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**COMMISSIONER:** Good morning. Welcome back. We will reconvene. Just to make a note, our hearing administrator, Jane, it is her birthday today. Happy birthday, Jane. Jane, along with submitters, have worked hard in terms of reorganising the schedule. If you are unsure of any matter, do not hesitate to see Jane and there is also information on the wall. In terms of this morning, we will hear from Rosemary Law and then we will move to Sam Dixon, Toby Dixon, Matt Peacock, Barney Walker, Luke Peacock, Richard Rowland, Tony Peacock, Gina Milestone and Layne Greensill. Some of the speakers may be different; they may be speakers on behalf of those submitters. Also we will have Taranaki Iwi. Rosemary Law, welcome.

**MS LAW:** Kia ora koutou. I'm Rosemary Law. For a bit of background on who I am and how I fit into this: I have lived for the first part of my life on the south side of Mount Taranaki in a place called Kaponga and for the rest of my life, about 25 years, on the north side, near the entrance to Lucy's Gully, which is the main road entrance to the Kaitake Range. I'm a paediatric dietician. I have a child at the local Oākura school. I'm connected to the tourism industry locally as an occasional surfing coach.

 I feel strongly connected to this community and to our environment. Thank you for this opportunity to outline my objections to the current development. I would also then like to make a proposal. I feel we need to very carefully plan for extra housing, for lots of reasons. If Oākura needs to expand, I do not feel this is the right approach. Our population is not necessarily going to expand as much as we might be expecting. We all know the oil and gas industry will be on the wane in our province and national migration is reducing.

 Housing plans will not need to be extensive, in my opinion, but will need to be very circumspect. Any urban development needs to be looking at intensifying what we already have, rather than moving into new green spaces. There are many experts who no doubt can speak to that and counsellors will understand the reasons for that far better than me. I often ask tourists how they find New Plymouth, as I really like our city. The say it is nice, but a bit quiet, even boring and there's often hardly anyone around.

 I believe vibrant cities need people living in them, not out in ever-expanding suburbs. This land is north-facing growing land, so I believe should be left for something like this purpose. If not for agriculture, then adding to the native bush or the much needed growing of veggies. As a health professional, I understand the need for protecting growing spaces and other green spaces. There is already a small, but great growing industry in the area and it seems like it has always been good for growing, historically.

 I understand that when people are building new buildings sites they often come across old kumara patches. I understand one of the land owner's arguments for redeveloping this land is that it's not currently an economic unit. I have an interest in our small family farm on the other side of the mountain, in Kaponga, and it remains economic, even with the changing compliance cost. I'm really disappointed that a local plan can be ignored and manipulated for the benefit of one landowner. They alone have the potential to massively impact, in my opinion, negatively on our local environment.

 I understand that there are other development areas in the region, particular across the road from this one. My main objection though is from the perspective of our national park. I understand there is a concerted effort to control predators as part of the predator free Taranaki and Mounga Projects. There are hunters clearing out goats in the bush; lots of trapping going on, with local involvement; the latest round of 1080 drops, which none of us like, but understand how important it is.

 I also understand that there are plans to relocated important bird species to our national park. The Kaitake section of the national park is recognised as a unique environment. Again, no doubt, others and counsellors will understand this better than I do. In my opinion, the last thing our national parks need is a suburb right next to it. Urbanisation comes with pests, cats, rats, noise pollution, light pollution and other unintended consequences that you cannot mitigate for.

 From the small amount of ecology I managed to sneak into my studies, I understand the national park needs a green space buffer. I guess at least a kilometre, but probably more like four to five kilometres. In fact, what our national park needs and what Taranaki does not have is a bush corridor to the sea. The Kaitake Range bush is the closest we get and we shouldn't be messing this up with spreading housing into the green spaces there.

 What I would like to propose is that we look at a project to use this development and those adjacent areas as a bike park, instead of a suburb. There are obvious benefits for this. It fits in really well with the project underway for the biking and walking track from Pukeiti to Surrey Hill Road. A bike park would better coexist with and enhance the national park environment.

We could tag in on the current government billion trees planting project and increase the bush area. I am sorry that this is a tangent, but I do feel strongly about it. The local people here obviously know to rally around a cause, as you can tell from this process and from the great response the council got to the trapping projects and the coastal planting we have been doing. I know they would rally around something like this.

I understand the council's looking for a flagship project. As much as I like the (inaudible) it's still a concrete and steel monolith. A more environment project with economic benefits would be a great next option. As the oil industry is on the wane, we really need to maximise our tourism potential. I don't think we can complete with Queenstown for extreme adventures, but promoting our fun outdoor lifestyle in terms of mountain walks, surfing, mountain biking and golfing, would be a winner. You just need to look at Rotorua to see the benefits of a biking industry for the local community there.

I am sure we could get this landowner and other landowners to buy into this idea. The opportunity to leave such a great legacy like this would bring out the best in our community. I know this is a random suggestion, but the more I think about it the more potential I can see: locals could buy into it with options like donating a certain amount for naming rights to a track. As they have done in Christchurch, lifts that are no longer required on the mountain could be put in place here.

In conclusion, please make the right decision for our environment, for our bush, our birdlife and for the Taranaki economy. A housing subdivision gives a limited amount of income in the short term and requires a massive amount of coastal investment. A bike park would also require massive investment, but not any more than this development requires, I believe, and the income would be much more sustainable.

An investment in tourism and the environment would get buy-in from many of us in this community. Another thought is: as the government has squashed the oil and gas, I'm sure as part of their provincial funding they would buy into it as well. Please don't go for the compromise that some people think we could live with and reduce the housing density. This is not what urban development should look like. Any density this close to the national park is not acceptable, in my opinion.

I feel very privileged to be living in this part of the world, between the mountain, bush and the sea. I will continue to do what I can to protect our unique local environment. Thank you for listening to my submission.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you. Mr Coffin?

**MR COFFIN:** Good morning. Did I hear correctly, you said you were a volunteer life-guard?

**MS LAW:** No, sorry, surfing.

**MR COFFIN:** Oh, surfing. So you spend a bit of time out on the water at Oākura.

**MS LAW:** Yes.

**MR COFFIN:** We had, yesterday, an expert talking about the effect of pesticides that people are using, I wondered whether you were aware of any children who were swimming down at Wido Stream(?) towards the beach there? Have you seen any issues like rashes or anything like that?

**MS LAW:** No. As a paediatric dietician, I see a lot of children with allergies, but I have never seen a connection with pesticides. I have seen when the Wairau River was -- I think some waste overflowed and people got sick from that. But I haven't seen or heard any evidence for pesticides.

**MR COFFIN:** You mentioned you had a small farm as well.

**MS LAW:** I have part shares in my family's farm on the south side of Taranki --

**MR COFFIN:** What size farm is it?

**MS LAW:** It's 150 acres, 150 cows. I don't know what that is in hectares.

**MR COFFIN:** It's dry stock is it?

**MS LAW:** No, it's a dairy farm.

**MR COFFIN:** Dairy farm.

**MS LAW:** The council's quite good with small holders like us. They all work with us to make sure our compliance costs aren't massive.

**MR COFFIN:** You mentioned your main concern was about predators and you mentioned pests, cats, dogs and noise.

**MS LAW:** Yes.

**MR COFFIN:** Which pests were you particularly concerned with.

**MS LAW:** Humans, no. We do know that humans are what creatures will stay away from the most, probably. I understand cats are probably the worst. I understand, I could be wrong, that The Paddocks was meant to be cat free, but somebody I know who lives there, says that people have cats. I don't think that's an easy thing to monitor, for a council. I understand that creatures will live a certain distance away from people and so even though there is a territory they won't live close to that line if housing comes up to it.

**MR COFFIN:** You were talking about you see investment in tracks which be beneficially, not only for the community but also potentially to outdoor tourism. Were you suggesting that that was an alternative to residential development? Or did you see those just being complimentary --

**MS LAW:** As an alternative. There's already a lot of interest in the community.

**MR COFFIN:** Thank you very much.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you. Okay. Sam Dixon? I have just been given the hard word, you cannot hear me properly. Just a couple of clarifications, Mr Dixon, you are also going to speak on behalf of Toby Dixon.

**MR DIXON:** That's correct.

**COMMISSIONER:** Is that part of this statement or ...?

**MR DIXON:** No, I'll be reading his statement verbatim, separately after this, yes.

**COMMISSIONER:** Notwithstanding you have a Planning Degree, this statement, you're not presenting it as expert evidence?

**MR DIXON:** No.

**COMMISSIONER:** I am happy to take all your qualifications and experience as read, when you get to that and any other matters, I am happy to take as read, if you feel that is appropriate.

