



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

Summary of submissions

Private Plan Change 55

1135 MAYMORN ROAD 'GABITES BLOCK' | JUNE 2022



Guide to Submission Summary

The following format is used to summarise submissions received on Proposed Private Plan Change 55:

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter xx			
S1.1			

These submissions are ordered by submitter number. Each decision requested by a submitter is individually listed (SX.X).

The accompanying volume “Submissions on Proposed Private Plan Change 55” contains full copies of the submissions received on Proposed Private Plan Change 55. Where the submitter proposes an amendment to the proposed new or existing text or provision, the amendment proposed by the submitter is shown underlined and highlighted in **red**. Where the submitter proposes the deletion of proposed new or existing text, this is shown ~~strikethrough~~.

Making a Further Submission

Clause 8 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act outlines the persons that may make a further submission, being:

- (a) any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; and,
- (b) any person that has an interest in the proposed plan greater than the interest that the general public has; and
- (c) the local authority itself.

A further submission must be in support of or in opposition to the submissions that have already been made and which are summarised in this document.

Further submissions should be made in writing, in general accordance with Form 6 of the Resource Management Act (Forms, Fees, and Procedure) Regulations 2003. Copies of Form 6 are available from:

- Upper Hutt City Council Offices, Level 1 Reception, Civic Administration Building, 838-842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt.
- Upper Hutt Library, 844 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt.
- Pinehaven Branch Library, corner of Pinehaven Road and Jocelyn Crescent, Pinehaven, Upper Hutt.
- On the Plan Change webpage at upperhuttcity.com/ppc55.

Further submissions may be lodged in the following ways:

Online	letskorero.upperhuttcity.com	Email	planning@uhcc.govt.nz
In Person	Upper Hutt City Council Offices Level 1 Reception Civic Administration Building 838- 842 Fergusson Drive Upper Hutt	Post	Proposed Private Plan Change 55 Upper Hutt City Council Private Bag 907 Upper Hutt 5140

The closing date for further submissions is Friday 17th of June at 5pm.

Service of further submission on original submitter:

Within 5 working days of making the further submission to Council, the further submitter must service a copy of the further submission on the person who made the original submission to which the further submission relates. The address for service for each submitter is contained on the following page.

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited to clause 6(4) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Submitter No.	Submitter name	Address for service
1	Hugh Wiffen	1138B Maymorn Road, Maymorn
2	Wayne Chapman	4 Riverlea Way, Totara Park
3	Debbie Hawinkels	177 Mangaroa Valley Road, Mangaroa
4	Beatrice Serrao	13 York Avenue, Heretaunga
5	Rebecca Cato	8 Franconia Road, Clapham, London
6	Nathan King	89 Thackery Street, Trentham
7	Tamara Carson	14 Prestige Place, Maoribank
8	Jonathan and Lisa Bryant	1095 Maymorn Road, Maymorn
9	Rob Prest	83 Flux Road, Mangaroa
10	Sonia Morgan	172 Plateau Road, Te Mārua
11	Gerard Bourke and Trish Coley	51 Flux Road, Mangaroa
12	Jo Perez	17B Blue Mountains, Pinehaven
13	Sofia Moers-Kennedy	202 Akatarawa Road, Birchville
14	Jaki Sifflett	206 Plateau Road, Te Mārua
15	Bob Anker	76 Katherine Mansfield Drive, Whitemans Valley
16	Peter Barnes	7 Penny Lane, Silverstream
17	Debbie Batson	124 Plateau Road, Te Mārua
18	Peter Sharkey-Burns	1166B Maymorn Road, Upper Hutt
19	Dean Spicer	224A Parkes Line Road, Maymorn
20	Antoinette Spicer	224A Parkes Line Road, Maymorn
21	Barry and Fiona Evans	1071C Maymorn Road, Maymorn
22	Marita Maass	646 Main Road North, Te Mārua
23	Bridgewater Trust	224A Parkes Line Road, Maymorn
24	Kathryn Regan	217 Parkes Line Road, Maymorn
25	Kim Gibbs	1166 Maymorn Road, Maymorn
26	Janet Pittman	1120 Maymorn Road, Maymorn
27	Lance Burgess	1144C Maymorn Road, Maymorn
28	Nerolie Burgess	1144C Maymorn Road, Maymorn

29	Rob and Sharon Houghton	5 Roseveare Grove, Te Mārua
30	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	PO BOX 3942, Wellington
31	Sue Boyle	PO BOX 40461, Upper Hutt
32	John Boyle	PO BOX 40461, Upper Hutt
33	Brett Stanaway	1071 Maymorn Road, Te Mārua
34	Judith Swildens	1176A Maymorn Road, Maymorn
35	Maymorn Collective	224A Parkes Line Road, Maymorn
36	Helen Regan	217 Parkes Line Road, Maymorn
37	Lynn Bialy	180A Parkes Line Road, Maymorn
38	Kim Williams	1166H Maymorn Road, Maymorn
39	Michael Byrne	172A Plateau Road, Maymorn
40	Greater Wellington Regional Council	100 Cuba Street, Te Aro, Wellington
41	Mary Beth Taylor	165A Katherine Mansfield Drive, Whitemans Valley
42	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	PO BOX 740, Napier 4140
43	Paul Baker	253 Whirinaki Road, Napier
44	Lesley Francis (on behalf of 4 households)	1164 Maymorn Road, Maymorn
45	Tony Chad	165A Katherine Mansfield Drive, Whitemans Valley
46	Christopher Northmore	1142 Maymorn Road, Maymorn
47	Bob Orriss	118 Maymorn Road, Maymorn
48	Richard Bialy	180A Parkes Line Road, Maymorn
49	John and Margaret Ankcorn	270A Parkes Line Road, Maymorn
50	Paul Persico	216 Parkes Line Road, Maymorn

