

PORIRUA C C

26 APR 2007

RECEIVED

PORIRUA CITY COUNCIL

PO Box 50 218, Porirua City Council

FORM 13

SUBMISSION	
26 APR 2007	
NO.	2

PLA.02

SP

SUBMISSION ON A PUBLICLY NOTIFIED APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 96 OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991 CONCERNING A RESOURCE CONSENT

To: Porirua City Council

Name of Submitter: STEVE NICKSON

Submitters Postal Address: P.O. BOX 30063 LOWER HUTT

This is a submission on an application from (State Name of Applicant) STEVE NICKSON

The application is for a resource consent for: (Briefly describe the type of Resource Consent, the application/proposal, and land on which this resource consent is proposed).

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 6 - JUDGEFORD HILLS ZONE - TO THE PORIRUA CITY DISTRICT PLAN

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are: (Give details)

The plan change, the access road, the number of clustered houses, the economic analysis, and the lack of detail.

I support or oppose the application:

for a PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 6 - JUDGEFORD HILLS

The particular parts of the application I support or oppose are: (Clearly indicate which parts of the application you support or oppose or wish to have amendments made to)

See separate list of 5 points

(Please type or print clearly in Black Pen)

The reasons for making my submission are:

See Separate sheet Points 1-5

I wish the consent authority to make the following decision: (Give details, including the nature of any conditions sought)

See Separate sheet Points 1-5

I do ~~or do not~~ wish to be heard (speak) in support of my submission at any subsequent Hearing

~~*If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.~~
*Delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case.

(Signature of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Steve Nickson

(Date) 26 April 2007

Address for service of person making submission:

111A BRADEY ROAD
RD 1
PORIRUA

Telephone No: 027 2013981

Fax No: —

Contact person: STEVE NICKSON

NOTE

- You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission to Council.
- Please ensure all areas of this submission form are completed.

1. I object to the application proceeding prior to the review of the Rural District Plan

The developers appear to want to fast-track the application to avoid the review of the Rural District Plan. The review commences in 2008, and this development should not be approved prior to that, so that wider consultation can take place, and the private change does not compromise the District Plan. The developer's claim that further delay is causing them further financial burden is a problem that rests either with the developer's current farming skills, or their funding arrangements. Neither of these should become drivers to force the Council to prejudice their review of the Rural District Plan.

The application should be declined until after the review of the Rural District Plan

2. I object to the application to use Bradey Road as the access to the development.

The development has frontage on Belmont Road, and this is the road that should be used for access. As has happened in Flightys Road, at some stage the Council will have to upgrade Belmont Road as development continues. This development provides the opportunity for that upgrade to happen at the developer's cost, and not the ratepayers. To use Bradey Road, the Council [and ratepayers] will ultimately bear the cost in the future. The only rationale for the developers not using Belmont Road is that it erodes their profits! If Council approved Bradey Road as the access, it is simply using taxpayer's money to provide a subsidy for the developer.

When the Elmwood subdivision was proposed, Council required a 2 lane bridge linking to SH58. The Environment Court overturned that decision, however if Council deemed a 2 lane bridge appropriate for 14 lots, then it would certainly require one for 54 lots if Bradey Road traffic increased.

The only access for the development should be via an upgraded Belmont Road

3. I object to the cluster housing development, as concentrating the development in defined areas will detract from the rural environment.

The aggregation of several dwellings together will not provide the "space and privacy" or "seclusion" claimed by the developers. A traditional smallholding does not have neighbours on a 0.2 hectare lot. Taking residential lots and dropping them onto a rural landscape is nothing more than trying to extract maximum profits from the land available.

The application should be declined in favour of a conventional rural development of 5ha lots

4. I object to economic analysis of alternative land uses.

The proposal states [section 4.3] that “The nature of the market for rural residential or lifestyle blocks has changed over the years. Whereas previously the desire was more for a farmlet with primary production as a main aim, the market now is smaller lots with residence in a rural setting being a primary motive. Provision of smaller lots avoids the purchase of unwanted and therefore underutilized land”

Where is the evidence for this change in demand?

In the same section it states “traditional subdivision is leading to under-utilisation of the land” This is simply incorrect and in most cases, better utilization of the land is obtained than purely pastoral. Examples include:

- Farming of all kinds [including angora goats, ostriches and emus]
- Horticulture and aquaculture
- Bees, poultry and pigs
- Market gardening
- Boarding and breeding kennels
- Stud farms
- Forestry for production, protection and recreation
- Tree nurseries
- Glasshouses and factory farming
- Arts and craft studios
- Vineyards

This list gives an indication of the wide variety of alternative uses that can lead to more effective/efficient use of the land compared to pastoral farming, and also leading to improved quality of soils. For most people purchasing a smallholding, apart from the rural lifestyle, there is a strong motivation to produce and live off the land. The subdivision of traditional farmland into smallholdings tends to result in increased productivity through the many intensive land use alternatives.

Considering the Bradey Road properties, the land has been considerably enhanced from an ecological perspective through a vigorous planting programme improving the protection and regeneration of native plant life. There is no evidence the proposal will offer enhancements to this type of development.

The application should be declined in favour of a traditional rural development of 5ha lots.

5. I object to the lack of detail surrounding the proposed Private Plan change

- There is no guarantee that the developers will further sub divide the land. They have stated on numerous occasions in the proposal that farming the land is uneconomic. Reducing the land for farming does not make it any more economic. The developer's intention to continue farming must be seen as suspect. Why would they want to continue losing money by continuing to farm a smaller land size? They cannot achieve profitability now, and that will only worsen with less land. That is the rationale they use for not considering sub dividing the land into more traditional smallholdings because of the challenges farming smaller blocks bring. To choose to continue in a loss-making operation suggests they intend to further sub divide it in a stage 2.
- The developers have proposed Bradey Road as the access to Judgeford Hills, however they don't intend paying for a 2 lane bridge, or upgrading Bradey Road that is deteriorating in places with the current traffic use.
- The developers have stated that a sum will be set aside for future road maintenance, but do not state how much, or for how long?
- The proposal states that there will be improvements through environmental enhancements to the wetlands, but does not provide specifics

The developer must provide a guarantee that no further subdivision takes place.

The developer must use Belmont Road as the access for this proposal. If a decision is made to allow Bradey Road, a 2 lane bridge must be built and the existing Bradey Road upgraded.

The developer must state the quantum set aside for private road maintenance and for how long it will be provided. There should also be a sum set aside to cover eventualities such as major floods, earthquakes etc.

The developer must provide detail of all the environmental enhancements, including sums for each improvement.