**MR DIXON:** Sure.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you.

**MR DIXON:** Morēna.

(Mihi)

**COMMISSIONER:** Kia ora. Tēnā koe.

**MR DIXON:** So, yes, my name's Sam Dixon. I'm a resident of Oākura and also a professional environment planner, employed by WSP Opus. If you're happy to take my qualifications as read, I won't go through those, but I will cover off my relationship to Oākura at 2.2. So I've lived in Oākura since the age of four years, when my parents moved from Dunedin in 1981. They were drawn to Taranaki by the opportunity for an alternative lifestyle. They purchased a small block of dairy land on Kaitake Raod, where they established one of New Zealand's first certified organic kiwifruit orchards.

 My parents were originally attracted to live in Oākura because of its relaxed village-sense of place; the people; its productive, fertile soils for horticulture; its sheltered climatic position; the beach; and easy access and connectedness to village amenities. I was lucky enough to attend Oākura Playcentre and Oākura School. I was also lucky to enjoy a wonderful upbringing in rural Oākura, where as a child I had free and easy access to open, spacious farmland on Kaitake Road, Surrey Hill Road and Wairau Road. I also enjoyed exploring the Oākura River, the Kaitake Ranges and, of course, the beach, which I still consider to be one of the best in the world.

 I returned to live permanently in Oākura in 2003. My wife and I built a house on Surrey Hill Road in 2005 and we've since moved around the corner into our family homestead on Kaitake Road. We have four children. Three of which attend Oākura School and one which attends Oākura Kindergarten.

 The land that my parents purchased in 1981 continues to be used by our family for organic horticulture and food production. My younger brother, Toby, has continued the legacy and he now runs the land as an organic market garden, known as Kaitake Farm. I'll share his statement after mine.

 If we move through to my involvement with the proposal. Yes, I have prepared this statement in a personal capacity in my own time. So I became aware of the application to vary the consent notice and the proposed rezoning in 2017, prior to the application being lodged. At the time, the application was lodged in 2018, I reviewed the proposed zoning documentation and while I wanted to keep an open mind, I did lodge a submission in opposition. Since that time, I have reviewed the submissions received, the applicant's expert evidence, the expert evidence prepared on behalf of submitters, the section 42A report, supplementary 42A report and the expert witness joint -- witness statements, et cetera.

 So I'll just quickly outline my summary position on the proposal. So from the time that I became aware of the impending application in 2017, I did endeavour, as I've stated, to keep an open mind about what was being lodged. However, with the passing of time and the opportunity to hear from submitters and study the evidence, I have formed the view that I am opposed; firmly opposed. I believe that in the interest of the Oākura Community that the proposed rezoning and consent notice variation should be declined.

 My primary reasons for objecting to the proposed rezoning and proposed variation is because I believe it will result in significant adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated. The significant adverse effects that I'm particularly concerned about include a loss of village character and identity; a loss of Oākura's sense of place; a reduction in community connectedness; a reduction in amenity values; a significant loss of productive fertile soils; significant impacts on the terrestrial and aquatic ecology of the Wairau Stream catchment; and significant and unavoidable visual impacts on the outstanding landscape that is acknowledged as the Kaitake Ranges.

 As expressed most elegantly and powerfully within the Kaitake Community Board submission, a huge amount of work has been done by the community regarding the future that we seek for Oākura -- involvement in numerous engagement and planning processes. I list them there. They've been well canvassed, I think, over the last few days. I personally believe that residential growth for Oākura is best prioritised and maintained on the seaward side of State Highway 45. This reflects the Oākura community's desire, as expressed through the above mentioned processes.

 Additionally the 396 submissions in opposition to the request demonstrates, to me, that the community does not believe the proposal aligns with the vision for Oākura. In the Kaitake Community Plan, 2017, it emphasises that rapid and widespread expansion would negatively affect the special character of Oākura and adversely impact on matters such as education services, traffic and environment assets. These are the very issues that the submissions and the expert evidence of the submitters raise as concerns in relation to their quest(?).

 In short, sir, the proposal that you are considering, does not align with the vision for Oākura, as expressed by the community. I've listed the documentation that I've referred to.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you.

**MR DIXON:** I've also turned my mind to The Paddocks decision, as have others. I move on to the question of whether or not there is a need for this proposed rezoning. I do agree with the section 42A report, which to my mind correctly identifies the key question: do we need this as a community? The question is whether there is a requirement or a demand for the land in question to be rezoned to provide for Oākura's future housing needs?

 I note that the section 42A report reaches the conclusion that there is no evidence of a requirement for the site to be rezoned to provide for Oākura's short-term, medium-term or long-term housing supply needs. I know that was well canvassed yesterday with Mr Twigley's evidence and others. I think the message here is clear: we don't need to panic and rush in. I don't feel the need at all. I see other land available. There is enough land. There is enough land supply planned to meet foreseeable demand over the short, medium and long-term without the need for the proposed rezoning. I think on this matter alone the proposal, in my mind, falls over.

 Then turn to the consent notice. I don't want to labour that, because I think it's been well covered. I think I'll just say, you know, this consent notice is critical for the protection of landscape character of the rural land between State Highway 45 and the Kaitake Ranges. It is crystal clear, in my mind, that the opportunity to develop this land for residential purpose was lost when The Paddock subdivision was approved.

 I have reviewed the evidence of Mr Twigley on this matter. He goes into this in a lot of detail in his evidence. I do agree with his conclusion, that there has not been a change in circumstances that now renders the consent notice to be of no further value. Yes, in my mind, the consent notice is as important today as it was when it was first registered in 2014.

 I'll move on to 9 and 9.1, where I reflect on stormwater and the human health effects. Mr Roland's expert evidence raises serious questions in my mind about the stormwater runoff that would result from the request -- the development as a result of the request and subsequent residential development in the high sensitivity of the downstream contact recreation area that he refers to as the Wairau Lagoon.

 My own children play in this lagoon during the summer on a weekly basis, as do I. We spend a lot of time at the beach in that area. It is common for all age groups to swim in the pools, particularly when they have been warmed by the sun. What I find disappointing is that I can see absolutely nothing within the evidence -- within the applicant's evidence that assesses adverse water quality effects associated with urbanisation. I can see no assessment of effects on human health from regular exposure to this water. Now, considering that Oākura Beach is one of the most popular swimming beaches in the region, I'm surprised and disappointed that the applicant has not attempted to assess adverse human health effects.

 I then move to ecological effects. The applicant has provided an ecological assessment and statement of evidence that considers how the proposal might mitigate adverse effects on aquatic and terrestrial ecology. On review of this, I would challenge Mr Bever's evidence that he states -- sorry, where he states, I think it's at paragraph 11 of his evidence. He states that both the central and southern tributaries of the Wairau Stream are of moderate ecological value.

 What is not considered or expressed within Mr Bever's assessment is the unique nature and context of the Wairau Stream catchment. On a regional scale, the Wairau Stream is unique, because a very large and unprecedented proportion of it, and I've calculated approximately 59 per cent, is sourced from unmodified, indigenous vegetation within the Kaitake Ranges or Egmont National Park. I refer you here to Appendix A of my statement, which I have behind me on the screen and attached to my statement.

 So, here I've mapped, it's pretty self-evident, Egmont National Park boundary, which is the red-dashed line. Obviously this is indigenous, unmodified vegetation. I've then mapped the pastoral -- well, it's predominantly pastoral land. Obviously The Paddocks has been developed up in here. But, essentially, this area in here is currently pastoral, agricultural land or predominantly agricultural / horticultural land. Then, obviously, the urban extent of Oākura is shown here.

 This blue line is the boundary of the Wairau catchment. So the 558 hectares is encapsulated within that line. So the 59 hectares represents unmodified vegetation. The 27 hectares represents pastoral grazing land, predominantly, horticultural / agricultural land and the 14 per cent is this area in here, which is current residential, urban, Oākura. So the point I'm trying to make and I don't think it comes through in Mr Bever's assessment is that this is unique. If you zoom out from this map and you try and find another catchment on the ring plan that has such a high proportion of unmodified indigenous vegetation you can't find one.

 So, I guess, I'm really struggling with how Mr Bever has concluded that the Wairau Stream where he has assessed ecological values and where he's reached the conclusion that there are moderate ecological values. I believe that the ecological assessment is deficient, given the location, scale and context of the proposal. I believe that the applicant's response to potential adverse effects on the Wairau Stream ecology will not avoid remedy, mitigate, offset or compensate adverse effects. Considering the unique nature of the catchment, I am surprised and concerned that there has been no independence peer review of the ecological assessment provided by the applicant. I certainly couldn't find one, sir.