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 1: Hugh Wiffen			
S1.1	Entire Plan Change	1) The submitter supports the plan change request to rezone the Gabites Block to Settlement Zone.	1) Supports the development of the Gabites Block.
S1.2	General.	1) The submitter seeks Council to consider including the neighbouring properties along Maymorn Road in the Settlement Zone.	1) Considers it would be unreasonable to apply different rules to one landowner and not to others along Maymorn Road.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 2: Wayne Chapman			
S2.1	Financial Contributions.	1) The submitter seeks financial contributions to be made by the developer towards infrastructure and roading outcomes.	1) Concern that the roads that feed into this new subdivision are not adequate for extra vehicles. 2) New residents will expect a suburban type of environment with roads, wide footpaths and streetlighting. 3) Allocating funding will ensure the developer contributes to improved infrastructure and roading outcomes.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 3: Debbie Hawinkels			
S3.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined.	1) Opposes the request to rezone 74.5 hectares of land at the Gabites Block to Settlement Zone. 2) Loves the valley as it is. 3) Concerned about traffic entering and exiting the valley.
S3.2	Proposed zoning.	1) The submitter seeks to retain the existing zoning (General Rural and Rural Production) of the Gabites Block.	1) Believes the existing minimum subdivision requirements of the rural zones allows for the character and beauty of the valley to remain. 2) The infrastructure cannot support this type of development of smaller blocks.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 4: Beatrice Serrao			
S4.1	General.	1) The submitter seeks that the wetland is not developed.	1) Opposes the development of the wetland area as the beautiful area will be lost once building starts. 2) The preservation of wetlands and their protection from development is the duty of UHCC.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 5: Rebecca Cato			
S5.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter requests the application be approved with amendments of providing funding for community and urban design features.	1) Community wellbeing. 2) Supports the request for lot sizes to be reduced to 400m2.
S5.2	General.	2) The submitter seeks the following amendments so that the developer contributes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Funds for community facilities within the subdivision including their ongoing maintenance; b) A full transport plan is provided including a commitment to improve safety and accessibility to the site; and c) A full intensive housing community plan is provided to ensure a healthy living environment for families that live there. 	1) Please refer to the submission for details.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 6: Nathan King			
S6.1	General.	1) The submitter opposes the plan change request unless the following is provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A spilt-level intersection at State Highway 2 and Plateau Road is provided before subdivision commences; and b) A traffic management plan is submitted with the development plan. 	1) Concerned about the traffic management of the priority t-intersection and considers it a shambolic mess and death trap for drivers. 2) The priority t-intersection shows similarities to the State Highway 2 junction near Riverstone Terrace.
S6.2	Minimum Allotment Size.	1) The submitter seeks an amendment to the minimum allotment size from 400m2 to 1,000m2.	1) Concerned about the size of the smaller sections proposed for the Gabites Block. 2) 400m2 is far too small for this rural suburb.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 7: Tamara Carson			
S7.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the private plan change request.	1) Consider the appeal for many buyers of the valley is the quiet lifestyle. 2) Concern about the current traffic problems and the ability of the existing roading network to cater for increased traffic generation from the development. 3) The increase of households with families means children heading to school on high-speed narrow roads with no footpaths for pedestrians or space for cyclists.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 8: Lisa and John Bryant			
S8.1	Minimum Allotment Size.	1) The submitter seeks amendments to the minimum allotment size in the following areas: a) North-West Area from 400m ² to 2,000m ² . b) Valley Flats Area from 1,000m ² to 2,000m ² . c) Upper Plateau Area to 2,000m ² .	1) The proposed allotment sizes are not rural, but residential which is not in keeping with the current rural setting. 2) Most of the properties in the area are lifestyle blocks. 3) The allotment size of 2,000m ² is in keeping with the natural progression from urban-residential to lifestyle blocks. 4) The impacts if the proposal goes ahead. include increased noise, lighting, traffic, loss of privacy, loss of rural character, environmental degradation in terms of wildlife in the area and negative effects of the waterways.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 9: Rob Prest			
S9.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined. Or alternatively, seeks any decisions on the Gabites Block deferred to the PC50 review.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The plan change is not materially different in terms of proposed density in PC50. 2) There does not appear to be strong community support for the application request of the Gabites Block. 3) Making decisions on the Gabites Block now is likely to influence future decisions for PC50. 4) The Settlement Zone for the majority of the Gabites Block is not consistent with the surrounding area. 5) See submission for details.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 10: Sonia Morgan			
S10.1	Entire Plan Change.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The submitter opposes the private plan change request. 2) If the plan change proceeds, seeks upgrades to the local roading, schooling, school bus services, dental and health services in Upper Hutt. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It appears to be a money-making venture for the developer and Council without consideration of environmental, safety or support structures. 2) The services in the local area cannot support this type of development as there is only one dairy and one school. 3) Concerned about the increase in the number of traffic accidents and fatalities. 4) There may be a need to consider the safety of the intersection at Plateau Road and the Main Highway.
S10.2	Minimum Allotment Size.	1) If the plan change proceeds, the submitter seeks an amendment to ensure a minimum allotment size of two acres.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Consider the proposed allotment size is not in keeping with the rural character of the area. 2) Suggest there should be no allotment smaller than two acres on the Gabites Block to maintain the rural character.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 11: Gerard Bourke and Trish Coley			
S11.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks that the current zoning is retained and any future development for the Gabites Block falls within the guidelines of the existing zone.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The local community made it quite clear to UHCC a few years ago, that they did not want the zoning in the area changed for the Maymorn Structure Plan. 2) The breaking up of the Gabites Block into 170 to 200 extra dwellings will put huge pressure on the existing roading infrastructure. 3) The Te Mārua intersection to State Highway 2 will become another death trap like the one at Riverstone Terraces. 4) Every proposed property will be running at least 2 or 3 vehicles, many of which will be used to do multiple trips on a daily basis, placing huge pressure on both the entry and exit points of the area. 5) There will be significant issues with local roads in the immediate area from the increased traffic. 6) Public transport in and out of the area would not be a viable option. 7) Rural residents currently in this area are likely to have issues with people complaining about the presence of farmed animals, noise, odour, traffic and visual effects. 8) The impacts on wildlife and livestock from increased domestic animals in the area. 9) Consider drainage and run off will likely become an issue with the decrease in permeable areas due to the land development. 10) Any development should be done within the boundaries of the current zoning.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 12: Jo Perez			
S12.1	Minimum Allotment Size.	1) The submitter seeks an amendment to increase the minimum allotment size to 2,000m ² or larger.	1) The proposed allotment size of 400m ² is intensive and out of step for Plateau, Mangaroa and Maymorn. 2) A larger allotment size of 2,000m ² or larger is in keeping with the character of the surrounding community. 3) Also suggests planting early in the development to prevent the concrete community which is the visual result of the Wallaceville Estate.
S12.2	General.	1) The submitter seeks that the Council widen the verges of the roads for the following: a) Safe use by cyclists, foot traffic and horses, especially along Plateau, Parkes Line, Flux, Mangaroa Valley, Mangaroa Hill and Wallaceville Hill Roads; and b) Use or develop the existing paper roads to improve the valley. 2) If the development is approved, the developer should also contribute to the upgrading of roads and shifting of fences to improve pedestrian safety.	1) Local roads should be widened and upgraded and reclaim the Crown title on the side roads. 2) The development will generate a significant increase in local traffic from vehicles, cyclists and pedestrian traffic through Plateau, Parkes Line, Flux, Mangaroa Valley, Mangaroa Hill and Wallaceville Roads. 3) Resistance from existing landowners to move farm fences back to their legal boundary is unfounded. 4) 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 risk involved. 5) The development of existing paper roads will improve the valley. 6) The developer should at least contribute part of it. 7) See submission for details.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 13: Sofia Moers-Kennedy			
S13.1	General.	1) The submitter seeks that a bridleway is added along Maymorn Road and the road leading to the Rail Trail in addition to the shared path.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 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 navigate. 2) Add a bridleway so the rural characteristics of the area can continue to be enjoyed safely and equestrians do not become marooned within the valley. 3) Riders from outside the area occasionally park their cars and floats at the Maymorn Train Station to avoid clogging up the Rail Trail carpark.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 14: Jaki Sifflett			
S14.1	Entire Plan Change.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined. 2) However, if the plan change proceeds, the submitter seeks the proposed density be reduced by 50 percent and addresses infrastructure, roading and environmental concerns prior to the subdivision commenced. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The existing roads are not suitable for the volume of traffic this number of new houses would create. 2) Plateau Road and Maymorn Road intersection is hazardous with limited visibility, and the current low volume of traffic increases the risks of accidents. 3) Plateau Road and State Highway 2 junction is frequently congested and difficult to exit and enter during peak hours, weekends and public holidays. 4) UHCC does not improve roads when installing new subdivisions as evident at Riverstone Terraces and Wallaceville Estate, where no allowances were made for the increased traffic. 5) Limited public transport available and beyond a reasonable distance and so residents will need to use cars to travel beyond the subdivision to shop, work, attend school and entertainment. 6) Carbon absorbing vegetation will be replaced and smothered with heat generating concrete housing pads, natural fauna replaced by landscaped gardens that will impact wildlife. 7) Electricity would need to be significantly increased to include the needs of new houses. 8) Concern that the fibre network that was initially proposed in 2017 and is currently being installed, may not have foreseen such a large volume of houses on the network. 9) Water pressure is currently poor in this area and will be impacted by more users, concern that contingencies will be needed to improve this.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 15: Bob Anker			
S15.1	Entire Plan Change	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) If the proposal is accepted, it would create a new zone which is neither urban nor rural. 2) Questions the process within the District Plan for a new rural-urban hybrid to be created and the process of the plan change with minimal public consultation and notification as the appropriate way. 3) Repeated references to the NPS-UD to rationalise the statutory basis for the proposed plan change request should be disregarded. 4) The NPS-UD relates to urban areas and the Gabites Block is part of the rural area, and it is the understanding of the submitter that it would require a change to the District Plan to alter that status. 5) Peer Review of the Landscape Analysis is not supportive of the lot size progression from the existing Te Mārua residential area or the reduction of size within the North-West area of the Gabites Block. 6) The Landscape Analysis illustrates existing residentially zoned parcel sizes and shows only one existing 400m² among a range of larger parcel sizes. 7) The proposal is not a low-density development, due to the minimum allotment size down to 400m² in the North-West area. 8) PC50 Rural focus group was advised that 2,000m² was the appropriate allotment size to contain on-site provisions of water storage and wastewater disposal systems. 9) Consider the geotechnical assessment clause poses the question as to how much increase in earthworks in the high slope hazard risk is acceptable and who will quantify it. For example, a slip does not request property boundaries – accordingly the onus should

			<p>be on the person doing the work to establish the risk will not increase.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10) Notes the buffer zone is for bare truck, 6m-tall trees to be placed at 10m internals with planting in between. If the area is in multiple titles the continuity of the planting and space intervals between trees has the potential to become compromised. The individual titles within the buffer zone will also have the potential to generate complexities in establishing building setback distances from the boundary. 11) The intention of both PPC55 and draft PC50 is to have no direct property access to Maymorn Road or street lighting in the Gabites Block Area, and in both cases the wording “avoid” implies that direct access and lighting may occur. 12) The wording “significant” seeks to quantify the level of the effect and will open matters up to considerable debate regarding the Hillside area. 13) Concern regarding the area of public open space is included when calculations of the 2.5 hectares size for minimum allotments in the area. 14) Opposes the proposed zoning, as it seeks to override both the future PC50 Settlement Zone and the Operative District Plan. 15) Considers the construction activity will be more intense and continue for a longer period so suggests a Construction Traffic Management Plan. 16) Concerned about the factual errors, the quality of information and resultant erroneous conclusions within the following documents: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Gabites Block Plan Change Request. b) Gabites Block Section 32. c) Proposed Amendments to the District Plan. d) Integrated Transport Assessment. e) Landscape Analysis Assessment. f) Infrastructure Report Assessment.
--	--	--	---

			g) Gabites Block Update Memo (March 1 st). 17) See submission for details.
--	--	--	---

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 16: Peter Barnes			
S16.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request to be declined and a commitment to preserving the rural character of Mangaroa and Whitemans Valley by; a) Refusing to support any future developments; and b) Instead, more land should be acquired there for restoration of wetlands and native forest regenerations.	1) There will be significant environmental and transport problems during the development phase, and these will remain at some level permanently once development is completed. 2) Development in the area will cause problems for recreational cyclists using Parkes Line Road, Maymorn Road and Remutaka Rail Trail at the Maymorn entrance to Tunnel Gully. 3) Alternative routes for cyclists should be created but the experience of the submitter is that cyclist safety is not a priority for UHCC as evident at Alexander Road with roadworks signage in the cycle lane for months. 4) Development of the Gabites Block will increase contamination of the Maymorn River and the Blaikie Stream, and therefore increase pollution and degradation of Te Awa Kairangi.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 17: Debbie Batson			
S17.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the minimum allotment size be increased to 1,500m ² minimum and 2,000m ² average and to improve local facilities and infrastructure.	1) No objections to the subdivision but believes the lot sizes should be increased in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood. 2) Provisions should be made for the expected roll increase at Plateau School. 3) Infrastructure upgrades such as footpaths and pedestrian crossings for children at Plateau School and telecommunication improvements to the fibre broadband and mobile coverage should also be considered.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 18: Peter Sharkey-Burns			
S18.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request is withdrawn until the following occurs: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The developer changes the minimum allotment size for all lots to no less than 2,000m². An independent ecological report is commissioned. Consultation has been completed with Waka Kotahi and Kiwi Rail to understand that the new housing development does not exceed roading and rail capacity. 	1) The minimum allotment sizes deviate from the proposal for PC50 and introduces high density housing to the Gabites Block and conflicts with the aesthetic of Maymorn. 2) Introduces additional demand for the road and rail network. 3) Introduces domestic pets which will ruin the native birdlife at Pākuratahi Forest. 4) The ecological report is a desktop assessment only and lacks onsite analysis and is not independent. 5) There is no reference to the ITA (Integrated Transport Assessment) report in TP-R3 and the authors have not consulted with Waka Kotahi in relation to the projected traffic increase at the State Highway 2, Plateau Road and the propriety t-intersection. 6) Concerns that State Highway 2 is congested, and at risk of accidents given the dedicated right-turn bay is hidden at the junction. 7) Concerns that Kiwi Rail has not been consulted about

