get greater preference over these two larger subdivisions. Environment: Creating a subdivision here would impact the environment. With limited public transport, no safe cycleways and beyond a reasonable distance to walk, residents would need to take private vehicles when they wish to travel beyond the subdivision (for example to attend work or school or for shopping and entertainment). Carbon absorbing vegetation would be replaced and smothered with heat generating concrete housing pads. Landscaped gardens would replace natural fauna, impacting insect and bird life. Infrastructure: Rooding, as stated above is inadequate for the volume of traffic this subdivision would produce. Electricity would need to be significantly increased to include the needs of these new houses. The fibre internet currently being installed was initially proposed in 2017, has this been updated to include such a large volume of houses also wanting to access it? Mobile coverage is poor, not all providers cover this area. Water pressure is currently poor in this area. This will be impacted by more users what contingencies are in place to improve this?

I seek the following decision from local authority:

To veto this subdivision, or significantly reduce with volume of houses by 50% with the infrastructure, roading and environmental concerns addressed and improved PRIOR to the subdivision being commenced.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission



OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number

15

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

NAME OF SUBMITTER **R. J. (Bob) Anker**

POSTAL ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER **76 Katherine Mansfield Drive**
Whitemans Valley

AGENT ACTING FOR SUBMITTER (IF APPLICABLE)

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

CONTACT TELEPHONE **5286749**

CONTACT EMAIL **bob.anker@xtra.co.nz**

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please tick one): **yes** / **no**

Only answer this question if you ticked 'yes' above:

I **am** / **am not** (tick one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Details of submission

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

All aspects of the proposed PC55

USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

My submission is that:

As per attached document I consider that PC55 should be declined

PLEASE STATE IN SUMMARY THE NATURE OF YOUR SUBMISSION. CLEARLY INDICATE WHETHER YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OR WISH TO HAVE AMENDMENTS MADE, GIVING REASONS. PLEASE USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

As above

PLEASE GIVE PRECISE DETAILS AND USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

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.
 I **do not** 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** wish to make a joint case.
 I **do not** wish to make a joint case.

Signature and date

Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making submission:

R. J. Anker

SIGNATURE

4th April 2022

DATE

Private Plan Change 55

This Plan Change is poorly presented with the entire body of the report being re-written (which is not necessarily bad) and both versions being submitted (which is bad) and the reader being directed to a Onedrive link to view the revised version, only to find that the link does not work (which is abysmal)

The original documentation incorporates an Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA). The follow up documents include a peer review of the ITA and to a large extent rubbishes the original ITA.

Both the original ITA and the review contain basic factual errors and then make erroneous conclusions.

The Landscape report included in the original is also peer reviewed and found lacking. That report is then changed with both the original and the revised versions remaining in the PC55 submissions.

Housing Density

Throughout the PC55 documentation there is a repeated Mantra – Low Density Development.

This proposal is not Low Density. It has lot sizes down to 400 square metres. In the context of the Rural Zone, it is High Density.

Rural Density levels are assessed by lot size.

Low Density Rural consists of lots with an area equal to or greater than 4 hectares.

Medium Density Rural consists of Lifestyle/Rural Residential lots with an area equal to or greater than 1 hectare.

Settlement Density Rural consists of lots with a minimum area of 2,000 square metres.

The Landscape peer review takes issue with the lot size progression from the existing Te Marua residential area and demonstrates a reduction of size within the Gabites block North West corner.

Zoning

Prior to consideration of various proposals contained within the documentation tabled, relative to PC55, Council needs to first determine the status of the area containing the Gabites block in terms of the District Plan.

It is my understanding that the area is not zoned “Urban” but is zoned “Rural”.

Further, it is my understanding that in terms of draft PC50 it is proposed that the Gabites block area is classified as “Settlement Zone” with a relatively small area marked up as a Village precinct

Within draft PC50 there are other areas proposed to be classed as Settlement Zones. In each of these areas the minimum lot size is set to 2,000 square metres. Within a Village Precinct of the Settlement zone there is provision for an individual lot to be down to 1,000 square metres but the average of all lots within the Precinct must be not less than 2,000 square metres. The PC50 focus group, of which I was a member, was advised that 2,000 square metres was the appropriate size to contain on-site provision of water storage and wastewater disposal systems.

Zone Change 1

If the proposals put forward under PC55 are accepted, the effect will be to create a new zone which is neither Urban nor Rural.

Is there a process within the District Plan for a new Rural/Urban hybrid to be created?

If such a process exists, then is a Private Plan Change – with minimal public consultation and notification – the appropriate way to do it?

Zone Change 2

Amendment # 20 – Development Area 3 – Gabites block development area

This chapter seeks to override both PC50 Settlement Zone rules and the District Plan.

Allowing this chapter to stand would mean that Council effectively disenfranchises itself by allowing a Private Plan Change to negate the District Plan.

As such Council would need to be sure of both the legality and desirability of such a move.

Reticulated Water Supply

Within the body of the documentation that forms part of the PC55 proposal there are several references to the Water Supply Network. Those references, in the submitter’s own documents, state that there is no capacity in the network for additional connections.

Regardless of these statements, within their own documentation, the proponents of PC55 make the planning assumption that in the Northwest area there will be water supply connections.

The two positions contradict each other and pose the question as to which is correct.

Waste Water disposal

PC55 states that that the proponents have had discussions with Wellington Water in respect of the ability for the existing system to receive wastewater from the proposed Gabites block development.

The statement is made that in dry conditions there is spare capacity but in wet weather the system is at maximum load. This indicates that faulty connections exist which are allowing storm water to enter the system.

The proposal is for wastewater to be held and released to the system at off peak times. Wet weather events can persist for days or even weeks and given that the loading problems within the system are caused by stormwater, the timed-release concept may well be fatally flawed. Within any such system there would need to be a sizeable storage capacity and thought needs to be given as to what happens when that capacity is exceeded

For the small block sizes that are proposed, off-site disposal of wastewater will be essential.

Infrastructure report - Wastewater

This report enters a circular argument by drawing 2 conclusions which cannot be reconciled with each other.

4.1 states that *“wastewater discharge from the site could not connect to the existing public downstream reticulation without the current wet weather capacity issues being addressed.”*

4.2 This clause forwards the conclusion that *“discharge of wastewater should be by connection to the existing public network located adjacent to the site.”*

The conclusion reached in 4.2 follows a site analysis showing major problems with on-site disposal.

On site water storage.

The proposals refer to the storage of potable water and suggest a capacity of 10,000 litres.

The inclusion of this quantity indicates that the proponents have no concept of the logistics of living without a reticulated water supply.

Stored water must meet all water related needs for the household – drinking, cooking, personal hygiene, laundry and toilet flushing.

Within the valley it is not unusual for us to go without rain for periods of up to 3 months. Given the average figures for water usage the 10k storage quantity would last for less than 2 weeks.

Our family has lived on tank water for some 36 years and we are well versed in the practicalities of water conservation. We have storage capacity of 50k Litres, and I am not aware of any within our community having any less than 25k litres storage.

It concerns me to find a basic error such as this within the proposal and it leaves me asking “what else is wrong”?

Public Transport.

Within the rural zone there is basically no public transport. The population must be self-reliant, and the only practical solution is the private car.

The PC55 proponents introduce two misleading concepts.

Firstly, we have reference to the bus stop close to SH2 and the service from there. Walking to that stop from the Gabites block is not a practical option. You could drive there but where would you park your car and if you cycle there where would you secure your bike?

Secondly, we have reference to Maymorn Station.

This is a demand stop station – you have to flag down the driver for him to stop so that you can get on. If you are on the train and want to get off at Maymorn you have to let the train staff know when you board the train.

In the morning there are 3 services to Upper Hutt and on to Wellington. These leave within an hour of each other, the first at 6.49am and the last at 7.49am. There are then 3 more services, at a 4-hour intervals, then a 5 hour interval and finally another 4 hour interval.

The PC55 proponents suggest that service levels will increase. Documented evidence from Metlink to this effect would have been useful.

The only way that services will increase at Maymorn is if the transport demand from the Wairarapa increases and then that will only be within the constraints of a single-track operation.

The line is a single track and likely to remain so. The investment needed to increase it to double track would be cost prohibitive as would any move toward electrification.

The platform at Maymorn is short and only the first 3 carriages can be brought alongside. Enhanced services to date have consisted of improved carriages, but the length constraints have remained constant.

Service frequencies during the day are unlikely to increase. Train movements are timed to get passengers to Wellington within the time window for commencing work and the return journeys are tailored to meet the demands of workers returning home to the Wairarapa. Movements also need to dovetail in to the main Metlink commuter services to Wellington.

The documentation notes that the proponents contacted Kiwi Rail but got no response. Maymorn station services are operated by Metlink in conjunction with Kiwi Rail. It took me

less than one minute to make phone contact with Metlink who were able to confirm that any increase in the frequency of passenger train movements through Maymorn will be demand driven from Masterton. Track and signalling improvements will make 15 minute intervals possible but there are no plans for any increase in intra day services unless demand ex Masterton dictates.

National Policy Statement – Urban Development.

The proponents make repeated reference to this document in an attempt to rationalise their submissions. This NPS relates to the Urban area and does not relate to the Rural area.

The Gabites block is not part of the Urban area, it is part of the Rural area, and it is my understanding that it will require a change to the District Plan to alter that status.

Accordingly, all references to the NPS–UD are not relevant to PC55 proposals and should be disregarded.

Intersections with Maymorn Road

Draft PC50 considered that the maximum number of intersections to Maymorn Road should be 2.

PC55 proposes that there should be 3 and it would appear that this is to accommodate the development of the North-West area of the block.

The North West area intersection is at the apex of a bend and as such has compromised sight lines. The calculations in the Transport Assessment are flawed and even after adjusting from the incorrect data do not appear to meet Council’s minimum requirements.

Direct property access to Maymorn Road and Street lighting

The intent of both PC55 and draft PC50 is to have no direct property access to Maymorn Road. It is also the intent that there should be no street lighting in the Gabites block area.

In both cases PC55 uses the wording “avoid” which implies that direct access and street lighting may occur.

Maymorn Road buffer zone

Both PC50 and PC55 call for a 5-metre-wide buffer zone to be created along the boundary of the Gabites block with Maymorn Road. This 5-metre-wide zone would be in addition to the provision of a strip to accommodate a walkway and cycleway. The width of the walkway/cycleway is noted in the follow up documentation as 2.5 metres.

The planting plan for the buffer zone is for bare trunk, 6-metre-tall trees to be placed at 10 metre intervals with other planting between. For this concept to work, the zone would need to be in a single title, ideally vested in Council. If the zone is in multiple titles the continuity of the planting and the spacing intervals between trees has the potential to become compromised.

Individual titles within the buffer zone will also have the potential to generate complexities in establishing building set back distances from the boundary.

Subdivision in Hillside area

PC55 states the objective that within the Hillside area, “Built development does not have a *significant* adverse effect on the skyline.”

The word *significant* seeks to quantify the level of the effect and will open the matter up to considerable debate.

For clarity this clause should read “does not have adverse visual effects on the skyline.”

Hillside area Lot size calculation

PC55 is putting forward the concept that you should include the area of *Public Open Space* when calculating the 2.5-hectare average size for lots in this area.

This concept makes no sense.

First you exclude an area termed *Public Open Space* from the subdivision and then you add it back in again to calculate an average size.

Does this concept apply to properties bordering Trentham Memorial Park – I think not.

Amendment # 28 – Earthworks in the High Slope Hazard Overlay

Item 1 – clause states that earthworks will not unacceptably increase the risk from slope instability.

This clause poses the question as to how much increase in risk is acceptable. Who will quantify it?

A slip does not respect property boundaries – accordingly the onus should be on the person doing the work to establish that risk will not increase.

Integrated Transport Assessment

There are factors within this report that indicate that it is a desktop analysis rather than a boots on the ground study.

Of concern is that the report has a factual error before the end of page 2.

The statement is made that the Gabites block is approximately 6km from Upper Hutt CBD. It is in fact 8.5km from the CBD.

The second material factual error can be found in Section 3.2 Speed Environment. The second line of this chapter states that the speed limit changes to Open Road 100kph. The whole of the Mangaroa/Whiteman's Valley has a maximum speed limit of 80kph.

As a result of this error the rest of this paragraph goes on to make erroneous conclusions based on the factually incorrect limit.

Road Hierarchy 3.0

The report states that Maymorn Road meanders through a number of bends to join the existing Te Marua residential area. There is no mention of the fact that in the vicinity of the junction with Plateau Road there are 2 ninety-degree bends which form an S bend configuration.

There would appear to be few options available for this "choke point" to be modified or its configuration changed.

There is also no mention of the effect on traffic volumes and congestion arising from Plateau school situated at the end of Molloy Road. At school start and finish times traffic collects in the vicinity of the Molloy/Plateau Road intersection further constricting the carriageway.

Local Traffic Volumes

The report makes use of traffic count statistics that warrant more close examination.

The Maymorn Road count is dated 2008 – some 14 years old and prior to increased development in the area, on the opposite side of the road from the Gabites block.

Given the absence of public transport that is of practical use to households, and the lack of any shops or facilities within walking distance, together with the fact that the target demographic will give rise to multi-vehicle households, it would seem reasonable to expect that greater than normal volumes of vehicle movements per household will be the case.

The concern is not the capacity of Maymorn Road, nor is it the capacity of the junction at SH2. Rather it is the safe capacity of the S bend choke point at the Plateau Road intersection which has been ignored.

Traffic originating from the Gabites block development will not conform with established Suburban norms. The pattern will probably reflect the movement pattern to and from Katherine Mansfield Drive.

The majority vehicle movements there form an ebb and flow pattern with an outward movement between 7am and 9.30am with a return flow between 3pm and 6.30pm.

Rail Network #5.

The report makes the statement that “train service levels are expected to significantly increase across all periods by 2029”.

There is no supporting evidence for this assertion neither is there any indication as to what any revised levels would be. Phone enquiries made to Metlink in early April 2022 indicated that increased levels during the day are not likely to occur

Figure 5.1 in the report identifies work on the Wairarapa line as having a target date of 2026, not 2029 as stated in the narrative, and consists of renewing track, bridges and signalling, all of which are reaching the end of their serviceable life.

On the Wairarapa line, although the capacity of individual trains is one constraint, the major constraint is that it is a single-track operation which restricts its functionality. It also carries both freight and passengers. Passenger trains will be demand driven ex Masterton.

Trip Generation #7.1

This aspect of the report forecasting requires further detailed examination.

The use of trip generation rates for ‘Outer Suburban’ areas is not appropriate and will be moderated by the availability of Public Transport throughout the day. It will also be affected by the presence of shops, schools and other facilities within walking distance.

None of these moderating factors exist at the Gabites block.

Construction Traffic # 8.3

It would be unwise to underestimate the volume of construction traffic that will be associated with the site development.

The entire, internal roading network will require a lot more than “some transport of roading aggregate”. The proponents also table a report which states that in order to provide suitable building platforms areas of soft fill would need to be removed and replaced with engineered fill. That new fill would come from off site.

Construction machinery, concrete trucks, building materials, builders, plumbers and electricians will all need to access the site. The vast majority of these vehicle movements will negotiate the Te Marua S bends and will potentially cause major degradation to the road surface.

Council will be aware of the damage and disruption that arose from recent logging truck activity and the measures that had to be taken to moderate the impact on the Te Marua residential area. This activity will be more intense and will continue for a longer period.

Summary #8.4

The report forms the conclusion that the subdivision “will not trigger any fundamental network operational issues.”

This conclusion ventures into the realm of wishful thinking.

Plan Change 50

In yet another factual error the report states that the provisions in draft PC50 relative to “Settlement Zone” specifies a minimum lot size of between 1,000 and 2,000 square metres.

Plan Change 50 provides that lot sizes in the Settlement Zones shall be a minimum of 2,000 square metres. It also provides that in the Village Zone, a subset of the Settlement Zone, although an individual lot could be 1,000 square metres, the average of all plots in the Village Zone is to be a minimum of 2,000 square metres

Accordingly, the proposed structure plan does not align with the PC50 vision nor does it comply with PC50 Gabites Block provisions.

Appendix B – Tracks model level of service plots

Under this heading the report includes 4 maps.

None of the maps even indicate the location of the Gabites block.

Only one map has any coloured indication in the Rural area and that consists of a yellow dot at the junction of Whitemans Valley Road with Katherine Mansfield Drive – not even close to the Gabites block.

It would be interesting to know what the Report authors considered the relevance of these maps to be.

Document 12 – PC55 Update Memo

Peer Review of Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA)

Context 1.2

The peer review commences with a misleading statement which implies that a lot size of 1,000m² forms part of PC50. If we follow the link in the document we are taken to PC50 and from there through to the PC50 Gabites Block section which details among other things a lot size of not less than 2,000m².

Not a good start for a Peer Review.

1.3 then goes on to further detail areas of PC55 (which happen to be non-compliant with PC50)

Given the adoption of this false premise at the outset of the Peer Review we should not be surprised to find erroneous conclusions in the remainder.

Review 3.2 (i)

This clause states that “it appears, from separate enquiry – (*source not specified*) – that the total number and type of new dwellings proposed by the applicant is consistent with the expectations for the PC50 proposals”. This statement is incorrect.

Review 3.2 (ii)

The statements here are valid and conform with my own observations made in my review of the ITA. If the volumes within the ITA are wrong then the conclusions drawn arising from those volumes are likely to also be wrong.

Review 3.2 (iv)

Whilst this clause draws out some valid observations, it also perpetuates the basic error that Maymorn Road is a 100kph environment. It is not – it is a maximum 80kph environment, as is the entire Upper Hutt rural road network.

Review 3.10

The factually incorrect reference to a 100kph environment re-iterated.

Review 4.2

Again, the re-iterated 100kph factually incorrect information.

Scale and Significance Evaluation.

This evaluation is highly subjective, and the results will vary depending upon the point of view of the person conducting it. The random nature is exacerbated when the application methodology is flawed.

In some sections it appears to be calling for an ability to crystal ball gaze.

For example, #3 poses the question as to “Degree of public interest and engagement in the issue”. How can this be established in advance of the issue being made public. The report is dated November 2021 and yet the proposals were not made public until March 2022.

In forming an assessment outcome, the report authors have changed the Factor headings to suit their own purposes. They then appear to have manufactured a result that meets a pre-determined conclusion

Accordingly, this evaluation is of little practical help.

Transport

The review and analysis of this section repeats the flawed assertion that Maymorn station is a key public transport node. It is not.

The statement is made that “Maymorn station affords regular peak period connections”.

There is no definition of 'regular'.

There is no definition of 'peak period'.

This is pure flannel.

There are 3 trains in a one-hour period between 6.45am and 7.45am, then nothing for 4 hours, then nothing for 5 hours followed by nothing for 4 hours to 9.15pm.

The statement is then made that the "service frequency is set to increase" with no indication as to the level of any increase or it's format.

At the beginning of April, I contacted Metlink who advised that any increase in the number of trains through Maymorn is dependant on an increase in demand from Masterton but that is unlikely to result in more services during the day.

Traffic Generation – Page 36

This is yet another example of a badly written clause that does not appear to have been adequately proof read.

The report refers to "modest additions of around 2 extra vehicles on the network during the daily peak hours".

I have problems making sense of this!

Conclusion

On balance, having considered all the documentation tabled by the proponents, it is my considered opinion that Private Plan Change 55 should be declined.

R. J. Anker,

76 Katherine Mansfield Drive,

Upper Hutt.

Submission 16

Cotofana just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Peter Barnes

Postal address of submitter

7 Penny Lane

Address for service (if different from above)

No Answer

Contact telephone

No Answer

Contact email

pzaq1@ymail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and
does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Transport and environment

My submission is that:

(1) Environment: Any development in this area is likely to increase contamination of the Mangaroa River and/or Blaikie Stream, and therefore increase pollution and degradation of te Awa Kairangi. (2) Transport: Development in this area will cause problems for recreational cyclists using Parkes Line and Maymorn Rd as well as those accessing the Remutaka Rail Trail at the Maymorn entrance to Tunnel Gully. In both areas, environment and transport, there will be very significant problems during the development phase, but the problems will remain at some level and be permanent once the development is completed. I would like to believe the optimistic assurances that alternative routes will be created but in my experience, nobody at UHCC actually does anything when cyclist safety is compromised. I reported when roadworks signage was blocking the cycle lane on Alexander Rd and received an assurance that it would be cleared, but it stayed in the cycle lane for months afterward.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

UHCC should decide (a) to decline the application for Private Plan Change 55 at 1135 Maymorn Rd; (b) commit to preserving as far as possible the rural character of Mangaroa & Whitemans Valleys by refusing to support any future residential developments there. Instead, more land there should be acquired for restoration of wetlands and native forest regeneration.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 17

Debs24 just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Debbie Batson

Postal address of submitter

124 Plateau Road, Te Marua

Contact telephone

0272110800

Contact email

thebatsons@outlook.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Size of the lot sizes

My submission is that:

I have no objection to the subdivision but believe the lot sizes should be restricted to no smaller than 1500/ 2000 square metres. This would be more in keeping with surrounding neighbourhoods. I would also like to see improved infrastructure including a safe pathway and crossings for children to walk to Plateau school which should help with decreasing traffic. Improved local facilities such as fibre broadband and mobile coverage should also be considered. Provisions should be made for the expected increased roll at the plateau school. All in all I do not object to the new subdivision but provisions should be made to make it inkeeping with the surrounding neighbourhoods and improve the facilities for Te Marua.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Amendment of the plan to make the lot sizes larger and improve local facilities and infrastructure.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 18

HeadedBiscuit48 just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Peter Sharkey-Burns

Postal address of submitter

1166B Maymorn Road, Upper Hutt

Contact telephone

021969003

Contact email

p.sharkey.burns@mac.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and
does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Subdivision, Ecology and Transport provisions.

My submission is that:

Subdivision (SUB-DEV3-S1) - the minimum allotment size deviates from that proposed in consultation for UHCC Plan Change 50 and introduces high density housing which; 1) conflicts with

the aesthetic of Maymorn, 2) introduces additional demand to the road and rail network and 3) introduces domestic pets which could ruin the native bird life in Pakuratahi Forest Ecology (Dev3-ECO-01) - the Ecology assessment was undertaken as a Desktop Assessment, an onsite assessment has not been undertaken to determine the ecological impact of the proposed development. This needs to be undertaken by an organisation independent of the developer to provide an impartial view of the ecological impact. Transport (TP-R3) - there is no reference to the the Integrated Transport Assessment which has been provided and in the assessment the authors have not consulted NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi in relation to the projected traffic increase for State Highway (SH) 2/Plateau Road Priority T-intersection, as we see across Upper Hutt. SH2 now has multiple traffic lights where traffic feeds onto SH2 which have added to congestion, queues of traffic heading North are at risk of an accident given the dedicated right turn bay is hidden. In addition Kiwi Rail has not been consulted about the projected commuter increase to the Wairarapa Line or Maymorn Station, currently only three train carriages can stop at the platform and there are no future plans by Kiwi Rail to improve the platform.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

That the Private Plan Change Request Gabites Block be withdrawn until: 1. The developer changes the minimum allotment size for all lots to be no less than 2000 sqm 2. An independent ecological report is commissioned 3. Consultation has been completed with Waka Kotahi and Kiwi Rail to understand that the new housing development does not exceed roading and rail capacity.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 19



SUBMISSION FORM (FORM 5)

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN: PROPOSED PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 55- REZONING OF GABITES BLOCK AT 1135 MAYMORN ROAD

File Number: 351/13-011
Submission Number: 19
(for office use only)

To: Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Submissions can be:

Delivered to: Level 1 Reception, Civic Administration Building, 838-842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt
Posted to: Proposed Private Plan Change 51, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt
Emailed to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

The closing date for submissions is Wednesday 13 April 2022 at 5pm

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz

DETAILS OF SUBMITTER

Name of submitter	Dean Spicer		
Postal address of submitter	224a Parkes Line Road, Maymorn, Upper Hutt		
Agent acting for submitter (if applicable)			
Address for service (if different from above)			
Contact phone / email	Telephone: 021582531	Email: deanajspicer@icloud.com	
I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (Please tick one)	NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Only answer this question if you ticked YES: I am / am not (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	

DETAILS OF SUBMISSION

The specific provisions of the proposed private Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

I am in favour of allowing development of the Maymorn area where it retains a distinctly rural character of the area.

(Please use additional sheets if necessary)

My submission is that:

Upper Hutt City Council has delayed completing the PC50 process, according to Counsellor Angela McLeod (1), this was due to changes proposed by central government with respect to the Resource Management Act and the need for council to consider the impact of the change before allowing changes to proceed. This private plan change should therefore also be delayed until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made taking into account the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. There is an inequality in considering the desire of a commercial property developer while ignoring the clear preferences of the wider community for a well planned and considered district plan. This is poor governance by Council and will be changed to the full extent possible under the law.