 I then turn to traffic effects, which again have been well canvassed. The merits or otherwise of the applicant's traffic impact assessment and the possible engineering solutions to mitigate adverse traffic effects are widely canvassed. My over-riding impression is that too little analysis was done by the applicant to consider access alternatives. Their decision to rely on a single access point was flawed from the beginning. My review of the documentation leaves me thinking that little genuine consideration was given to pedestrians, cyclists or equestrian modes of transport during the design process.

 I'll just walk you through my daily routine, which involves commuting to New Plymouth from Kaitake Road. I commonly encounter horses on Surrey Hill and Wairau Road during my daily commute and in the weekends, obviously. So that's the norm for me, as a user of this road network; it's not the exception, particularly in the summer months. So while I didn't encounter a horse on the way to this hearing this morning, sir, it's not uncommon to.

 I don't own horses, but I expect to meet them on a regular basis. It's not unusual to wait patiently at the Wairau Road / State Highway 45 intersection while a couple of horses and their riders negotiate this intersection. I love this about Oākura. I value the fact that horses can use the road network, as it reflects, in my mind, the identity and the equestrian heritage of Oākura.

 It speaks to the close connection between the village and the rural community that live on Upper Wairau, Surrey Hill and Kaitake Road. I think that the proposal as it stands will generate traffic volumes on Wairau Road and the State Highway 45 intersection. That will severely compromise this connectedness, this urban rural connectedness and result in poor outcomes for pedestrian, cyclists and equestrian users of the road network.

 I then turn to adverse landscape and visual effects. On further review of the submissions and listening to the submissions over the last day, it's apparent that there is genuine concern about the loss of rural landscape and rural outlook on the southern entrance to Oākura and impact on the outstanding landscape of the Kaitake Ranges. So, having reviewed the evidence of Mr Bain, Ms McCray(?) and Mr Kensington, I'm firmly of the opinion that future development which would be enabled by the proposed rezoning will inevitably result in significant adverse effects on landscape and visual effects.

 The section 42A report also concludes that the adverse landscape and visual effects would be significant. I've concluded that the proposal simply seeks to maximise development potential on the property, sir. In my opinion, the proposed mitigation measures will not address the relevant adverse landscape and visual effect issues that will arise. If adopted, the proposed plan change will enable a high-density residential development that will fundamentally change this landscape from rural to urban.

 I've made a brief comment on the section 42A report. I've said -- essentially I'm agreeing with the conclusion that Mr Twigley has reached in his expert planning evidence, where he states at paragraph 174 of his evidence -- I won't read that all out, but I will just read out the last part of it. Mr Twigley concludes:

"The recommendation for the request appears to be an infrastructure-led decision, with the approval of 167 lots, based largely on an assessment of available water supply, despite there being significant concerns raised in the section 42A report about traffic, landscape and visual amenity issues, et cetera."

So, I don't understand how the section 42A report identifies traffic, landscape and visual amenity affects as significant and essentially unavoidable, but it then places little or no weight on these effects when recommending approval in part of the request. I note that the supplementary section 42A report, which I briefly looked at, dated 19 July, appears to have taken a different approach and has reserved judgment, from what I could tell, based on traffic effects.

 In conclusion, having assessed the information available relating to the plan change, I consider that the proposal will create significant adverse effects. The proposed variation to the consent notice would open the door for the plan change request and would severely undermine the integrity of The Paddock subdivision and in turn result in significant adverse effects on rural character, amenity values, significant adverse landscape effects, adverse cumulative effects and would be contrary to the objectives and policies of the Operative District Plan.

 I've covered this, there's not been a change in circumstances that renders the consent notice to be of no further value. I'll just summarise, at 14.4, the adverse effects that will be generated by the request and the significance of those effects have been addressed in evidence. It's my conclusion that those effects be so significant that approval should be refused. To grant the request, in my opinion, would be contrary to the objectives of the Operative District Plan and the purpose of the RMA.

 To grant the request would severely affect the confidence that the Oākura community has in the integrity of the District Plan and decisions made under it to protect rural character, preserve landscape values and provide for the wellbeing of the community. To grant the request would, in my opinion, purposefully ignore the unique status of the Wairau catchment and severely risk the ecological health of the Wairau Stream and its tributaries and the threatened aquatic and terrestrial species that have been identified to live within it.

 Granting a request would forever eliminate through permanent land-use change from rural to urban the opportunity for the community to connect the Kaitake Ranges and the Egmont National Park to the sea via a strong ecological and landscape amenity corridor. Realistically Oākura is likely to be the only location in the Taranaki region where a relatively uninterrupted, ecological corridor could be made from the maunga to the moana.

 Granting the request would forever eliminate the productive capacity of the soils and climatically advantaged aspect of this land. Granting the request would result in children who regularly use the Wairau Stream for swimming being exposed to pesticides and other harmful contaminants known to be associated with urban stormwater.

 Finally, sir, granting the request would severely affect the confidence that the Oākura community has in the District Council and the Kaitake Community Board engagement and planning processes that have clearly signalled on numerous occasions a preference for contained growth within Oākura that avoids significant adverse effects on rural character and the unique, outstanding landscape that we value as the Kaitake Ranges. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you, Mr Dixon. Mr Coffin?

**MR COFFIN:** Good morning.

**MR DIXON:** Morning.

**MR COFFIN:** At 2.2 you've said you've been since the age of 4 and I'm assuming you've been here continuously for that 37 or so years.

**MR DIXON:** Almost continuously, yes. No, I studied away at university, I travelled, OE, et cetera, et cetera, but, yeah, almost continuously lived here.

**MR COFFIN:** Then later in that paragraph -- and I have got a few questions and I just wanted to clarify your idea of the rural character and village character. I had in my notes: are you talking about rural character or village character? But later on in your evidence you talk about those as being quite connected. Am I right in that assumption?

**MR DIXON:** Yes. I think I told the story about the horse for a reason.

**MR COFFIN:** Yes, that's right, yeah.

**MR DIXON:** Yeah, Wairau Road, Surrey Hill Road, Kaitake Road are a dead end. It's a cul-de-sac, there's no way out, so that is our connection between the urban / rural environment predominantly. That, in my mind, reflects the village character, yes. In my mind the character of the village is influenced by its connectedness to that rural environment.

**MR COFFIN:** Thank you. At 5.2, at the top of page 5, where you say that one of those significant adverse effects from your view is a loss of village character and identity. Are you picking up again on those matters you raised at 2.2? Is that what you are referring to there?

**MR DIXON:** Sorry, you referred to 5.2?

**MR COFFIN:** Yes, at 5.2, page 5, and those bullet points, the very one, "A loss of village character and identity." I just wanted to clarify: are you referring back to your comments at 2.2, which we have just talked about?

**MR DIXON:** Yes. Sure. Yes, I am.

**MR COFFIN:** Just a little point, at 5.3, where you say, "Do not believe the proposal lines with the vision for Oākura". I'm assuming you mean the Kaitake Community Plan, the vision.

**MR DIXON:** Yes. Well and the other planning processes which I refer to at 5.1, yes, collectively.

**MR COFFIN:** Okay. At 7.3, there's the sentence that starts, "There is enough land supply to meet foreseeable demand over short, medium and long-term, without the need for the proposed rezoning." When you are talking about the meet foreseeable demand, was there anything specifically you were referring to or one of the experts?

**MR DIXON:** I listened carefully yesterday, I think, to Mr Twigleys' evidence. I haven't gone in and studied the latest exchange of housing business capacity documentation. But the evidence I heard yesterday supports the statement I'm making there. Yes. From my own experience living there and my awareness of land, certainly on the seaward side, which was well canvassed again yesterday, I believe there is certainly available land to meet foreseeable needs.

**MR COFFIN:** Thank you. At 9.2, you've said that your children play in the lagoon during the summer on a weekly basis. Have you noticed or observed any current issues of pollution or contaminants affecting the children?

**MR DIXON:** No, their behaviour's generally very good. Look, I don't know. I'm not an expert in epidemiological issues, but none of them have any cancers, sir. I don't know how to answer that question.

**MR COFFIN:** Have you observed any like skin rashes or irritations or they've got tummy bugs as a result of being in the water?

**MR DIXON:** Well, kids are always getting sick. I don't know how to make that connection.

**MR COFFIN:** Okay.

**COMMISSIONER:** Just on that theme, because in your statement under 14.4, that is the second to last statement, note: "Would result in children who regularly use the Wairau Stream for swimming being exposed to pesticides and other harmful contaminants." So following on from Mr Coffin, it was just understanding the justification for that statement, given what I take from what you have outlined just now that at this point there has not been anything giving rise to concerns about pesticides, et cetera, in the lagoon. So I am just trying to understand the rationale for that last statement.