			<p>the projected commuter increase to the Wairarapa Line or Maymorn Train Station.</p> <p>8) At present only three carriages can stop at Maymorn Train Station and there are no future plans by Kiwi Rail to improve the platform.</p>
--	--	--	--

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 19: Dean Spicer			
S19.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In favour of allowing development of Maymorn when it retains a distinctly rural character of the area. 2) The proposal will lead to inconsistent zoning practices. 3) The Gabites Block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure ratepayers are not disadvantaged. 4) Delay until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made taking into account the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. 5) There is 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. 6) This is poor governance by Council and will be charged to the full extent possible under law. 7) Ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider ratepayers. 8) Concerned about congestion issues on Maymorn Road and Parkes Line Road. 9) Increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure that was not designed for it. 10) The impact on horizontal infrastructure and the flow-on impacts to residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more in keeping with the rural character. 11) The proposal does not meet the Sustainability Strategy (2020) principle “to minimise our environmental impact, maximise, remedial action role-model sustainable community living.” 12) The expert reports provided by the applicant are

			<p>inadequate.</p> <p>13) Challenges the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the plan change.</p> <p>14) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	--

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 20 Antoinette Spicer:			
S20.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In favour of allowing development of Maymorn when it retains a distinctly rural character of the area. 2) The proposal will lead to inconsistent zoning practices. 3) The Gabites Block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure ratepayers are not disadvantaged. 4) Delay until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made taking into account the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. 5) There is 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. 6) This is poor governance by Council and will be charged to the full extent possible under law. 7) Ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider ratepayers. 8) Concerned about congestion issues on Maymorn Road and Parkes Line Road. 9) Increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure that was not designed for it. 10) The impact on horizontal infrastructure and the flow-on impacts to residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more in keeping with the rural character. 11) The proposal does not meet the Sustainability Strategy (2020) principle “to minimise our environmental impact, maximise, remedial action role-model sustainable community living.” 12) The expert reports provided by the applicant are

			<p>inadequate.</p> <p>13) Challenges the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the plan change.</p> <p>14) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	--

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 21: Barry and Fiona Evans			
S21.1	General.	1) The submitter seeks UHCC to answer all the questions listed on the submission form.	1) Questions listed throughout the submission regarding the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Stormwater. Traffic. Excavation works. Cellphone and wi-fi coverage. Noise and lighting. 2) See submission for details.
S21.2	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined.	1) The current form suits the developer and not the overall character of the area which is enjoyed by the wider Hutt community. 2) The submitter shares a boundary on the north-west end of the Gabites Block and has concerns regarding this development area. 3) High density housing would be right on their boundary and is not compatible with the existing Maymorn area. 4) Considers 400m ² to 600m ² allotment sizes are not in character with the surrounding sections or compatible with the neighbouring rural lifestyle blocks of 3,500, 4,000 and 7,500m ² . 5) Concerned about heavy rainfall events and the catchment of the Blaikie stream that runs through the Gabites Block and flows into their property. 6) UHCC diverted the stream to meet the needs of the culvert going under Maymorn Road and seeks assurance of the responsibility of the stream and costs for damages. 7) Estimates there will be at least 400 extra vehicles going past their property and this will create extra noise and pollution. 8) Similar to the Riverstone Terrace junction, the State Highway 2 / Plateau Road t-intersection is often congested with traffic from the Wairarapa and backs up

			<p>on the blind corner on the bridge which causes a major safety hazard.</p> <p>9) Can foresee accidents happening near Mangaroa Hill on the one lane bridge which has a blind corner.</p> <p>10) Plateau Road near the dairy lacks adequate parking for Plateau School and Molloys Road.</p> <p>11) Access to adequate footpaths is of great concern for parents in Maymorn, due to the increase of traffic accessing narrow roads such as Plateau Road.</p> <p>12) It is important to ensure the road space complements land use and is managed to meet community and school needs.</p> <p>13) Concerned regarding the clearance of the hills above their property, the movement of trucks and diggers and how excavation will affect properties prone to erosion below.</p> <p>14) There is a lack of cellphone coverage and Wi-Fi coverage is marginal in the area.</p> <p>15) The layout of new dwellings and buildings of the northwest corner will generate significant noise transmission within the site.</p> <p>16) Their property is 15 to 20m below the property boundary of the North-West area and allowing buildings up to 8m would in effect allow a high-rise apartment block. This would reduce their rural outlook and be detrimental to property and remove any resemblance of a rural lifestyle block.</p> <p>17) It is important to limit street lighting to ensure the development is compatible with the rural character, as there is no street lighting past the 80km/h sign heading south on Maymorn Road.</p> <p>18) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	---

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 22: Marita Maass			
S22.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks a plan must be in place to deal with the increased needs relating to water, wastewater, traffic, education and health facilities before this development proceeds.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Concerned by the lack of consideration for and understanding of the wider impact that such a substantial number of people will have on the community. 2) Considers the information provided is longwinded, wordy and becomes tedious to try and work through. 3) The documents provided had many assumptions and the data provided was not analysed against the reality of modern-day living. 4) Concerned that the drinking water supply and wastewater are at capacity, and questions how Council can contemplate new development when the basic needs are under threat should anything go wrong. 5) Concerns regarding school, healthcare and policing and Council needs to have a plan in place to deal with these issues before consent is given to the developer. 6) Plateau School will not have capacity for the potential number of primary school aged children that will come from 200 plus new homes in the future. 7) Mangaroo School may still have capacity, but not enough to be the solution to the issues. If more children are attending Mangaroo School, there will be significant school traffic on Parkes Line Road which is narrow and dangerous. 8) The ITA and Infrastructure reports are misleading, lack information and the solutions offered by the developer are short-sighted and a recipe for disaster. 9) See submission for details.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 23: Bridgewater Trust			
S23.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In favour of allowing development of Maymorn when it retains a distinctly rural character of the area. 2) The proposal will lead to inconsistent zoning practices. 3) The Gabites Block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure ratepayers are not disadvantaged. 4) Delay until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made taking into account the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. 5) There is 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. 6) This is poor governance by Council and will be charged to the full extent possible under law. 7) Ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider ratepayers. 8) Concerned about congestion issues on Maymorn Road and Parkes Line Road. 9) Increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure that was not designed for it. 10) The impact on horizontal infrastructure and the flow-on impacts to residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more in keeping with the rural character. 11) The proposal does not meet the Sustainability Strategy (2020) principle “to minimise our environmental impact, maximise, remedial action role-model sustainable community living.” 12) The expert reports provided by the applicant are

			<p>inadequate.</p> <p>13) Challenges the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the plan change.</p> <p>14) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	--

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 24: Kathryn Regan			
S24.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The land known as the Gabites Block should only be considered as part of the wider PC50, as previously outlined by UHCC, for consistency. 2) Negatively impacts the rural character of the area due to the large number of houses and cars in the rural area. 3) Results in inconsistent zoning practices. 4) Progressing the plan change as a standalone plan, i.e., outside the context of PC50 or the current zoning rules will disadvantage local ratepayers. 5) Considering the plan change before progression PC50 is poor governance by UHCC. 6) The area as defined under PC50 is uniquely situated to provide for future growth and development opportunities, while still retaining a distinctly rural character. 7) In the consultation documents, the proposed development of the Gabites Block was referred to numerous times as part of PC50. The submitter states 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. 8) If it is important enough for the Council to reconsider the potential impacts of changes to the RMA on PC50 then the plan change should be subject to the same scrutiny. 9) There is 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. 10) A District Plan enabled through PC50, which continues to prescribe a rural character to the Maymorn area, balancing the graduated transition from Maymorn Railway Station outwards to the east, south and west. 11) Impact on the wider community and loss of the rural

			<p>character of the area.</p> <p>12) Congestion issues on Maymorn and Parkes Line Road from over intensification and increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure. For example, no provisions for sewerage, walking, cycleway and footpaths.</p> <p>13) The proposal does not meet the Sustainability Strategy (2020) principle “to minimise our environmental impact, maximise, remedial action role-model sustainable community living.”</p> <p>14) The expert reports provided by the applicant are inadequate.</p> <p>15) Challenges the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the plan change.</p> <p>16) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	--

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 25: Kim Gibbs			
S25.1	Minimum Allotment Size.	1) The submitter seeks the following decisions: a) A minimum allotment size of 2,000m ² with an average of 2,500m ² throughout the development as the main purpose is to protect the environment and wetlands. b) Further residential units cannot be increased on future lots without consultation or assessment of environment and community effects.	1) The construction of new residential units on future sites, subject to proposed bulk and location provisions due to the ambiguous nature of the wording is ill-defined. 2) It is open to exploitation by the developer to significantly increase the number of units without further consultation or assessment of impacts to the environment and existing community. 3) To protect areas of significant vegetation on the site, the most viable way is to limit development to fewer houses on larger allotments. 4) Opposes the minimum lot sizes in the North-West area of 400m ² and 600m ² . 5) Does not oppose the 1 hectare minimum and 2.5-hectare average of the Hillside Area.
S25.2	General.	1) The submitter seeks that the developer prior to a decision on the plan change will do the following: a) Invest in improvements to access roads for Maymorn Road and Parkes Line Road to widen roads, provide safe pathways. Increased pedestrian signage, and reduced speed limits to accommodate residents. b) Mitigate additional runoff into waterways. c) Consult with the Ministry of Education and Local Board of Trustees to plan for the impact of additional families in the area on local schools. d) Include requirements that new homes meet passive home standards, recognising the micro-climate and different energy needs in the area.	1) Increased housing would increase demand for a linking bus service, along with a need to improve the facilities at Maymorn station which is barely servicing existing commuters. 2) The importance of landscaping along Maymorn Road frontage of the site, that needs to be accompanied by safe roading and walkways. 3) The development of Riverstone Terrace illustrated poor planning outcomes and left an entire community disconnected from the public transport network. 4) The report lacks information regarding the changes to the road network and provision for a new public cycleway connecting to the Remutaka Rail Trial. 5) It is not acceptable that residents and Council incur the costs of such infrastructure, as a result of allowing this type and size of development. 6) It is important to mitigate the stormwater run-off from development into waterways. 7) There is no apparent consideration of the impacts of