The private plan is not consistent with retaining a distinctly rural character of the area in particular we oppose the intensification proposed for the following reasons:

- Impact on the wider community and lose of the rural character of the area.
- Congestion issues on Maymorn and Parkes Line Road from over intensification and increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure that is not designed to for it.
- Impact on horizontal infrastructure and flow on impact to local residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more inkeeping with the rural character.
- The proposed plan does not meet the Upper Hutt City Council Sustainability Strategy 2020 principles to 'minimise our environmental impact, maximise remedial action, and rolemodel sustainable community living'.
- We believe the expert reports provided by the applicant are inadequate

(1) Angela McLeod post on Facebook group 'Mangaroa and Whitemans Valley Community Group' 10 March 2022
 In conclusion, I oppose the Private Plan on the basis that it will leave to inconsistent zoning practices and that Gabites block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure other rate payers are not disadvantaged. The process Council has elected to run shows poor process and governance and is a breach of the Local Authority Act 2002.

(Please state in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons. Please use additional sheets if necessary)

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

That Council delay consideration of the Private Plan change until it is in a position to consider the plan changes under PC50 that have been delayed. This is to ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider rate payers. Under the 'Options To Progress The Plan Change' – page 49, Section 32, Report of the proposed Plan Change – Gabites Block we are the view that the second option 'Rely on Proposed Plan Change 50' is the correct approach and oppose the stated 'Preferred Option' and challenge the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the PPC55.

(Please give precise details and use additional sheets if necessary)

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	✓
	I do not 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 wish to make a joint case	
	I do not wish to make a joint case	✓

SIGNATURE AND DATE

Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making submission

Date: _____

(Note: A signature is not required if you are making your submission by electronic means)

Terms of making a submission - Upper Hutt City Council collects contact information on this form as part of the consultation process. Your personal information will be securely stored at Upper Hutt City Council and only accessed by Council officers for the intended purpose. You can request that your personal information be corrected at any time. Submission of this form is deemed as your agreement to these terms.

Submission 20

SUBMISSION FORM (FORM 5)

**PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT PLAN: PROPOSED PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 55 - REZONING OF
GABITES BLOCK AT 1135 MAYMORN ROAD**



File Number: 25/13011
Submission Number:
(for office use only)

To: Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Submissions can be:

Delivered to: Level 1 Reception, Civic Administration Building, 838-842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt
Posted to: Proposed Private Plan Change 51, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 007, Upper Hutt
Emailed to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

The closing date for submissions is Wednesday 13 April 2022 at 5pm

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz

DETAILS OF SUBMITTER

Name of submitter	Antoinette Spicer		
Postal address of submitter	224a Parkes Line Road, Maymorn, Upper Hutt		
Agent acting for submitter (if applicable)			
Address for service (if different from above)			
Contact phone / email	Telephone: 0275029523	Email: Antoinette.rgh.spicer@gmail.com	
I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (Please tick one)	<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Only answer this question if you ticked YES: I am / am not (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
	<input type="checkbox"/> YES		

DETAILS OF SUBMISSION

The specific provisions of the proposed private Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

I am in favour of allowing development of the Maymorn area where it retains a distinctly rural character of the area.

(Please use additional sheets if necessary)

My submission is that:

Upper Hutt City Council has delayed completing the PC50 process, according to Counsellor Angela McLeod (1), this was due to changes proposed by central government with respect to the Resource Management Act and the need for council to consider the impact of the change before allowing changes to proceed.

This private plan change should therefore also be delayed until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made taking into account the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. There is an inequality in considering the desire of a commercial property developer while ignoring the clear preferences of the wider community for a well planned and considered district plan. This is poor governance by Council and will be changed to the full extent possible under the law.

The private plan is not consistent with retaining a distinctly rural character of the area in particular we oppose the intensification proposed for the following reasons:

- Impact on the wider community and lose of the rural character of the area.
- Congestion issues on Maymorn and Parkes Line Road from over intensification and increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure that is not designed to for it.
- Impact on horizontal infrastructure and flow on impact to local residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more inkeeping with the rural character.
- The proposed plan does not meet the Upper Hutt City Council Sustainability Strategy 2020 principles to 'minimise our environmental impact, maximise remedial action, and role-model sustainable community living'.
- I believe the expert reports provided by the applicant are inadequate

- (1) Angela McLeod post on Facebook group 'Mangaroa and Whitemans Valley Community Group' 10 March 2022

In conclusion, I oppose the Private Plan on the basis that it will leave to inconsistent zoning practices and that Gabites block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure other rate payers are not disadvantaged. The process Council has elected to run shows poor process and governance and is a breach of the Local Authority Act 2002.

(Please state in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons. Please use additional sheets if necessary)

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

That Council delay consideration of the Private Plan change until it is in a position to consider the plan changes under PC50 that have been delayed. This is to ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider rate payers. Under the 'Options To Progress The Plan Change' - page 49, Section 32, Report of the proposed Plan Change - Gabites Block we are the view that the second option 'Rely on Proposed Plan Change 50' is the correct approach and oppose the stated 'Preferred Option' and challenge the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the PPC55.

(Please give precise details and use additional sheets if necessary)

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission (Tick appropriate box)	I do wish to make a joint case	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	I do not wish to make a joint case	<input type="checkbox"/>

SIGNATURE AND DATE

Anbinette Spicer 

Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making submission

Date: 13/04/2022

(Note: A signature is not required if you are making your submission by electronic means)

Terms of making a submission - Upper Hutt City Council collects contact information on this form as part of the consultation process. Your personal information will be securely stored at Upper Hutt City Council and only accessed by Council officers for the intended purpose. You can request that your personal information be corrected at any time. Submission of this form is deemed as your agreement to these terms.



OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number

21

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN
Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

NAME OF SUBMITTER Fiona and Barry Evans

POSTAL ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER 1071c Maymorn Road, Upper Hutt 5018

AGENT ACTING FOR SUBMITTER (IF APPLICABLE)

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

CONTACT TELEPHONE 0211916746

CONTACT EMAIL barryfionaevans@weltec.ac.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please tick one): **yes** / **no**

Only answer this question if you ticked 'yes' above:

I am / am not (tick one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- (a) adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Details of submission

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Private Plan Change 55 - Gabites Block

USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

My submission is that:

See additional document

PLEASE STATE IN SUMMARY THE NATURE OF YOUR SUBMISSION. CLEARLY INDICATE WHETHER YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OR WISH TO HAVE AMENDMENTS MADE, GIVING REASONS. PLEASE USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

To have all questions answered and this proposal rejected.

PLEASE GIVE PRECISE DETAILS AND USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

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.

I **do not** 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** wish to make a joint case.

I **do not** wish to make a joint case.

Signature and date

Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making submission:

SIGNATURE

FJ Evans

DATE

11/4/2022

Private Plan Change 55 – Gabites Block

Our property borders the proposed development at the north/western end. We have quite a few concerns regarding this proposal.

Our concerns are:

- Storm Water
- Traffic
- Excavation work
- Cell phone coverage/wifi coverage
- Noise/Lighting

Firstly, we brought this lifestyle block for the lifestyle – rural character, native bush outlook, peace and quiet, scattered neighbours, no major street lighting which is bliss on a clear night.

Storm Water

The stream (Blakies stream) that runs right through the Gabites property and down through ours; in heavy rain this causes our property to flood – also our neighbours further down the stream. We would like to know what measures are being taken to make sure this development – if it goes ahead – will not cause anymore flooding/erosion to our property. There has already been a slip into the stream on the Gabites property that we had to clear at our expense. Storm water will definitely be an issue unless you are thinking of creating another stream. We would like to know what they are going to do about increased storm water? As this stream has been redirected by the UHCC 90 degrees with an approximate width of 1 meter on our joint boundary. We would seek an assurance from the UHCC, as this is their responsibility as they diverted the stream to meet the culvert going under Maymorn Road, that the Upper Hutt City Council will cover any costs for damage to our property from run-off from this proposed development.

Traffic

The report supplied is a report done on the Council's proposal PC50. Where is the applicants individual report on PC55?

We estimate there will be at least 400 extra cars a day going past our place. This will create extra noise and pollution. Also, turning off SH2 into Plateau Road is often a mission with the stream of traffic that comes from the Wairarapa. So sitting waiting to turn would get backed up to the blind corner at the bridge – believe me this happens now causing a major safety hazard (another Riverstone traffic problem)!

The road from the dairy to our place is windy and there literally is no parking for school pick-ups etc. So this would be of great concern to parents when you have increased traffic accessing the narrow road. Included in this is the footpath stops short of our place. Would this be extended to allow for safe use for children, dog walkers and cyclists (of which there is quite a number going past each day)?

How do you think the increased traffic to this level will stay in keeping with the rural character of this area?

Further, the condition of the rural roads is shocking now to say the least so adding more traffic will cause more issues. Also have you thought of the number of one-lane bridges that are over here? I can definitely see accidents happening especially at the Mangaroa Hill one (blind corners)!

How do you intend to keep traffic to a minimum?

Excavation work

If you were clearing the hills above our place – how are you going to guarantee that none of the excavation work affects the neighbouring properties. We feel with the trucks/diggers etc that you would have going up the hill that there would be quite a bit of erosion and this will affect the

properties below. How do you propose to clear the land? How do you propose to make sure there is no damage to the stream below?

Cell phone coverage/wifi coverage

There is a lack of cell phone coverage throughout this whole area. Wifi coverage is marginal. What do you intend to do to fix this for your buyers?

Noise/Lighting

At present there is no street lighting past the 80km sign heading south. We would hate for this to change as this area is mainly lifestyle blocks and putting in street lighting would change the whole feel of the place and is not in keeping with the rural character this area.

The noise would definitely increase – especially if you are intending on putting 400-600 sqm size sections at the north western corner. This is certainly not in character with the surrounding sections and is no way comparable with the neighbouring lifestyle blocks adjoining which are 7000, 4000 and 3500 sqm.

How do you intend to keep the area as a lifestyle character when proposing 400-600 sqm sections?

Overall

We would be very disappointed if this development went ahead in its current form which will only suit the developers not any existing residents or the overall rural character of the area which is enjoyed by the wider Hutt Valley community.

High Density housing would be right on our boundary. Not compatible with existing in any way.

This is not in keeping with the rural character of this area.

There will be an effect on properties with livestock.

Amendment 39 M2 Dominance effects on adjoining sites. Our property is 15/20m below the boundary of high density housing up to 8m would have the effect of building a high rise apartment block that would totally block our rural outlook and be over bearing and quite daunting and very detrimental to our property. Removing any resemblance of a rural lifestyle block.

Existing good development of the area with suitable sized properties in keeping with the character of this rural area. We would encourage the continuation of that type of development.

Finally, we think even without this development you need to look at the infrastructure over here.

Fiona and Barry Evans

barryfionaevans@gmail.com

Submission 22

Marita just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Marita Maass

Postal address of submitter

646 Main Road North Te Marua

Address for service (if different from above)

646 Main Road North Te Marua

Contact telephone

+64211130858

Contact email

marita.maass@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Wider community impact.

My submission is that:

The change request does not cover many aspects of the impact this development will have on the wider community.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

A plan has to be in place to deal with increased needs relating to water, wastewater, traffic, education, and health BEFORE this development can get the go-ahead. File attached.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

If you have additional information to include with your submission, please upload it here:

https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/3e1ea0512a2d6136284e5889180f83d308dc8cf9/original/1649667672/9e9e611426f3b0ab89a7854b9cb822e8_Gabites_Block.docx?1649667672

PPC55 Gabites Block

I would like to start by saying that I am in principle NOT opposed to the Gabites Block development. There is currently a housing shortage and people have to live somewhere. I am however very concerned by the lack of consideration for and understanding of the wider impact that the addition of such a substantial number of people, will have on the community.

A lot of information is provided, all of it longwinded and wordy. It is of course not difficult to present and interpret information in a way that is consistent with the desired outcome. And if the information is then also wrapped in a large amount of waffle, then it becomes too tedious for the common person to try and work through it. Sadly, that is how I found the documentation included in this plan change request. Many assumptions are made. Data is provided but not analysed against the reality of modern-day living.

I was shocked to read that our drinking water supply is at capacity and our wastewater system is at capacity on wet-weather days! I have to wonder; how can the council even contemplate new development when our basic needs are already under threat should anything go wrong?

And it is not just water and wastewater. What about traffic, schooling, healthcare, policing.

Here are my thoughts on some specific points from the published documentation. I really hope our council will realise that they need to have a plan to deal with these issues and have a plan in place BEFORE giving consent to this development.

1. Integrated Transport Assessment: Attachment 2 refers:

Point 3.1 Local Traffic Volumes, on pg 4, is misleading.

Table 1: Daily Traffic Volumes

ROAD	LOCATION	COUNT DATE	ADT ¹
Maymorn Road	(btwn Parkes Line and Plateau Rd)	2008	930
Plateau Road	(btwn SH2 and Molloy's)	2021	2,700
Parkes Line Road	(btwn Maymorn Rd and Mangaroa Hill Rd)	2020	500
Mangaroa Hill Road	(btwn Mangaroa Hill Rd and Fergusson Dr)	2018	1,500
Mangaroa Valley Road	(btwn Flux Rd and Wallaceville Rd)	2020	600

"To the north of the Site, count data indicates average weekday traffic volumes on Plateau Road just prior to the SH2 intersection of around 2,700 vehicles per day (vpd), with corresponding peak hour volumes of around 280 vehicles per hour (vph) and 240vph for the AM and PM peaks, respectively. These two-way volumes sit well within the capacity of the carriageway. "

- a. What is not said, is that there is a primary school right there on Molloy Street, and that most of those 2700 cars on Plateau Road are dropping kids off and picking kids up, with all the potential issues that this activity creates. Cars parked on both sides of Plateau Rd, reduces the road to one lane.
- b. Another thing that is not pointed out, is that there is a dairy right there on that corner, with vehicles turning in and out.
- c. A 3rd issue is the blind corner just south of this intersection.

- d. And, living on SH2, very close to this intersection, I can also tell you that a large number of the vehicles that pass here on SH2, is large trucks, especially the large logging trucks with trailers, heavily laden and often driving above the current 80km/h speed limit.

Yes, the intersection is well constructed, but it has also already been brought to Waka Kotahi's attention by residents, that this is a part of SH2 that needs attention with a too high-speed limit for the many potential hazards. Adding more traffic to Plateau Rd is only going to add to the potential danger.

Point 7.1 Trip Generation, on pg 12, is misleading.

Table 3: Forecast Traffic Generation

Activity	Yield	Peak Hour Movements		Daily
		AM Peak	PM Peak	
Scenario 1	170 dwellings	119	119	1,394
Scenario 2	200 dwellings	140	140	1,640

As shown, peak hour traffic additions generated by the proposed residential development are not large, with the equivalent of approximately 2 vehicles per minute added during peak hours.

- a. The calculation of 2 vehicles per minute is misleading as in reality, this is not a nicely spaced 2 vehicles every minute. The current 2700 vehicles that are already daily on Plateau Rd, is to a large extend school traffic, which creates congestion 2x a day as there is not enough space for parents to drop off and pick up as it is. To add to that the vehicles from all the new homes, on their way to work and in many cases also dropping kids off to Plateau school, will cause a nightmare. Cars are going to back up, cutting off the cars coming down from Plateau Rd to the intersection with Maymorn Rd.
- b. Once there is a bottleneck during peak hour at this intersection, commuters will go the other way, using Parkes Line, which is not suitable for heavy traffic.

2. Infrastructure: Attachment 6 refers:

- a. 4.0 Wastewater: The solution offered by the developer, to collect wastewater and only release it on "dry-weather days" as there are already capacity issues on "wet-weather days", is short-sighted and a recipe for disaster. Does this then also mean that any new properties to be built in the area in the future will have to be on septic tank as there will then be absolutely no capacity left once this development is completed? Surely the community needs to be informed how the council plans to deal with the wastewater capacity issues before consent is given to this development to go ahead.
- b. 6.0 Water Supply: Building 200+ modern homes and putting them all on tank water does not seem very forward thinking but that is a matter for buyers to decide on. There is one sentence in the paragraph though that is cause for concern: "Each lot will also need to have a dedicated firefighting water supply available." There is no further explanation as to how that will be achieved. Surely not using tank water....? And surely the

community has a right to know what the council's plans are on future development and water supply, given we are at capacity already.

3. Maymorn Station:

- a. It is wonderful to envisage a future where more commuters can use the train. However, nowhere in any of the documents did I see a reference to upgrading the station and additional parking for the additional commuters that are expected to use the train. Will these cars end up parked along Parkes Line, an already narrow road, co-used by cyclists and livestock?

4. Schooling:

- a. I could not find any reference as to how the issue of the children's schooling will be addressed. I do not believe that Plateau School will have capacity for the potential number of primary school-aged children that will come from 200+ new homes.
- b. Mangaroa School may still have capacity but probably not enough AND, should this school be the solution to the schooling issue, that then flies in the face of the statement that most vehicles are expected to travel down Maymorn Rd, Plateau Rd and onto SH2, as there would be significant additional school traffic going the other way, on Parkes Line, a road already quite narrow and dangerous, given it is used by cyclists and sometimes horses and I have also encountered a herd of alpacas on that road in the past.
- c. I do not have any knowledge of secondary school capacity in Upper Hutt but believe that the community needs to be informed of the potential impact the influx of new families will have on all schools in the area. Are there any plans for new schools in Upper Hutt that the community is not aware of?

5. Health services:

- a. Already medical practices are at capacity, and it is difficult to get doctor's appointments in Upper Hutt. What plans are there to provide more health services to provide for this growth?
- b. How is Hutt Hospital going to cope, given this is not the only new development?

6. Changes that will come from the new district plan

- a. As I understand it, the aim of the 'right to build' strategy is to allow homeowners to build additional dwellings on their properties in order to house more people. I am all for that, BUT that eventuality has not been included in any of the calculations in any of these documents. What is proposed to be a development with 200/220 homes, and potentially 2 vehicles per property could in fact end up being 200 homes with several additional secondary dwellings housing grandparents, grown children or tenants, each driving their own vehicle too. That could potentially change all these calculations, estimates and projections.

7. In summary

It is not just about signing off on the development of an area to house 200+ more families. It is about the impact this growth will have on our wider community and the

services needed for it to function well and to provide us with a healthy environment to live in.

OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number **23**

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

Name of Submitter: Dean Spicer, Michelle Spicer as Trustees of Bridgewater Trust

Postal Address 224a Parkes Line Road, Maymorn, Upper Hutt

Agent Acting for the submitter (if applicable)

Address for Service (if different from above)

Contact Telephone: 021582531 Contact Email: deanajspicer@icloud.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? **No**

Only answer this question if you answered 'yes above'

I am/ am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- (a) Adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Details of Submission:

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

I am in favour of allowing development of the Maymorn area where it retains a distinctly rural character of the area.

Upper Hutt City Council has delayed completing the PC50 process, according to Counsellor Angela McLeod (1), this was due to changes proposed by central government with respect to the Resource Management Act and the need for council to consider the impact of the change before allowing changes to proceed.

This private plan change should therefore also be delayed until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made taking into account the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. There is an inequality in considering the desire of a commercial property developer while ignoring the clear preferences of the wider community for a well planned and considered district plan. This is poor governance by Council and will be changed to the full extent possible under the law.

The private plan is not consistent with retaining a distinctly rural character of the area in particular we oppose the intensification proposed for the following reasons:

- Impact on the wider community and loss of the rural character of the area.
- Congestion issues on Maymorn and Parkes Line Road from over intensification and increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure that is not designed for it.
- Impact on horizontal infrastructure and flow on impact to local residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more inkeeping with the rural character.
- The proposed plan does not meet the Upper Hutt City Council Sustainability Strategy 2020 principles to 'minimise our

environmental impact, maximise remedial action, and role-model sustainable community living’.

- We believe the expert reports provided by the applicant are inadequate

(1) Angela McLeod post on Facebook group ‘Mangaroa and Whitemans Valley Community Group’ 10 March 2022

In conclusion, I oppose the Private Plan on the basis that it will leave to inconsistent zoning practices and that Gabites block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure other rate payers are not disadvantaged. The process Council has elected to run shows poor process and governance and is a breach of the Local Authority Act 2002.

We seek the following decision from the local authority:

That Council delay consideration of the Private Plan change until it is in a position to consider the plan changes under PC50 that have been delayed. This is to ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider rate payers.

Under the ‘Options To Progress The Plan Change’ – page 49, Section 32, Report of the proposed Plan Change – Gabites Block we are the view that the second option ‘Rely on Proposed Plan Change 50’ is the correct approach and oppose the stated ‘Preferred Option’ and challenge the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the PPC55.

I **do** wish to heard in support of our submission

I **Do not** wish to make a joint case

OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number

24

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

Name of Submitter: Kathryn Regan

Postal Address of the Submitter

217 Parkes Line Road, Maymorn, Upper Hutt

Agent Acting for the submitter (if applicable)

Address for Service (if different from above)

Contact Telephone: 0275 188217 **Contact Email:** mandanz@hotmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? **No**

Only answer this question if you answered 'yes above'

I am/ am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- (a) Adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Details of Submission:

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

1. The area as defined under PC50 is uniquely situated to provide for future growth and development opportunities, while still retaining a **distinctly rural** character.
2. Upper Hutt City Council has delayed completing the PC50 process, according to Counsellor Angela McLeod¹, this was due to changes proposed by central government with respect to the Resource Management Act and the need for Council to consider the impact of the change before allowing changes to proceed.
3. In the consultation documents, the proposed development of the Gabites Block, PPC55, was referred to numerous times as part of PC50. My position is that the land known as Gabites block or PPC55 should therefore be considered in the context under which it was originally consulted on, i.e. as part of the PC50 as it relates to the wider Maymorn area.
4. Additionally, if it is important enough for the Council to reconsider the potential impacts of changes to the RMA on PC50 then PPC55 should be subject to the same scrutiny.
5. There is inequity in considering the desire of a commercial property developer while ignoring the clear preferences of the wider community for a well-planned and considered district plan.
6. Ultimately, I wish to see a District Plan, enabled thorough PC50, which continues to prescribe a rural character to the Maymorn area, balancing the graduated transition from the Maymorn Railway Station outwards to the east, south and west.
7. The private plan is not consistent with retaining a distinctly rural character of the area in particular,

I oppose the intensification proposed for the following reasons:

- Impact on the wider community and loss of the rural character of the area.
- Congestion issues on Maymorn and Parkes Line Road from over intensification and increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure. No extra provision for sewerage. No provision for walk/cycleway/footpath

¹ Angela McLeod post on Facebook group 'Mangaroa and Whitemans Valley Community Group' 10 March 2022

- The proposed plan does not meet the Upper Hutt City Council Sustainability Strategy 2020 principles to 'minimise our environmental impact, maximise remedial action, and role-model sustainable community living'.
- I believe the expert reports provided by the applicant are inadequate

My submission is that:

I oppose PPC55 because:

1. The land known as Gabites Block should only be considered as part of the wider PC50, as previously outlined by UHCC, for consistency
2. PPC55 will negatively impact the rural character of the area due to the very large number of houses and cars in a rural area
3. PPC55 will result in inconsistent zoning practices
4. progressing PPC55 as a standalone plan, i.e. outside the context of PC50 or the current zoning rules (RZR) will disadvantage local ratepayers.
5. considering PPC55 before progressing PC50 is poor governance by UHCC.

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

That Council proceeds with the second option 'Rely on Proposed Plan Change 50' as the correct approach.