**MR DIXON:** Sir, I'm simply taking the evidence of Mr Rowlands that we can expect higher concentrations of contaminants, including pesticides, in the Wairau Lagoon, which we know for a fact is used extensively for swimming. It's a favoured place to swim. The logical conclusion that I've drawn is that if Mr Rollins' evidence is to be taken as correct, that there will be a higher incidence of exposure to contaminants. It's not clear to me what effect that may have, but it seems to me logical that it would be an adverse effect, not a positive one. There is simply no evidence that's quantified what that effect might be. Mr Rollins, I think, is simply illustrating that the evidence isn't there and I've picked up on that.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Thank you.

**MR COFFIN:** I just had a couple more questions. This one, at 10.3, is under the heading of ecological effects. You showed us the map showing us the percentages of ground cover, urban, peri-urban, pastoral farming and the native bush. You talked about the unique nature of the Wairau catchment. You have talked about the percentages, but I am just interested in the characteristics that fall out of the percentages.

 I see it is the very last bullet point on page 13, where you mention where a relatively uninterrupted ecological corridor could be made up from the maunga to the moana. I was wondering whether that is what you are talking about in that character or representativeness of the percentage. There is a percentage of ground cover, but what does that actually mean?

**MR DIXON:** Well, I'm purely, I guess, trying to illustrate the facts or present the facts. On my review of the ecological evidence, I don't believe the context of that catchment has been taken into account. I think a site-based assessment within the confines of -- or within the extent of the proposed rezoning has been undertaken, but there has been no consideration to the wider catchment. That's really the point I'm trying to raise: it's a very -- in my opinion, with ecological assessments, the one that has been presented is entirely site based. I cannot see it taking a broader contextual look, landscape-based look.

 It's self-evident that by developing this land it eliminates forever the connection or the potential for a connection from the mountain to the sea. Yes, that's a fact; I'm just trying to point it out.

**MR COFFIN:** Thank you. That was all I wanted to ask.

**COMMISSIONER:** We have nothing further, so thank you, Mr Dixon, on that.

**MR DIXON:** Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** Now you are going to present on behalf of Toby Dixon.

**MR DIXON:** Okay. Before I do that, you've been asking some good questions of submitters around what they value. I think you asked the submitters a number of times yesterday: what makes Oākura what it is? Last night, my daughter came home late and she asked me what I had been doing during the day. I said I'd sat through part of this hearing and there's a man who's making a decision about a development in Oākura and he's asking people what is special about Oākura.

 She promptly said: "Oh, I did a dance about that the other day at school". I said, "What do you mean?" She said, "Oh well, I created a dance about what makes Oākura special". I said, "Okay. Can you show me the dance?" It was about a 10-20 second dance and I said, "Well, how about I video that and I show that to this man tomorrow?" She explains what the dance means. Of course, I've always wanted to do an interpreted dance at a hearing, sir. So this is my opportunity. It's about a minute video. I don't think the audio will be very good, but it does illustrate the youth voice. She's 11 years old. She goes to Oākura School. It's very impromptu.

**COMMISSIONER:** okay.

**MR DIXON:** I'll put it on.

**COMMISSIONER:** Oh, you're not going to do it yourself, personally?

**MR DIXON:** No, not this time.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay.

**MS DIXON (on video):** We were at school and we had to make up a dance about why we love Oākura and what makes Oākura special and unique. So I made this up. I'll explain what it means. So this bit is like the ocean and going in the sea and surfing and playing with friends in the water. It's not that crowded. Everyone's just like -- yeah. Then this bit means I like going up the Kaitakies and going up the mountain. This bit is like going to the bush and discovering new things. This bit is like you know everybody. Everyone's like your family. That's my dance and that's why I like Oākura.

**COMMMISSIONER:** Nice. Well done. We should get more evidence like that, I think. You can thank your daughter on behalf of us, Mr Dixon.

**MR DIXON:** Thank you. Okay.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Thank you, Mr Dixon.

**MR DIXON:** Okay. So my younger brother, Toby, can't present this today. He's taking a well-earned rest from producing vegetables and he's gone on holiday. So he's asked me to read his statement.

 Kia ora koutou. My name is Toby Dixon. Taranaki is my maunga, Oākura is my awa and Kaitake is my papa kāinga. I have lived on the foothills of the Kaitake Range on the edge of Oākura for my whole life, for 30 years. I am a cadastral surveyor with a degree in surveyor from Otago University. Three years ago, I chose to start Kaitake Farm and provide local grown, organic produce to local people. Our approach is sustainable and consistent with a low carbon and ecologically restorative economy. The same economy that we must all transition to for a climate and biosphere that is safe for humanity to flourish.

 Oākura has a strong history of such market gardening and Kaitake Farm seeks to reinvigorate this and help the village ensure a sustainable food future. Our whenua and the soil that sustains us is at risk. I'd like to remind us all what the definition of the word Kaitake actually means. The definition of Kaitake is the source or abundance of food available to be grown on its slopes. The slopes between the Kaitakies and the ocean have always been important to mana whenua.

 Koru Pā is nearby, at the end of Surrey Hill Road, and is recognised as the first Māori settlement in Taranaki. For over 1000 years it remained a critical hub for mana whenua, because of its strategic location and abundance of secure food sources. These soils and productive slopes are just as important today. However, this plan change will directly degrade them and with it our food security and our identity in Oākura.

 Sprawling residences across quality soil is not sustainable. Kaitake soils are incredible. Removing productive soils from the food cycle at a time when global soil health and replenishment rates indicate only 60 years of conventional farming remain is ludicrous. Add to this the booming global population, more mouths to feed and changing climate disrupting food production and supply, our agricultural systems are up for revolution. Our productive land is extremely precious and will become even more so as the effects of these changes increase.

 We have to change our approach to land use at the rural / urban boundary. This plan change is a classic example of bad practice. The location, character and scale of the proposed development is not consistent with the values or future vision of Oākura. There are more suitable locations and scales for growth in Oākura and through to New Plymouth.

 This development will significantly change the character of Oākura. Its landscape between the ocean and the mountain will be cut and replaced with urban sprawl. This rural is an important part of Oākura's character and identity. It is a small village, perched on the coast. The horizon is either ocean, forest or farms; it's not houses.

 This sprawl and changed identify will reverberate through the village community, shattering its character. Oākura is popular and it's not uncommon for the village to feel it's over capacity, particularly during summer. The seasonality of this blooming is part of the village's character, but a greater and permanent swelling will shift the community into an urban culture that it does not currently inhabit or want.

 Such a massive, lopsided development will knock the community off its access and the wayfinding and social relations that have emerged over many decades will be thrown and lost to significant increases in vehicle movements, expanded traffic corridors and management systems. This infrastructure and volume will sever the translucent and shared spaces that define small coastal village communities. The scale of this development secures the loss of Oākura's character, exacerbated significantly by the proposal's asymmetric location.

 Like the collision of two celestial bodies, neither are recognisable once the dust settles. A satellite one-third of the size of the village will cause a wobble in Oākura's cultural orbit, losing its balance, its core and repositioning its centre of gravity in a paddock on the side of State Highway 45.

 I regularly deliver vegetables in our electric van about Oākura. I meet all sorts of people on the way that want to know more about what we are doing at Kaitake Farm. They are hugely supportive of our local food supply role and the sustainable and just transition the region is pushing for. They buy our veggies and recommend other people and businesses to also do so. We're all doing our best for Oākura.

 From these journeys, I can confidently say that the people of Oākura do not want this plan change. I also see this in the number and character of opposing submissions, the feedback from peers I grew up with in Oākura and the engagement in visioning work facilitated by the Kaitake Community Board. The message from the Oākura community is a very clear "no". The people I've met that haven't opposed the plan change don't live in Oākura. They don't know about the already identified growth areas for Oākura. They tend to be New Plymouth based trades people that see it as a source of short-term income.

 I believe this land would be better used for food production, not only to fill growing demand for local produce, but to retain the visual green buffer and the rural feeling between the village and the Kaitake Ranges. Primarily, I'm opposed to the development as it will fill the slopes from the ocean to the base of the ranges with houses. For these reasons, I fully support the submission from the Kaitake Community Board and I oppose the plan change in its entirety. Thank you. Toby Dixon.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Thanks, Mr Dixon. Thank you very much.