			<p>additional housing on the demands and pressures of the Plateau School Zone.</p> <p>8) Plateau School Zone has limited physical capacity or land to expand, and Maymorn School is out of zone for most residents.</p> <p>9) Refers to the Wallaceville subdivision and how many families fell out of zone for schools and have continued to struggle to access education facilities for children nearby.</p> <p>10) Consider it important to support development that incorporates energy conservation, efficiency and generation on site, due to the area is colder in winter and warmer in summer than central Upper Hutt.</p> <p>11) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	---

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 26: Janet Pitman			
S26.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the following decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) UHCC does not allow for the rezoning of the Gabites Block to Settlement Zone and Low Density Residential, or b) UHCC to consider larger minimum allotment size of 2,000m² with an average size of 3,000m² for the Gabites Block. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The proposed minimum allotment sizes of 400m², 600m², 1,000m² and 2,000m² are too small for the site. 2) Rainfall in Maymorn over the last nine years is sustainably more than received in Upper Hutt (1,600mm to 1,950mm) and large stretches of the land exhibit surface flooding, which extends onto and significantly impinges the width of Maymorn Road. 3) The creek along the side of Maymorn Road and part of the wider catchment becomes overwhelmed in rainfall events. 4) A vast number of reeds and water-loving birds that reside in the area. 5) The covering of significant area of impervious material will increase the amount of rainfall that must be fed into these poor stormwater outlets. 6) The flooding problem will be exacerbated with the global change as New Zealand gets wetter. 7) The promises made by Maymorn Developments Limited, and the best intentions by UHCC and GW, the infrastructure put in place will ultimately fail. 8) The Wairarapa Line service is only three in the morning and afternoon, one midday train and bus replacements for the near future. 9) Pre-covid these trains were full and require the submitter to stand from Maymorn into Wellington at least three days a week and the same would occur on the way home if the submitter did not arrive at the station early. 10) The development of high-density housing without adequate transport facilities is irresponsible, as it encourages the increased use of private vehicles which collectively increases the carbon footprint. 11) The future network changes to the rail network are not possible, nor is putting more trains at Maymorn Station

			<p>due to diesel engines and the uniquely sized carriages are not easily obtained.</p> <p>12) The rural aesthetic will be destroyed and the love of living on a lifestyle block will end.</p> <p>13) Refers to Parkes Line Road and McLaren Street where a small block of low-density residential zoning has destroyed the rural aesthetic.</p> <p>14) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	--

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 27: Lance Burgess			
S27.1	Minimum Allotment Size.	<p>1) The submitter seeks the following decisions:</p> <p>a) Do not allow the North-West, Station Flats and Hilltop Basin to be any denser than 2,000m².</p> <p>b) Do not allow the Hilltops to be any denser than 1 hectare.</p>	<p>1) The allowed housing for the North-West, Station Flats, Hilltops and Hilltop Basin are too dense for the area and will ruin the visual nature of the valley.</p> <p>2) It will add to road traffic and pollution from heating.</p> <p>3) It will drive away the native birds in the area. For example, the Hawks, Tui, Moreporks, Kereru and Fantails that have returned in greater number in the last few years.</p>

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 28: Nerolie Burgess			
S28.1	Minimum Allotment Size.	1) The submitter seeks the following decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Do not allow the North-West, Station Flats and Hilltop Basin to be any denser than 2,000m². b) Do not allow the Hilltops to be any denser than 1 hectare. 	1) The allowed housing for the North-West, Station Flats, Hilltops and Hilltop Basin are too dense for the area and will ruin the visual nature of the valley. 2) The increase in road traffic from the proposal will make it harder for groups of hobbyists who use the road to be safe i.e., cyclists and horse-riding. 3) It will add to road traffic and pollution from heating. 4) It will drive away the native birds in the area. For example, the Hawks, Tui, Moreporks, Kereru and Fantails that have returned in greater number in the last few years.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 29: Rob and Sharon Houghton			
S29.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined. a) Reduce the number of properties proposed. b) Reduce the number of dwellings proposed for the North-West corner. c) Increase the minimum allotment size to “lifestyle blocks” especially those bordering properties along Roseveare Grove and Plateau Road.	1) Not opposed to the Gabites Block and the need for additional housing. 2) The proposal is not in keeping with the Te Mārua area and the Gabites Block will effectively become another Riverstone Terrace. 3) Purchased their property due to the privacy and this will be reduced significantly if the plan change is approved. 4) Concerned about the noise and light pollution of the proposed 8 to 9 properties that will be directly on their boundary. 5) Increase in the minimum allotment size will maintain the existing character of the neighbourhood such as native bush, natural gully and reflect existing allotments of 5 to 10 acres. 6) Their property on Roseveare Grove has three points that receive waters from the Gabites Block catchment. 7) It is important that the proposal does not increase the rate or quantity of stormwater, sediment or other pollutants entering the stream due to previous flood events. 8) The proposal lacks information about catchment planning and management. 9) Post development properties located on Roseveare Road are at risk if the sewerage system breakdown or leaks. 10) A previous landowner pushed the tops of the hills into gullies and buried the stumps of pine trees which resulted in land stability behind their property. There have also been several landslips previously in the gully behind 5 and 6 Roseveare. 11) Concerns regarding the increase of domestic cats and dogs and the impacts on biodiversity at the Tunnel Gully Reserve, and agriculture land with animal husbandry.

			<p>12) Concerns about the compatibility of the proposed development and the existing use rights of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>13) 70 percent of land being retained as undeveloped rural is simply the area which is unusable due to the terrain or boundary restrictions.</p> <p>14) The risk of increasing traffic congestion at the junction of Plateau Road and Maymorn Road, which also has a blind corner and unused stop-sign is significant.</p> <p>15) The proposal will add 400 plus vehicles and put pressure on the priority t-intersection with lengthy wait times and 8 to 10 queuing, especially as the volume of traffic increases as the Wairarapa develops.</p> <p>16) The existing transport environment is not designed for the volume of vehicles proposed from this development.</p> <p>17) Access to emergency vehicles would be compromised due to Plateau School is reduced to one lane with vehicles parked on both sides of Plateau Road during peak hours.</p> <p>18) Heavy vehicles accessing the tip site and concrete works on Maymorn Road make this dangerous during peak school times and will exacerbated with increased car parking in the area.</p> <p>19) Concerns about the direct effects the proposal will have on their property and the Te Mārua community such as erosion, water, sediment runoff, privacy, character, noise pollution and use of land, traffic and roading.</p> <p>20) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	--

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 30: Fire and Emergency New Zealand			
S30.1	SUB-DEV3-S2 North-West area.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to SUB-DEV3-S2: 2) <u>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 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.</u>	1) This subdivision standard requires compliance with the Code of Practice with respect to the firefighting water supply which is supported. 2) Ensure that fire appliances can access and connect to dedicated on-site fire-fighting supply in the event of fire, Fire and Emergency requests that the standard is amended to ensure such access is provided in accordance with the Code.
S30.2	SUB-DEV3-S2. All other areas.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to SUB-DEV3-S2: 2) <u>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 appliances access to such supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u>	1) This subdivision standard requires compliance with the Code of Practice with respect to firefighting water supply which is supported. 2) Ensure that fire appliances can access and connect to the dedicated on-site fire-fighting 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.
S30.3	SUB-DEV3-S2.	1) The submitter supports SUB-DEV3-S2 to be retained as notified.	1) Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports the inclusion of a note advising that installation of sprinklers is the preferred means of compliance with the Code in non-reticulated areas.

S30.4	SUB-DEV3-P1.	<p>1) The submitter supports with an amendment to SUB-DEV3-P1:</p> <p><u>3) Are serviced by reticulated network utilities or on-site servicing including adequate provision and access to a firefighting water supply in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p>	<p>1) When proposed standards relating to fire-fighting water supply are unable to be met, Policy SUB-DEV3-P1 would be a relevant matter of discretion in assessing such applications.</p> <p>2) This policy, as drafted, requires all new allotments to be serviced by reticulated network utilities or on-site servicing.</p> <p>3) Requests that the matter of discretion makes explicit reference to the provision of an adequate firefighting water supply in accordance with the Code of Practice.</p>
S30.5	SUB-DEV3-S6.	<p>1) The submitter supports with an amendment to SUB-DEV3-S6:</p> <p><u>2) 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. 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).</u></p>	<p>1) Requests an additional performance standard which requires the construction of 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>
S30.6	SUB-DEV3-P2.	<p>1) The submitter supports with an amendment to SUB-DEV3-P2:</p> <p><u>5) Ensure all new buildings and dedicated self-sufficient firefighting water supply can be accessed by fire appliances.</u></p>	<p>1) 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.</p> <p>2) This policy, as drafted, ought to include consideration of access for emergency vehicles.</p>
S30.7	DEV3-ECO-R1.	<p>1) The submitter supports with an amendment to SUB-DEV3-ECO-R1:</p> <p><u>1) Activity Status: Permitted.</u></p> <p><u>Where: a) The trimming or removal of vegetation is to:</u></p> <p><u>..... (i-x)</u></p> <p><u>xi) For the creation or maintenance of a firebreak.</u></p>	<p>1) Refers to Section 43 and Section 64 of the Fire and Emergency NZ Act (2017) only permits authorised persons (i.e., Fire and emergency personnel) to trim or remove vegetation in an emergency.</p> <p>2) As Fire and Emergency should not be solely relied upon to manage fire risks associated with vegetation, landowners should be permitted to trim or remove vegetation for the purpose of fire risk management.</p>

S30.8	General.	<p>1) The submitter supports with an amendment to ensure that the key access requirements, specific roading and access widths, surface and gradients to support the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency appliances are maintained. This includes, but is not limited to the following:</p> <p>a) The minimum roading and carriageway widths should not be less than 4m. This width is required for firefighters to efficiently work around the fire appliances to access hoses and pumps.</p> <p>b) A clear passageway / vehicle crossing of no less than 3.5m wide should be provided as site entrances, internal entrances and between buildings.</p> <p>c) The maximum negotiable gradient is 1:5, but in general the roading gradient should not exceed 16%.</p> <p>d) The height clearance along accessways (for example trees, hanging cables and eaves) must exceed 4m</p>	<p>1) The importance of adequate access to the source of the fire (or other emergency) and a firefighting water supply is essential to the efficient operation of Fire and Emergency.</p> <p>2) The requirements for firefighting access are set out in the Code of Practice and further detailed in Fire and Emergency appliances.</p>
-------	----------	--	---