I oppose the stated 'Preferred Option' and I challenge the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the PPC55

I do not wish to be heard in support of our submission

I do not wish to make a joint case

Submission 25

kimbochi just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Kim Gibbs

Postal address of submitter

1166 Maymorn Road, Maymorn

Contact telephone

021456569

Contact email

kimang.gibbs@me.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and
does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

We are commenting on all of the proposed provisions below. We note that the survey has not been presented in a user-friendly way that would maximise engagement in this process and support residents to submit views. ***** Along with the creation of a Settlement Zone, the site would also be subject to the Gabites Block Development Area and the changes would enable approximately 170 – 200 residential units to be built on the site. The proposed provisions seek to: *Allow for lots with a minimum area of 400m² in the northwestern corner of the site, with an average lot area of 600m² *Allow for lots with either a minimum area of either 1000m² or 2000m² on the valley flats *Allow for lots with a minimum area of 1 hectare along the vegetated western hill escarpment *Allow for lots with either a minimum area of either 1000m² or 2000m² on the upper plateau *Protect the

areas of significant vegetation on the site *Provide for a new roading network on the site *Provide for a new public cycleway connecting to the Remutaka Rail Trail *Require landscaping along the Maymorn Road frontage of the site; and *Allow for the construction of new residential units on the future sites, subject to the proposed bulk and location provisions

My submission is that:

1. Allow for lots with a minimum area of 400m² in the north-western corner of the site, with an average lot area of 600m² We object to allowing smaller lots, particularly given the loose provision below that would "Allow for the construction of new residential units on the future sites, subject to the proposed bulk and location provisions." This suggests there are many more houses than the mentioned 170 - 200 residential builds indicated, which would have a bigger environmental and infrastructural impact than presented. Impacts include: - significantly more traffic on already narrow roads providing main access to the proposed residential site (Parks Line and Maymorn Road). These roads are not fit for more vehicles and are already posing danger to families who use the road to get children to and from school. For a potentially intensive development we urge the Council to require more investment from the developers upfront, to first widen the access roads; reduce speed limits; increase pedestrian signage and provide safe walkways/footpaths. It is not acceptable that residents and Councils should incur the costs of such infrastructure as a result of allowing this type and size of potential development. - education facilities - there is no apparent consideration of the impact of additional housing on the demand for and pressure on schools in the area. This development would currently fall into the Plateau School zone. Plateau school has limited physical capacity or land to expand. Maymorn school is out of the zone, and also at capacity. We urge Council to require the developer to consult with local schools and the Ministry of Education on these changes. We note that when the Wallaceville subdivision commenced families fell out of zone for most schools and struggled accessing schools nearby. This impact also relates to the need to plan safe walkways for future families. - public transport - we have seen with Riverstone, in particular, that poor planning has left an entire community disconnected from the public transport network. Increased housing would increase demand for a linking bus service, along with a need to improve the facilities at Maymorn station which is barely serving existing commuters. Contribution for improvements to Maymorn station should therefore be made by the developer. 2. Allow for lots with either a minimum area of either 1000m² or 2000m² on the valley flats We object to 1000m²; the minimum should be 2000m² lots, with an average size of 2500m² to reduce environmental impact on the wetland and biodiversity. 3. Allow for lots with a minimum area of 1 hectare along the vegetated western hill escarpment. We do not object to 1-hectare developments. 4. Allow for lots with either a minimum area of either 1000m² or 2000m² on the upper plateau We object to 1000m². The minimum should be 2000m² lots, with an average size of 2500m² to reduce environmental impact on wetland and biodiversity. 5. Protect the areas of significant vegetation on the site The most viable way to protect vegetation is to limit the development to fewer houses of larger blocks. 6. Provide for a new roading network on the site This provision appears to cover only roading network on the residential site; it does not address issues of the roading access the area - maymorn road and parks line. 7. Provide for a new public cycleway connecting to the Remutaka Rail Trail There is not enough information around this provision. We support a safe cycle way, but also urge council to require the developer's investment into safe walkways along Maymorn and Parks Line. 8. Require landscaping along the Maymorn Road frontage of the site; and Agree, however needs to be accompanied by safe roading, walkway. 9. Allow for the construction of new residential units on the future sites, subject to the proposed bulk and location provisions We are absolutely opposed the ambiguous nature of this provision. The wording is ill-defined, making it open to exploitation by the developer as a back door to significantly increase the number of units without additional further consultation or

assessment of impacts to the environment and existing community. Additional comments: a. We would like assurance that the developer will mitigate the additional run off from residential developments into our waterways. b. A number of years ago, it was purported that this site would be an "eco-community". If this is the case, as a starting point, requirements should be put in place to ensure that the houses built on these sites need to meet passive home standards. This is particularly important from an energy conservation perspective given the area is colder than central Upper Hutt in winter (so requires additional heating); and warmer in summer (so requires cooling). There is a real opportunity for this development to lead standards in building for the rest of the country by requiring builds that are truly energy efficient and above the current NZ minimum standards. General comment: We would like to see Upper Hutt City Council take a more proactive approach to town planning that is less directed by the wants or desires of developers; and more around a vision for the city - what do we want Upper Hutt to look like in 10-20 years' time. Do we have enough schools, early childhood services and public transport? Do we care about climate and the environment? If so, we need developments that are require less cars and better access to amenities and public transport. Plan the infrastructure and amenities FIRST, then people and housing follow. Kia ora.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

1. Confirmation that the plan allows ONLY sites with a minimum size of 2000m² with an average of 2500m² throughout the development. The main purpose of this is to protect the environment and wetlands. 2. Confirmation that ahead of the development, an undertaking is made by the developer to invest in improvement of access roads of Maymorn Road and Parks Line to provide for widen roads, safe footpaths; and reduced speed limits to accommodate additional residents. 3. Confirmation that ahead of the development, the developer has consulted with the Ministry of Education and local Boards of Trustees to plan for the impact on additional families in the area on local schools. 4. Confirmation that the developer will mitigate additional run off into waterways. 5. Make a requirement for new homes to meet passive home standard, recognising the micro-climate and different energy needs in this area.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 26

Directly effected just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Janet Pitman

Postal address of submitter

1120 Maymorn Road

Address for service (if different from above)

No Answer

Contact telephone

021 171 0570

Contact email

mrspitty@me.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and
does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

The re-zoning of Gabites Block to Settlement Zone and Low Density Residual.

My submission is that:

I oppose the re-zoning of Gabites Block to Settlement Zone and Low Density Residential. There are three key reasons why I would like the re-zoning of Gabites Block to be reconsidered and argue that the Settlement Zone and especially the Low Density Residential sites are too small. The rainfall in the Maymorn area (directly opposite the Gabites Block where I live) has ranged over the past nine years between 1600 to 1950mm. This is substantially more rain than received in Upper Hutt. During winter, the soil become water logged and the water table on numerous occasions rises above ground level. Large stretches of land exhibits sustained surface flooding which extends onto, and significantly impinges the width of Maymorn Road. The creek that extends along the side of Maymorn Road becomes overwhelmed with the volume of water it receives. This is evidenced by the huge numbers of reeds and water-loving birds that reside on this land. The covering of significant areas of impervious material will only increase the amount of rainfall that must be fed into these extremely poor stormwater outlets. Moreover, this problem will only be exacerbated with global change as New Zealand gets wetter. Despite the promises made by Maymorn Developers, and the best intentions of GW, the infrastructure put in place will almost definitely fail. The amenities that are continually advertised with reference to Gabites Block are the close proximity of a train station. I have taken the train to Wellington every week day for the past five years. The train service is the Wairarapa line which services only three morning trains from Wairarapa to Wellington, one mid day train that is currently ,and for the foreseeable future, a bus replacement and three afternoon trains from Wellington to Wairarapa. Pre-COVID, these trains were full and I had to stand from Maymorn into Wellington at least three days a week. The same would occur on the way home if I didn't get to the Wellington station early. Increasing the numbers on these trains is not an option, nor is putting on more trains because these diesel engines and their uniquely-sized carriages are not easily obtained, even internationally. Thus, you are encouraging more individuals to get into their cars and drive even further than they do already. Putting high density housing areas like this in a rural area without adequate transport facilities is irresponsible and collectively, increases our carbon footprint. The rural aesthetic of Maymorn will be completely destroyed. It breaks my heart that my love of living here on my life style property surrounded by my sheep and hens will come to end. You just have to drive up Parkes Line Road and turn down McLaren Street to see how even a small block of 'Low Density Residential' zoning destroys rural aesthetic. Whilst this is an emotive, rather than a pragmatic, point, I feel it has to be made as Upper Hutt City Council continues to line the pockets of developers and destroy the unique areas of Upper Hutt that makes it so special.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

I seek that the local authority do not allow for re-zoning of Gabites Block to Settlement and Low Density Residential zoning at the stipulated plot sizes. The average sizes of 2000m² and 600m², respectively and minimum sizes of 1000m² and 400m², respectively are too small. I would like the local authority to consider larger plot sizes of 2000m² minimum and 3000m² average for the entire block.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 27

Rurallifestyle just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Lance Burgess

Postal address of submitter

1144C Maymorn Road Maymorn

Address for service (if different from above)

1144C Maymorn Road Maymorn

Contact telephone

027 2891925

Contact email

lance.t.burgess@outlook.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

The proposed structure plan

My submission is that:

The following zones allow housing that is too dense for the area and will run the visual rural nature of the valley, add too much road traffic and pollution from heating, and drive away the native birdlife such as hawks, moreporks, tuis, fantails, kereru that have returned in the last two years:
NORTH WEST STATION FLATS HILLTOPS HILLTOP BASIN

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Do not allow NORTH WEST to be any denser than 2000m2 minimum Do not allow STATION FLATS to be any denser than 2000m2 minimum Do not allow HILLTOPS to be any denser than 1.0 Ha minimum Do not allow HILLTOP BASIN to be any denser than 2000m2 minimum

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 28

Not my Maymorn just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Nerolie Burgess

Postal address of submitter

1144c Maymorn Road Maymorn Upper Hutt

Contact telephone

0274891925

Contact email

nerolie.burgess@outlook.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

The proposed structure plan

My submission is that:

In the following zones; North West Station Flats Hilltops Hilltops station I feel the allowed housing is too dense for area. It will destroy the lovely rural nature of the valley, it will cause too much road traffic, making it harder for groups of hobbyists who use the road to be safe, ie cyclists and horse

riding. It will increase pollution from traffic and heating and also drive away to lovely native birds in the area such as Hawkes, Tuis, Moreporks, Kereru, Fantails that have returned in greater number in the last few years

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Do not allow North West to be denser than 2000m2 Minimum, Do not allow Station Flats to be any denser than 2000m2 minimum. Do not allow Hilltops to be any dense than 1.0 Ha minimum and Do not allow Hilltop basin to be any dense than 2000m2 minimum

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission



OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number

29

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

NAME OF SUBMITTER Rob and Sharon Houghton

POSTAL ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER 5 Roseveare Grove, Te Marua, Upper Hutt 5018

AGENT ACTING FOR SUBMITTER (IF APPLICABLE)

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

CONTACT TELEPHONE 021 724 794

CONTACT EMAIL robsharonhoughton@xtra.co.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please tick one) **yes** **no**

Only answer this question if you ticked 'yes' above:

I **am** / **am not** (tick one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- (a) adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Details of submission

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

See document attached.

USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

My submission is that:

See document attached.

PLEASE STATE IN SUMMARY THE NATURE OF YOUR SUBMISSION. CLEARLY INDICATE WHETHER YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OR WISH TO HAVE AMENDMENTS MADE, GIVING REASONS. PLEASE USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

Reduction in the number of properties proposed.

Reduction in the number of dwellings proposed for the North East corner (along Maymorn Road).

Reduced impact on traffic, light and noise pollution of the Te Marua suburb.

Increase in the size of sections to 'lifestyle blocks' especially those bordering Roseveare Grove/Plateau Road.

PLEASE GIVE PRECISE DETAILS AND USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

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.

I **do not** 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** wish to make a joint case.

I **do not** wish to make a joint case.

Signature and date

Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making submission:

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 55 – REZONING OF GABITES BLOCK AT 1135 MAYMORN ROAD

As rate payers of Upper Hutt we accept there needs to be development of the property as its the world we live in and that Upper Hut needs the additional housing. However, from what we see this is not in keeping with the Te Marua area and it effectively becomes another Riverstone.

Below are set out our concerns in two areas:

1. Direct effect on our property at 5 Roseveare Grove, Te Marua.
2. Effect locally on Te Marua.

Potential Effects/Concerns on Our Property (5 Roseveare Grove, Te Marua)

Erosion and Water/Sediment Runoff

- Water run-off from development, there are at least three points on our property which receive water from Gabites including a major stream through our property. Post development we will potentially have multiple properties with own sewage systems which could flow directly onto our property should there be a breakdown or leak. There are no details around this in the proposal but there is a question about fences!
- Sediment run-off from development and post development.
- Stability of land directly behind our property given the previous owner pushed the tops of the hills into gullies and buried the stumps of pine trees in the gullies. There has already been several landslides previously in the gully behind 5 & 6 Roseveare Grove, Te Marua.

Privacy/Character/Noise Pollution and Use of Our Land

- Privacy - we purchased our property partly due to the privacy. This will be reduced significantly if the proposal goes ahead.
- Noise and light pollution of the proposed 8-9 properties which we have seen suggested, which will directly border our property - when we purchased and currently, we have no development. As we have said we accept there will be change but it needs to keep with the character and fit of the surrounding area. The proposed road on the hill above our property which as a dead end, will no doubt attract unwanted users like nightly boy racer events.
- Maintaining the character of our neighbourhood - our property is in a native bush natural gully with the surrounding properties generally in the 5-10 acre range. Having 2000 sq/m properties is not in keeping with the area.
- Nuisance dogs and cats to livestock on our and neighbouring property - if there are 8-9 properties adjoining we could have 20 odd new animals affecting the area. This will also affect wildlife in the area and Tunnel Gully Reserve.
- Future changes in Zone due to development becoming concentrated - i.e. will we be able to keep animals like rosters and pigs or have burn-offs if this is changed. It's a slippery slope!

Overall comment is that the Plan change talks about rural character a number of times, the proposed change is simply not in keeping with this. From the limited information we have access to, it is simply a developer trying to maximise his/her profits and chuck in what he can into an area. One other point, the proposal talks about 70% of land being retained as rural undeveloped, well it seems to us this is simply the areas which are unusable due to terrain or the ability to access because they border the back of the property.

The Suburb (Te Marua)

If this was to proceed with the suggested 220 properties, which will include option for 2nd dwellings and accommodation, we can expect upwards of 400+ additional cars entering and exiting the suburb mostly via Plateau Road/SH2.

Traffic & Roading

- Surrounding roads are not designed for volumes of vehicles.
- At peak hours exiting Plateau Road onto SH2 is already difficult at times, sometimes needing to queue to get out. Add 400+ cars it will become a lengthy wait with potentially 8-10 cars queuing, especially as the volume of traffic increases as the Wairarapa develops further. Currently you can have lines of 30+ cars at peak hour or weekends/long weekends heading south to Upper Hutt.
- The junction of Plateau Road and Maymorn Road currently has a blind corner and stop sign, increased traffic will mean more risk.
- Plateau School parking area including school drop offs and/or events. Currently at these times the road is reduced to one lane with cars parked on both sides of Plateau Road and sadly parking on corners already occurs. Access of Emergency vehicles will be compromised.
- Heavy vehicles accessing the tip site and concrete works on Maymorn Road make this dangerous at peak school times, this will be exacerbated with increased cars parking in the area.
- Lack of parking for Plateau School, already an issue but roll will clearly increase with this proposal.
- No pedestrian crossings on Plateau or Maymorn Roads for people to access the local dairy, Plateau School or up to Plateau Hill. You simply cannot place a crossing on a blind corner.
- Increased traffic flows during development, including heavy vehicles and equipment.
- Traffic noise and pollution.
- Parking at Maymorn Station for increased users, will Maymorn Road and Upper Parkes Line Road become the default for parking.
- Walking access down Maymorn Road if accessing the Station or Tunnel Gully, no current pathway or crossings to access Tunnel Gully entrance.
- The rail over-bridge affects the current access for cyclist and pedestrians and is dangerous as there is no dedicated pathway. Increased vehicles (including heavy traffic) and other users will lead to accidents.
- Speed Limit of Maymorn Road and Upper Parkes Line Road would need to be reduced from 80km/ph.
- Outside of the Te Marua area, there will be the same pressures added to the Mangaroa Hill Road and the exit out onto SH2 and Ferguson Drive.
- Weekend and Holiday Traffic, Friday nights and Sundays mean traffic congestion is considerable either going to the Wairarapa or returning. This will only increase.
- Future Road closures due to emergencies, weather, flooding. If SH2 is blocked then Mangaroa Hill Road to Plateau becomes the alternative. If we have major development of this magnitude then the bottleneck will only be increased.
- There is no lighting or pavements in the area.

As we stated earlier, we are not anti-development at all, we understand the need, but from what we have seen this is ill considered and is being pushed through by the developer because it suits his agenda. There also appears to be little courtesy or consideration to neighbouring properties.

We would like the Council to consider a reduction in the number of sites and dwellings proposed for the area to keep in character with the semi-rural environment. Increasing the size of the properties to 'lifestyle blocks', particularly the areas bordering Roseveare Grove/Plateau Road should be considered.

We have tried to keep this as brief as possible and would expect as a direct neighbour, we will get an opportunity to convey our concerns in a meeting or discussion as part of the changes.

Can you please acknowledge this email and direct us to the appropriate feedback location/opportunity if we have missed it.

Thanks and regards

Rob and Sharon Houghton

5 Roseveare Grove,
Te Marua

Rob 021724794

Submission 30

Form 5

Submission on notified proposal for Plan Change 55 – Rezoning of Gabites Block

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Upper Hutt City Council
Submission on: Private Plan Change 55 – Gabites Block
Name of Submitter: Fire and Emergency New Zealand (Fire and Emergency)

This is a submission on notified Proposed Plan Change 55 – Rezoning of Gabites Block to the District Plan (the Plan) as notified by Upper Hutt City Council.

Fire and Emergency could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

The specific provisions of the plan change that Fire and Emergency's submission relates to is:

- Provision of a firefighting water supply, and access to such supply, in accordance with the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice in both reticulated and non-reticulated areas; and
- The trimming or removal of vegetation for the purposes of creating a fire break or defensible space.

Fire and Emergency's submission is:

In achieving the sustainable management of natural and physical resources under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), decision makers must have regard to the health and safety of people and communities. Furthermore, there is a duty to avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment. The risk of fire represents a potential adverse effect of low probability but high potential impact. Fire and Emergency has a responsibility under the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 to provide for firefighting activities to prevent or limit damage to people, property and the environment. As such, Fire and Emergency has an interest in the land use provisions of the District Plan to ensure that, where necessary, appropriate consideration is given to fire safety and operational firefighting requirements.

In order for Fire and Emergency to achieve its principal objective which includes reducing the incidence of unwanted fire and the associated risk to life and property, protecting and preserving life, and preventing or limiting injury, damage to property, land and the environment, Fire and Emergency requires adequate water supply be available for firefighting activities; and adequate access for new developments and subdivisions to ensure that Fire and Emergency can respond efficiently and effectively to emergency call-outs.

Adequate water supply and access for firefighting activities

The proposal involves rezoning approximately 74.5 hectares of land at 1135 Maymorn Road, Te Mārua, from 'General Rural' and 'Rural Production Zone' to a newly created 'Settlement Zone'. The private plan change request also proposes the introduction of a 'Gabites Block Development Area' for the site. Despite the proximity of the development to existing water supply infrastructure, there is no spare capacity to be utilised within the development. Infrastructure upgrades, such as a new reservoir and rising main upgrades, have been proposed

but are not yet confirmed or programmed. It is noted that the Council does not wish to see any extension of the three waters network therefore the proposed subdivisions require dedicated on-site firefighting water supply to be provided, as opposed to reticulated connections. Therefore, the proposed subdivision would require water supply, including firefighting water supply, to be provided via individual site collection and storage of roof water.

For the North-West area, the proposed lot sizes (average 600m², down to 400m²) make it difficult to provide an on-site water supply in the house designs. The applicant's Infrastructure Report therefore suggests that subdivisions below 1000m² should only be carried out when a suitable public water supply is available. In circumstances where supply is available, SUB-DEV3-S2 requires all allotments capable of being connected to a reticulated water supply to do so in accordance with the Wellington Water Limited Regional Standard for Water Services (2019), which sets out compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Fire Fighting Water Supply Code of Practice SNZPAS 4509:2008 (Code of Practice) as a proposed performance standard. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply is unavailable, all allotments must be capable of being provided with a firefighting water supply in accordance with the Code of Practice. Proposed performance standard SUB-DEV3-S2 sets out that allotments in Valley Flats Area, Station Flats Area, Hilltops Area, Hilltop Basin Area and Hillside Area cannot be connected to a reticulated water supply and instead, must be capable of being provided with access to a self-sufficient firefighting water supply in accordance with the Code of Practice.

The New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 (Code of Practice) is a non-mandatory New Zealand Standard that sets out the requirements for firefighting water and access.

Fire and Emergency support the requirement of proposed performance standard SUB-DEV3-S2 which will require subdivisions in non-reticulated areas to provide a firefighting water supply in accordance with the Code of Practice, whilst also providing an opportunity for allotments to be connected to a reticulated water supply in accordance with the Code of Practice, where practicable.

Notwithstanding the above, the standards as currently worded do not expressly require access to new developments or access to a dedicated on-site firefighting water supply in accordance with the Code of Practice. It is noted that the roading typologies of the plan change area have been designed to align with NZS4404:2010 as far as practicable, with some bespoke provisions employed to appropriately respond to the topographical constraints which exist within the eastern portion of the site. The maximum gradients of the roading typologies are however unknown.

Adequate access to both the source of a fire (or other emergency) and a firefighting water supply is essential to the efficient operation of Fire and Emergency. The requirements for firefighting access are set out in the Code of Practice and further detailed in Fire and Emergency's 'Designer's guide to firefighting operations - Emergency vehicle access' (December 2021).

In general, the key access requirements include specific roading and access widths, surface and gradients to support the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency appliances. This includes, but is not limited to the following:

- The minimum roading and carriageway widths should not be less than 4m. This width is required for firefighters to efficiently work around the fire appliance to access hoses and pumps.
- A clear passageway / vehicle crossing of no less than 3.5m wide should be provided as site entrances, internal entrances and between buildings.
- The maximum negotiable gradient is 1:5, but in general the roading gradient should not exceed 16%.
- The height clearance along accessways (for example trees, hanging cables and eaves) must exceed 4m.

Fire and Emergency therefore seeks an amendment to the proposed performance standards relating to both water supply (SUB-DEV3-S2) and roads (SUB-DEV3-S6) to require that all subdivisions are provided with firefighting water supply, and access to such supply, in accordance with the Code of Practice. This will ensure that Fire and Emergency can operate efficiently, providing for the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the wider community.

Furthermore, it is noted that in circumstances where subdivisions do not comply with the aforementioned performance standards, the activity status would be Restricted Discretionary and matters of discretion do not expressly require the Council to consider firefighting water supply or fire appliance access. Fire and Emergency therefore request that proposed policies SUB-DEV3-P1 and SUB-DEV3-P2 include provision for adequate firefighting water supply and access in accordance with the Code of Practice as matters of discretion respectively.

Given the rural location of the plan change area, where a reticulated connection is unavailable, Fire and Emergency strongly recommends the installation of sprinklers are the best means of compliance with the Code. Fire and Emergency therefore also support the note attached to the subdivision provisions which makes such a recommendation.

Flammable vegetation and the creation of defensible spaces

It is noted that a significant proportion of the plan change area will involve the construction of new buildings on vegetated areas of land which comprise flammable species, particularly pine. Accordingly, areas of vegetation will be cleared to enable construction of new buildings and it is understood that vegetation will be restored, where possible, in order to achieve a net gain in biodiversity value. Based on both existing vegetation to be retained within the plan change area, together with proposed landscaping enhancements, there is a risk that future structures may not be adequately defended in the event of a vegetation fire, or vice versa, that the wider environment would not be adequately protected from the spread of fire in the event of a structural fire.

On this basis, it is requested that policies, rules and standards are included within the plan change area which ensure that a defensible space is achieved between the external walls of all new buildings and on or off-site vegetation. The definition of a 'defensible space' can be in the form of a clearance zone entirely free of vegetation or comprise low flammability species only, and thereby acting as a fire break. Fire and Emergency personnel would be open to discussing alternatives ways of achieving this.

A further provision is also sought within the proposed rules relating to the Gabites Block Natural Area to allow landowners to trim or remove vegetation where it is for the purpose of creation or retention of a fire break.

Fire and Emergency seek the following:

- Amend PC55 where requested to provide for the safety and wellbeing of people and communities in the plan change area by making the changes set out in Appendix A to this submission, including any further or consequential relief that may be necessary to address the matters raised in this submission.
- That the applicant proposes rules and standards (and associated matters of discretion) which require all new allotments, which will contain or adjoin retained or proposed vegetation of a flammable nature, to benefit from a defensible space between the external walls of new buildings and vegetation for the purposes of mitigating fire risk/spread.

Fire and Emergency wishes to be heard in support of its submission. If others make a similar submission, Fire and Emergency will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.



Fleur Rohleder

on behalf of

Fire and Emergency

Date: 13/04/2022

Electronic address for service of person making further submission: Fleur.rohleder@beca.com

Telephone: +64 4-460 1792

Postal address: Beca Ltd, PO Box 3942, Wellington 6140

Contact person: Fleur Rohleder

Appendix A: Fire and Emergency New Zealand Submission Points on the Proposed Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City District Plan

The following table sets out the relief sought by Fire and Emergency, including specific amendments to the provisions of the Proposed Plan Change 55. These amendments are shown as **red** (for new text sought).