**MR DIXON:** Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** We will now move to hear from Matt Peacock.

**MR PEACOCK:** Good morning, Commissioners.

**COMMISSIONER:** Good morning.

**MR PEACOCK:** I've got three statements. One of my own, one from my brother, Luke, who's not here and one from Barney Walker, who's also overseas.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay.

**MR PEACOCK:** Do you want all three or do you just want mine to start off with?

**COMMISSIONER:** No, we will circulate all three.

**MR PEACOCK:** There's four copies and that's the last one.

Thankfully, they're all short, apart from my one.

**COMMISSIONER:** Sorry?

**MR PEACOCK:** I said, thankfully, the two after mine are short.

**COMMISSIONER:** So I have not seen your statement yet but given you have been ...

**MR PEACOCK:** Yes, I was just going to say that, this is prepared from a personal --

**COMMISSIONER:** Yes. No, and I understand that.

**MR PEACOCK:** Okay.

**COMMISSIONER:** The other part was though where matters have already been highlighted to us --

**MR PEACOCK:** Yes, I will do my best.

**COMMISSIONER:** -- and if you have got those in your statement --

**MR PEACOCK:** I will do my best.

**COMMISSIONER:** -- we will take them as read, thank you. We are just trying to ...

**MR PEACOCK:** Yes, yes.

**COMMISSIONER:** Submitters have been very clear to date in terms of highlighting issues, so ...

**MR PEACOCK:** Yes. So, in the interest of time I will skim through my history and feelings for Oākura.

**COMMISSIONER:** Yes, thank you.

**MR PEACOCK:** Insofar to say that I currently live there with my wife and my two girls, 6 and 8, and we live there because of the small rural village lifestyle and community that we live amongst. So some things that make Oākura appealing to me, like Sam Dixon, I encounter horses on the road regularly. The unappealing this is the horse poo that's left on the road. I drop my kids to school several times a week and I can interact with their teachers and the other parents that are there.

 Sometimes when you try and go places in Oākura you encounter people you know and it takes you longer to get to where you intend to go than originally intended. When you want to go for a coffee in Oākura there's no need to ring your friends, you can just turn up and you'll meet people you haven't seen for a long time and you can catch up. Children ride their bikes, walk to school, generally because it's fun and it's relatively safe. Parents allow their kids to roam the streets of Oākura down on the beach, skate park, Four Square to pick things up for them. As a parent I feel that it's a safe environment for the kids.

 The village has a good surf lifesaving club, a surfing club, boardriders' club, football team, golf club, bowls club, yoga, Town Hall is busy most nights. And you meet a bunch of like-minded people, the vibe's good, everyone knows each other, there's very little trouble. There's also a diverse range of ethnicities in Oākura. You'll meet people who came for a year and are there for five years and others who visited three times and went home and found a wife and came back to live.

**COMMISSIONER:** There will not be any questions about that, I do not think.

**MR PEACOCK:** The village has limited commercial space. There's a Four Square, a single petrol station and some shops. There's not a lot of room for this to expand. Limited parking again, not a lot of room for that to expand. The Private Plan Change 48 application, if approved, will completely change the small village of Oākura into a much larger congested town, taking away all those values that attracted me to it. If the plan change is accepted in its entirely it will increase the number of lots in Oākura by 60 per cent.

 If I wanted to live in a town with more than one petrol station or supermarket I'd choose to live in New Plymouth city. But I choose to live in a small rural village that has attributes of a small rural village. PPC48, if approved, will change this. What would it look like, for example, if The Paddocks residents were allowed to subdivide their sections into 400 sq m lots, ruining the rural character of the development and devaluing the primary reason people chose to live there? I think the PPC applicant, Mike McKie's statement of evidence is completely off the mark when he states, and I quote:

"We have listened to and heard and have a very good understanding of the Oākura community's concerns."

For if Mike McKie had understood the Oākura community he would have noted that 450 people submitted against the PPC application in its entirety and that not a single submission supported the development in full. From this feedback if the applicant really did have a good understanding of the community's concerns he would have personally engaged with the community, not through the New Plymouth District Council's arranged pre-hearing meetings and realised that there are major issues with his proposal to develop any of his remaining land.

 The applicant has either failed to correctly read and interpret the facts or he's not telling the truth in his statement of evidence. The applicant previously completed The Paddocks development on upper Wairau Road. In The Paddocks' final decision Commissioners' report 8 March 2011 and it contains numerous statements by Mike McKie and Oākura Farm Park's hired experts that contradict the proposed Private Plan Change, PPC48. The contradictions include Mike McKie stating that the current 58 hectare farm would be able to be retained as a productive farming unit for The Paddocks subdivision and now conveniently being reclassified as becoming increasingly marginal farm unit in the current plan change. During The Paddocks hearing Mike McKie said:

"The development of this area protects the open landscape and views of the Kaitake Ranges."

This is the exact area of 58 hectares of rural land he intends to develop. Mike McKie concludes in his Paddocks evidence that they are trying to achieve a vision that will stand the test of time and says his vision was for an eco-friendly environmentally safe-guarded and protected project that was future-proofed and enjoyable for generations. Now, doesn't that sound wonderful? The landscape architect, Richard Bain, states in his Paddocks submission:

"The proposed remaining 66.5 hectares of farm lot would remain rural character, particularly with regard to spaciousness and would maintain extensive views from State Highway 45 up to the outstanding natural area."

This is the same 66.5 hectares of spacious rural land that Mr Bain has now decided is no longer an important feature in front of the outstanding natural area and can be developed. To me these statements show that the applicant has been misleading the community, paddocks land purchasers and the council and that the applicant is an inexperienced land developer who believes that he can change his statements to suit the best outcome for himself.

 In my opinion, these are intentional decisions by the applicant and that they are not merely a change of circumstances outcome. I think that since purchasing the farm in 2008 Mr McKie has always intended to develop the land into residential property and to achieve this he is willing to say what he thinks the council and the people of Oākura community want to hear.

 As you are aware the application process has involved the council reviewing the technical information. This is the S42A report. From the council's own housing capacity information - and we've heard this a couple of times - the housing demand for the next 30 years is between 210 and 247 houses. This is an increase of about 7 or 8 houses per year or 1.3 per cent per annum. Beyond a 30-year timeframe population numbers are anyone's guess and a report I've read predicts that population will decline in the years to come due an ageing population, less number of children per family and even the impact from immigration of older people who have already had their children.

 This growth rate at 1.3 per cent per year for Oākura is consistent with how Oākura has developed naturally over the last 50 years and what the Oākura structure plan states. NPDC 2015 plans and strategies assessment plan predicts the New Plymouth population will increase on average by approximately 490 people per year or around 0.7 per cent for the next 30 years. This is less than the Oākura growth rate.

 It's interesting to know that Oākura has always had a higher priced property market and this is like all other beachfront areas in New Zealand and this will not change by developing more land. The price for any new property in Oākura will be above the six times average wage to average property price and be unobtainable for most people in New Zealand. For example, take The Paddocks development and this was approved in 2011, 26 lots were available and there are still four lots for sale there.

 Despite what the applicant will tell us, like all developers he'll strive to get the highest price for every section in the development. Where are all these people going to come from that can afford higher than normal priced sections? NPDC S42A report determines the available undeveloped land already zoned residential in Oākura will yield 158 lots. The currently zoned residential land would provide 20 years of growth in Oākura.

 Adding infill development into the number of currently zoned residential land available in Oākura and assuming only 60 per cent uptake on infill development, would yield another 10 years of development, a total of 234 available lots or 94 per cent or 100 per cent of the housing demand in Oākura for the next 30 years. Considering this information why would the council spend all these resources, people's time and energy processing the application?

 Further on the land supply in Oākura I've asked myself, why would the council decide to give the lion's share of the available sections to one or two individual developers in Oākura when there is available up to 120 infill sections, which would give many people in Oākura the opportunity to financially benefit, not just two families? If the question is whether these infill section owners will actually subdivide their land, I suggest that from experience it is the council who makes this process difficult to complete for these one-time small developments and is the council who should be working on making this infill subdivision process easier and encouraging people to do it when it suits the circumstances.

 Infill development has many advantages over green field development, of which some of these benefits are that there is significantly less carbon-producing infrastructure costs, less intense visual and landscape effects and the new lots are instantly located in an established developed area. Paragraph 13.8 in the S42A report is a major statement by the authors in deciding how the application should be assessed.

 This paragraph suggests that the remaining available capacity for Oākura, the future of Oākura, be decided on the current unknown water aquifer capacity. This paragraph goes on to state that a 50/50 split be determined between two landowners and is considered fair and reasonable. This conclusion appears more like that of a poker game than a private plan change application. The idea of allocating 160 lots to PPC48 application is a major recommendation throughout the S42 report, which has been reached based on the capacity of the Oākura water supply, which was from a bore of unknown size and unknown future capacity and quality.