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 31: Sue Boyle			
S31.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In favour of allowing development of Maymorn when it retains a distinctly rural character of the area. 2) The proposal will lead to inconsistent zoning practices. 3) The Gabites Block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure ratepayers are not disadvantaged. 4) Delay until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made taking into account the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. 5) There is 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. 6) This is poor governance by Council and will be charged to the full extent possible under law. 7) Ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider ratepayers. 8) Concerned about congestion issues on Maymorn Road and Parkes Line Road. 9) Increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure that was not designed for it. 10) The impact on horizontal infrastructure and the flow-on impacts to residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more in keeping with the rural character. 11) The proposal does not meet the Sustainability Strategy (2020) principle “to minimise our environmental impact, maximise, remedial action role-model sustainable community living.” 12) The expert reports provided by the applicant are

			<p>inadequate.</p> <p>13) Challenges the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the plan change.</p> <p>14) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	--

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 32: John Boyle			
S32.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In favour of allowing development of Maymorn when it retains a distinctly rural character of the area. 2) The proposal will lead to inconsistent zoning practices. 3) The Gabites Block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure ratepayers are not disadvantaged. 4) Delay until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made taking into account the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. 5) There is 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. 6) This is poor governance by Council and will be charged to the full extent possible under law. 7) Ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider ratepayers. 8) Concerned about congestion issues on Maymorn Road and Parkes Line Road. 9) Increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure that was not designed for it. 10) The impact on horizontal infrastructure and the flow-on impacts to residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more in keeping with the rural character. 11) The proposal does not meet the Sustainability Strategy (2020) principle “to minimise our environmental impact, maximise, remedial action role-model sustainable community living.” 12) The expert reports provided by the applicant are

			<p>inadequate.</p> <p>13) Challenges the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the plan change.</p> <p>14) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	--

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 33: Brett Stanaway			
S33.1	Minimum Allotment Size.	1) The submitter seeks that the plan change does not allow or approve 400m ² or 600m ² minimum allotment sizes anywhere on the Gabites Block.	<p>1) Considers the proposed residential density would not be in keeping with the character of the existing residential area on the northern boundary.</p> <p>2) The high density proposed would impact the current views of the ranges to the south of their property which was a major decision to purchase.</p> <p>3) The high density housing of 400m² and 600m² allotments on their property boundary would adversely impact the saleability.</p>

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 34: Judith Swildens			
S34.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the zoning for the Gabites Block to remain as it is to protect the rural landscape of Maymorn for future generations.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Appreciate that housing demand is high, but simply rezoning and intensifying the housing will do irreversible damage. 2) Questions how Upper Hutt can genuinely sustain this amount of growth, alongside the development of Te Mārua Golf course, Gillespies Road, Totara Park, Wallaceville Estate, St Patrick's Silverstream and changes made to allow for development of multi-storey buildings. 3) The plan change is reminiscent of the Maymorn Structure Plan. This was overturned because it conflicted with the values of the District Plan that was in place to protect the Rural Zone. 4) Ten years may be a long time in the property developing world, but for those of us living in forever homes, the prospect of this development causes a lot of anxiety. 5) Aware of UHCC changes to rural chapter of the District Plan, as outlined in the draft proposal of PC50. 6) UHCC likely sees rezoning and intensification as an effective way to generate income in the way of rates, but a lot of residents are concerned about these changes. 7) Due to the difficulties of submissions for many people, it seems illogical and dismissive of the efforts that residents have made in draft PC50 to not consider their submissions from last year on the Gabites Block. 8) Considers many residents will not make a submission to this plan change application because of the time required to read 12 PDFs full of jargon and have already

			<p>put a submission for draft PC50 and assumes it counts.</p> <p>9) Cautious about developers, especially when reading through the amendments to the district plan with non-contractual phrases like “Council may impose conditions” and “Proposed Planting” and “Avoid, remedy or mitigate.” This language reflects empty promises from the developer and in the end cannot be held accountable.</p> <p>10) The current zoning of the Gabites Block would allow for between 7 to 17 lots, compared to the proposed 200 lots.</p> <p>11) Questions where UHCC draws the line in the protection of the rural landscape and agricultural land.</p> <p>12) Have seen plans to build another 200 lots on the other side of the train tracks to the northern end of Parkes Line Road.</p> <p>13) Opposes the commercial development of Maymorn Rail Station.</p> <p>14) Supports the recommendation for dedicated surveys of native lizards and bats to be undertaken prior to any future resource consenting for the site. This is to avoid impacts of land use and development on key areas of biodiversity.</p> <p>15) Notes 41% of NZ households have a cat, and at least 34% of NZ households have a dog.</p> <p>16) If the proposal was approved, it would generate 82 cats and 68 dogs within 1.2m high fence posts and rail fencing and believes the impact on the native birds and lizards would be catastrophic.</p> <p>17) Maymorn is a historical highlight on the Hutt River Trail and Mount Climie, people come to take in the quiet surroundings, the greenfields and provides a sunning backdrop for photos.</p> <p>18) The Gabites Block is a windy spot, and the wind blows up Maymorn Road with no resistance until it hits Mt Climie.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>19) The amount of wind noise generated from the built form, design and layout of 200 houses plus secondary dwellings will destroy the peace and quiet.</p> <p>20) The existing traffic environment does not illustrate Plateau School and Molloy's Road near the Gabites Block.</p> <p>21) At-present Plateau School has Covid-19 measures in place with staggered pick-ups and drop-offs, but once the measures are removed congestion will occur and get worse due to the proposal.</p> <p>22) The Principal of Plateau School was not aware of the proposal.</p> <p>23) The Ministry of Education states Plateau School zoned for Maymorn is currently at 94% capacity, space for another 10 children of the 175.</p> <p>24) Mangaroa School is close but out of zone and has capacity for another 15 children.</p> <p>25) The Ministry of Education anticipates an additional 44 primary school aged children should the proposal go ahead</p> <p>26) The Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) raised many concerns that must be considered before allowing this document to support any change in zoning.</p> <p>27) The proposal will ruin the night sky even without the provision of street lighting to avoid adversely affecting landowners in Maymorn.</p> <p>28) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	---

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 35: The Maymorn Collective			
35.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Collective's properties and immediate surrounding area of Maymorn is uniquely situated to provide for future growth and development opportunities, while still retaining a distinctly rural character. 2) Supports development of the Gabites Block in line with the proposed zoning but questions the need for a specific policy framework, which at present is ambiguous. 3) 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. 4) The land understood to be the Gabites Block should be subject to the same opportunities and constraints that are afforded to all other areas proposed to be Rural Settlement Zone (RSZ). 5) In favour of allowing development of Maymorn when it retains a distinctly rural character of the area. 6) The proposal will lead to inconsistent zoning practices. 7) The Gabites Block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure ratepayers are not disadvantaged. 8) Delay until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made taking into account the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. 9) There is 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.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10) This is poor governance by Council and will be charged to the full extent possible under law. 11) Ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider ratepayers. 12) Concerned about congestion issues on Maymorn Road and Parkes Line Road. 13) Increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure that was not designed for it. 14) The impact on horizontal infrastructure and the flow-on impacts to residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more in keeping with the rural character. 15) The proposal does not meet the Sustainability Strategy (2020) principle “to minimise our environmental impact, maximise, remedial action role-model sustainable community living.” 16) The expert reports provided by the applicant are inadequate. 17) Challenges the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the plan change. 18) See submission for details.
--	--	--	--

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 36: Helen Regan			
S36.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The land known as the Gabites Block should only be considered as part of the wider PC50, as previously outlined by UHCC, for consistency. 2) Negatively impact the rural character of the area due to the large number of houses and cars in the rural area. 3) Result in inconsistent zoning practices. 4) Progressing the plan change as a standalone plan, i.e., outside the context of PC50 or the current zoning rules will disadvantage local ratepayers. 5) Consider the plan change before progression PC50 is poor governance by UHCC. 6) The area as defined under PC50 is uniquely situated to provide for future growth and development opportunities, while still retaining a distinctly rural character. 7) In the consultation documents, the proposed development of the Gabites Block, was referred to numerous times as part of PC50, and so 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. 8) If it is important enough for Council to reconsider the potential impacts of changes to the RMA on PC50 then PPC55 should be subject to the same scrutiny. 9) There is 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.

			<p>10) A District Plan enabled through PC50, which continues to prescribe a rural character to the Maymorn area, balancing the graduated transition from Maymorn Railway Station outwards to the east, south and west.</p> <p>11) Impact on the wider community and loss of the rural character of the area.</p> <p>12) 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.</p> <p>13) The proposal does not meet the Sustainability Strategy (2020) principle “to minimise our environmental impact, maximise, remedial action role-model sustainable community living.”</p> <p>14) The expert reports provided by the applicant are inadequate.</p> <p>15) Challenges the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the plan change.</p> <p>16) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	--

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 37: Lynn Bialy			
S37.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the delay of the private plan change request until UHCC can consider plan change PC50.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Not opposed to development in the Maymorn area but opposed to passing inconsistent zoning decisions which have the enormous potential to unfairly impact negatively on most current residents. 2) If the proposed development is passed by Council, the submitter does not believe the current rural character will be well-enough preserved. 3) The traffic along Parkes Line Road will become incompatible with current nuances. For example, riding or leading horses along the road. At times cows are moved from one property to another along the road. Both are just small examples of the rural character of where the submitter has chosen to live. 4) Parkes Line Road has no footpaths because the current zoning does not make it necessary. For example, the grass verges are sufficient but if the plan change is approved the car numbers will make it dangerous for either of the two examples given to continue. 5) There has been inadequate study or acknowledgement of the flow-on effects the proposed Gabites Block development would have on the wider current Maymorn community. 6) Ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider ratepayers. 7) There are plenty of repeated messages from Council and Government around the need for more housing to