	Provision	Position	Comment	Relief Sought
Settlement Zone				
1	<p>SUB-DEV3-S2 – WATER SUPPLY North-West Area</p> <p>2. <i>Where a connection to Council's reticulated water supply is unavailable, all allotments must be capable of being provided with access to a self sufficient potable water supply with a minimum volume of 10,000L and a firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Firefighting Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</i></p>	Support subject to relief sought	This subdivision standard requires compliance with the Code of Practice with respect to firefighting water supply which is supported. In order to ensure that fire appliances can access and connect to dedicated on-site firefighting supply in the event of a fire, Fire and Emergency requests that the standard is amended to ensure such access is provided in accordance with the Code.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><i>Where a connection to Council's reticulated water supply is unavailable, all allotments must be capable of being provided with access to a self sufficient potable water supply with a minimum volume of 10,000L and a firefighting water supply, and appliance access to such supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</i></p>
2	<p>SUB-DEV3-S2 – ALL OTHER AREAS</p> <p>2. <i>All allotments must be capable of being provided with access to a self sufficient potable water supply with a minimum volume of 10,000L and a firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Firefighting Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</i></p>	Support subject to relief sought	This subdivision standard requires compliance with the Code of Practice with respect to firefighting water supply which is supported. In order to ensure that fire appliances can access and connect to dedicated on-site firefighting supply in the event of a fire, Fire and Emergency requests that the standard is amended to ensure such access is provided in accordance with the Code.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><i>All allotments must be capable of being provided with access to a self sufficient potable water supply with a minimum volume of 10,000L and a firefighting water supply, and appliance access to such supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</i></p>

	Provision	Position	Comment	Relief Sought
	<p>SUB-DEV3-S2 – WATER SUPPLY</p> <p><i>Note: Fire and Emergency New Zealand recommends that the most appropriate way to comply with the New Zealand Firefighting Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 is through the installation of fire sprinkler systems, in accordance with NZS 4541:2013</i></p>	Support	Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of a note advising that installation of sprinklers in the preferred means of compliance with the Code in non-reticulated areas.	Retain as notified.
3	<p>SUB-DEV3-P1 – CREATION OF ALLOTMENTS</p> <p><i>Require subdivision to result in allotments that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Give effect to the Gabites Block Development Area Structure Plan in DEV3-APPENDIX1;</i> 2. <i>Are of a size and shape that are sufficient to accommodate the anticipated use and development form for the applicable Area;</i> 3. <i>Are serviced by reticulated network utilities or on-site servicing.</i> 	Support subject to relief sought	Where proposed standards relating to firefighting water supply are unable to be met, Policy SUB-DEV3-P1 would be a relevant matter of discretion in assessing such applications. This policy, as drafted, requires all new allotments to be serviced by reticulated network utilities or on-site servicing. Fire and Emergency request that this matter of discretion makes explicit reference to the provision of an adequate firefighting water supply in accordance with the Code of Practice.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><i>Require subdivision to result in allotments that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Give effect to the Gabites Block Development Area Structure Plan in DEV3-APPENDIX1;</i> 2. <i>Are of a size and shape that are sufficient to accommodate the anticipated use and development form for the applicable Area;</i> 3. <i>Are serviced by reticulated network utilities or on-site servicing <u>including adequate provision and access to a firefighting water supply in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></i>

	Provision	Position	Comment	Relief Sought
	<p>SUB-DEV3-S6</p> <p>1. <i>Roads must be constructed in general accordance with the Rooding Typologies of the Gabites Block Development Area Structure Plan and NZS 4404:2010 Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure</i></p>	Support subject to relief sought	Fire and Emergency requests an additional performance standard which requires the construction of all new roads and accessways to be constructed in accordance with the Code of Practice to support the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency appliances and enable an efficient response in an emergency.	<p>Amend as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Roads must be....</i> 2. <u><i>Roads, accessways and private driveways must be constructed to enable Fire and Emergency appliances to access structures and/or on-site firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</i></u> <p><u><i>Note: The requirements for firefighting access are further detailed in Fire and Emergency's 'Designer's Guide to firefighting operations – Emergency vehicle access' (December 2021).</i></u></p>
	<p>SUB-DEV3-P2 – Transport Network</p> <p>Require subdivision to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Provide transport corridors....</i> 2. 	Support subject to relief sought	Where proposed standards relating to emergency access to new buildings and firefighting water supply are unable to be met, Policy SUB-DEV3-P2 would be a relevant matter of discretion in assessing such applications. This policy, as drafted, ought to include consideration of access for emergency vehicles.	<p>Amend as follows.</p> <p>Require subdivision to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Provide transport corridors....</i> 2. ... 3. ... 4. ... 5. <i>Ensure all new buildings and dedicated self-sufficient firefighting water supply can be accessed by fire appliances.</i>
5	<p>DEV3-ECO-R1 – Trimming or removal of vegetation within a Gabites Block Natural Area</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Activity Status: Permitted</i> 	Support subject to relief sought	Section 43 and section 64 of the Fire & Emergency NZ Act 2017 only permits authorised persons (i.e. Fire and Emergency personnel) to trim or remove vegetation in an emergency situation. As Fire and Emergency	<p>Retain notified provision subject to addition as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Activity Status: Permitted</i>

	Provision	Position	Comment	Relief Sought
	<p><i>Where:</i></p> <p>a. <i>The trimming or removal of vegetation is to</i></p> <p>...</p> <p>ix. <i>Comply with section 43 or section 64 of the Fire & Emergency NZ Act 2017</i></p>		<p>should not solely be relied upon to manage fire risk associated with vegetation, landowners should be permitted to trim or remove vegetation for the purpose of fire risk management.</p>	<p><i>Where:</i></p> <p>a. <i>The trimming or removal of vegetation is to</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><u><i>xi. For the creation or maintenance of a firebreak.</i></u></p>

OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number

31

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

Name of Submitter: Sue Boyle

Postal Address of the submitter: PO BOX 40461, Upper Hutt ,

Agent Acting for the submitter (if applicable) N/A

Address for Service (if different from above): 224B Parkes Line Road, Maymorn , Upper Hutt, 5018

Contact Telephone: 027 313 7864 Contact Email: jslboyle@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (Please tick one)	NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Only answer this question if you ticked YES: I am / am not (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Details of Submission:

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

I am in favour of allowing development of the Maymorn area where it retains a distinctly rural character of the area.

Upper Hutt City Council has delayed completing the PC50 process, according to Counsellor Angela McLeod (1), this was due to changes proposed by central government with respect to the Resource Management Act and the need for council to consider the impact of the change before allowing changes to proceed.

This private plan change should therefore also be delayed until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made taking into account the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. There is an inequality in considering the desire of a commercial property developer while ignoring the clear preferences of the wider community for a well planned and considered district plan. This is poor governance by Council and will be changed to the full extent possible under the law.

The private plan is not consistent with retaining a distinctly rural character of the area in particular we oppose the intensification proposed for the following reasons:

- Impact on the wider community and loss of the rural character of the area.
- Congestion issues on Maymorn and Parkes Line Road from over intensification and increased traffic flow on road infrastructure that is not designed for it.
- Impact on horizontal infrastructure and flow on impact to local residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more inkeeping with the rural character.
- The proposed plan does not meet the Upper Hutt City Council Sustainability Strategy 2020 principles to 'minimise our environmental impact, maximise remedial action, and role-model sustainable community living'.
- I believe the expert reports provided by the applicant are inadequate

(1) Angela McLeod post on Facebook group 'Mangaroa and Whitemans Valley Community Group' 10 March 2022

In conclusion, I oppose the Private Plan on the basis that it will leave to inconsistent zoning practices and that Gabites block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure other rate payers are not disadvantaged. The process Council has elected to run shows poor process and governance and is a breach of the Local Authority Act 2002.

We seek the following decision from the local authority:

That Council delay consideration of the Private Plan change until it is in a position to consider the plan changes under PC50 that have been delayed. This is to ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider rate payers.

Under the 'Options To Progress The Plan Change' – page 49, Section 32, Report of the proposed Plan Change – Gabites Block we are the view that the second option 'Rely on Proposed Plan Change 50' is the correct approach and oppose the stated 'Preferred Option' and challenge the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the PPC55.

I **dont** wish to be heard in support of our submission

I **do** wish to make a joint case , YES

OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number

32

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

Name of Submitter: John Boyle

Postal Address of the submitter: PO BOX 40461, Upper Hutt ,

Agent Acting for the submitter (if applicable) N/A

Address for Service (if different from above): 224B Parkes Line Road, Maymorn , Upper Hutt, 5018

Contact Telephone: 0276 977 503 Contact Email: jslboyle@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (Please tick one)	NO	X	Only answer this question if you ticked YES: I am / am not (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
	YES		

Details of Submission:

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

I am in favour of allowing development of the Maymorn area where it retains a distinctly rural character of the area.

Upper Hutt City Council has delayed completing the PC50 process, according to Counsellor Angela McLeod (1), this was due to changes proposed by central government with respect to the Resource Management Act and the need for council to consider the impact of the change before allowing changes to proceed.

This private plan change should therefore also be delayed until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made taking into account the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. There is an inequality in considering the desire of a commercial property developer while ignoring the clear preferences of the wider community for a well planned and considered district plan. This is poor governance by Council and will be changed to the full extent possible under the law.

The private plan is not consistent with retaining a distinctly rural character of the area in particular we oppose the intensification proposed for the following reasons:

- Impact on the wider community and loss of the rural character of the area.
- Congestion issues on Maymorn and Parkes Line Road from over intensification and increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure that is not designed for it.
- Impact on horizontal infrastructure and flow on impact to local residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more inkeeping with the rural character.
- The proposed plan does not meet the Upper Hutt City Council Sustainability Strategy 2020 principles to 'minimise our

environmental impact, maximise remedial action, and role-model sustainable community living’.

- I believe the expert reports provided by the applicant are inadequate

(1) Angela McLeod post on Facebook group ‘Mangaroa and Whitemans Valley Community Group’ 10 March 2022

In conclusion, I oppose the Private Plan on the basis that it will leave to inconsistent zoning practices and that Gabites block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure other rate payers are not disadvantaged. The process Council has elected to run shows poor process and governance and is a breach of the Local Authority Act 2002.

We seek the following decision from the local authority:

That Council delay consideration of the Private Plan change until it is in a position to consider the plan changes under PC50 that have been delayed. This is to ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider rate payers.

Under the ‘Options To Progress The Plan Change’ – page 49, Section 32, Report of the proposed Plan Change – Gabites Block we are the view that the second option ‘Rely on Proposed Plan Change 50’ is the correct approach and oppose the stated ‘Preferred Option’ and challenge the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the PPC55.

I **do** wish to heard in support of our submission, YES

I **do/** wish to make a joint case , YES

Submission 33

Brett just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Brett Stanaway

Postal address of submitter

1071 Maymorn rd, Te Marua, Upper Hutt

Contact telephone

5262520

Contact email

stanaways@xtra.co.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and
does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Section size of 400m² & or 600m² on my southern boundary. The proposed residential density would not be in keeping with the character (size) of the existing residential area on the northern boundary. This high density proposal would impact our current views of the ranges to the south of our property. The peaceful environment & the views to the south were major factors in our decision to purchase our property. High density housing on our boundary would adversely impact the saleability of our property

My submission is that:

As above

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Do not allow or approve 400m2 & or 600m2 section anywhere on the proposed land
(Gabites Block)

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 34

smith just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Judith Swildens

Postal address of submitter

1176A Maymorn Road, Maymorn

Contact email

judith.swildens@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and
does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

The rezoning

My submission is that:

I oppose the rezoning of Gabites Block

I seek the following decision from local authority:

I wish the zoning for Gabites Block to remain as it is to protect the rural landscape of Maymorn for future generations

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission

If you have additional information to include with your submission, please upload it here:

https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/chq-production-australia/58dca0e71485267e0cfbb070be93910ce953ec1f/original/1649810764/a46d57aed3786e473153fdb082cb96e2_FEEDBACK_ON_PPC55_GABITES_BLOCK.pdf?1649810764

Feedback on Private Plan Change 55 (Gabites Block).

From:

Judith Swildens

1176A Maymorn Road, Maymorn

I apologise if this is a little bit “wordy” but I figure after reading 12 pdf’s submitted by the developer you at least owe me the decency of reading my thoughts.

Personally, I have lived in Maymorn for nearly 10 years, my partner has been here for nearly 18 years. We own our own home.

I’ve lived in Upper Hutt for half of my life. It was my first home when I immigrated to NZ at the age of 5. I returned as an adult. Now I’m in Maymorn to raise my family and live out my years with the love of my life, in my forever home.

PPC55 is reminiscent of the Maymorn Structure Plan. This was overturned because it was in conflict with the values of the District Plan that was in place to protect the Rural Zone. For the locals I have spoken to, there is a feeling of “here we go again”. 10 years may be a long time in the property developing world, but for those of us living in our forever homes, the prospect of this development causes a lot of anxiety.

I am aware that the council is looking to change the District Plan as outlined in the draft proposal of PC50, at the request of Central Government. The council likely sees rezoning and intensification as a good way to generate more income in the way of rates, but a lot of Upper Hutt residents are concerned about the changes.

I can appreciate that housing demand is high, but simply rezoning and intensifying the housing will do irreversible damage. Can Upper Hutt genuinely sustain this amount of growth, alongside the development of:

Te Marua Golf Course

Gillespies Road

Totara Park

Wallaceville Estate

St Patricks Silverstream

As well as changes made to allow for development of multi-storey buildings.

I am not opposed to the development of the Gabites Block; I am opposed to changing the zoning.

I’ve been advised that submissions made for the PC50 draft plan in relation to the Gabites Block Development will not be considered when making decisions on this PPC55.

This in itself that seems illogical and dismissive of the effort that residents have made. Putting in a submission is difficult for many people. The council website is confusing, the information provided is often long winded and hard to decipher. For a lot of residents, putting in a submission is just “too hard” and that is a real shame. The submissions need to be heard; you owe it to the people who did take the time to make a submission to the PC50 draft proposal to include their submissions. The requested plan change for Gabites Block is in essence the same in PC50 draft as it is the PPC55.

There will be many residents who will not make a submission to this PPC55 because:

- They don't have the time
- They find it all overwhelming (12 pdfs full of jargon to read)
- They have already put in a submission for PC50 and assume it counts

I propose the council go door-knocking. Visit the residents of Maymorn and ask them the key questions. The mail drop isn't sufficient. Go and speak to your constituents.

Our home has been here since the 1940's, it was originally built to house people working on the Maymorn railway tunnel. A third of our section is covered in a small but old native Beech Forest with Kahikatea, Pittosporum, five-finger, and countless more. A very small but very diverse patch that supports so much fauna.

During our home ownership we have seen the development of Maymorn Waters. Our home had beautiful clusters of established native trees and shrubs growing along a solidly built lifestyle fence. The original Maymorn Waters developers approached my partner and offered to build a new 1.8m high fence at their expense. This was to protect him from traffic noise and to offer some privacy. He told them he didn't want to see his native trees damaged, they promised to do as little damage as possible, and transplant them if possible. On this premise he agreed to let them build the fence.

One day he came home from work, the lifestyle fence was gone, the trees and shrubs that grew alongside were destroyed, completely bulldozed. The new fence was eventually built, approximately 100m of fence with only two rails and shallow concrete for the posts. No bolts, just nails. The concrete nib that was promised to be poured alongside the fence for a tidy look and low maintenance, that was never made.

The developer went bankrupt. Dews Construction then took over, they offered to fix the fence, which was just a token gesture, a little bit more concrete here and there but structurally nothing has changed. The fence is constantly coming apart. We chase the loose nails and replace with bolts. We will eventually have to tear it down, dig fresh holes, and build 100m of fencing at our own cost because the developer over promised and under delivered.

I hope you can understand why we are cautious about developers, especially when we read submissions with non-contractual phrases like "Council **may** impose conditions" and "**proposed** planting" and "avoid, remedy or **mitigate**". These are empty promises that developers in the end cannot be held accountable to.

I have carried out some rough calculations based on statistics, to help me get a grasp on what we could potentially see in our community with the introduction of 200 households. I am also aware that secondary dwellings could be possible for many of these sections.

I couldn't get a reliable answer from the council when questioned about how many homes the Gabites Block would currently allow under the Rural Valley and Rural Hill zoning, but from my rough calculations:

Lot 2 DP 356697 – 14.6420 hectares zoned Rural Valley would support **3x 4ha lots**

Part Section 299 Hutt District – 59.8915 hectares zoned Rural Hill and Rural Valley **at most 14 x 4ha lots or at least 3 x 20ha lots**

At current zoning the Gabites Block would allow for between 7 and 17 lots, compared to the proposed 200. This indicates to a 1000% increase at least, at worst a 2500% increase in lots.

From a quick count on Apple Maps (more up to date than Google Maps) I counted approximately 40 homes currently using the 80kmh section of Maymorn Road to access their homes. Less than a quarter of what the developers are proposing to add to the community.

I have done my best to read through all of the submitted documents and assessments provided by the developer on the UHCC website and I have many concerns. Below are my concerns, in no particular order.

The Ecological Assessment:

The fact that there is a local bat sighting on record is incredible. The Ecological Assessment outlines that the environment of Gabites Block has the habitat to support bats, it is **“also sufficiently rural that urban influences such as light spill and residential noise, which can reduce bat activity, would not affect the site”**

This can only remain true if the site is not intensively developed.

I note the proposed plan change details outline “Require subdivision to: Avoid providing streetlighting.” **This needs to be an absolute must.** Not only for the sake of wildlife, but to avoid adversely affecting people who already live in Maymorn for the lack of light pollution. The night sky out here is incredible and it must remain that way.

The Ecological Assessment noted an abundance of pest mammals such as “rodents, possums, hedgehogs, mustelids, and cats”. Any increase in housing will only support the population growth of these pest mammals. On top of this, you should consider that around 41% of NZ households have a cat, and at least 34% of NZ households have a dog.

If zoning change goes ahead, we can expect at least 82 cats and 68 dogs, contained only by 1.2m high post and rail fencing. The impact on the native birds and lizards will be catastrophic. If any of the secondary dwellings have pets, we are potentially looking at over 200 predatory mammals introduced to the area.

In contrast, given **the current zoning we could expect to see between approximately 3-7 cats, or 2-6 dogs.**

The council owes it to our local wildlife and future generations of NZers to insist on a comprehensive lizard and bat survey as advised in the Ecological Assessment.

The Integrated Transport Assessment:

I must highlight that this assessment raised many concerns, there are some errors that must be considered before allowing this document to support any change in zoning.

In section **3.1 Local Traffic Volumes** it refers to a table showing data dating back to 2008, this data counted flows of *“930 vehicles per day (vpd) on Maymorn Road sitting well within the typical volumes for a Local Distributor. Volumes across the wider network of Distributor and Local Routes to the south and west are also within the carriageway capacities for such roads.*

To the north of the Site, count data indicates average weekday traffic volumes on Plateau Road just prior to the SH2 intersection of around 2,700 vehicles per day (vpd), with corresponding peak hour volumes of around 280 vehicles per hour (vph) and 240vph for the AM and PM peaks, respectively. These two-way volumes sit well within the capacity of the carriageway.”

Data from 2008 is completely irrelevant. This assessment provided no definition of what “capacity of the carriageway” actually means. There is no mention in the assessment of the heavy presence of commercial vehicles, **the fully laden concrete trucks leaving Upper Hutt Ready Mix, the fully laden double trailer trucks carrying materials to Upper Hutt Ready Mix, the trucks carrying product to and from HCP. There is no mention of the frequent heavy machinery using the local roads to maintain and upgrade the Kiwirail facilities. There is no mention of the fact that a house removal company currently works out of Maymorn Road.** Vehicle movement data only tells part of the story. If we focus on just the 50kmh area of Maymorn Road, **there are three distinct blind corners which have no yellow lines to discourage parking, and a constant flow of very large trucks.** This must be taken into consideration when assessing the suitability of extra traffic.

There is also **no mention at all in the traffic assessment that there is a Primary School** on Molloys Road with **absolutely zero traffic management, or speed restrictions during school hours.** Currently the school has some Covid-19 measures in place, one is staggered pick-ups, allowing the juniors to be picked up 10 mins earlier, this has made traffic a little easier around 2:45-3pm, but once that measure is removed, the traffic woes continue and will only be worse if the intensification of Gabites Block goes ahead. The families that attend Plateau School have for years asked for temporary speed reductions during school hours, a pedestrian crossing. Nothing has come of it. It is a very dangerous area for small kids and near misses happen often. **Does a child need to be hurt before a change is made by the council?**

In section 3.2 Speed Environment it outlines:

“Maymorn Road has a posted speed limit of 50kph between Plateau Road and 100m north of the Site boundary, where it changes to open road (100kph) as land use becomes more rural, across the frontage of the Site and into Parkes Line Road.”

This is incorrect. The posted speed limit changes from 50kph to 80kph. This error allows the assessment to make the following incorrect statement:

“A traffic speed survey at two locations along Maymorn Road adjacent to the Site’s proposed new access roads indicate 85th percentile ‘operating speeds’ of approximately 70kph. In this manner, it is apparent that operating speeds are lower than the current posted limit and, with the associated change in the nature of the function of the Maymorn Road in providing access to the development site, could be a trigger to implement a downward revision of the current limit.”

The fact that the assessment would be published with an error to this level doesn’t fill me with much confidence that the assessor has done their due diligence in generating the report.

The assessment highlights local public transport:

“The nearest current bus stop to the Site is on Plateau Road, to the north. This bus stop serves the local Route #112 ‘Te Marua – Timberlea – Maoribank – Upper Hutt’, which operates at a 20-minute frequency during the peaks and hourly in the off-peak. Additionally, a local school bus service currently routes between Plateau, Birchville and Trentham schools”

This statement looks great on paper, in reality the #112 bus is the first to be cancelled when there is a driver shortage, the cancellations are often at very short notice and often several days in a row. Anecdotally, locals do not use this bus service as it is completely unreliable.

In section 7.1 Trip Generation there is a table showing **Forecast Traffic Generation**.

This table does not take into consideration the possibility of additional vehicles belonging to the people housed in secondary dwellings.

The section also states "peak hour traffic additions generated by the proposed residential development are not large, with the equivalent of approximately **2 vehicles per minute added during peak hours**."

This again is without the consideration of secondary dwellings. Speaking to parents at Plateau School there are concerns especially from residents in Beechwood Way and Beechwood Lane who turn northbound on SH2 to access Plateau Road, an additional 2 vehicles per minute will make it very difficult for them to exit safely.

The assessment also assumes that **30% of traffic will use Parkes Line Road as opposed to Maymorn Rd to Plateau Road to access SH2, this is pure speculation, from my experience, local contacts and vantage point, completely false, it is likely less than 5%**.

In section 4 the assessment outlines the safety and accident history in the area, specifically the SH2/Plateau intersection. The fact that a death hasn't occurred at that intersection is pure luck. You ask anyone in the area how many near-misses they have had and they will have many:

- People turning into Plateau Road from Northbound SH2 miscalculating the oncoming traffic
- People turning into Plateau Road Southbound from SH2 and entering the carpark of the Te Marua Store, often they approach at speed due to the lack of turning bay into Plateau Road for cars approaching from the North.
- Trucks pulling over alongside the Te Marua Golf Course, stopping to visit the Te Marua Store often force northbound traffic into the Plateau Road turning bay
- Cars turning southbound onto SH2 merging incorrectly
- The current turning bay Northbound into Plateau Rd is essentially on a blind corner approach, you anticipate you can fit in the turning bay but you never really know what's around the corner

Plateau Road/Maymorn Road/Parkes Line/Mangaroa Valley Road is also an alternative route used when road closures due to accidents occur on SH2 between Plateau and Akatarawa Road.

The assessment noted that the current intersection of SH2 at Plateau Road

"the intersection has been developed to a good standard"

I question the legitimacy of this statement. **NZTA have "sight distance standards" for intersections and accessways at State Highways. The current intersection does not meet the standard.**

In the SH2/Plateau Road case, the posted speed is 80kmh, the operating speed is assumed to be 90kmh (as per NZTA) so **the intersection is supposed to have 203m of clear line of sight in both directions**. Northbound the intersection meets that standard, looking Southbound **it does not**.

The traffic assessment is lacking a lot of information, it does not take into account the effects that the increase in traffic will have for people who live in suburbs around Maymorn.

Since the development of Wallaceville Estate the Silverstream area is gridlocked most mornings. Was this forecasted in the planning?

Schooling

I could not find any helpful data in all of the assessments and documents provided that outlined how the proposed development would affect the local schools.

On a larger scale, Upper Hutt is at capacity for its Intermediates, High Schools as well as the primary schools. This will only get worse with all of the developments happening around Upper Hutt.

One of my children attends Plateau School, my other child will start next term. I have spoken to the Principal of Plateau School who hasn't had any consultation with the developers.

I have been in touch with the Ministry of Education who told me that **Plateau School** (zoned for Maymorn) is currently at 94% capacity, **space for another 10 children**. The school currently has the capacity for 175 kids. Plateau School is special, its unique, it's a small school with a semi-rural feel and children thrive.

Mangaroa school is close but out of zone, they **have capacity for another 15 students**.

The **MoE anticipate an additional 44 primary school aged children should the development go ahead**.

Do we need to fill these schools beyond capacity when children in NZ are already struggling with basic literacy?