 I find it unacceptable that such a critical decision can be reached with very little consideration to the many other contributing factors, such as landscape, planning, traffic, infrastructure and the community structure plan for Oākura. The allocation of the remaining 134 lots or 167 between each lucky card player fails to mention that the applicant has already has his full house when developing The Paddocks subdivision and that now he intends to have his royal flush also.

 The authors of the S42A report have reached some alarming conclusions when based on the NPDC experts' reviews of the application. The NPDC experts were hired to review the various aspects of the PPC48 application and they all provided a report for their review. For example, that AECOM traffic review report appendix 7 identifies on a number of occasions that the applicant's traffic report is incomplete and I quote:

"There are inconsistencies between the application documents and the supplementary information. A full revised traffic assessment report needs to be provided that correlates to the amended proposal and further that AECOM report, 'My overall view is that there is a lack of information provided by the applicant for a number of items listed below'."

However, the S42A report authors are satisfied to conclude and I quote:

"Taking all these factors into account overall, I consider the traffic, parking and access effects can be effectively managed through the implementation of various methods."

How are the S42A report authors able to come to this conclusion without the applicant providing all the correct and relevant design information, as identified in the AECOM report? The NPDC report authors have based their recommendation on the applicant's traffic expert information, which has been identified as lacking in the correct relevant information. That would be like a peer reviewer of a building accepting the design when the design engineer has chosen the incorrect seismic zone or soil type.

 This is not possible because the whole design of the building would change when the correct design information was used. You simply can't accept that the design would meet code requirements when incorrect design data and analysis is chosen. With regard to the S42A report landscape and visual impact assessment, the authors conclude in 13.70:

"Taking all these factors into account, overall, I consider the landscape and visual impacts would be significant."

However, the report authors' recommendations in 1.12 conclude that:

"The OFPL PPC48 application is approved in part."

Again, I question the logic of this decision and don't see how the application can be approved in part when the proposed development will have significant impacts on landscape and visual aspect. It appears to me that while the S42A report authors acknowledge there will be significant impact on the existing outstanding natural landscape and visual outlook, by developing the land somehow they are still satisfied to approve it in part. Which part of PPC48 application are they approving?

 Evidence submitted by Richard Bain, landscape architect, suggests that the proposed development scale is suitable for Oākura area. I can't see how Richard Bain considers that providing a development that will increase the size of Oākura by 60 per cent is not significant in scale. The Ministry of Education has provided a short report to determine the capacity of the Oākura School. Their calculations, on the back of a napkin it seems, show that Oākura School is able to support a student size of 1,000 children. This is almost three times the current school population.

 The largest school in New Plymouth is Boys High School with approximately 1,300 students and school grounds 14 hectares in size. In comparison, Oākura School grounds are approximately 2.7 hectares. Without any further comments I'm sure you can see there is a vast difference between the two school grounds. I've produced a plan of the Oākura School at the back of the information you've got. It shows how the school would look if 1,000 students were there and additional single-level buildings were provided. Looking at the plan it's quite ridiculous to think that the Ministry of Education would suggest 1,000 students could attend Oākura School.

 Recent submission of evidence by Lachlan Muldowney in paragraph 131 relating to social impacts for Oākura states that:

"Once fully developed, the total plan change area will contribute to an approximate 20 per cent increase in the population of Oākura."

Mr Muldowney is incorrect with his calculation of population increase. If we take the current number of houses in Oākura as 549, that's from NPDC S42A report table 1, and the proposed number of new lots being 399, this is actually 70 per cent increase in number of houses. It appears to me Mr Muldowney has been basing his assessment of social impact of the proposed development on a population increase of 20 per cent and not 70 per cent, which is a significant difference.

 If PPC48 is approved the proposed plan change will result in a large development lasting many years in a small community village and will dramatically increase the current population. It will result in a land distribution monopoly to the applicant. The applicant will be able to control the supply of land to meet the demand and be able to set the land value at his discretion. This will severely restrict other smaller developments from happening in Oākura area. In larger towns, such as New Plymouth, there are competing subdivisions which assist in moderating the price of land and improving development quality. This would not occur in Oākura with such a large development proposed by the applicant and there would be no room for other land developments.

 For the last 18 months I've been involved with the Oākura community in opposing the PPC48 application. It's consumed many hours of my time, early mornings, late into the night, on weekends and during school holidays with my family. I'm quite certain the applicant has absolutely no idea of the extent to which the Oākura community has gone to oppose the application. He's not even here at the hearing. He writes how his family recognised the importance of good relationships, has a very good understanding of the Oākura community's concerns. He even enjoyed the interaction at the pre-hearing meetings.

 To me, these are just words of a salesman. Why else would Mr McKie take lease of the land in 2005 and by 2008, despite the farm being profitable, as the applicant states, he was putting together his plan to subdivide the whole 82 hectares of farmland that includes The Paddocks and PPC48 application land. This isn't the action of a person that understands and wants to work with the community, this is the actions of someone who wants to convert rural land into residential to make money.

 Over the past 18 months I've gained a good understanding of how difficult the process is for a community to rally together and oppose a private plan change such as this. The whole process is heavily weighted in favour of the developer who is able to get assistance from the council and paid experts that write reports in favour of the proposed development, while they build their development concept. The developer has many months or years to put the development proposal together, go back and forth with the council and change their submission, as per council requests.

 On the contrary, the submission process for the community opposing such a proposed development only lasts four to six weeks and is completed generally by lay people who are unsure of the consent application process and the language used in the developer's reports. Who in the general public has the time to read and understand a 450-page submission such as PPC48? The community typically has no or minimal funding to fight against a proposed land development and unless some members of the community are familiar with the application process, as has been the case for Oākura, and have funds to fight the developer, the developer is often able to get away with much of their proposal.

 The council needs to assist, engage much earlier and better with the community with these types of major proposed developments and provide at least as much planning support to the community as that which the developer receives from the council. It's all far too late to provide minimal support during a four to six-week public submission process. A major part of the council's function is to work with the community and listen to what the people are saying and then act on their opinions, not those of a single developer who does not live in the area and is not part of the community.

 In conclusion, I would like to make these points about why the PPC48 application should be rejected in full. The Oākura structure plan was created by the people of Oākura in conjunction with NPDC. Much time and effort went into creating this vision for Oākura and the plan makes no allowance for the size and housing density of the application. Why spend the time in producing a structure plan and not following it?

 Consultation with the Oākura community concluded that over 450 people took the time in writing and in full against the application and no single submission was received that supported the application in full. Oākura has developed naturally and is still increasing in size at a growth rate appropriate for a rural village. If PPC48 is approved it will increase the number of lots in Oākura by 60 per cent. To me this is an inappropriate increase in size to Oākura and in fact any village or town.

 There is currently available enough residential zoned land in Oākura to provide the forecast into housing demand for the next 30 years. Let's concentrate on developing this more appropriate infill land and the west FUD, which is closer to the beach where people would want to live. Despite what the applicant writes in his submission, I've concluded that he has always intended to develop his pristine rural farmland into residential property lots, solely for the purpose of making money.

 It appears to me, based on the S42A report and associated technical reports, that there is a lack of correct and relevant technical information in the application to adequately assess impacts of PPC48 on the landscape, traffic, stormwater, water supply and the environment of Oākura.

 I'd like to leave you with one final comment, by now I'm sure you'll appreciate the extent to which the Oākura community has and is taking to oppose this application. The reason for this is that Oākura is a wonderful place to live, with a community that represents how all communities should and could function. The people are afraid and annoyed that this application will quickly diminish the current community environment due to its size, poor design and location. The applicant has not consulted with the Oākura community, who feel strongly about where they live and how it should grow and that they are rejecting this application. Thank you for your time, Commissioners.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you, Mr Peacock. Mr Coffin.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** I have just got one set of questions and they just relate to the appendix. This is the map that you provided for the Oākura school student building growth.

**MR PEACOCK:** Yes, yes.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** The first question is a rhetorical one.

**MR PEACOCK:** Yes.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** Were you referring to the Ministry of Education guidelines for design construction of building and ...

**MR PEACOCK:** No, it was purely just a reflection of how much area would be required if they were going to add single-level buildings to the school. It's based on the amount of area of the current school buildings and the approximate number of children there, something like 334 or something like that. Then I've just worked out how much more area of buildings would be needed to provide 1,000 students there.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** Would you accept that would be normal practice for any significant increase in roll, that that would normally involve master planning, consultation with the community about --

**MR PEACOCK:** In normal practice I think that -- yes.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** The board of trustees would oversee the --

**MR PEACOCK:** Yes.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** -- expansion redevelopment and potentially additional buildings on site.