			<p>meet the increasing population, but in this situation, it is about a development that will have a major impact on an established rural community, not on a brush covered hillside on the city side of the hill.</p> <p>8) 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 by people wishing for a semi-rural lifestyle.</p> <p>9) Cannot understand why the Council would be willing to grant a residential development at the end of the road to provide for many new houses, yet repeatedly opt not to agree to rezone the side of Parkes Line Road, which seems a sensible build option. This inconsistency in zoning shows a lack of planning and impact studies.</p> <p>10) Challenges the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the plan change.</p> <p>11) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	--

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 38: Kim Williams			
S38.1	General.	1) The submitter seeks a traffic survey that needs to be carefully, owned, administered and managed by UHCC with direct engagement with the local community as they both play a vital role.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The ITA report does not adequately recognise the physical constraints of the road width between Plateau Road and the Gabites Block 2) The road width is tight and winding and at-present struggles to accommodate large vehicles and normal traffic movement combined with vehicles parked on both sides of the road. 3) There is no mention of the effect on traffic volumes and congestion arising from Plateau School situated at the end of Molloy's Road. 4) The existing transport environment section states an incorrect posted speed, as the limit is 80km/h and this error allows the authors to make the statement regarding the 85th percentile operating speed. 5) The report lacks information on the wider transport network and does not consider the true effects on people who live in suburbs around Maymorn. 6) Failure to properly understand, increase traffic on local roads for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers bordering the development will result in unacceptable risk. 7) There is no mention of the effect on traffic volumes arising from heavy vehicles leaving Alpha Specialised Movers, Upper Hutt Ready Mix and Hutt Concrete Products on Maymorn Road. 8) The ITA report lacks evidence of the contributing factor of heavy vehicles to the traffic distribution on local roads in Maymorn. 9) The mention of construction traffic does not reflect the

			<p>likely volume and size of traffic impacts.</p> <p>10) Refers to the Wallaceville Development Area as a good indication of volume and duration of construction traffic and the impacts on the community.</p> <p>11) See submission for details.</p>
S38.2	General.	2) The submitter seeks UHCC and the developer to address the need to protect the valley against light pollution created by the Gabites Block.	<p>1) Refers to the special significance of the Mangaroa valley that was first identified by an independent commissioner during earlier proposals to develop the valley.</p> <p>2) Refers to the Tekapo Dark Sky Reserve for standards such as lighting plans for roadways, pathways and external lighting of each dwelling.</p> <p>3) Tekapo Dark Sky Reserve is a simple and cost-effective measure with real benefits to the community and the environment of the wider valley.</p> <p>4) This remains critical due to the threat of urban sprawl into the rural zone across the wider district.</p>

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 39: Michael Byrne			
S39.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks that approval of the private plan change is deferred until greater clarity can be provided on the impact on the local infrastructure in a consolidated and readable way to enable proper consultation.	1) The increase in volume of people from additional housing on the Gabites Block is not considered or clearly shown in the document associated with rail, schooling and traffic. 2) The rail network assessment implies greater capacity yet there are no plans in place for this that supports the assessment for future network changes. 3) The lack of assessment for transport impacts on school traffic and planning for the increase in population needs to be supported by the local school. 4) The 2 vehicles per minute during peak hours does not consider the impacts on timing of the current intersection.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 40: Greater Wellington Regional Council			
S40.1	General.	1) The submitter supports the private plan change with the amendments set out below: a) To correct all references to the “Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington region” (RPS). b) Ensure alignment with all relevant Te Whanganui-a-Tara Whaitua Implementation Programme and Te Mahere Wai o Te Kahui Taiao recommendations. c) Include wetlands and waterbodies for the Gabites Block Natural Area definition d) Inclusion of identified natural watercourses and wetlands in future site mapping and structure planning with development setbacks along identified	1) Reference to the RPS is currently incorrect and the RPS sets out the objectives, policies and methods to achieve integrated management of natural and physical resources for the Wellington region. 2) Recommendation 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 the relevant recommendations. 3) Regional Council has the primary role to implement the NES-FM regulations within and adjacent to wetlands, district councils have a complementary role

		<p>watercourses to create a riparian buffer.</p> <p>e) Amend the development plan transport provisions to require an EV charging station as part of the development plan provisions.</p>	<p>to play in managing land use in areas surrounding wetlands.</p> <p>4) To support integrated management, GWRC considers that including known wetlands in planning maps and ensuring there are policies that provide for wetland protection are needed.</p> <p>5) 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 subdivision and structure planning. This approach would help to achieve NPS-FM Policies 6 and 7.</p> <p>6) Requiring EV charging stations will enable residents to use public and zero carbon transport.</p> <p>7) See submission for details.</p>
S40.2	SUB-DEV3-S4.	<p>1) The submitter supports the proposal and seeks a requirement that stormwater be adequately treated (e.g., sediment ponds) before being discharged into natural waterways or wetlands.</p>	<p>1) To ensure that the requirements of the Proposed Natural Resource Plan for the Wellington Region and Natural Environmental Standards for Freshwater are met.</p> <p>2) The proposed plan change does not provide adequate detail to demonstrate how the stormwater network will work; nor how the identified natural watercourses and wetland will be avoided.</p> <p>3) Supports Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) approach to protect watercourses through setbacks and riparian buffers to minimise flood risk and in line with the principle of hydraulic neutrality.</p> <p>4) Support the stormwater management techniques in the Section 32 report, however the relationship between the identified watercourses, site plan and stormwater system are currently unclear.</p> <p>5) Demonstrating how the development will avoid adverse effects of development on health and well-being of waterbodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments, is required under NPS-FM 3.5.</p> <p>6) It is also essential to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai and</p>

			align with the direction of Te Whaitua Te Whanganui-a Tara and Te Mahere Wai.
S40.3	SUB-DEV3-S2.	1) The submitter supports the proposal and seeks to clarify whether bore water could be used as water supply. In addition, 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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The site once contained an unregulated pig slurry dumping ground and had sewage ponds. 2) 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. 3) Seeks reassurance that bore water has not been contaminated, particularly if this water might be used for water supply.
S40.4	SUB-DEV3-S1.	1) The submitter supports the proposal and seeks an increase in the development density to maximise the number of dwellings on the site closer to the potential yield of 457 dwellings, within the identified constraints.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) While GWRC understand the site has several development constraints, the density proposed is very low. 2) Refers to 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. 3) 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.
S40.5	General.	1) The submitter supports efforts taken to protect and enhance areas of significant indigenous biodiversity at the site and has no concerns with the proposal from a geographical hazard perspective. The submitter seeks consideration of opportunities to encourage the planting of the slopes and ridgelines outside of the natural area to native vegetation, to help to secure erodible land and create corridors for indigenous flora and fauna.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 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.” 2) The potential hazard related issues will be dealt with through the appropriate standards and geotechnical investigations on the steeper parts of the site. 3) Seismic hazards for the site are manageable and can be

			<p>dealt with through building standards.</p> <p>4) The Wellington Fault is around 1.8km to the west, but no other faults are known to bisect the site and therefore the fault rupture risk is low.</p> <p>5) GWRC liquefaction and ground shaking maps do not extend to cover Gabites Block but assessments for liquefaction, lateral spreading, rock fall and debris flows have been undertaken and are considered low and manageable.</p> <p>6) Slope failure hazards represent the greatest risk to the site, which is recognised and provided for in the site assessment.</p>
S40.6	DEV3-ECO-P2 and DEV3-ECO-R2.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to the wording to remove “identified” before “biodiversity value” when referring to adverse effects caused by activities or maintenance of biodiversity values. For example: Avoid adverse effects on identified indigenous biodiversity values where practicable; Minimise other adverse effects on the identified biodiversity values where avoidance is not practicable.”	<p>1) Policy 24 and 47 should also be noted of the RPS directs Councils to protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with indigenous biodiversity values.</p> <p>2) The qualifier “identified” unnecessarily limits the consideration of effects to those values identified within the Gabites Block Natural Area at the time of plan notification.</p>
S40.7	DEV3-ECO-R2.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to change the Permitted Activity status for removal of non-indigenous plants that are not pest plants to Restricted Discretionary or Controlled Activity status. The submitter suggests including a specific rule permitting the removal of pest plants within the Gabites Block Natural Areas, where appropriate for restoration and maintenance of these areas.	<p>1) The removal of non-indigenous vegetation being a permitted activity within the Gabites Block Natural Area is not appropriate.</p> <p>2) Any non-indigenous plants within the Gabites Block Natural Area that are not pest plants may still provide significant habitat for indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>3) This understanding is recognised in section 6C of the RMA which directs the protection of the “significant habitats of indigenous fauna” not the significant indigenous habitats of indigenous fauna.</p>

S40.8	DEV3-S6.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to ensure that all houses on lots along the eastern property boundary are required to be setback from this boundary at a scale distance to protect from future forestry harvest.	1) There has been plantation forestry planted along the boundary of the eastern section of the property. 2) There is a risk that dwellings may be too close to the boundary for safe harvesting if only the current 3m to the setback rule is applied.
S40.9	DEV3-ECO-Appendix 2. DEV3-ECO-Appendix 3.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to the framework of principles for biodiversity offsetting and compensation to be consistent with the Proposed Natural Resources Plan (PNRP) and Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) guidance.	1) The framework of principles for biodiversity offsetting and compensation should align with those scheduled in Proposed Natural Resources Plan (PNRP). This is to ensure continuity between district and regional requirements for biodiversity effects management. 2) LGNZ (2018) Biodiversity Offsetting under the Resource Management Act guidance should be followed.
S40.10	SUB-DEV3-P5.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to allow additional parking for the Rail Trail and Pākuratahi park users within the road reserve boundary adjustments on Maymorn Road and connections between the development roads and park tracks should also be made where appropriate (e.g., Pandy Track in Pākuratahi Forest).	1) Development of an off-road connection to the rail trail and Pākuratahi Forest. 2) Tutu 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). 3) Trail development should consider horse riders' needs including opportunities for parking. Parking is limited to the nearby Parkes Line Road. 4) 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 Haereanga. Opportunities to enhance the trail surface width and safety in this location should be prioritised
S40.11	SUB-DEV3-P5.	1) The submitter supports with an amendment 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.	1) The suggested provision of land to create a potential future active mode shared path along 1135 Maymorn Road section boundary would represent significant compromise to active recreation opportunities because of the increased volume of high-speed traffic associated with this development.