Where will these children, plus all the others from the many other new developments go to college? It feels like development of housing is happening before the basic infrastructure and amenities are being upgraded. You need to be ahead of the development, not playing catch up.

Noise

Maymorn is a windy spot, the wind blows up Maymorn Road with no resistance until it hits Mt Climie, sound travels up the wind like you wouldn't believe. The amount of noise generated from 200 houses, plus secondary dwellings will destroy any moment of peace and quiet forever.

Conclusion:

I have no opposition to the Gabites Block being subdivided to its current zoning. Maymorn must stay open and rural. 1000m² sections is not rural, it's what suburbia used to be before it got subdivided and children lost their backyards.

I have seen the plans to eventually build another 200 lots on the other side of the train tracks at the northern end of Parkes Line Road, and I ask the councillors, where do you draw the line? When is our rural landscape no longer worth keeping? If the proposed PPC55 is allowed to go ahead, it will be the catalyst for the destruction of rural Upper Hutt as we know it. I understand the 50kmh area of Maymorn Road is distinctly urban, as well as Maclaren St, but that does not mean that we need to fill the in between with the same.

Maymorn is a historical highlight on the Hutt River Trail, people come here to take in the quiet surroundings, the green fields, Mt Climie providing a stunning backdrop for photos.

What the developers are proposing will decimate birds and lizards, and potentially destroy the habitat of native bats. It will ruin the night sky, even without streetlights the light pollution from such an amount of housing will take its toll. This development would obliterate the peace and tranquillity that Maymorn is known for.

I've also seen mention of allowing some light commercial activity to happen around the Maymorn station. I can assure you that the majority of Maymorn residents do not want this. We have a dairy down the road, that is all we need. We don't want the added traffic of a café, or any other such facility. Its unnecessary and will only add to the traffic, the noise, the pollution and crime.

OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number

35

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

Name of Submitter: Dean Spicer on behalf of The Maymorn Collective consisting of the following residents.

- Tamara Hrstich
- Bruce Bates & Kim Cheeseman
- Lynn & Richard Bialy
- Megan & Paul Persico
- Dean & Michelle Spicer
- John & Sue Boyle
- Phillip & Teresa Eales
- Amanda & Rami Mounia
- Mandy Regan

Postal Address of the Submitter
224 Parkes Line Road, Maymorn, Upper Hutt

Agent Acting for the submitter (if applicable)

Address for Service (if different from above)

Contact Telephone: 021582531 Contact Email: deanajspicer@icloud.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? **No**

Only answer this question if you answered 'yes above'

I am/ am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- (a) Adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Details of Submission:

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

The Collective have provided consistent messaging through the consultation and feedback process for PC50, that land which constitutes The Collective's properties and the immediately surrounding area of Maymorn is uniquely situated to provide for future growth and development opportunities, while still retaining a distinctly rural character. The Collective's landholdings represent approximately 25% of the land within the Maymorn area, zoned either currently Rural Lifestyle or Rural Valley Floor, including the properties at McLaren Street and the Gabites Block (being 45ha of 178ha in total), but excluding properties accessed from Colletts Road.

Ultimately, The Collective wish to see a District Plan, enabled thorough PC50, which continues to prescribe a rural character to the Maymorn area.

The Collective supports development of the Gabites block in line with the proposed zoning but questions need for a specific policy framework, which at present is ambiguous. The proposed policy framework is not underpinned by a specific precinct or overlay within the proposed zoning, which might otherwise provide a clearer signal as to how the policy framework is supposed to be interpreted. The Collective's view is that the land which is understood to be the Gabites

block should be subject to the same opportunities and constraints that is afforded to all other areas proposed to be RSZ.

Upper Hutt City Council has delayed completing the PC50 process, according to Counsellor Angela McLeod (1), this was due to changes proposed by central government with respect to the Resource Management Act and the need for council to consider the impact of the change before allowing changes to proceed.

This private plan change should therefore also be delayed until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made, taking into account, the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. There is an inequality in considering the desire of a commercial property developer while ignoring the clear preferences of the wider community for a well planned and considered district plan. This is poor governance by Council and will be changed to the full extent possible under the law.

The private plan is not consistent with retaining a distinctly rural character of the area in particular we oppose the intensification proposed for the following reasons:

- Impact on the wider community and loss of the rural character of the area.
- Congestion issues on Maymorn and Parkes Line Road from over intensification and increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure that is not designed for it.
- Impact on horizontal infrastructure and flow on impact to local residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more inkeeping with the rural character.
- The proposed plan does not meet the Upper Hutt City Council Sustainability Strategy 2020 principles to 'minimise our environmental impact, maximise remedial action, and role-model sustainable community living'.
- we believe the expert reports provided by the applicant are inadequate

(1) Angela McLeod post on Facebook group 'Mangaroa and Whitemans Valley Community Group' 10 March 2022

In conclusion, we oppose the Private Plan on the basis that it will leave to inconsistent zoning practices and that Gabites block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure other rate payers are not disadvantaged. The process Council has elected to run shows poor process and governance and is a breach of the Local Authority Act 2002.

We seek the following decision from the local authority:

That Council delay approval of the Private Plan change until it is in a position to consider the plan changes under PC50 that have been delayed. This is to ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider rate payers.

Under the 'Options To Progress The Plan Change' – page 49, Section 32, Report of the proposed Plan Change – Gabites Block; we are of the view that the second option 'Rely on Proposed Plan Change 50' is the correct approach and oppose the stated 'Preferred Option' and challenge the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the PPC55

We **do** wish to be heard in support of our submission

We **do not** wish to make a joint case

OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number

36

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

Name of Submitter: Helen Regan

Postal Address of the Submitter

217 Parkes Line Road, Maymorn, Upper Hutt

Agent Acting for the submitter (if applicable)

Address for Service (if different from above)

Contact Telephone: 021 657 295 Contact Email: hajopella@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? **No**

Only answer this question if you answered 'yes above'

I am/ am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- (a) Adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Details of Submission:

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

1. The area as defined under PC50 is uniquely situated to provide for future growth and development opportunities, while still retaining a distinctly rural character.
2. Upper Hutt City Council has delayed completing the PC50 process, according to Counsellor Angela McLeod¹, this was due to changes proposed by central government with respect to the Resource Management Act and the need for Council to consider the impact of the change before allowing changes to proceed.
3. In the consultation documents, the proposed development of the Gabites Block, PPC55, was referred to numerous times as part of PC50. My position is that the land known as Gabites block or PPC55 should therefore be considered in the context under which it was originally consulted on, i.e. as part of the PC50 as it relates to the wider Maymorn area.
4. Additionally, if it is important enough for the Council to reconsider the potential impacts of changes to the RMA on PC50 then PPC55 should be subject to the same scrutiny.
5. There is inequity in considering the desire of a commercial property developer while ignoring the clear preferences of the wider community for a well-planned and considered district plan.
6. Ultimately, I wish to see a District Plan, enabled thorough PC50, which continues to prescribe a rural character to the Maymorn area, balancing the graduated transition from the Maymorn Railway Station outwards to the east, south and west.
7. The private plan is not consistent with retaining a distinctly rural character of the area in particular,

I oppose the intensification proposed for the following reasons:

- Impact on the wider community and lose of the rural character of the area.

¹ Angela McLeod post on Facebook group 'Mangaroa and Whitemans Valley Community Group' 10 March 2022

- Congestion issues on Maymorn and Parkes Line Road from over intensification and increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure designed and constructed in the early 20th century i.e. never designed for the increase in housing as currently proposed.
- The proposed plan does not meet the Upper Hutt City Council Sustainability Strategy 2020 principles to 'minimise our environmental impact, maximise remedial action, and role-model sustainable community living'.
- I believe the expert reports provided by the applicant are inadequate

My submission is that:

I oppose PPC55 because:

1. The land known as Gabites Block should only be considered as part of the wider PC50
2. PPC55 will negatively impact the rural character of the area
3. PPC55 will result in inconsistent zoning practices
4. progressing PPC55 as a standalone plan, i.e. outside the context of PC50 or the current zoning rules (RZR) will disadvantage local ratepayers.
5. considering PPC55 before progressing PC50 is poor governance by UHCC.

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

That Council proceeds with the second option 'Rely on Proposed Plan Change 50' as the correct approach.

I oppose the stated 'Preferred Option' and I challenge the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the PPC55

I **do not** wish to be heard in support of my submission

I **do not** wish to make a joint case

Helen Regan

12 April 2022

Signature of submitter

Date

OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number

37

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

Name of Submitter: Lynn Bialy
Postal Address of the Submitter 180A Parkes Line Road, Maymorn
Agent Acting for the submitter (if applicable)
Address for Service (if different from above)
Contact Telephone: 526 9913 / 021 390 568
Contact Email: lynnrich@xtra.co.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? **No**

Only answer this question if you answered 'yes above' I am/ am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- (a) Adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

Details of Submission:

I am not opposed to development in the Maymorn area, but I am opposed to passing inconsistent zoning decisions which have the huge potential to unfairly impact negatively on a majority of current residents.

If the proposed Gabites Block development is passed by Council:

- I do not believe our current rural character will be well-enough preserved.
- The traffic along Parkes Line Road will become incompatible with current lifestyle nuances i.e., riding or leading horses along the road. At times cows are moved from one property to another along the road. Both these things are just a small example of the rural character of where we have chosen to live. We have no footpaths along Parkes Line Road, because at the moment our zoning does not make this necessary - the grass verges are sufficient. But if Gabites is approved, at the very least the car numbers will make it impossibly dangerous for either of the two examples given to continue.
- Who would be paying for all the necessary infrastructure (road surfaces, water and sewerage plant capability upgrades, water connections, sewerage connections, street lights) to be undertaken to support the new Gabites Block residents? Would any of this cost be added to current Maymorn residents' rates? If 'yes', then that is totally unacceptable if our preferred rural character has been taken away from us as a result of the Gabites Block rezoning.

I do not feel there has been adequate study or acknowledgement of the flow-on effects the proposed Gabites Block development would have on the wider current Maymorn community.

There are plenty of repeated messages from Council and Government around the need for more housing to meet the ever-increasing population, but in this situation, you are talking about a development that will have a major negative impact on an established rural community, not on a brush covered hillside on the city side of the hill.

Many of the Parkes Line Road residents on the side of the road currently zoned to be subdividable down to no less than 10 acres, have expressed willingness to consider rezoning to allow subdividing to smaller lifestyle blocks for new builds, as already exists on the other side of Parkes Line Road. These blocks are highly sought after by people wishing to embrace the semi-rural lifestyle. I cannot understand why Council would be willing to grant a residential development at the end of the road to provide so many new houses, yet repeatedly opt not to agree to rezone that side of Parkes Line Road, which seems a sensible build option. This inconsistency in zoning shows a lack of planning and impact studies.

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

That Council delay consideration of the Private Plan change until it is in a position to consider the plan changes under PC50 that have been delayed. This is to ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding ad hoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider rate payers.

Under the 'Options to Progress the Plan Change' (page 49, Section 32, Report of the proposed Plan Change – Gabites Block) I am of the view that the second option 'Rely on Proposed Plan Change 50' is the correct approach and oppose the stated 'Preferred Option' and challenge the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the PPC55.

I **do** wish to be heard in support of my submission

I **do** wish to also be included in the joint case of the Maymorn Collective written submission

Submission 38

Maymorn Local just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Kim Williams

Postal address of submitter

1166 H Maymorn Rd

Contact telephone

9779262

Contact email

kkw1166mm@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and
does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

PPC 55 - Gabites - Integrated Transport Assessment Environment - street lighting / light pollution

My submission is that:

Traffic Impacts and risks The traffic assessment contains a basic error is assessing the existing speed limit along Maymorn Road (is 80kmhr not 100kmhr) and its impact on risk related to traffic flows / numbers. Doesn't illustrate the attention needed in analyzing and addressing the traffic impacts of the proposal. The report does not adequately recognize the physical constraints of the road width between Plateau Rd and the Gabites block - it is very tight and winding and cannot accommodate large vehicles and normal traffic movement

combined with vehicles parked on the side of the road. There are constant near misses (not acknowledged nor mentioned) that will increase in number with the construction traffic and existing commercial activity of the concrete plant site (daily large truck movements) and other businesses in that proximity. These will be overtaken when the occupants of the development move into the development to live. The report makes little / no mention of the heavy traffic factor that exists through these neighboring businesses (and the many that service the wider valley beyond). The mention of construction traffic is scant and does not seriously reflect the likely volume and size of vehicles involved (the Wallaceville development gives a good indication of the volume and duration of this element) and its impact on the existing community. These factors deserve closer survey and analysis and will present real risk and challenges for the development, community (all people living, visiting and using the valley) and council to mitigate and manage or face the increased reality of near misses and with that likely increases in traffic risk and actual accidents. The development provides for cycle pathways but the pathway to SH2 after that is dangerous to navigate, even in current circumstances. Light Pollution The special significance of the Mangaroa valley was identified by previous independent commissioners during earlier proposals to develop the valley. This remains critical and is enhanced as we see urban creep into rural settings across the wider district. An aspect of the special nature of the valley is the night sky and lack of light pollution as the valley exists in its current state. It provides extraordinary night viewing and supports related nature and wild nightlife not found in the urban areas. The development needs to ensure this remains through the strict introduction of low light pollution design and features for the wider lighting plans to the roadways and pathways as well as would be applied to external lighting related to each dwelling. An example of where this is applied is the Mackenzie Basin, Tekapo and the development could easily and effectively apply such measures of the same standard.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Traffic risk and response An additional wider detailed road user and site survey needs to be taken with all occupants and users of the valley floor engaged (e.g. from SH2 diary Maymorn Rd back to and including Flux Rd / Collets road as a minimum - likely wider). The daily users and community will provide the most accurate advice and evidence in regards use, risks and potentially offer possible measures to mitigate (e.g. extended footpaths, lower speed limits, no parking zones, barriers and bollards/plantings etc). The failure to properly understand, identify and address the risk the increased traffic that will present during development and afterwards to pedestrians (including school children walking to / from schools, homes and the train etc), cyclists, vehicle drivers and those properties bordering the development through this increased traffic load will result in unacceptable risk to property and people with potential outcomes of injury or worse. Any such survey needs to be carefully owned, administered and managed by UHCC (not the authors of the current traffic assessment) in direct engagement with the community as they will play a vital role in the impacts beyond the boundary of the development. It will also be a key influence in the future impacts of PC50 and how this will dovetail in decisions and outcomes taken in addressing these risks now - as part of the longer term response to PCC55. Light Pollution The UHCC and Developer should address the need to protect against light pollution as will be created by the PPC 55 development and the wider PC 50 through a standard and specification as can be found in Tekapo Dark Sky reserve. This is a simple and cost effective measure with real benefits to the community and the environment of the wider valley.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 39

MikeB just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Michael Byrne

Postal address of submitter

172a Plateau Road Te Marua

Contact telephone

0223270145

Contact email

mike@byrne.net.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Transport assessment

My submission is that:

The considerations of the increase in volume of people from the additional housing isnt considered or clearly shown in the documents in relation to rail, schooling and traffic. The rail network assessment implies greater capacity expected yet there are no plans in place for this that support that assessment . Where is the impact assessment from the transport and impact on the school traffic. Where is the impact and planning of the increase in population that needs to be supported by the local school? The 2 vehicles per minute assessment doesn't detail impacts on timing of the current intersection

I seek the following decision from local authority:

That approval isnt given until greater clarity can be provided on the impact on the local infrastructure in a consolidated and readable view for a proper consultation feedback.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission



OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number

40

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

NAME OF SUBMITTER Greater Wellington Regional Council

POSTAL ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER 100 Cuba Street, Wellington

AGENT ACTING FOR SUBMITTER (IF APPLICABLE)

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

CONTACT TELEPHONE **021 814
323**

CONTACT EMAIL **sally.owen@gw.govt.nz**

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please tick one): **yes** / **no**

Only answer this question if you ticked 'yes' above:

I am / **am not** (tick one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Details of submission

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Private Plan Change 55 - Gabites Block

USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

My submission is that:

See additional documents

PLEASE STATE IN SUMMARY THE NATURE OF YOUR SUBMISSION. CLEARLY INDICATE WHETHER YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OR WISH TO HAVE AMENDMENTS MADE, GIVING REASONS. PLEASE USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

See additional documents

PLEASE GIVE PRECISE DETAILS AND USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

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.

I do not 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 wish to make a joint case.

I do not wish to make a joint case.

Signature and date

Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making submission:

SIGNATURE



DATE

13/04/2022

By email

13 April 2022

100 Cuba Street,
Te Aro
PO Box 11646,
Wellington 6011
T 04 384 5708
www.gw.govt.nz

Submitted to: UHCC.Planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Submission on Proposed District Plan Change 55: Gabites Block

Please find enclosed the Greater Wellington Regional Council's submission on District Plan Change 55.

Please feel free to contact me on 021 814 323 or sally.owen@gw.govt.nz if you have any questions or concerns.

Yours sincerely



Sally Owen

Kaitohutohu Matua –

Senior Policy Advisor, Environmental Policy

Attachment 1: Greater Wellington Regional Council Submission

To:	Upper Hutt City Council
Submission on:	Proposed Plan Change 55 – Gabites Block

REASON FOR SUBMISSION

1. The Greater Wellington Regional Council (**Greater Wellington**) wishes to make a submission on Proposed Plan Change 55 (**the Plan Change**) pursuant to Schedule 1 clause 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**the Act**). This submission is from Greater Wellington officers.
2. Greater Wellington broadly supports the strategic direction of the Plan Change, particularly the focus on protection of significant natural areas within the 74.5-hectare site at 1135 Maymorn Road (known as **Gabites Block**).
3. Responses to specific provisions are included in Attachment 2, to be read alongside this letter.

POLICY FRAMEWORK

Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region

4. The Regional Policy Statement (**RPS**) is a regional document that identifies significant resource management issues within the region and sets out the objectives, policies and methods to achieve integrated management of natural and physical resources for the Wellington region. The RPS was made operative on 24 April 2013.
5. The RPS contains four types of policies: the first set (policies 1-34) must be given effect to when making changes to district and regional plans (in accordance with section 75 of the Act). The second set (policies 35-60) are to be considered when deciding on resource consents, notice of requirements, or a change, variation or replacement to a plan. A number of the second set of policies cease to have effect once the first set are given effect to through district or regional plans. The third set (policies 61-63) allocates responsibilities for indigenous biodiversity, natural hazards and hazardous substances. The fourth set (policies 64-69) outlines non-regulatory actions.
6. Greater Wellington is particularly interested in how the plan change will support and contribute to achieving the integrated management of natural and physical resources in the Wellington region. Our focus is on considering how the plan change and the Upper Hutt District Plan fits within the policy framework for addressing the region's resource management issues of fresh water; indigenous ecosystems; natural hazards; and regional form, design and function.

Proposed Natural Resources Plan

7. The Proposed Natural Resources Plan (**PNRP**) assists Greater Wellington to carry out its functions under section 30 of the Act. The PNRP includes objectives, policies, methods and rules to manage the natural resources of fresh water, air, soil, and the coastal marine area.
8. The PNRP establishes rules for activities that discharge contaminants into water or to land where the contaminant might enter water, such as wastewater and stormwater discharges. It also

restricts certain uses of land within natural wetlands and beds of lakes and rivers, such as structures, vegetation clearance and earthworks.

9. The PNRP was notified on 31 July 2015. The Council's Decision on the PNRP was notified on 31 July 2019. We are awaiting four outstanding consent orders from the Environment Court before all appeals are resolved. The rules in the PNRP have legal effect and the objectives and policies are relevant to decision making under the Act. Under section 74(2)(a) of the Act, the Upper Hutt City Council (**UHCC**) must have regard to the PNRP when making its decision on the proposed plan change.

National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020

10. As a Tier 1 local authority, UHCC is required to give effect to the relevant objectives and policies within the the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (**NPS-UD**). The NPS-UD requires that UHCC provides sufficient development capacity to meet expected housing and business demand over the short, medium and long term.

National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020

11. The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (**NPS-FM**) provides local authorities with updated direction on how they should manage fresh water under the Act. Although regional councils have primary responsibility for managing fresh water, district plan provisions must also give effect to the NPS-FM. In particular, clause 3.5 of the NPS-FM sets out provisions for integrated management, including that territorial authorities must include objectives, policies and methods in district plans to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments.

The Wellington Regional Growth Framework

12. The Wellington Regional Growth Framework (**WRGF**) is a spatial plan that describes a long-term vision for how the region will grow, change and respond to key urban development challenges and opportunities in a way that gets the best outcomes and maximises the benefits across the region. Our current priorities are housing supply, affordability and choice; transport choice and access; Iwi/Māori housing, capacity and taonga; and climate change and resilience.
13. The Gabites Block as a development site was not included within the WRGF, with the WRGF recognising that delivering medium density housing development around the Maymorn Railway Station was not aligned with the Upper Hutt Land Use Strategy 2016. While the WRGF does not include the Gabites Block as a Future Urban Development Area, the PPC still has the potential to contribute to the objectives of the WRGF.

Te Mahere Wai and Te Whaitua te Whanganui-a-Tara Implementation Programme

14. UHCC was a member of the Te Whanganui a Tara Whaitua Committee, and supported the Whaitua te Whanganui-a-Tara Implementation Programme (**WIP**). The WIP and Te Mahere Wai together form the programme to restore and improve water quality and ecosystem health in Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara. They reflect the views of Mana Whenua and community representatives, and provide an approach to giving effect to Te Mana o Te Wai as required by the NPS-FM. They contain recommendations for freshwater, with several recommendations directed towards Upper Hutt City Council. Specific recommendations for Upper Hutt were detailed to UHCC in the report *Te*

Whanganui-a-Tara Whaitua Implementation Programme and Te Mahere Wai o Te Kāhui Taiao,
presented to the 20 October 2021 Policy Committee meeting.

AREAS OF INTEREST

15. Within this policy context, the following matters are of particular interest to Greater Wellington:

- Protecting natural wetlands and watercourses
- Balancing environmental and community pressures against future housing needs
- Providing for regional and private transport choice in a net-zero carbon future.

16. These matters are the focus of our detailed comments in Appendix 2.

17. In general, the notified plan change contains insufficient detail on the proposed housing layout and stormwater design to demonstrate how adverse effects on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments are to be avoided, remedied, or mitigated, as required by NPS-FM 3.5. For this reason, we cannot be fully supportive of the proposal at this stage.

18. We also note that Greater Wellington's contacts at the Mandated Iwi Authorities of Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa Rangatira were unaware of this plan change as of 31 March 2022. The Section 32 report states that contact was initiated and no response was received. Policy 66 of the Regional Policy Statement seeks to enhance involvement of tangata whenua in resource management decision making, and we seek reassurance that all efforts to involve Mana Whenua in this plan change have been taken, to give effect to Policies 49 and 66 of the Regional Policy Statement.

RELIEF SOUGHT

19. Should Upper Hutt City Council approve the Proposed Plan Change 55, GWRC requests that our support is noted and amendments are made where sought in this submission, including this letter, Appendix 2 and any necessary consequential amendments.

FURTHER INVOLVEMENT

20. Greater Wellington wishes to be heard in support of its submission. We would welcome the opportunity to clarify and further discuss the matters raised. We also look forward to continued engagement on PC55.