**MR PEACOCK:** Yes, yes.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** That would likely look quite different to what --

**MR PEACOCK:** Yes.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** -- appears to be worst case scenario.

**MR PEACOCK:** It's a little tongue in cheek because the Education Ministry just came back and, like I said, it was a pretty brief review and they just said, "Oākura is suitable for 1,000 students". It seems they've worked that out on the amount of area available from the school, divided by the amount of area a child needs and then they've worked out some sort of capacity based on that. So, it's by no means a detailed design.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** Thank you. I wasn't taking it -- tongue in cheek ...

**MR PEACOCK:** Yes.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you, Mr Peacock. If you can then proceed to read the other two statements, please.

**MR PEACOCK:** This one's from Barney Walker. My name's Matt Peacock and I'll be reading Barney Walker's statement on his behalf. I'm opposed to the proposed development because no provision has been made for the additional impact it will have on local infrastructure and services. Firstly, the school does not have the capacity to support additional students. In the longer term my understanding is that the school premises can be expanded to compensate for this but at a cost to the taxpayer and with the reduction in green space available to the pupils.

 Secondly, the traffic going through Oākura is likely to significantly increase as a result and there are not adequate calming measures as it stands. Increased traffic with no additional infrastructure, for example, extend 50 km per hour speed zone and safer crossings around the school, is going to increase the probability of an accident. Overall, little thought appears to have been put into the proposal for the development with regards to the wider community, so I'm opposing it. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay, and just pause for a moment, Mr Peacock. Okay, just before you proceed to read Luke Peacock's statement, I notice under the "Why" there is a comment there and in terms of word greedy and I suggest you may wish to withdraw that, thank you.

**MR PEACOCK:** Okay.

**COMMISSIONER:** I would just like to make it clear that the applicant is entitled, notwithstanding that people have problems or have outlined problems with the process, the RMA is what it is and it is the process that this matter is being considered on. I just want to clarify any misconception that the applicant is doing something that they are not entitled to do. There is a process and that process is being utilised and we, as part of the Commission and this hearing, is also part of that process. I would just like to make that observation.

**MR PEACOCK:** Understood, thank you for the clarification. I'm Matt Peacock and I'll be reading Luke Peacock's statement on his behalf. Why do we need an extra 400 houses? Do we have a housing shortage crisis in Oākura? Why are the powers to be considering this highly dense and overpopulated development? Why it appears that financial benefit is coming first before community and family?

 Why are the voices of Oākura's community not being heard? You ask any parent and could tell an extremely qualified doctor what is wrong with their sick spouse and this is the same for Oākura. Ask the people that live and breathe Oākura and they, the people, could tell you, as a collective, what is in the best interest of their community.

 Why are we even thinking about putting more load on an already dangerous traffic problem around the village? I live close to the main road in and out of Oākura. Every day I walk my oldest daughter to school and my youngest to kindy and the amount of vehicles I see are for ever increasing. Tie that into schoolkids walking this route and the pure volume and speeding vehicles, it's a recipe for a major incident to occur. Add 400 house, 400 to 800 more vehicles and 1,200 more people in this equation and the maths and safety do not add up.

 Why is it that one individual has the power to think that what they are doing is right for the Oākura community, when this individual does not even live in Oākura? Four years we started talking about moving back to New Zealand from Perth. It wasn't a hard decision to make. We both wanted to give our two daughters the same kiwi upbringing that we both had. In deciding where in New Zealand to do that was easy. Where else but a small beachside village called Oākura, with the added bonus of a grandparent and two sets of aunties, uncles and cousins who had decided to call Oākura home?

 We are now looking at having the dream of a small village upbringing for our family shattered with the impending possibility of Wairau estate being built. This is not what we had in mind for a quiet place to live when moving to Oākura. What concerns us is the increased traffic that will travel through the village. There is already far too many cars that speed through, ignoring the 50 km speed limit and neglecting to take notice of people waiting at the zebra crossing, especially children.

 It's easy for these big developers to say that our school can handle 1,000 students when they are not living here. Where are they meant to go? Presumably more buildings will have to be built, thus taking away outside play areas and locally-run community services. One of the things we love most about Oākura School is the big outside areas for the students to play and explore. It will be very sad to see our little village become another populated Auckland smallville. I was once told that it's always good to end with a quote, so here it is:

"When the last tree is cut down, the last fish is eaten and the last stream is poisoned, you will realise that you cannot eat money."

Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Thank you, Mr Peacock.

**MR PEACOCK:** Thank you, Commissioners.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thanks for also reading out those two statements on behalf of those residents. Now, just a slight change in order and, Mr Rollins, thank you for being happy to change the order in which you appear. Therefore, we will move to Te Kāhui o Taranaki, Puna Wano-Bryant. Welcome.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** (Māori spoken). I am Puna Wano-Bryant. I am the Pou Taiao Iwi Environmental Manager for Te Kāhui o Taranaki, the mandated iwi authority for the area of interest relating to this plan change proposal. I have here with me a representative of the mana whenua of Ngāti Tairi of Ngā Mahanga and Tane is the Chairperson of Puniho Pā and a trustee on Waikura Pā.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** I have a Bachelor of Laws and Arts. I have 20 years of experience in Treaty of Waitangi jurisprudence, general litigation planning law and iwi development and environmental management. I have been Pou Taiao for the last two years and was responsible for the drafting and implementation of Taiao Taiora, the environmental management plan of Taranaki iwi.

 Further to the private plan change for the Wairau Road Oākura Rezoning, Te Kāhui o Taranaki, Taranaki Iwi, as I shall refer to it from now, referred to our submission of 10 August 2018 and letter of 17 April 2019, which we take as read. It's submitted in our letter of 10 August 2018, under the RMA authorities must take into account iwi planning documents that are endorsed by iwi authorities. Taiao Taiora was endorsed by Te Kāhui o Taranaki in April of last year and publicly launched in July of last year.

 Taranaki Iwi further submitted that they are directly affected by the Oākura rezoning and are in opposition, due to potential adverse effects on the environment. In the pre-hearing meeting of 29 January 2019 Taranaki Iwi stated that the applicant's assessment of environmental effects and/or technical reports did not include a cultural impact assessment or sufficient application of Taiao Taiora. The Taiao Taiora engagement form was completed on 27 July 2018 at our request and merely referenced their technical reports without adequately applying Taiao Taiora.

 The applicant's consultant, Colin, then agreed that they would overlay Taiao Taiora within their own technical reports and we thank Colin for doing that, is a new planning document and it is a statutory framework that planners have to abide by but it is something that is new, certainly within the Taranaki planning environment, so we appreciate the time taken to do that.

 Taranaki Iwi had a further meeting with Colin on 8 March 2019 to review the application of Taiao Taiora assessment report and, although the report has provided some mitigation measures, Taiao Taiora is clear on the following positions:

"Taranaki Mounga, section 11.8.7, Taranaki Iwi will not support any residential subdivision and development within 5 km of the National Park boundaries. Taranaki Mounga, section 11.8.4, Taranaki Iwi supports Project Mounga and will be prominently involved in that project at governance and operations levels."

At page 25 of his brief of evidence, Colin Comber states that:

"Taranaki have approved of the mitigations proposed within the plan change. This suggests that from the iwi perspective they are confident there will be no adverse impacts on the natural environment arising from the proposed development. Further, in the response Te Kāhui have not spoken of any concerns with regard to potential or adverse cultural impact."

This conclusion is not correct and neither does the applicant have the authority to draw such a conclusion. To that end, on 1 April 2019 the trustees of Taranaki Iwi resolved the recommendation to continue in their opposition to the Oākura rezoning and in terms of the relief sought, Taranaki Iwi state for clarity here today that they decline outright this private plan change.

 I now address a selection of points we wish to underscore. Firstly, Taranaki Iwi commend and acknowledge the engagement with the hapū Ngāti Tairi by the applicant and note the resulting MOU signed between them on 19, correction, October 2018, which covers entranceways, street names, a commitment to a cultural impact assessment and concerns regarding wastewater and other matters. The first of the points with that acknowledgment said that I wish to address this process.

 There has been no cultural impact assessment of effects, despite a commitment by the applicant to include one. Iwi became involved later when the proposal was fully developed and other technical assessments completed. If applicants are going to work genuinely with our hapū to provide a cultural impact assessment they need to ensure they, our people, fully understand the application and all associated evidence in support. Symbolic entranceways and street names, while significant, are not a trade-off for cultural impact assessments.