S40.12	General	1) The submitter supports with an amendment to the speed limits on the affected stretches of Maymorn Road from 100kph to 50kph.	1) As PPC55 transforms the area from rural to urban/rural fringe, thereby extending the urban extent of Maymorn Road, speed limits should be revisited.
S40.13	Integrated Transport Assessment.	1) The submitter supports with additional analysis of the proposed plan change for the impact of increased traffic caused by the development on the Mangaroo School gate.	1) This attachment notes “a local school bus service currently routes between Plateau, Birchville and Trentham schools.” 2) With respect to this reference to school bus services, it would appear no mention is made of Mangaroo School throughout any of the planning documents, despite Mangaroo School being one of the closet schools to the development (in travel time terms).
S40.14	DEV3-NH-P1.	1) The submitter seeks the following insertion into DEV3-NH-P1: <u>3) The earthworks adopt effective erosion and sediment control measures to retain silt and sediment on the site.</u>	1) This policy provides for earthworks and mitigates the risks of slope failure, however there is no consideration for the discharge of sediment from the site to a waterbody. 2) Water quality is a consideration for both regional and district plans under the NPS-FM.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 41: Mary Beth Taylor			
S41.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined and that pending plans and policies such as the draft PC48, PC50 and NPS-IB (National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity) needs to be implemented before this private plan change. In addition, a Biodiversity Restoration Plan to accompany the land use application.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It is presumptuous to assume there is general support for a private plan change in this sensitive area without having been presented the plan to the public. 2) The documents have been presented with several factual errors and unfounded assumptions. This is 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 documents proves confusing for the public. 3) The community has stated clearly that intensive development and pseudo-urban form is not what is needed or wanted in this area. 4) It appears to be another effort to “urbanise” the rural area as was previously attempted under the Maymorn Structure Plan. 5) The developer reinforces the NPS-UD in a way that makes it clear they have truly missed the mark of the intentions of the NPS-UD. Referencing the NPS-UD incorrectly exposes the ignorance of the developer and unwillingness to work within the agreed limits to growth outside of urban areas. 6) Maymorn is best placed to respond to the demand for additional rural lifestyle properties and should be considered only in this context. 7) Does not support the suggestion to ‘add on’ sections to the northern side of MacLaren Street, as this would infringe upon some of the most productive land in the upper valley. 8) The reputation of the developer in the rural area, evident with amendments 8 and 9 to exiting protection to indigenous vegetation. 9) A good model for the settlement zone of the Gabites

			<p>Block includes sections down to a minimum of 2,000m2.</p> <p>10) Lack of information is presented around the impact of the additional numbers of domestic animals that will be introduced at the Gabites Block. Anticipate that 200 plus additional dwellings will generate an equal number of apex predator species (e.g., cats predominantly), which can create colonies of feral cats and UHCC does not currently have a cat policy. Concern about uncontrolled cat ownership can signify the destruction of large number of indigenous species.</p> <p>11) There will be additional environmental considerations to include in the future development of the Gabites area that are not mentioned in the documents.</p> <p>12) Concern that not enough research has been done in the ecological report to understand the habitats of species (e.g., bats, native birds, reptiles and insect populations) and how intensive residential development will affect them.</p> <p>13) The current zoning controls for rural land are working. Current rules protect the rural areas from over development and provide some environmental protection for these vulnerable areas.</p> <p>14) 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.</p> <p>15) The rural areas of the city have an important role to play in achieving sustainability and mitigating the future effects of climate change, contribute to food security, resilience, recreation, and hospitality in the city.</p> <p>16) There is an absence of any developed rural recreation space or public services in most rural areas of the city.</p> <p>17) The possibility soil and water table toxicity for this site</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>should be considered.</p> <p>18) Opposed to any suggestion of suburban density of 400m² on the Gabites block. Smaller lifestyle blocks on this land compatible with neighbouring developments and the rural environment, sections no smaller than half an acre and up to one hectare would be appropriate. A much denser development would destroy this and set the precedent for urban incursion into the rural area.</p> <p>19) Any land use decisions and future development must achieve hydraulic neutrality.</p> <p>20) Revisit the maximum 55m² family flat policy for rural areas. The size of a second dwelling for multi-generation living in a rural area should be owner regulated.</p> <p>21) All the relevant issues regarding the proposed development in this area were covered in depth during the notification of draft PC50 last year.</p> <p>22) No doubt the NPS-IB will shed further light on environmentally sensitive issues within the Gabites area.</p> <p>23) The NPS-IB will need to be taken into consideration when making zoning land use decisions. In addition to seeing PC50 process to completion, it would be prudent to hold back on any further plan changes for the area until the NPS-IB has been finalised.</p> <p>24) Significant areas of SNA's on the doorstep of the proposed private plan change and there will be repercussions for zoning and land use decisions in that area.</p> <p>25) It is time essentially for UHCC to reconsider their decisions around land use with references to a large number of policies at national, regional and local government levels.</p> <p>26) It is good practice to wait for the finalisation of the PC48, PC50 and the NPS-IB before challenging them</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>with a private plan change that deviates considerable from the intention of these emerging policies.</p> <p>27) It feels that this plays “Devil’s Advocate” with the Land Use Strategy (2016). It challenges the community to re-confirm their loyalty to protecting rural land and wilderness areas The Land Use Strategy is a document to be respected as it was widely consulted publicly, initially through the Rural Strategy consultation and later combined with the Urban Growth Strategy.</p> <p>28) Concern that development will be a threat to the role of the Mangaroa Peatland as hydrological buffer.</p> <p>29) National and Regional documents need to be considered. It is 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.</p> <p>30) Landowners and their consultants and engineers are incredibly good at finding ways around the rules.</p> <p>31) 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.</p> <p>32) Through the land use decision, we need to have the tools to leave the environment in better not worse conditions. This would mean the developer would have in place a plan to restore and improve biodiversity of the site by leaving ecological features in place and working around them instead of through them, native tree planting, riparian planting, and a green belt connection.</p> <p>33) A Biodiversity Restoration Plan would differ from a Landscape Plan in that it would aim at supporting and restoring native biodiversity.</p> <p>34) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	---

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 42: Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			
S42.1	General.	1) The submitter supports the application in part, but is seeking better provision and greater certainty of construction timing for multi-modal travel connections.	1) Supports planned 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. 2) Considers the Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) and SIDRA outputs provided by the applicant via email on 25 November 2021 gives assurance that traffic generated by the PPC55 will not adversely affect the safe function of the SH2 Plateau Road intersection. 3) The proposal does not go far enough to provide sufficient connectivity for non-vehicular modes of transport for Waka Kotahi to support this plan change entirely.
S42.2	Structure Plan.	1) The submitter seeks the following amendments to the structure plan: a) A minimum, single sided sealed footpath within the road corridor throughout the site to facilitate internal site circulation. b) The shared user path ('SUP') along the roadside boundary of Maymorn is constructed to a clear path width of no less than 2.5m on Ausroads "Cycling Aspects of Ausroads Guide (2017)" Figure 7.2, assuming less than 50 pedestrians will typically be using the path during peak hours prior to onsite works commencing on the subject site. c) The applicant constructs a ('SUP') connection including a safe road crossing to the passenger platform of the Maymorn Train Station.	1) Supports the proposed internal traffic functioning as described in Section 10 of the ITA. 2) A sealed footpath needs to be constructed on at least one side of the internal road network to provide better connections to the wider transport network and encourage multi-modal travel onsite. 3) Footpaths have not been shown on the Structure Plan Prepared by Envelope (reference 1594-01 Dated 24 Feb 2022), so this certainty of footpath provision is requested. 4) Commends the applicant on their proposal to vest a portion of the subject site adjacent to Maymorn Road and the local roading network for the purpose of a Shared User Path ('SUP'). 5) The location of the site for PPC55 with 200m of Maymorn Train Station is an appealing characteristic of the proposal for housing and an opportunity to enable and encourage use of alternative transport modes. 6) It is currently difficult to access from the proposed

			<p>development on foot because there is no safe crossing location nor formalised route to the platform.</p> <p>7) Seeks a connection from the SUP is made to Maymorn Train Station passenger platform and a safe road crossing constructed prior to any onsite development works to ensure that the subject site is well connected prior to the households establishing daily routines within the development site. Including this connection will better enable active mode and public transport links that provide legitimate transport choice for all people.</p> <p>8) Integration with existing networks, and the required infrastructure improvements will contribute to the Toitu Te Taiao framework identified in Section 3 of this submission.</p> <p>9) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	---

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 43: Paul Baker			
S43.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined and 14.6 hectares of relatively flat land in the valley retained for agriculture purposes.	<p>1) Opposes the change in zone from “Rural Hill” and Rural Valley” to “Settlement Zone” and it should be made at the time the District Plan is available for wider consultation, so that others with land in a comparable situation can put their proposals forward.</p> <p>2) The data supplied by the consultants is misleading in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Soil and Land Use Capability b) Wilding pines. <p>3) The land should not be squandered by intensive housing or subdivision and retained for agriculture.</p> <p>4) A sizable proportion of the Hilltop Basin with 1,000m² lots will involve the construction of new buildings on vegetated areas of land which comprises of flammable species.</p> <p>5) See submission for details.</p>