Nāku nā,



Matt Hickman
Manager, Environmental Policy

Attachment 2: Specific comments on Proposed Plan Change 55

Provision	Submission	Relief sought	Reasons
Throughout proposed amendments	Support with amendment	Correct all references to the 'Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington region' (RPS)	References to the RPS are currently incorrect.
Throughout proposed amendments	Support with amendment	Ensure alignment with all relevant Te Whanganui-a-Tara Whaitua Implementation Programme and Te Mahere Wai o Te Kāhui Taiao recommendations.	Recommendations of the WIP and Te Mahere Wai were supported by council officers, and the Whaitua Committee included UHCC representation. This Private Plan Change 55 (PPC55) should align with all relevant recommendations.
Definition: Gabites Block Natural Area	Oppose	Amend the definition of Gabites Block Natural Area to include wetlands and waterbodies.	<p>Wetlands and waterbodies should be included in Gabites Block Significant Natural Areas.</p> <p>We do not support the view that the National Environmental Standards for Freshwater (2020) (NES-F) and the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region (PNRP) alone adequately protect wetlands. While the regional council has the primary role to implement the NES-F regulations within and adjacent to wetlands, district councils have a complementary role to play in managing land use in areas surrounding wetlands. To support integrated management, we consider that including known wetlands in planning maps and ensuring there are policies that provide for wetland protection are needed. UHCC also has a role in integrated management of freshwater under NPS-FM Clause 3.5, and the District Plan should provide for protection of watercourses and wetlands during sub-division and structure planning. This approach would help to achieve NPS-FM Policies 6 and 7.</p>
Freshwater and stormwater planning	Support with amendment	We seek inclusion of identified natural watercourses and wetlands in future site	The proposed plan change does not provide adequate detail to demonstrate how the stormwater network will work; nor

<p>and provisions; including SUB-DEV3-S4</p>		<p>mapping and structure planning. Development setbacks should be established along identified watercourses, to create a riparian buffer.</p> <p>We seek a requirement that stormwater be adequately treated (e.g. settlement ponds) before being discharged into any natural waterways or wetlands, to ensure that the requirements of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region and Natural Environmental Standards for Freshwater are met.</p>	<p>how the identified natural watercourses and wetland will be avoided.</p> <p>We support Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) initiatives in line with Wellington Water Ltd Standards and Guidelines, and the principle of hydraulic neutrality proposed, provided that the proposed flood hazard assessment is undertaken. In line with a WSUD approach, it is recommended that natural watercourses through the site are protected through setback areas that allow riparian planting buffers to be established to minimise flood risk.</p> <p>We support the stormwater management techniques alluded to in the Section 32 report, however the relationship between the identified watercourses, site plan and stormwater system is currently unclear. For example, the site plan appears to propose road alignments very close to identified permanent and intermittent watercourses.</p> <p>Demonstrating how the development will avoid adverse effects of development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments, is required under NPS-FM 3.5. It is also essential to give effect to Te Mana o Te Wai and align with the direction of Te Whaitua Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Te Mahere Wai.</p>
<p>SUB-DEV3-S2 Water Supply</p>	<p>Support with amendment</p>	<p>Clarify whether bore water could be used as water supply.</p> <p>If it is possible that bore water could be used for water supply, seek reassurance that bore water has not been contaminated by prior land use.</p>	<p>The site once contained an unregulated pig slurry dumping ground and had sewage ponds. In 2007 high levels of E.coli were recorded upstream of the site- 5600 cfu/100ml, Upstream ex pond-510 cfu/100ml and downstream below culvert-900 cfu/100ml. We seek reassurance that bore water has not been contaminated, particularly if this water might be used for water supply.</p>

Proposed Development Density throughout, including SUB-DEV3-S1	Oppose	Increase the development density to maximise the number of dwellings on the site, within the identified constraints.	<p>While we understand the site has several development constraints, the density proposed is very low.</p> <p>The most recent Housing and Business Capacity Assessment (HBA) that UHCC completed in 2019 identified that Upper Hutt could not meet its forecast housing demand. The Gabites Block was identified as a greenfield site in that modelling, with a potential yield of 457 dwellings. The proposed dwelling yield is only 220, which is significantly lower than might be expected for a site of this size.</p>
ECO provisions and high slope hazard overlay provisions	Support with amendment	<p>We support efforts taken to protect and enhance areas of significant indigenous biodiversity at the site.</p> <p>We seek consideration of opportunities to encourage the planting of the slopes and ridgeline outside of the natural area to native vegetation, to help to secure erodible land and create corridors for indigenous flora and fauna.</p>	Policy 47 of the RPS notes that in considering plan changes, particular regard shall be given to: “maintaining connections within, or corridors between, habitats of indigenous flora and fauna, and/or enhancing the connectivity between fragmented indigenous habitats”.
DEV3-ECO-P2 and DEV3-ECO-R2	Support with amendment	<p>Amend wording to remove ‘identified’ before ‘biodiversity values’ when referring to adverse effects caused by activities or maintenance of biodiversity values, for example as below:</p> <p>“Avoid adverse effects on identified indigenous biodiversity values where practicable;</p> <p>Minimise other adverse effects on the identified biodiversity values where avoidance is not practicable”.</p>	<p>Policy 24 of the RPS directs councils to protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values. Policy 47 should also be noted.</p> <p>We seek removal of the qualifier ‘identified’ before indigenous biodiversity values. This qualifier unnecessarily limits the consideration of effects to those values identified within the Gabites Block Natural Area at the time of plan notification.</p>
DEV3-ECO-R2	Support with amendment	Amend permitted activity status for removal of non-indigenous plants that are not pest plant to Restricted Discretionary or Controlled activity	The removal of non-indigenous vegetation being a permitted activity within the Gabites Block Natural Area is not

		<p>status.</p> <p>Consider including a specific rule permitting the removal of pest plants for within the Gabites Block Natural Areas, where appropriate for restoration and maintenance of these areas.</p>	<p>appropriate.</p> <p>Any non-indigenous plants within the Gabites Block Natural Area that are not pest plants may still provide significant habitat for indigenous biodiversity. This understanding is recognised in section 6(c) of the RMA which directs the protection of the “significant habitats of indigenous fauna” not the significant indigenous habitats of indigenous fauna.</p>
DEV3-S6	Support with amendment	Amend to ensure that all houses on lots along the eastern property boundary are required to be setback from this boundary at a safe distance to protect form future forestry harvests.	There has been plantation forestry planted along the boundary of the eastern section of the property. There is a risk that dwellings may be too close to the boundary for safe harvesting if only the current 3m setback rule is applied.
DEV3-ECO-Appendix-2: Biodiversity Offsetting and DEV3-ECO-Appendix-3: Biodiversity Compensation	Support with amendment	Amend framework of principles for biodiversity offsetting and compensation to be consistent with the PNRP and Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) guidance.	<p>The framework of principles for biodiversity offsetting and compensation should align with those Scheduled in the PNRP. This is to ensure continuity between district and regional requirements for biodiversity effects management.</p> <p>LGNZ guidance should also be followed. See LGNZ (2018) Biodiversity Offsetting under the Resource Management Act.</p>
Geological Hazard	Support	No relief sought.	<p>We have no concerns with the proposal from a geological hazard perspective. In summary, potential hazard related issues will be dealt with through the appropriate standards and geotechnical investigations on the steeper parts of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seismic hazards for the site are manageable and can be dealt with through building standards. • The Wellington Fault is around 1.8 km to the west, but no other faults are known to bisect the site and therefore the fault rupture risk is low. • GWRC liquefaction and ground shaking maps do not extend to cover Gabites Block but assessments for liquefaction, lateral spreading, rock fall and debris flows

			<p>have been undertaken and are considered low and manageable.</p> <p>Slope failure hazards represent the greatest risk to the site, which is recognised and provided for in the site assessment.</p>
SUB-DEV3-P5	Support with amendment	<p>Amend to allow additional parking for Rail Trail and Pākuratahi park users within the road reserve boundary adjustments on Maymorn Road. Connections between the development roads and park tracks should also be made where appropriate e.g. Pandy Track in Pākuratahi Forest.</p>	<p>We support development of an off-road connection to the rail trail and Pākuratahi Forest.</p> <p>Toitū Te Whenua Parks Network Plan 2020-2030 identifies that Maymorn Park entrance and area of forest is popular with horse riders and opportunities for access and facility improvements are required (Action A315). Trail development should consider horse rider needs including opportunities for parking. Parking is very limited at the nearby Parkes Line Road.</p> <p>Maymorn Road and the entrance to Pākuratahi Forest off Parkes Line Road are part of the Remutaka Cycle Trail route, one of New Zealand's 22 Great Rides and part of Nga Haerenga. Opportunities to enhance the trail surface, width and safety in this location should be prioritised.</p>
SUB-DEV3-P5	Support with amendment	<p>Amend to require the first subdivision in the Valley Flats Area to adjust the boundary of Maymorn Road, to provide sufficient width in Maymorn Road for a future cycleway and walkway.</p> <p>Amend the speed limits on the affected stretches of Maymorn Road from 100kph to 50kph.</p>	<p>The suggested provision of land to create a potential future active mode shared path along the 1135 Maymorn Road section boundary would represent significant compromise to active recreation opportunities as a result of the increased volume of high-speed traffic associated with this development. As PPC55 transforms the area from rural to an urban/rural fringe, thereby extending the urban extent of Maymorn Road, speed limits should be revisited.</p>
Integrated Transport assessment	Support with amendment	<p>Seek analysis of the proposed plan change for the impact of increased through traffic caused by the development on the Mangaroa School gate.</p>	<p>This Attachment notes “a local school bus service currently routes between Plateau, Birchville and Trentham schools.”</p> <p>With respect to this reference to school bus services, it</p>

			would appear no mention is made of Mangaroo School throughout any of the planning documentation, despite Mangaroo School being one of the closest schools to the development (in travel time terms).
Development plan transport provisions	Support with amendment	Amend to require an EV charging station as part of the development plan provisions.	The close connection with the Maymorn Railway Station and the provision of a cycleway/walkway will enable residents to use public and zero carbon transport. Potential improvements could be made by requiring EV charging stations as part of the development plan provisions and considering how active transport and public transport could be provided for within the development area itself.
DEV3-NH-P1 Development policy P1 for earthworks in the High Slope Overlay	Support with amendment	We seek the following insertion into DEVE3-NH-P1, as follows: <u>3. The earthworks adopt effective erosion and sediment control measures to retain silt and sediment on the site.</u>	Development policy P1 for earthworks in the High Slope Overlay states: <i>Provide for earthworks in the High Slope Hazard Overlay of the Gabites Block Development Area Structure Plan in DEV3-APPENDIX1, where:</i> <i>1. A geotechnical assessment confirms that the proposed earthworks will not unacceptably increase the risk from slope instability to people and buildings; and</i> <i>2. The earthworks will not increase the risk of slope failure at adjacent sites</i> The policy provides for earthworks and mitigates the risk of slope failure, however there is no consideration for the discharge of sediment from the site to a waterbody. Water quality is a consideration for both regional and district plans under the NPS-FM (2020).

Submission 41

Mary Beth just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Mary Beth Taylor

Postal address of submitter

165A Katherine Mansfield Drive Whiteman's Valley RD1, Upper Hutt

Acting agent for submitter (if applicable)

n/a

Address for service (if different from above)

165A Katherine Mansfield Drive Whiteman's Valley RD1, Upper Hutt

Contact telephone

+6445283884

Contact email

mbtaylor.tierra@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

The entire proposed plan change.

My submission is that:

Private Plan Change 55 be denied in its totality.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Reject PC55 in its entirety. File at the end of this submission.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission

If you have additional information to include with your submission, please upload it here:

https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/2509b82681509add4ff89021544873cecab6d7d2/original/1649820545/e6280bc508bfd575600db4f181a1f216_Submission_-_PC_55_Gabites_Block_-_Mary_Beth_Taylor.doc?1649820545

Upper Hutt City Council
Private Bag 907
UPPER HUTT 5140

Mary Beth Taylor
165A Katherine Mansfield Drive
Whiteman's Valley
UPPER HUTT 5371
mbtaylor.tierra@gmail.com
04 528 3884

12 April 2022

Private Plan Change 55 – Gabites Block

Below is my submission to the Upper Hutt City Council in relation to this consultation.
I wish to be heard in support of this submission.

General Comments

My initial reaction to this private plan change is 'why is this happening?' My second reaction is 'what a mess'.

As late as 1 March 2022 the developer has had to make significant amendments in light of information provided that should have been included in the original private plan change. I'm no sure the public will be able to find and digest this fact.

The planner obviously did a liberal cut and paste exercise with letterhead revealing that Kapiti Coast District Plan was the source for their thinking for our city. Borrowing good ideas is fine but presenting them under the banner of another council is unprofessional and does not instill confidence in the integrity of the proposed plan change.

A series of emails also reveal the haste and uncertainty around this work. 22 December 2021:

"Hi Drew I am sorry for the delay in sending this through. It has been manic. (James Beban)" Not a good look. *"Hi James, For your reference - As earlier indicated, I can indicate general support for the Gabites Block private plan change. (Rachael Annan Senior Landscape Planner-4sight consulting).*

It is presumptuous to assume there is general support for a private plan change in this sensitive area without have presented the plan to the public. From the social media responses throughout the city the opposite impression is evident.

This work has been presented with several factual errors and unfounded assumptions. Even after being peer reviewed the original and revised plans have been presented, both of which have been found to be deficient. The inclusion of both versions of the plan could prove confusing to the public.

The Maymorn Structure Plan 2012

Without going into detail, the Gabites Private Plan Change 55 tries unsuccessfully to engender support for the failed MSP. How many times does the community need to state clearly that intensive development and pseudo-urban form is not what is needed nor wanted in this area.

NPS UD

The developer harks to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020 in a way that makes it clear that they have truly missed the mark with regard to the intentions of the NPS.

For Tier 1 cities such as Upper Hutt, the focus is on urban intensification around existing water and transportation infrastructure. The aim is to create 'walkable cities' by subdividing and building up to 3 to 6 stories thus using land already invested in housing.

This developer aims to urbanise the rural area by stealth. Referencing the NPS UD incorrectly simply exposes the ignorance of the developer and unwillingness to work within the agreed limits to growth outside of urban areas. Gabites is located within the rural zone and should be developed with this in mind.

PC 50 – no reticulated connections

I was a member of the PC50 Rural Focus Group. This group spent two years discussing and fine tuning the changes to this chapter of the District Plan. The consultation within the group was robust and the Maymorn area was a focus of more than one meeting.

Consensus was reached around a good model for zoning in the Gabites area that included a settlement zone with sections down to a minimum of 2000 m². This was put to the community in extensive pre-consultation sessions and again there was general agreement around the zoning changes included in the draft plan change.

Unfortunately the RMA bombshell changes stalled the notification and final consultation for PC50. Though the rural chapters were largely complete and ready for consultation, the residential chapters were affected by the RMA changes so the entire plan change has been held up.

It is prudent and professional to see the PC50 consultation through its public notification and submission process as soon as possible. This must certainly be before any additional plan change for that area is considered.

It is my opinion that PC 55 is unnecessary and is an attempt to undermine the intentions of PC50.

NPS IB

In addition to seeing the PC 50 process to completion, it would be prudent to hold back on any further plan changes for that area until the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity has been finalized.

No doubt the NPS IB will shed further light on environmentally sensitive issue within the Gabites area. These will need to be taken into consideration when making zoning land use decisions.

PC48

In addition to seeing the PC50 and NPS IB finalized it is also prudent to complete the drafting and consultation around the PC48 Ecology and Landscape. With significant areas of SNA's on the doorstep of the proposed private plan change there will be repercussions for the zoning and land use decisions in that area.

Essentially it is a time for councils to reconsider their decisions around land use with reference to a large number of policies at national, regional and local government levels. It is good practice to await the finalization of these policies before challenging them with a private plan change that deviates considerable from the intention of these emerging policies.

Environmental issues

There will be additional environmental considerations to include in the future development of the Gabites area that are not mentioned in the private plan change 55.

For example, though some information around the number of cars and vehicle movements are suggested, no information is presented around the impact of the additional numbers of domestic animals that will be introduced in that area.

The Gabites block aligns with the boundary of Pakuratahi Regional Park. Within this regional treasure volunteers have set up an intensive trapping project to reduce the number of predators threatening native bird, reptile and insect populations. This area may also be home to the only native mammal species in New Zealand, bats.

My first concern is that not enough work and research has been done to understand the habitats of these species and how intensive residential building will affect them.

Secondly, it can be anticipated that 200+ additional dwellings in that area will generate an equal number of apex predator species (cats predominantly). Domestic cats can and do create colonies of feral cats. UHCC does not currently have a Cat Policy to align with its Dog Policy. Uncontrolled cat ownership can signify the destruction of large numbers of indigenous species. This must be considered for all new subdivisions but especially for those that interface with regional parks and protected areas.

Conclusion

It is my opinion that PC55 must be denied.

It is my opinion that the above mentioned pending plans and policy changes must be finalized and put into practice as soon as possible.

I wish to be heard.

It is unfortunate that the current Covid19 situation has interrupted this consultation. The inability to take the consultation to the people of Upper Hutt for face to face discussion may affect the quantity and quality of submissions. However we have been assured that this is one of several future opportunities for the community to feed into this plan change.

This is an excellent and honest work that clearly identifies the local land use issues and options for public discussion. This is reassuring and is appreciated.

I particularly support these leading comments:

“To grow smarter, we’ll need to grow differently.”

“...enable the right types of housing growth in the right places.”

Upper Hutt’s growth in recent decades has been a story of largely ‘greenfield’ developments in the central river valley and more recently infringing on rural areas. This style of development has been relatively quick, easy and profitable for developers, especially with the lack of environmental controls at that time. While this may have seemed appropriate then, hindsight has taught us about the sacrifices the city has made in terms of resulting pressures on water quality and supply, loss of highly productive soils, and loss of indigenous biodiversity and amenity values.

As stated above, we need to grow differently...we know better now.

It feels like this consultation plays ‘Devil’s Advocate’ with the Land Use Strategy 2016. It challenges the community to re-confirm their already stated loyalty to protecting rural land and wilderness areas over allowing short term profit for developers from poor land use decisions in these areas.

Community focus groups

As a member of the PC 50 Rural Focus Group I can see how this group’s collective input has been valued and included in the consultation material.

Though it was a good move to tap into local rural land owners’ experiences it is important to understand that their feedback is just a historical snap shot of current land owners’ opinions.

I appreciate the admission that the focus group conclusions may not “accurately reflect their understanding of the environment.” Sadly, a lack of awareness and understanding of the environment is a common characteristic of much of the Upper Hutt community. It is hoped that the draft Sustainability Strategy consultation will serve to increase local environmental awareness and understanding.

Plan Change 48 - Significant Natural Areas

There is a serious issue with the sequencing of the current plan change reviews.

Completion of Plan Change 48 logically needs to precede any land use decisions in Plan Change 50. I understand that the intention is that it will but this must be enforced.

The groundwork for PC 48, Significant Natural Areas, has sat at the back of DP Chapter 12, Landscape and Ecology, for at least ten years within a 16 year old district plan. The lack of progress on PC 48 has been questioned repeatedly by the public. Reasons for this delay have been varied ranging from ‘It’s just too hard,’ to ‘We are currently short staffed,’ to ‘We don’t want to make the same mistake Lower Hutt made.’ This is clearly a fail for UHCC. There will be reasons for this deliberate delay and they are most likely political rather than administrative.

Mangaroa Peatland (Waipango Swamp)

The Mangaroa Peatland is a unique geomorphological structure in the Wellington region and its peat type is also unique among remaining peatlands in New Zealand.

As it stands today, the Mangaroa Peatland has been degraded through human activity. Most natural vegetation except manuka has been removed and the bog drained however the swamp remains an important geomorphological feature – a large valley peatland – which is rare regionally and also in all of the North Island.

There is a threat to the role of the Mangaroa Peatland as a hydrological buffer. Increased intensity of draining and land use on peat soils may increase the flooding risk from Black Creek and the Mangaroa River as well as excessive nitrogen release from the peat into local waterways.

In addition, when peatlands are drained they tend to release significant levels of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. Conversely re-wetted and restored peatlands are amazing carbon sinks that can store four times the amount of carbon as a forest of similar size.

As the city's largest SNA the Mangaroa Peatland merits immediate protection and restoration. I would like assurance that Plan Change 48 will ensure this protection and that this plan change will inform and precede Plan Change 50.

International - National – Regional Plans, Policies, Strategies

The UHCC District Plan was never intended to be the sole document against which local land use decisions are made. For some reason though, our 16 year old DP has functioned as Upper Hutt's land use 'Bible', in the words of ex-UHCC planner Derek Vos. This needs to change.

Our Council must incorporate relevant aspects of these international, national, regional and local strategies, plans, policies and agreements into Plan Change 50:

- Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019
- Waste Minimisation Act 2008
- Resource Management Act 1991 (under review)
- Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington region 2013 (GWRC)
 - Includes interim assessment framework during DP reviews
- National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014
- Proposed National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land
- Draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2019
- Proposed National Resources Plan 2019
- New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy 2020
- UHCC draft Sustainability Strategy 2020
- United Nations Sustainable Development Goals 2015
- Te Tiriti o Waitangi 1840

This list of relevant documents must be consulted and applied by land owners, developers, engineers and UHCC planners when assessing applications for development in our city. They should be especially visible in the District Plan.

It's not good enough to have to wait for a strategy, policy or plan at a higher level to be 'triggered' by a local land use application. We know that land owners and their consultants and engineers are very good at finding ways around the rules. Let's be more pro-active and clearly lay out all the rules for land use at all levels.

Biodiversity Restoration Plan

Another way to think of Biodiversity is to think of it as 'Environmental Infrastructure'. Like 'Human Built Infrastructure' it provides services - ecosystem services, essential to all life on the planet. These include fresh air, clean water, productive soil, abundant flora, and thriving fauna.

Similar to 'Human Built Infrastructure', 'Environmental Infrastructure' needs management and maintenance but most importantly nowadays it needs protection and restoration. PC50 needs to reflect this in criteria for making land use decisions.

An Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) is required for most applications for land use consents. The AEE relies on a very broad definition of 'environment' and not just the natural environment. An AEE involves listing the positive and adverse environmental effects of a proposed project and seeks to limit environmental effects to 'not more than minor.'

The idea of the AEE is to not cause further damage the environment which may, in fact already be seriously damaged.

Given the dire state of New Zealand's Biodiversity I propose that a Biodiversity Restoration Plan should accompany all land use applications, especially for rural areas. This would mean that the developer would have to have in place a plan to restore and improve biodiversity on the site of the proposed development. For example, this could involve leaving ecological features in place and working around them instead of through them, native tree planting, riparian planting, and green belt connections. A Biodiversity Restoration Plan would differ from a Landscape Plan in that it would be aimed at supporting and restoring native biodiversity.

Through our land use decisions we need to have the tools to leave the environment in better not worse condition.

Land Use Strategy 2016

This is a document to be respected. It was widely consulted publicly, initially through the Rural Strategy consultation and later combined with the Urban Growth Strategy.

Of particular importance are pages 49, 'Desired environmental outcomes' and 72, 'Delivering good quality housing'.

What the Upper Hutt community has indicated is that they seek to

- keep the country in the country and the city in the city;
- protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity;
- develop a compact and sustainable central city;
- utilise and improve existing urban infrastructure and transport facilities;
- achieve well designed high density urban intensification;
- provide an abundant supply of quality and affordable housing;
- incentivise the building of healthy and environmentally efficient homes.

No rural zone changes, no structure plans in the district plan

The current zoning controls for rural land are working. They protect the rural areas from over development and provide some environmental protection for these vulnerable areas.

It is important to maintain a healthy mix of property types for future generations.

While an older couple may wish to subdivide their one hectare lifestyle block into smaller sections for financial reasons, this must not be allowed. The older couple can sell and move to a smaller property but a younger couple seeking a larger lifestyle property may be out of luck if intense subdivision becomes widespread in our rural areas.

Property speculation from subdivision for pure financial gain is a reality, but strong and consistent rural zoning rules can control this.

Common sense

Good old common sense is quite useful when considering land use and/or abuse decisions. We can't toxify the waterways upstream through over development and over use of agricultural inputs and expect the river to be pristine downstream. We can't ditch, drain and top dress a wetland and expect the endemic species to thrive. We can't remove extensive sections of forest and expect the land to stay put. We can't expect additional pricey rural lifestyle properties to solve our city's need for compact affordable housing. Commonsense costs nothing but is invaluable.

Rural economy

The rural areas of the city have an important role to play in achieving sustainability and mitigating the future effects of climate change. There exists great potential for the rural areas to contribute to food security, resilience, recreation, and hospitality in the city.

The Land Use Strategy asserts that there are no highly productive Class I soils in the rural areas and only Class II and III which could limit agricultural activities. This is contestable. With the incorporation of regenerative agriculture and sustainable perma-culture practices some rural properties are currently producing abundances of high end organic produce. A well designed and managed 'family farm' is seen as the most sustainable food production unit globally. When I first arrived in Upper Hutt, and New Zealand in general, I was amazed by the traditional 'Kiwi Quarter Acre Section' with a back section veggie patch. Let's bring recycle this tradition!

Given some organization and encouragement, local growers could supplement local food choices and increase food security for the city.

Perhaps there is a role for UHCC Community Services to encourage local food security projects.

Rural Hub- The start of a Whitemans Valley 'settlement'

As part of building the rural community there is a proposal to establish a Rural Hub on UHCC Reserve Land on Whiteman's Valley Road. Work on this project was begun in 2015 with several community meetings to build a working group and business case study. The aim has been to build a multi-purpose community centre with a commercial kitchen to comply with the Food Act and enable the production and sale of produce and food products from the rural areas. This would boost the rural economy.

There is an absence of any developed rural recreation space or public services in most rural areas of the city. While there has been substantial Council investment in the inner city parks there has been no investment in a rural park in the upper valleys. The Whitemans Valley Reserve is a good place for a public rural park.

The rural park would include a large shelter roof for solar energy generation and

water collection over a platform with composting public toilets and a car park. The covered space would provide a multi-purpose area that could be used to stage recreational events like cycling and car rallies. It could be a venue for local growers to create a Farmers' Market or simply a place for locals and visitors to stop, rest, picnic and use the public toilets. This would mark a modest beginning for the Rural Hub but would provide much needed permanent services in the area for locals and visitors.

Maymorn

'A strong interest in rural lifestyle living options' does not equate to creating urban sprawl in a rural setting. This fact was unanimously established through the Maymorn Structure Plan process and should continue to guide city planning. Maymorn is best placed to respond to the demand for additional lifestyle properties and should be considered **only** in this context.

I do not support the suggestion to 'add on' sections to the back of the northern side of Maclaren Street sections. This would infringe upon some of the most productive land in the upper valley. This should be reserved for lifestyle blocks.

Gabite's block

I am opposed to any suggestion of suburban density (400 m²) housing on the Gabite's block in Maymorn. Smaller lifestyle blocks on this land which are compatible with neighboring developments such as Maymorn Waters and with the rural environment are appropriate. A much denser development would destroy this compatibility and would set the precedent for urban incursion into the rural areas. To preserve the rural character of this urban/rural transitional area a combination of sections no smaller than ½ acre and up to one hectare would be appropriate.

The possibility soil and water table toxicity for this site must be considered.

Guildford

Tensions are high in this area and all care must be taken to not over-ride the rights and concerns of the locals. Their well-being is fundamental to the success of development on the land that backs their properties. In other words, any development in any area should be not only environmentally sustainable but also socially sustainable.

Any land use decisions and future development must achieve hydraulic neutrality.

The Memorandum of Understanding to do a land swap, publicly owned Silverstream Spur for densely wooded steep Pinehaven land, must be disregarded and abandoned. This was a gentlemen's agreement between three men and was not publicly consulted. The community must be consulted on land use decisions of this importance especially when dealing with council owned land.

Multi-generational living in rural areas

I'm pleased that Council is taking a new look at how people are building and living in the rural areas with an eye toward multi-generational living. This represents a real win for sustainability in terms of environmental, social and economic well-being. This is not a new way to live, rather an old extended family concept of 'Homesteading' that is worth recycling in the district plan.

While multi-generational living does not involve re-zoning or subdivision it does require some relaxation on the number and kind of dwellings per rural block.

I would like Council to re-visit the maximum 55 m2 family flat policy for rural areas. The size of a second dwelling for multi-generational living in a rural area should be owner regulated. Serious consideration would have to be given to the design and care of additional septic systems with composting toilets being an option.

Politics and personalities

While the current UHCC leadership is temporary, land use decisions are mainly permanent. The phrase 'When it's gone...it's gone,' comes to mind.

Upper Hutt has a 43 year recent history of two mayors with one going on to be a regional councilor for nine years. It is important to take the current leadership personalities, networks and leadership styles into account during this consultation process. Political interference in land use decision making is inappropriate.

Submission 42



Level 2, Dunvegan House
215 Hastings Street
Napier 4140
New Zealand
T 0800 699 000
www.nzta.govt.nz

Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Reference: 2021-2049

13 April 2022

Upper Hutt City Council
838-842 Fergusson Drive
Upper Hutt 5018

Sent via email: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Dear Sir/ Madam

Submission on Submission on Private Plan Change 55 Gabites Block

Attached is the Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency submission on the notified private plan change application made by Maymorn Developments Limited relating to the property at 1135 Maymorn Road, Maymorn legally known as Part Section 299 Hutt District and Lot 2 DP 356697.

We welcome the opportunity to discuss the contents of our submission with the council and the applicant as required.

If you have any questions, please contact me on 06 986 4596.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Connie Mills', is written in a cursive style.

Connie Mills
Planner – Poutiaki Taiao / Environmental Planning
System Design, Transport Services

FORM 5 PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 6 OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

Submission on Plan Change 55 Gabites Block –1135 Maymorn Road, Maymorn – Maymorn Developments Limited

To: Upper Hutt City Council
Level 1 Reception
Civic Administration Building
838-842 Fergusson Drive
Upper Hutt

Via email: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

From: Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency
Private Bay 11777
Palmerston North 4442

1. This is a submission on an application from Maymorn Developments Limited for:

Private Plan Change 55 (PPC55) proposes the rezone of 74.5 hectares of land at 1135 Maymorn Road, known as 'Gabites Block', from its current Rural Hill and Rural Valley zoning to Settlement Zone. The PPC55 will facilitate an additional housing capacity of 170 – 200 residential units.

2. Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi) could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

3. Role of Waka Kotahi

Waka Kotahi is a Crown entity with its functions, powers and responsibilities set out in the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA) and the Government Rounding Powers Act 1989. The primary objective of Waka Kotahi under Section 94 of the LTMA is to contribute to an effective, efficient, and safe land transport system in the public interest.

An integrated approach to transport planning, funding and delivery is taken by Waka Kotahi. This includes investment in public transport, walking and cycling, local roads and the construction and operation of state highways.

Waka Kotahi must carry out its functions in a way that delivers the transport outcomes set by the Government which are provided in the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021/22-2030/31 (GPS).

Waka Kotahi must give effect to the strategic outcomes set by the Government through the GPS. This sets out four strategic priorities, which are relevant to this plan change:

- **Safety:** Developing a transport system where no one is killed or seriously injured.
- **Better Travel Options:** Providing people with better transport options to access social and economic opportunities.
- **Climate Change:** Developing a low carbon transport system that supports emissions reductions, while improving safety and inclusive access.

To deliver on the outcomes set by the GPS, Waka Kotahi have developed several strategies. A summary below is provided of those strategies relevant to this plan change; Arataki and Toitū Te Taiao.

- Arataki¹ is Waka Kotahi ten-year view on the step changes and actions needed to deliver long-term outcomes for the land transport system. It includes a national view as well as a regional view for the Greater Wellington Region. The matters applicable to Upper Hutt include:
 - Future residential growth will be supported in areas where there is access to multiple transport options to reduce reliance on private vehicles.
 - An ongoing safety focus is needed on the greater Wellington region to address high-risk rural roads, vulnerable users, motorcyclists and speeding.
- Toitū Te Taiao² is Waka Kotahi sustainability action plan. This seeks to address the strategic challenges of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving public health. This strategy identifies an “Avoid Shift Improve” framework which includes:
 - **Avoid:** reducing the need to travel and/or the time or distance travelled by car, while improving or maintaining accessibility,
 - **Shift:** changing how we move e.g., shifting from cars to lower-emission types of travel (e.g., public transport, cycling and walking)
 - **Improve:** improving the emissions efficiency and the use of low-carbon fuels

The Ministry of Transport (MOT) has issued its ‘Outcomes Framework’ to define the long-term strategic outcomes for New Zealand’s transport system and explain how government and the transport sector should work together toward these outcomes.

The MOT Framework describes the following five long-term outcomes for the transport system:

- a) Inclusive Access
- b) Economic Prosperity
- c) Resilience and Security
- d) Environmental Sustainability
- e) Healthy and safe people

4. State highway environment and context

State Highway 2 (‘SH2’) in this location is identified as a Regional (State Highway) Road under the Waka Kotahi One Network Classification³, with an estimated Annual Average Daily Traffic count of 6,583 (6% heavy vehicles). SH2 is one of the two main routes in the Wellington region that connect Wellington City to the lower north island and provides a connection to the Wellington Port. SH2 is also a Limited Access Road in this location and has a posted speed limit of 80km/hr.

Cyclists commute from the Hutt Valley to Wellington utilising SH2 and local roads. The 2018 Corridor Management Plan⁴ identifies that cycling infrastructure could be better integrated along SH2 in general and existing Park and Ride facilities for the train stations are at capacity.

The specific parts of the application that this submission relates to are:

Waka Kotahi supports the application in part, but as per pre-notification engagement is seeking

- a) better provision of; and
- b) certainty of construction timing for multi-modal travel connections.

5. The submission of Waka Kotahi is:

¹ <https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/planning-and-investment/arataki/docs/regional-summary-wellington-august-2020.pdf>

² <https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/resources/toitu-te-taiao-our-sustainability-action-plan/sustainability-action-plan-april-2020.pdf>

³ <https://nzta.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=95fad5204ad243c39d84c37701f614b0>

- (i) In general, Waka Kotahi supports planned land use development in appropriate areas integrated with key infrastructure such as transportation. This should occur in a manner which does not compromise the effectiveness, efficiency, resilience, connectivity and safety of the transport network.
- (ii) The Integrated Transport Assessment ('ITA') and additional SIDRA outputs provided by the applicant via email on 25 November 2021 gives Waka Kotahi assurance that traffic generated by the PPC55 will not adversely affect the safe function of the SH2 Plateau Road intersection. However, Waka Kotahi is of the position that the proposed plan change does not go far enough to provide sufficient connectivity for non-vehicular modes of transport for Waka Kotahi to support this plan change entirely.

Onsite Transport Network

- (iii) Waka Kotahi supports the proposed internal traffic functioning as described in Section 10.0 of the ITA provided that a sealed footpath is constructed on at least one side of the internal road network as the footpath will provide for better connections to the wider transport network and will encourage multi-modal travel onsite. It is noted that footpaths have not been shown on the Structure Plan prepared by Envelope [referenced 1594-01 PC-01 dated 24 Feb 2022] so this certainty of footpath provision is requested.

Shared User Path

- (iv) Waka Kotahi commends the applicant on their proposal to vest a portion of the subject site adjacent to Maymorn Road with the local roading network for the purpose of a Shared User Path ('SUP'). As stated in the pre-notification discussions held with the applicant, Waka Kotahi seeks that sufficient land is vested to enable a SUP of no less than 2.5m width based on Austroads 'Cycling Aspects of Austroads Guides (2017)' Figure 7.2. This standard / width is sought on the assumption that less than approximately 50 pedestrians will typically be using the path during peak hours.

Rail Station Connections

- (v) Waka Kotahi notes that the location of the site for PPC55 within 200m the Maymorn Train Station is an appealing characteristic of the proposal for housing development and an opportunity to enable and encourage use of alternate transport modes. It is currently difficult to access from the proposed development by foot because there is no safe crossing location nor formalised route to the platform.
- (vi) Waka Kotahi seeks that a connection from the SUP is made to the Maymorn Train Station passenger platform and a safe road crossing installed. Including this connection will better enable active mode and public transport links that provide legitimate transport choice for all people. Integration with existing networks, and the required infrastructure improvements will contribute to the Toitū Te Taiao framework identified in Section 3 of this submission.

Timing of SUP and Rail Station Connection Installation

- (vii) Waka Kotahi seeks that the SUP and safe road crossings are constructed prior to undertaking any onsite development works to ensure that the subject site is well connected prior to households establishing daily routines within the development site.

6. Waka Kotahi seeks the following decision from the consent authority:

- (i) Waka Kotahi seeks that, at a minimum, a single sided sealed footpath is installed within the road corridor throughout the site to facilitate internal site circulation.
- (ii) Waka Kotahi seeks that the SUP along the roadside boundary of Maymorn Road is constructed to a clear path width of no less than 2.5m based on Austroads 'Cycling Aspects of Austroads Guides (2017)' Figure 7.2, assuming less than approximately 50 pedestrians will typically be using the path during peak hours prior to onsite works commencing on the subject site.
- (iii) Waka Kotahi seeks that the applicant constructs a SUP connection including a safe road crossing to the passenger platform of the Maymorn Train Station.

7. Waka Kotahi does wish to be heard in support of this submission.
8. If others make a similar submission, Waka Kotahi will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
9. Waka Kotahi is willing to work with the applicant in advance of a hearing.

Signature:



Caitlin Kelly
Principal Planner – Poutiaki Taiao / Environmental Planning
System Design, Transport Services
Pursuant to an authority delegated by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

Date 13 April 2022

Address for service: Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency
Private Bay 11777
Palmerston North 4442

Contact Person: Connie Mills
Telephone Number: 06 986 4596
E-mail: Connie.Mills@nzta.govt.nz.
Alternate Email: EnvironmentalPlanning@nzta.govt.nz

Submission 43

Arbor253 just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Paul Baker

Postal address of submitter

253 Whirinaki Road, RD2, Napier

Acting agent for submitter (if applicable)

I make my own submission as a landowner in Akatarawa Valley.

Address for service (if different from above)

253 Whirinaki Road RD2

Contact telephone

+6421818191

Contact email

ashmar@xtra.co.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

My concern with this proposal for a Private Plan Change is as follows: 1) The land in question appears owned by the developers (Maymorn Developments Limited. Chaofeng YANG) for at least a year prior to making this request. The change in designation from "Rural Hill and Rural Valley" to "Settlement Zone" should be made at the time the District

Plan is available for wider consultation, so that others with land in a similar situation have the opportunity to put their proposals forward and not simply have an opportunistic single developer put his proposals forward. This is not a small land development, the 74.5 ha would provide many homes. The 14.6 ha of relatively flat land should be kept for agricultural purposes. 2) The data supplied by Mr Yang's consultants is misleading I feel because one report (Soil and Land Use Capability...) showed a lot of disturbance (Pg 17) on the Valley Flats on the Heretaunga Stoney Silt Loam (LUC3s2) where it is proposed (Private Plan Change Request Report of 54 pages) on page 50- 51 to have 400 m2 lots in the Northwest, 2000 m2 lots on the Valley Flats and 1000 m2 lots on the Station Flats. These sites on the Heretaunga Stoney Silt Loam would support agriculture; grow grass for sheep and cattle, grow some crops etc on the "rural valley" sites at least. The land should not be squandered by intensive and extensive housing sub-divisional development. 3) The forest on the Kaitoke Hill Soil (LUC 6s1) in the low lying hills was described in part as "wilding pines" in some of the supplied literature. The site was a plantation under John Gabities forest management and was harvested, with some of it replanted. A small part looks to have wilding seedlings which no doubt arose from the first crop. My contention is that the negative connotations of wilding pines are magnified to make the "Private Plan Change" more appealing. This misinformation should not be allowed to sway the proposal to finality. 4) The steeper hill country (Kaitoke Hill Soil) is proposed to have 1 - 2.5 ha lots formed with the hilltop basin having 1000 m2 lots. Fire is a concern at this site as the homes would have limited access on "no exit roads", amongst high available fuel loads and no doubt have limited water on hand to deal with a wild fire should one arise. Gorse is present throughout the site as seed, if not in the bushy state. Gorse will burn very well even in light drizzle and more so in warm summer windy conditions. Radiata pine will burn well also under certain conditions. Better thought needs to be given for "fire control measures" at this site. I can vouch for rapid fire spread and gorse regrowth as I burnt the adjoining land off as OIC prior to replanting on Wellington Regional Council lands over 30 years ago.

My submission is that:

The Private Plan Change Request for Gabities Block, Maymorn Upper Hutt by Maymorn Developments Limited be declined on the basis of points 1 - 4 above and contained in Section 9 of this submission. The Private Plan Change Request is opposed on the basis of points made in Section 9 of this submission.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

Decline the Private Plan Change Request for Gabities Block, Maymorn Upper Hutt submitted by Maymorn Developments Limited in its entirety.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 44

Puppypower just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Lesley Francis (on behalf of 4 households)

Postal address of submitter

1164, Maymorn Road, Maymorn Road, Maymorn Road Maymorn Road

Address for service (if different from above)

1164, Maymorn Road, Maymorn Road, Maymorn Road Maymorn Road

Contact telephone

+64274478517

Contact email

lesley.francis@ngahuiagroup.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and
does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

This application is a joint application from Lesley Francis & Georgios Ziogas (1164 Maymorn Road) Kate McCaffrey & Mitchel Markov (1160 Maymorn Road) Lianne & Ivan Markov (1162 Maymorn Road) Monique & Mark Wilson (1158 Maymorn Road) We oppose the proposed subdivision for the below reasons We disagree with the allotment sizes proposed. We brought in Maymorn to have a semi-rural lifestyle. The changes proposed personally impact our lives and the reason why we chose to live in Maymorn. The minimum allotment size in our view should be 2000sqm. With the proposed housing

development - this will mean in excess of 250 homes. The current rail & road will need to be upgraded. This will mean an additional 500 cars (at least) on this road, footpaths, street lighting, cycle ways and parking (for the train station) and increased train services will need to be considered. Again, the increased light pollution directly impacts us all personally as we currently enjoy no street lights with beautiful clear night skies. Furthermore, one of the entrances to the proposed housing development is directly opposite our driveway. This will mean a constant flow of car headlights directly up our driveway and into our homes, again, personally impacting the peaceful lifestyle that we enjoy here in Maymorn. The proposed changes are going to have a negative impact on the environment. The birds and wildlife that call Maymorn home will dramatically change with the increased housing. Not just with the physical housing build, but the additional light pollution, noise pollution and also all the additional services that are required with a housing build of this size. There will be 250+ wheely bins, 250+ houses with storm water run-off, sewerage pipes etc etc. The current services to Maymorn road will require a HUGE upgrade. Mains water, storm water, sewerage, internet coverage is poor as is cellular coverage all need to be considered. How will this impact us as rate payers? The last topic we would like to raise is the schooling plans that support the subdivision. The current school; Plateau school is a small school which is part of its appeal for the community. The size of the school is of significant appeal to the community in that it provides quality education. The traffic situation of this school is already challenged and has staggered finishing times to account for the number of cars for the current number of students. What is the plan to the schooling situation for the increased population and additional traffic to support the new subdivision? The current subdivision plan does not appear to have answered all the areas that we believe need to be considered. The areas that we have identified are our main areas of concern, but we would welcome the opportunity to hear more about the plans and answers to the queries we have raised. We are 4 of the residents (families) that are directly and immediately impacted by this proposed subdivision (in that one of the proposed entrances is directly opposite our driveway) Our driveway currently houses 1158/1160/1162 & 1164 Maymorn Road. We all chose to reside in Maymorn because of the semi-rural lifestyle, beautiful landscape whilst only being 10-15 minutes from Upper Hutt CBD. We urge you to reconsider the proposed subdivision and to leave Maymorn as a Semi rural suburb and NOT a high-density housing location. Thank you for reading our submission and we look forward to hearing from you. Regards Lesley Francis-Ziogas & Georgios Ziogas Kate McCaffrey & Mitchel Markov Lianne & Ivan Markov Monique & Mark Wilson

My submission is that:

This application is a joint application from Lesley Francis & Georgios Ziogas (1164 Maymorn Road) Kate McCaffrey & Mitchel Markov (1160 Maymorn Road) Lianne & Ivan Markov (1162 Maymorn Road) Monique & Mark Wilson (1158 Maymorn Road) We oppose the proposed subdivision for the below reasons We disagree with the allotment sizes proposed. We brought in Maymorn to have a semi-rural lifestyle. The changes proposed personally impact our lives and the reason why we chose to live in Maymorn. The minimum allotment size in our view should be 2000sqm. With the proposed housing development - this will mean in excess of 250 homes. The current rail & road will need to be upgraded. This will mean an additional 500 cars (at least) on this road, footpaths, street lighting, cycle ways and parking (for the train station) and increased train services will need to be considered. Again, the increased light pollution directly impacts us all personally as we currently enjoy no street lights with beautiful clear night skies. Furthermore, one of the entrances to the proposed housing development is directly opposite our driveway. This will mean a constant flow of car headlights directly up our driveway and into our homes, again, personally impacting the peaceful lifestyle that we

enjoy here in Maymorn. The proposed changes are going to have a negative impact on the environment. The birds and wildlife that call Maymorn home will dramatically change with the increased housing. Not just with the physical housing build, but the additional light pollution, noise pollution and also all the additional services that are required with a housing build of this size. There will be 250+ wheely bins, 250+ houses with storm water run-off, sewerage pipes etc etc. The current services to Maymorn road will require a HUGE upgrade. Mains water, storm water, sewerage, internet coverage is poor as is cellular coverage all need to be considered. How will this impact us as rate payers? The last topic we would like to raise is the schooling plans that support the subdivision. The current school; Plateau school is a small school which is part of its appeal for the community. The size of the school is of significant appeal to the community in that it provides quality education. The traffic situation of this school is already challenged and has staggered finishing times to account for the number of cars for the current number of students. What is the plan to the schooling situation for the increased population and additional traffic to support the new subdivision? The current subdivision plan does not appear to have answered all the areas that we believe need to be considered. The areas that we have identified are our main areas of concern, but we would welcome the opportunity to hear more about the plans and answers to the queries we have raised. We are 4 of the residents (families) that are directly and immediately impacted by this proposed subdivision (in that one of the proposed entrances is directly opposite our driveway) Our driveway currently houses 1158/1160/1162 & 1164 Maymorn Road. We all chose to reside in Maymorn because of the semi-rural lifestyle, beautiful landscape whilst only being 10-15 minutes from Upper Hutt CBD. We urge you to reconsider the proposed subdivision and to leave Maymorn as a Semi rural suburb and NOT a high-density housing location. Thank you for reading our submission and we look forward to hearing from you. Regards Lesley Francis-Ziogas & Georgios Ziogas Kate McCaffrey & Mitchel Markov Lianne & Ivan Markov Monique & Mark Wilson

I seek the following decision from local authority:

more information requested on the areas we are concerned about

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission

Submission 45

Tony's LTP Feedback 21 just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Tony Chad

Postal address of submitter

165A Katherine Mansfield Drive Whiteman's Valley

Address for service (if different from above)

Katherine Mansfield Drive, Whiteman's Valley

Contact telephone

+6445288968

Contact email

tonygchad@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Please see attached file.

My submission is that:

see later

I seek the following decision from local authority:

see later

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission

If you have additional information to include with your submission, please upload it here:

https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/997450e284fb85672e61926ce18e05b9fc772431/original/1649825702/ab04a6d9f41ded6916418bf2f6f127d2_Submission_-_PC_55_Gabites_Block.doc?1649825702

Upper Hutt City Council
Private Bag 907
UPPER HUTT 5140

Tony Chad
165A Katherine Mansfield Drive
Whiteman's Valley
UPPER HUTT 5371
tonygchad@gmail.com
04 528 8968

13 April 2022

Private Plan Change 55 – Gabites Block

Below is my submission to the Upper Hutt City Council in relation to this consultation.
I wish to be heard in support of this submission.

General Comments

There are many documents attached to this plan change request and much reading. I will be better placed to comment when presenting in person. Hopefully this will be the case now we are moving to Traffic Light Orange.

At first reading it appears that this is a messy, contradictory, confusing collection of documents that is not yet ready for consideration. It also appears to be another effort to “urbanise” the rural area as was previously attempted under the Maymorn Structure Plan. This is not appropriate and should be declined.

This proposal is not Low Density. It has lot sizes down to 400 square metres. In the context of the Rural Zone, it is High Density.

This developer does not have a good reputation in the rural area. When he seeks to make amendments to existing protections to indigenous vegetation at Amendments 8 and 9 then we should be worried!

All the relevant issues regarding development in this area were covered in depth in PC 50. The rural section of that needs to be put out to public submission and adopted before this private plan is considered.

I look forward to being heard further down the track.

Regards

Tony Chad

My initial reaction to this private plan change is 'why is this happening?' My second reaction is 'what a mess'.

As late as 1 March 2022 the developer has had to make significant amendments in light of information provided that should have been included in the original private plan change. I'm no sure the public will be able to find and digest this fact.

The planner obviously did a liberal cut and paste exercise with letterhead revealing that Kapiti Coast District Plan was the source for their thinking for our city. Borrowing good ideas is fine but presenting them under the banner of another council is unprofessional and does not instill confidence in the integrity of the proposed plan change.

A series of emails also reveal the haste and uncertainty around this work. 22 December 2021:

"Hi Drew I am sorry for the delay in sending this through. It has been manic. (James Beban)" Not a good look. *"Hi James, For your reference - As earlier indicated, I can indicate general support for the Gabites Block private plan change. (Rachael Annan Senior Landscape Planner-Asight consulting).*

It is presumptuous to assume there is general support for a private plan change in this sensitive area without have presented the plan to the public. From the social media responses throughout the city the opposite impression is evident.

This work has been presented with several factual errors and unfounded assumptions. Even after being peer reviewed the original and revised plans have been presented, both of which have been found to be deficient. The inclusion of both versions of the plan could prove confusing to the public.

The Maymorn Structure Plan 2012

Without going into detail, the Gabites Private Plan Change 55 tries unsuccessfully to engender support for the failed MSP. How many times does the community need to state clearly that intensive development and pseudo-urban form is not what is needed nor wanted in this area.

NPS UD

The developer harks to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020 in a way that makes it clear that they have truly missed the mark with regard to the intentions of the NPS.

For Tier 1 cities such as Upper Hutt, the focus is on urban intensification around existing water and transportation infrastructure. The aim is to create 'walkable cities' by subdividing and building up to 3 to 6 stories thus using land already invested in housing.

This developer aims to urbanise the rural area by stealth. Referencing the NPS UD incorrectly simply exposes the ignorance of the developer and unwillingness to work within the agreed limits to growth outside of urban areas. Gabites is located within the rural zone and should be developed with this in mind.

PC 50 – no reticulated connections

I was a member of the PC50 Rural Focus Group. This group spent two years

discussing and fine tuning the changes to this chapter of the District Plan. The consultation within the group was robust and the Maymorn area was a focus of more than one meeting.

Consensus was reached around a good model for zoning in the Gabites area that included a settlement zone with sections down to a minimum of 2000 m². This was put to the community in extensive pre-consultation sessions and again there was general agreement around the zoning changes included in the draft plan change.