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 44: Lesley Francis			
S44.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Disagrees with the allotment size proposed and of the view it should be 2,000m². 2) The submitter brought in Maymorn for the semi-rural lifestyle, amenity and privacy and the changes proposed will impact their lives if approved. 3) Reconsider the proposed subdivision and leave Maymorn as a semi-rural suburb and not a high-density housing location. 4) The existing transport environment will require upgrades due to an additional 500 vehicles on the roads. Improvements to the footpaths, street lighting, cycleways, parking at the train station and services for public transport will need to be considered. 5) Concern about the increase of light pollution in the area due to the streetlights that will affect the night skies. 6) One of the proposed entrances to the housing development is directly opposite their driveway which means a constant flow of vehicles and lighting spills from headlights. 7) The proposal will have a negative impact on the environment as the birds and wildlife of Maymorn will dramatically change with the increase of housing. 8) The current infrastructure along Maymorn Road will require huge upgrades such as improvements to pipes, water supply, stormwater, wastewater and telecommunications must be considered for a housing build of this size. 9) Plateau School is a small school which is part of the appeal for the community and the traffic situation of the school is already a challenge with staggered finishing times to minimise congestion. 10) See submission for details.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 45: Tony Chad			
S45.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined and that pending plans and policies such as the draft PC48, PC50 and NPS-IB (National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity) needs to be implemented before this private plan change. In addition, a Biodiversity Restoration Plan to accompany the land use application.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It is presumptuous to assume there is general support for a private plan change in this sensitive area without having been presented the plan to the public. 2) The documents have been presented with several factual errors and unfounded assumptions. This is 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 documents proves confusing for the public. 3) The community has stated clearly that intensive development and pseudo-urban form is not what is needed or wanted in this area. 4) It appears to be another effort to “urbanise” the rural area as was previously attempted under the Maymorn Structure Plan. 5) The developer reinforces the NPS-UD in a way that makes it clear they have truly missed the mark of the intentions of the NPS-UD. Referencing the NPS-UD incorrectly exposes the ignorance of the developer and unwillingness to work within the agreed limits to growth outside of urban areas. 6) Maymorn is best placed to respond to the demand for additional rural lifestyle properties and should be considered only in this context. 7) Does not support the suggestion to ‘add on’ sections to the northern side of MacLaren Street, as this would infringe upon some of the most productive land in the upper valley. 8) The reputation of the developer in the rural area, evident with amendments 8 and 9 to exiting protection to

			<p>indigenous vegetation.</p> <p>9) A good model for the settlement zone of the Gabites Block includes sections down to a minimum of 2,000m².</p> <p>10) Lack of information is presented around the impact of the additional numbers of domestic animals that will be introduced at the Gabites Block. Anticipate that 200 plus additional dwellings will generate an equal number of apex predator species (e.g., cats predominantly), which can create colonies of feral cats and UHCC does not currently have a cat policy. Concern about uncontrolled cat ownership can signify the destruction of large number of indigenous species.</p> <p>11) There will be additional environmental considerations to include in the future development of the Gabites area that are not mentioned in the documents.</p> <p>12) Concern that not enough research has been done in the ecological report to understand the habitats of species (e.g., bats, native birds, reptiles and insect populations) and how intensive residential development will affect them.</p> <p>13) The current zoning controls for rural land are working. Current rules protect the rural areas from over development and provide some environmental protection for these vulnerable areas.</p> <p>14) 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.</p> <p>15) The rural areas of the city have an important role to play in achieving sustainability and mitigating the future effects of climate change, contribute to food security, resilience, recreation, and hospitality in the city.</p> <p>16) There is an absence of any developed rural recreation space or public services in most rural areas of the city.</p> <p>17) The possibility soil and water table toxicity for this site</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>should be considered.</p> <p>18) Opposed to any suggestion of suburban density of 400m² on the Gabites block. Smaller lifestyle blocks on this land compatible with neighbouring developments and the rural environment, sections no smaller than half an acre and up to one hectare would be appropriate. A much denser development would destroy this and set the precedent for urban incursion into the rural area.</p> <p>19) Any land use decisions and future development must achieve hydraulic neutrality.</p> <p>20) Revisit the maximum 55m² family flat policy for rural areas. The size of a second dwelling for multi-generation living in a rural area should be owner regulated.</p> <p>21) All the relevant issues regarding the proposed development in this area were covered in depth during the notification of draft PC50 last year.</p> <p>22) No doubt the NPS-IB will shed further light on environmentally sensitive issues within the Gabites area.</p> <p>23) The NPS-IB will need to be taken into consideration when making zoning land use decisions. In addition to seeing PC50 process to completion, it would be prudent to hold back on any further plan changes for the area until the NPS-IB has been finalised.</p> <p>24) Significant areas of SNA's on the doorstep of the proposed private plan change and there will be repercussions for zoning and land use decisions in that area.</p> <p>25) It is time essentially for UHCC to reconsider their decisions around land use with references to a large number of policies at national, regional and local government levels.</p> <p>26) It is good practice to wait for the finalisation of the PC48, PC50 and the NPS-IB before challenging them with a private plan change that deviates considerable from the intention of these emerging policies.</p> <p>27) It feels that this plays "Devil's Advocate" with the Land</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Use Strategy (2016). It challenges the community to re-confirm their loyalty to protecting rural land and wilderness areas. The Land Use Strategy is a document to be respected as it was widely consulted publicly, initially through the Rural Strategy consultation and later combined with the Urban Growth Strategy.</p> <p>28) Concern that development will be a threat to the role of the Mangaroa Peatland as hydrological buffer.</p> <p>29) National and Regional documents need to be considered. It is 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.</p> <p>30) Landowners and their consultants and engineers are incredibly good at finding ways around the rules.</p> <p>31) 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.</p> <p>32) Through the land use decision, we need to have the tools to leave the environment in better not worse conditions. This would mean the developer would have in place a plan to restore and improve biodiversity of the site by leaving ecological features in place and working around them instead of through them, native tree planting, riparian planting, and a green belt connection.</p> <p>33) A Biodiversity Restoration Plan would differ from a Landscape Plan in that it would aim at supporting and restoring native biodiversity.</p> <p>34) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	--

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 46: Christopher Northmore			
S46.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The proposed number and intensity of houses is excessive and will significantly detract from the rural amenity values. 2) A rural zone reflects open spaces between the houses, wide green space and low-density rural housing with outbuildings. 3) Supportive of development, but not the plan change that is significantly more intense than the current plan provides for and will substantially change the environment and ambiance. 4) A substantial number of houses will create visual impact and other effects. 5) The rural quiet will be replaced with a constant commutative noise. 6) The construction of 200 additional houses will likely mean constant construction activity for ten years. 7) This timeframe and intensity are significantly higher than development that is provided for within the current zoning. 8) The “old pig farm site” can adequately develop within the current plan rules and there are other places in Upper Hutt where intensive development is better suited.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 47: Bob Orriss			
S47.1	General.	1) The submitter seeks a comprehensive lizard survey be undertaken on the assumption that the plan change goes ahead in some shape or form.	1) The transport report is flawed. For example, a 60m right hand turn lane from Plateau Road onto SH2 is stated but does not consider the "bicycle island. It will prevent traffic turning left if more than three vehicles want to turn right on the road. 2) A comprehensive survey as highlighted in the ecological report is necessary due to lizards on their property.

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 48: Richard Bialy			
S48.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	1) Not opposed to development in the Maymorn area. 2) Opposed to passing inconsistent zoning decisions which has the huge potential to unfairly impact negatively on many current residents. 3) Concern that the rural character of the area will not be preserved if the rezoning of Gabites Block is approved. 4) Concern that the area is not identified for productive agriculture land and challenges this as it was initially zoned this way so that farmers would be eligible for government subsidies. If any land is productive, it is the Gabites area. 5) If the Gabites rezoning goes through the whole character of this area will change. 6) The traffic along Parkes Line Road will become incompatible with the current lifestyle. 7) There has been inadequate study or acknowledgement of the flow-on effects the proposed Gabites Block development would have on the wider current Maymorn community.

			<p>8) For over two years, the submitter has been working on PC50 and suddenly it is shelved because we have a developer that wants to put in substantial housing in the Gabites Block area.</p> <p>9) There are plenty of repeated messages from the Council and Government around the need for more housing to meet the ever-increasing population, that is why residents of Parkes Line Road should be given the same opportunities as the Gabites Block as this inconsistency in zoning shows a lack of planning and impact studies.</p> <p>10) Challenges the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the plan change.</p> <p>11) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	---

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 49: John and Margaret Ankcorn			
S49.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter seeks the private plan change request be declined.	<p>1) Opposes the proposed plan change request to allow for the construction of residential units and future development on the site.</p> <p>2) Concern that there is no indication of improvements in infrastructure and amenities i.e., footpaths, shops, public transport and phone reception to support this type of development.</p>

S49.2	General.	1) The submitter seeks the new cycleway connecting to Pākuratahi Forest / Remukata Rail Trail consider existing users as equally important.	1) The proposed new cycleway will impact on the existing track continuation for track users such as horse riders, walkers with dogs and children. 2) Concern that users other than cyclists will be put at increased risk when using this track.
-------	----------	---	---

Submission Point	Provision	Decision Sought	Reasons
Submitter 50: Paul Persico			
S50.1	Entire Plan Change.	1) The submitter opposes the intensification proposed by the plan change request and seeks that the private plan change request be delayed until UHCC considers PC50.	1) In favour of allowing development of Maymorn when it retains a distinctly rural character of the area. 2) The proposal will lead to inconsistent zoning practices. 3) The Gabites Block should be considered as part of the wider considerations under PC50 to ensure ratepayers are not disadvantaged. 4) Delay until UHCC understands the regulatory requirements and changes should be made taking into account the overall flows and impacts on the wider community. 5) There is 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. 6) If Council approves the plan change as site specific, Maymorn residents will join forces to an appeal to the Environment Court and Civil lawsuit against members of council for breach of their fiduciary duty. 7) Ensure consistency in delivering appropriate planning

			<p>outcomes for the community and avoiding adhoc approvals without the ability to consider the needs of the wider ratepayers.</p> <p>8) Concerned about congestion issues on Maymorn Road and Parkes Line Road.</p> <p>9) Increased traffic flow on roading infrastructure that was not designed for it.</p> <p>10) The impact on horizontal infrastructure and the flow-on impacts to residents due to loss of capacity for potential PC50 changes to accommodate housing better suited and more in keeping with the rural character.</p> <p>11) The proposal does not meet the Sustainability Strategy (2020) principle “to minimise our environmental impact, maximise, remedial action role-model sustainable community living.”</p> <p>12) The expert reports provided by the applicant are inadequate.</p> <p>13) Challenges the suggested better environmental and housing outcomes that the author suggested may be delivered by the plan change.</p> <p>14) See submission for details.</p>
--	--	--	--