Unfortunately the RMA bombshell changes stalled the notification and final consultation for PC50. Though the rural chapters were largely complete and ready for consultation, the residential chapters were affected by the RMA changes so the entire plan change has been held up.

It is prudent and professional to see the PC50 consultation through its public notification and submission process as soon as possible. This must certainly be done before any additional plan change for that area is considered.

It is my opinion that PC 55 is unnecessary and is an attempt to undermine the intentions of PC50.

NPS IB

In addition to seeing the PC 50 process to completion, it would be prudent to hold back on any further plan changes for that area until the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity has been finalized.

No doubt the NPS IB will shed further light on environmentally sensitive issue within the Gabites area. These will need to be taken into consideration when making zoning land use decisions.

PC48

In addition to seeing the PC50 and NPS IB finalized it is also prudent to complete the drafting and consultation around the PC48 Ecology and Landscape. With significant areas of SNA's on the doorstep of the proposed private plan change there will be repercussions for the zoning and land use decisions in that area.

Essentially it is a time for councils to reconsider their decisions around land use with reference to a large number of policies at national, regional and local government levels. It is good practice to await the finalization of these policies before challenging them with a private plan change that deviates considerable from the intention of these emerging policies.

Environmental issues

There will be additional environmental considerations to include in the future development of the Gabites area that are not mentioned in the private plan change 55.

For example, though some information around the number of cars and vehicle movements are suggested, no information is presented around the impact of the additional numbers of domestic animals that will be introduced in that area.

The Gabites block aligns with the boundary of Pakuratahi Regional Park. Within this regional treasure volunteers have set up an intensive trapping project to reduce the number of predators threatening native bird, reptile and insect populations. This area may also be home to the only native mammal species in New Zealand, bats.

My first concern is that not enough work and research has been done to understand the habitats of these species and how intensive residential building will affect them.

Secondly, it can be anticipated that 200+ additional dwellings in that area will generate an equal number of apex predator species (cats predominantly). Domestic cats can and do create colonies of feral cats. UHCC does not currently have a Cat Policy to align with its Dog Policy. Uncontrolled cat ownership can signify the destruction of large numbers of indigenous species. This must be considered for all new subdivisions but especially for those that interface with regional parks and protected areas.

Conclusion

It is my opinion that PC55 must be denied.

It is my opinion that the above mentioned pending plans and policy changes must be finalized and put into practice as soon as possible.

I wish to be heard.

It is unfortunate that the current Covid19 situation has interrupted this consultation. The inability to take the consultation to the people of Upper Hutt for face to face discussion may affect the quantity and quality of submissions. However we have been assured that this is one of several future opportunities for the community to feed into this plan change.

This is an excellent and honest work that clearly identifies the local land use issues and options for public discussion. This is reassuring and is appreciated.

I particularly support these leading comments:

“To grow smarter, we’ll need to grow differently.”

“...enable the right types of housing growth in the right places.”

Upper Hutt’s growth in recent decades has been a story of largely ‘greenfield’ developments in the central river valley and more recently infringing on rural areas. This style of development has been relatively quick, easy and profitable for developers, especially with the lack of environmental controls at that time. While this may have seemed appropriate then, hindsight has taught us about the sacrifices the

city has made in terms of resulting pressures on water quality and supply, loss of highly productive soils, and loss of indigenous biodiversity and amenity values.

As stated above, we need to grow differently...we know better now.

It feels like this consultation plays 'Devil's Advocate' with the Land Use Strategy 2016. It challenges the community to re-confirm their already stated loyalty to protecting rural land and wilderness areas over allowing short term profit for developers from poor land use decisions in these areas.

Community focus groups

As a member of the PC 50 Rural Focus Group I can see how this group's collective input has been valued and included in the consultation material.

Though it was a good move to tap into local rural land owners' experiences it is important to understand that their feedback is just a historical snap shot of current land owners' opinions.

I appreciate the admission that the focus group conclusions may not "accurately reflect their understanding of the environment." Sadly, a lack of awareness and understanding of the environment is a common characteristic of much of the Upper Hutt community. It is hoped that the draft Sustainability Strategy consultation will serve to increase local environmental awareness and understanding.

Plan Change 48 - Significant Natural Areas

There is a serious issue with the sequencing of the current plan change reviews.

Completion of Plan Change 48 logically needs to precede any land use decisions in Plan Change 50. I understand that the intention is that it will but this must be enforced.

The groundwork for PC 48, Significant Natural Areas, has sat at the back of DP Chapter 12, Landscape and Ecology, for at least ten years within a 16 year old district plan. The lack of progress on PC 48 has been questioned repeatedly by the public. Reasons for this delay have been varied ranging from 'It's just too hard,' to 'We are currently short staffed,' to 'We don't want to make the same mistake Lower Hutt made.' This is clearly a fail for UHCC. There will be reasons for this deliberate delay and they are most likely political rather than administrative.

Mangaroa Peatland (Waipango Swamp)

The Mangaroa Peatland is a unique geomorphological structure in the Wellington region and its peat type is also unique among remaining peatlands in New Zealand.

As it stands today, the Mangaroa Peatland has been degraded through human activity. Most natural vegetation except manuka has been removed and the bog drained however the swamp remains an important geomorphological feature – a large valley peatland – which is rare regionally and also in all of the North Island.

There is a threat to the role of the Mangaroa Peatland as a hydrological buffer. Increased intensity of draining and land use on peat soils may increase the flooding risk from Black Creek and the Mangaroa River as well as excessive nitrogen release from the peat into local waterways.

In addition, when peatlands are drained they tend to release significant levels of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. Conversely re-wetted and restored peatlands are amazing carbon sinks that can store four times the amount of carbon as a forest of similar size.

As the city's largest SNA the Mangaroa Peatland merits immediate protection and restoration. I would like assurance that Plan Change 48 will ensure this protection and that this plan change will inform and precede Plan Change 50.

International - National – Regional Plans, Policies, Strategies

The UHCC District Plan was never intended to be the sole document against which local land use decisions are made. For some reason though, our 16 year old DP has functioned as Upper Hutt's land use 'Bible', in the words of ex-UHCC planner Derek Vos. This needs to change.

Our Council must incorporate relevant aspects of these international, national, regional and local strategies, plans, policies and agreements into Plan Change 50:

- Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019
- Waste Minimisation Act 2008
- Resource Management Act 1991 (under review)
- Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington region 2013 (GWRC)
 - Includes interim assessment framework during DP reviews
- National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014
- Proposed National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land
- Draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2019
- Proposed National Resources Plan 2019
- New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy 2020
- UHCC draft Sustainability Strategy 2020
- United Nations Sustainable Development Goals 2015
- Te Tiriti o Waitangi 1840

This list of relevant documents must be consulted and applied by land owners, developers, engineers and UHCC planners when assessing applications for development in our city. They should be especially visible in the District Plan.

It's not good enough to have to wait for a strategy, policy or plan at a higher level to be 'triggered' by a local land use application. We know that land owners and their consultants and engineers are very good at finding ways around the rules. Let's be more pro-active and clearly lay out all the rules for land use at all levels.

Biodiversity Restoration Plan

Another way to think of Biodiversity is to think of it as 'Environmental Infrastructure'. Like 'Human Built Infrastructure' it provides services - ecosystem services, essential to all life on the planet. These include fresh air, clean water, productive soil, abundant flora, and thriving fauna.

Similar to 'Human Built Infrastructure', Environmental Infrastructure' needs management and maintenance but most importantly nowadays it needs protection and restoration. PC50 needs to reflect this in criteria for making land use decisions.

An Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) is required for most applications for land use consents. The AEE relies on a very broad definition of 'environment' and not just the natural environment. An AEE involves listing the positive and adverse environmental effects of a proposed project and seeks to limit environmental effects to 'not more than minor.'

The idea of the AEE is to not cause further damage the environment which may, in fact already be seriously damaged.

Given the dire state of New Zealand's Biodiversity I propose that a Biodiversity Restoration Plan should accompany all land use applications, especially for rural areas. This would mean that the developer would have to have in place a plan to restore and improve biodiversity on the site of the proposed development. For example, this could involve leaving ecological features in place and working around them instead of through them, native tree planting, riparian planting, and green belt connections. A Biodiversity Restoration Plan would differ from a Landscape Plan in that it would be aimed at supporting and restoring native biodiversity.

Through our land use decisions we need to have the tools to leave the environment in better not worse condition.

Land Use Strategy 2016

This is a document to be respected. It was widely consulted publicly, initially through the Rural Strategy consultation and later combined with the Urban Growth Strategy.

Of particular importance are pages 49, 'Desired environmental outcomes' and 72, 'Delivering good quality housing'.

What the Upper Hutt community has indicated is that they seek to

- keep the country in the country and the city in the city;
- protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity;
- develop a compact and sustainable central city;
- utilise and improve existing urban infrastructure and transport facilities;
- achieve well designed high density urban intensification;
- provide an abundant supply of quality and affordable housing;
- incentivise the building of healthy and environmentally efficient homes.

No rural zone changes, no structure plans in the district plan

The current zoning controls for rural land are working. They protect the rural areas from over development and provide some environmental protection for these vulnerable areas.

It is important to maintain a healthy mix of property types for future generations. While an older couple may wish to subdivide their one hectare lifestyle block into smaller sections for financial reasons, this must not be allowed. The older couple can sell and move to a smaller property but a younger couple seeking a larger lifestyle property may be out of luck if intense subdivision becomes widespread in our rural areas.

Property speculation from subdivision for pure financial gain is a reality, but strong and consistent rural zoning rules can control this.

Common sense

Good old common sense is quite useful when considering land use and/or abuse decisions. We can't toxify the waterways upstream through over development and over use of agricultural inputs and expect the river to be pristine downstream. We can't ditch, drain and top dress a wetland and expect the endemic species to thrive. We can't remove extensive sections of forest and expect the land to stay put. We can't expect additional pricey rural lifestyle properties to solve our city's need for compact affordable housing. Commonsense costs nothing but is invaluable.

Rural economy

The rural areas of the city have an important role to play in achieving sustainability and mitigating the future effects of climate change. There exists great potential for the rural areas to contribute to food security, resilience, recreation, and hospitality in the city.

The Land Use Strategy asserts that there are no highly productive Class I soils in the rural areas and only Class II and III which could limit agricultural activities. This is contestable. With the incorporation of regenerative agriculture and sustainable perma-culture practices some rural properties are currently producing abundances of high end organic produce. A well designed and managed 'family farm' is seen as the most sustainable food production unit globally. When I first arrived in Upper Hutt, and New Zealand in general, I was amazed by the traditional 'Kiwi Quarter Acre Section' with a back section veggie patch. Let's bring recycle this tradition!

Given some organization and encouragement, local growers could supplement local food choices and increase food security for the city.

Perhaps there is a role for UHCC Community Services to encourage local food security projects.

Rural Hub- The start of a Whitemans Valley 'settlement'

As part of building the rural community there is a proposal to establish a Rural Hub on UHCC Reserve Land on Whiteman's Valley Road. Work on this project was begun in 2015 with several community meetings to build a working group and business case study. The aim has been to build a multi-purpose community centre with a commercial kitchen to comply with the Food Act and enable the production and sale of produce and food products from the rural areas. This would boost the rural economy.

There is an absence of any developed rural recreation space or public services in most rural areas of the city. While there has been substantial Council investment in the inner city parks there has been no investment in a rural park in the upper valleys. The Whitemans Valley Reserve is a good place for a public rural park.

The rural park would include a large shelter roof for solar energy generation and water collection over a platform with composting public toilets and a car park. The covered space would provide a multi-purpose area that could be used to stage recreational events like cycling and car rallies. It could be a venue for local growers to create a Farmers' Market or simply a place for locals and visitors to stop, rest, picnic and use the public toilets. This would mark a modest beginning for the Rural Hub but would provide much needed permanent services in the area for locals and visitors.

Maymorn

'A strong interest in rural lifestyle living options' does not equate to creating urban sprawl in a rural setting. This fact was unanimously established through the Maymorn Structure Plan process and should continue to guide city planning. Maymorn is best placed to respond to the demand for additional lifestyle properties and should be considered **only** in this context.

I do not support the suggestion to 'add on' sections to the back of the northern side of Maclaren Street sections. This would infringe upon some of the most productive land in the upper valley. This should be reserved for lifestyle blocks.

Gabite's block

I am opposed to any suggestion of suburban density (400 m²) housing on the Gabite's block in Maymorn. Smaller lifestyle blocks on this land which are compatible with neighboring developments such as Maymorn Waters and with the rural environment are appropriate. A much denser development would destroy this compatibility and would set the precedent for urban incursion into the rural areas. To preserve the rural character of this urban/rural transitional area a combination of sections no smaller than ½ acre and up to one hectare would be appropriate.

The possibility soil and water table toxicity for this site must be considered.

Guildford

Tensions are high in this area and all care must be taken to not over-ride the rights and concerns of the locals. Their well-being is fundamental to the success of development on the land that backs their properties. In other words, any development in any area should be not only environmentally sustainable but also socially sustainable.

Any land use decisions and future development must achieve hydraulic neutrality.

The Memorandum of Understanding to do a land swap, publicly owned Silverstream Spur for densely wooded steep Pinehaven land, must be disregarded and abandoned. This was a gentlemen's agreement between three men and was not publicly consulted. The community must be consulted on land use decisions of this importance especially when dealing with council owned land.

Multi-generational living in rural areas

I'm pleased that Council is taking a new look at how people are building and living in the rural areas with an eye toward multi-generational living. This represents a real win for sustainability in terms of environmental, social and economic well-being. This is not a new way to live, rather an old extended family concept of 'Homesteading' that is worth recycling in the district plan.

While multi-generational living does not involve re-zoning or subdivision it does require some relaxation on the number and kind of dwellings per rural block.

I would like Council to re-visit the maximum 55 m² family flat policy for rural areas. The size of a second dwelling for multi-generational living in a rural area should be owner regulated. Serious consideration would have to be given to the design and care of additional septic systems with composting toilets being an option.

Politics and personalities

While the current UHCC leadership is temporary, land use decisions are mainly permanent. The phrase 'When it's gone...it's gone,' comes to mind.

Upper Hutt has a 43 year recent history of two mayors with one going on to be a regional councilor for nine years. It is important to take the current leadership personalities, networks and leadership styles into account during this consultation process. Political interference in land use decision making is inappropriate.

Submission 46

christopher just submitted the survey Submission Form (Form 5) with the responses below.

Name of submitter

Christopher Northmore

Postal address of submitter

1142 Maymorn Rd, Maymorn, Upper Hutt

Contact telephone

021 918 384

Contact email

northmorechris@gmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please choose one)

No

I am (please tick or leave blank) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

adversely affects the environment; and

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Number and intensity of houses

My submission is that:

I oppose the plan change. The proposed number and intensity of houses is excessive and will significantly detract from the rural ambiance and amenity value. I have lived at Maymorn for 24 years. I enjoy the rural environment, which includes open spaces between the houses, wide green spaces and low intensity rural housing and genuine rural out buildings. I am supportive of development, but not development that is significantly more intense than the current plan provides for, and will substantially change the environment and ambiance. In addition to the visual impact there will also be other effects, including the commutative noise that such a substantial number of houses will create - the rural quiet will be replaced with a constant commutative noise. The construction of 200 additional

houses will likely mean constant significant construction activity for ten years - a time frame and intensity significantly higher than development that is provided for within the current plan. The old pig farm site can adequately developed within the current plan rules. There are other places where intensive development is better suited.

I seek the following decision from local authority:

The plan change is declined.

Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission.

I do not wish to make a joint case

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission



OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number

47

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN
Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

NAME OF SUBMITTER BOB ORRIS

POSTAL ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER 1118 MAYMORN ROAD

AGENT ACTING FOR SUBMITTER (IF APPLICABLE) _____

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE) _____

CONTACT TELEPHONE _____ CONTACT EMAIL boborris@hotmail.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please tick one): **yes** / **no**

Only answer this question if you ticked 'yes' above:

I am / am not (tick one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- (a) adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Details of submission

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

My submission is that:

NO DOUBT THIS WILL GO AHEAD IN ONE SHAPE OR FORM, I WOULD JUST LIKE TO MAKE TWO POINTS PLEASE :-

- i) TRANSPORT REPORTS ARE FLAWED - WHEN WAS MAYMORN RD LAST A 100kmh ZONE ???!. A 60m RIGHT HAND TURN LANE FROM PLATEAU RD ONTO SH2 IS STATED - DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE "BICYCLE ISLAND" THAT WILL PREVENT TRAFFIC TURNING LEFT IF MORE THAN 3 CARS WANT TO TURN RIGHT
- ii) I HAVE SEEN LIZARDS ON MY PROPERTY SO LIZARD SURVEY AS PROPOSED IN THE ECOLOGICAL REPORT IS A MUST.

PLEASE STATE IN SUMMARY THE NATURE OF YOUR SUBMISSION. CLEARLY INDICATE WHETHER YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OR WISH TO HAVE AMENDMENTS MADE, GIVING REASONS. PLEASE USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

PLEASE GIVE PRECISE DETAILS AND USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

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.
- I do not 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 wish to make a joint case.
- I do not wish to make a joint case.

Signature and date

Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making submission:

SIGNATURE 

DATE 13/4/22

OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number

48

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

Name of Submitter: Richard Bialy
Postal Address of the Submitter 180A Parkes Line Road, Maymorn
Agent Acting for the submitter (if applicable)
Address for Service (if different from above)
Contact Telephone: 526 9913 / 021 248 3604
Contact Email: lynnrich@xtra.co.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? **No**

Only answer this question if you answered 'yes above' I am/ am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- (a) Adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

Details of Submission:

I am not opposed to development in the Maymorn area, but I am opposed to passing inconsistent zoning decisions which have the huge potential to unfairly impact negatively on a majority of current residents.

For over two years now we have been working on PC50 and all of a sudden that is shelved because we have a developer that wants to put in substantial housing in the Gabities Block area.

Many of the Parkes Line Road residents on the side of the road currently zoned to be subdividable down to no less than 10 acres, have expressed willingness to consider rezoning to allow subdividing to smaller lifestyle blocks for new builds, as already exists on the other side of Parkes Line Road. I cannot understand why Council would be willing to grant a residential development at the end of the road to provide so many new houses, yet repeatedly opt not to agree to rezone that side of Parkes Line Road, which seems a sensible build option. This inconsistency in zoning shows a lack of planning and impact studies.

Council have stated that they must preserve the rural character of this area well that will not happen if the rezoning of Gabities Block is approved.

Council state in documents that the area is productive land. I would challenge this as I understand it was initially zoned this way so that farmers would be eligible for government subsidies. If any land is productive it is the Gabities area. The land in my opinion is not productive with rocks all the way through it. The blocks are also too small to be commercial.

If the Gabities Rezoning goes through the whole character of this area will change. The traffic along Parkes Line Road will become incompatible with current lifestyle. In my opinion the volume of traffic will become dangerous. At the moment sometimes you can wait a while to get over the one way bridge with increased traffic you could be waiting a lot longer.

I do not feel there has been adequate study or acknowledgement of the flow-on effects the proposed Gabites Block development would have on the wider current Maymorn community.

There are plenty of repeated messages from Council and Government around the need for more housing to meet the ever-increasing population that is why the residents of Parkes Line Road should be given the same opportunities as the Gabites Block.

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

That Council delay consideration of the Private Plan change until it is in a position to consider the plan changes under PC50 that have been delayed. This is to ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the

community and avoiding ad hoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider rate payers.

Under the 'Options to Progress the Plan Change' (page 49, Section 32, Report of the proposed Plan Change – Gabites Block) I am of the view that the second option 'Rely on Proposed Plan Change 50' is the correct approach and oppose the stated 'Preferred Option' and challenge the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the PPC55.

I **do** wish to be heard in support of my submission

I **do** wish to also be included in the joint case of the Maymorn Collective written submission



OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number

49

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN
Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 838 – 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019

Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140

Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

NAME OF SUBMITTER

Mr & Mrs John & Margaret Ankeorn

POSTAL ADDRESS OF SUBMITTER

270 A Parkes line Road,
Maymorn, Upper Hutt 5018

AGENT ACTING FOR SUBMITTER (IF APPLICABLE)

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

CONTACT TELEPHONE

04 526 9564

CONTACT EMAIL

mar.jon@ktra.co.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please tick one ☐): yes ☐ / no

Only answer this question if you ticked 'yes' above:

I am / am not (tick one ☐) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- (a) adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Details of submission

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

Our objection on the proposed change on rural community in Maymorn is that if consent is granted the private plan change known as Gabites block at 1135 Maymorn should not be rezoned from general rural and rural production to a newly introduced settlement zone.

USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

My submission is that:

- The reasons for this is that the proposed plan allows for residential units and future development on this site with future construction of residential units. We have concerns that there is no indication of improvement of infrastructure and amenities i.e. footpaths, shops, public transport, phone reception.
- The proposed new public ^{cycle} way connecting to the Pakuratahi Forest (Remutaka Rail Trail) will impact on the existing track continuation :-

PLEASE STATE IN SUMMARY THE NATURE OF YOUR SUBMISSION. CLEARLY INDICATE WHETHER YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OR WISH TO HAVE AMENDMENTS MADE, GIVING REASONS. PLEASE USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

- We request that the proposed changes to zoning at 1135 Maymorn Road Upper Hutt should not be approved.
- If the proposed cycle way is to be created that consideration for other users be considered as equally important.

PLEASE GIVE PRECISE DETAILS AND USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

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.
- I do not 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 wish to make a joint case.
- I do not wish to make a joint case.

Signature and date

Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making submission:

SIGNATURE

McAnKern. John Ankers.

DATE

12.4.2022

Continuation Submission re. Gabites block 1135 may mean
the existing track used by horse riders, walkers with
dogs & children. Our concern is that users, other than
cyclists will be put at increased risk when using
this track.

me@ntecorn

12.4.2022.

John Anderson.

12/4/2022

OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission number **50**

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT PLAN
Proposed Private Plan Change 55—Rezoning of Gabites Block at 1135 Maymorn Road

The closing date for submissions is **13 April 2022**

To Upper Hutt City Council
 Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 55 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Deliver to: Upper Hutt Civic Centre, 835 - 842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt 5019
 Post to: Planning Policy Team, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140
 Scan and email to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

Details of submitter

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a Proposed Plan Change this is public information. By making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, all submissions must be published to allow for further submission on the original submission. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Planning Team via email at planning@uhcc.govt.nz.

Name of Submitter: Paul Pensico

Postal Address of the Submitter

216 Parkes Lane Road Maymorn

Agent Acting for the submitter (if applicable)

Address for Service (if different from above)

Contact Telephone: Contact Email: pensico@extra.co.nz

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (Please tick one)	NO	X	Only answer this question if you ticked YES: I am / am not (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
	YES		

Details of Submission:

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

I am in favour of allowing development of the Maymorn area where it retains a distinctly rural character of the area.

Upper Hutt City Council has delayed completing the PC50 process, according to Counsellor Angela McLeod (1), this was due to changes proposed by central government with respect to the Resource Management Act and the need for council to consider the impact of the change before allowing changes to proceed.

This private plan change should therefore also be delayed until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made taking into account the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. There is an inequality in considering the desire of a commercial property developer while ignoring the clear preferences of the wider community for a well planned and considered district plan. **This is poor governance by Council and will be challenged to the full extent possible under the law.**

The private plan is not consistent with retaining a distinctly rural character of the area in particular we oppose the intensification proposed for the following reasons:

- Impact on the wider community and loss of the rural character of the area.
- Congestion issues on Maymorn and Parkes Line Road from over intensification and increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure that is not designed to for it.
- Impact on horizontal infrastructure and flow on impact to local residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more inkeeping with the rural character.
- The proposed plan does not meet the Upper Hutt City Council Sustainability Strategy 2020 principles to 'minimise our environmental impact, maximise remedial action, and role-model sustainable community living'.
- We believe the expert reports provided by the applicant are false.

(1) Angela McLeod post on Facebook group 'Mangaroa and Whitemans Valley Community Group' 10 March 2022

In conclusion, the Collective opposes the Private Plan on the basis that it will leave to inconsistent zoning practices and that Gabites block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure other rate payers are not disadvantaged. The process Council has elected to run shows poor process and governance and is a breach of the Local Authority Act 2002.

We seek the following decision from the local authority:

That Council delay consideration of the Private Plan change until it is in a position to consider the plan changes under PC50 that have been delayed. This is to ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider rate payers.

Under the 'Options To Progress The Plan Change' – page 49, Section 32, Report of the proposed Plan Change – Gabites Block we are the view that the second option 'Rely on Proposed Plan Change 50' is the correct approach and oppose the stated 'Preferred Option' and challenge the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the PPC55.

If Council approves PPC55 as site specific

Maymorn residents will join forces for an appeal to the Environment Court and Civil law Suit against members of Council for a breach of their fiduciary duty,

I **do** wish to heard in support of our submission ✓

I **do/ ~~Do not~~** wish to make a joint case ✓