 Schedule 4 of the RMA on the assessment of effects has clear best practice requirements to take into account cultural value statements and impact assessments. This lack of information has left a gap in this rezoning application and it is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure these gaps are filled. Such an assessment will inform any provisions, should this application proceed.

 My next point, impact of the plan on the environment. I wish to focus on the outstanding natural landscape that is the Kaitake and emphasise that the Kaitake does not stop at the National Park boundary; it extends beyond that. The significance of the landscape and features of the Kaitake are not just aesthetic, nor should they be limited by the rules in the District Plan but guided by the objectives and policies in the council's management strategy.

 I now provide a short snipped of values that are missing from this process. Taranaki Maunga, Pouāki and Kaitake Ranges are powerful symbols of Taranaki Iwi identity. The bonds between Taranaki Iwi and Kaitake are inseparable and are fundamental to the foundation of Taranaki Iwi. These bonds are also expressed through cultural practices and art forms evolved from generations of occupation.

 Taranaki Iwi drew strength from the energy of Kaitake; they utilised the unique position and location and the many opportunities it afforded them and the flora and fauna that was abundant from the slopes to the sea which allowed them to prosper and flourish. I finish this point with our proverbial saying for Taranaki Iwi:

"Ko Taranaki, ko Pouākai, ko Kaitake, koia te puna i heke mai ai te tanagata. Koia ko ō mātou nei okiokinga, ko mātou nei tō rātou okiokitanga. Taranaki, Pouākai and Kaitake are a reflection of and the source of our inseparable existence, in life and in death. We are them and they are us."

Again, the values of the Kaitake are not just visual and, as with the Wakatipu decision, the broad range of values need to be taken into consideration. There are current deficiencies in the report, as they focus on features to the park boundary. A broader approach will inform specific provisions should the application proceed.

 The next point, infrastructure, Taranaki Iwi are concerned that the current infrastructure of Oākura is not prepared to cope with a rezoning of this size. While the District Plan deals with urban growth expectations, any funding to cater for a rezoning of this size needs to be budgeted for in the council's long-term plan. The current long-term plan does not provide for this.

 I wish to address one aspect of infrastructure that is a pressing national issue and one which has always been of significance to Māori and that is fresh water. In the last year all iwi within the NPDC district and the council, including the councillors, have agreed to a framework for the council's three water systems; drinking, waste and stormwater, called He Puna Wai. The words are found in the identity statement I used earlier referring to the Kaitake and the waters flowing from him to the sea, this denotes the inseparable link between people, water the principle that the first right to the water goes to the water and then to the consumer. The National Policy Statement Te Mana o te Wai aligns with this also.

 I received a call from council in the last two days with a letter to follow. The existing water system in Oākura is in trouble, with one aquifer referred to as Bore 100 available, there is no back-up water supply for the town. With Bore 200 down there is an urgent need to secure the water supply for the town and in the case of a fire emergency heading into the summer months there is no current back-up plan. When I was asked what iwi expect as a solution I simply said, "Ensure He Puna Wai is adhered to as it is a piece of work council and iwi are committed to and should be proud of".

 My last of the points to underscore is community and iwi. Taranaki Iwi supports the submissions and evidence of Doug Hislop and the Kaitake Community Board and submit that they keep the pulse of what the Oākura community want and Mr Hislop's submissions should be viewed as an expert on the matter of community expectation, given his role as the Chair of the Kaitake Community Board.

 With that said, in my experience, as Pou Taiao, the collective referred to the community doesn't often include the views of hapū, marae pā or iwi. Our people refer to Oākura as a settler town with lands gifted to soldiers who took part in the land wars and confiscation of Taranaki Iwi lands. In spite of the confiscation and colonisation, the people of Taranaki Iwi, Ngāti Tairi, Oākura pā, named after the river Oākuramātapu, have continued to exercise mana whenua and mana moana. The community now need the support of mana whenua for this rezoning. However, the knowledge, relevance and authority of our people withstands resource consents, plan changes and policies; it has been and will always be. Without their voice the community voice is not representative.

 In conclusion, Ta5ranaki Iwi supports the restoration of the Kaitake through Project Mounga and will prominently be involved in that project at governance and operations levels. Taranaki Iwi will not support any residential subdivision and development within 5 km of the National Park boundaries; 5 km is not a magic figure. It speaks to our integrated and holistic approach of mountain to sea, of a complex of sites, waterways and features that all serve a collective purpose in order to protect, preserve and enhance the rich biodiversity of our environment that looks after us, its caretakers.

 In the brief of evidence of Michael McKie he says:

"The land doesn't have a history of war and has avoided unsettling battles. I understand that the pā site located within the QEII protected area was home to 200 Māori who lived together in peace."

The pā site is Pāhakahaka and requires more korero that only a full and comprehensive cultural impact assessment can provide. Let me share with you in closing some context regarding the land, which, like the Kaitake, isn't limited to a boundary, zone or land title but forms part of a broad range of values, stories of peace and war and resulting effects. On 22 May 1863 the warship HMS Eclipse approached the coast at Tataraimaka to shell a number of pā in preparation for an attack against a large group of Māori who had gathered in the area. The Eclipse killed a number of Māori at the village of Tukitukipapa, including 12 boys playing on the beach. This occurred within at least 5 km of the Oākura rezoning site.

 At daybreak on 4 June the Eclipse returned to the area to fire shells into the Porou Pā above the Katikara River at Tataraimaka overwhelming a small defending force, killing at least 28. This occurred within at least 5 km of the Oākura rezoning site. On 25 March 1864 Crown troops attacked and destroyed Kaitake Pā on the Patua or Patau Range near Wairau and later established a redoubt on the site. Over a four day period in April troops conducted a scorched earth campaign in the Taranaki Iwi rohe clearing every acre of cultivation within 20 miles to the south of New Plymouth.

 The Crown also established or strengthened redoubts on the land between the Omata and Tataraimka blocks to control the area. The Pahitere, St Andrews and Fort Robert redoubts were located on the former Taranaki Iwi pā sites of Pahitere, Te Kahakaha and Rangiuru respectively. All of this occurred within at least 5 km of the Oākura rezoning site.

 In terms of the relief sought, Taranaki Iwi state that they decline outright this private plan change for the Oākura rezoning. There is no need to further develop this area intensively. It won't improve the environment. If the community doesn't need it, why do it? (Māori spoken)

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you, questions. Mr Coffin.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** (Māori spoken) Good morning. Just this for everybody, I was just acknowledging our representatives from Taranaki Iwi and Ngāti Tairi have come along and they also acknowledge the passing of my grandmothers. I just wanted to pay a special respect to them acknowledging that. I have got a number of questions for you related to the original submission and also the submission your brought today and I am happy for either either of you to answer them as you see fit.

 I think you have confirmed for me, my first question was around an expectation that a cultural impact assessment or a cultural values assessment would have been helpful for the Commissioner in terms of determination of this plan change. Is that something that normally happens with plan changes in other parts of New Plymouth? You would normally expect some type of cultural values assessment or statement.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Yes, definitely. I mean the yardstick that we use is very application-dependent. But something that is substantial in size is the first tick in the box and that alone would be a reason to proceed with a cultural impact assessment and there are many other things that we look at as well.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** Just on that --

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Yes.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** -- you have touched on in your statement but what would you see the key elements or matters to be considered, discussed in that cultural impact assessment?

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** They're not just cultural would be the first point. I mean certainly an expression of cultural values, so people understand the context and me providing that bit of history in the last section of our submission was focused on that context --

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** Yes.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** -- and the values that come out of that. That's one part but cultural impact assessments aren't just limited to cultural values. They are ecological, they are all of the things that you would find in any technical reports; they're ecological. Taiao Taiora looks at different aspects of our environment. They are (Māori spoken) which is the rivers flowing from the mountain to the sea. They are landscape architecture as well and we have developed our own coastal development guidelines, which set out expectations in terms of how any development within coastal zones should be done from a planning perspective, which isn't just cultural. We have our own scientific measures as well. So, in short, everything in Taiao Taiora covers everything really.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** I think Mr Wasi(?) has requested a copy of the Environmental Management Plan. We have not seen or sighted it to this point, so I think that is a request we have made.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Certainly, kia ora.

**COMMISSIONER:** Certainly that is going to be one of the things that Mr Wasi will take into account. Are there particular parts of the management plan that you would like to point us to? You have picked up on a few of the matters, which I will ask questions about but is there particular parts of the plan that you want to direct us towards that you think would be quite important for us?

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Certainly. So, the two that I mentioned in my submission, which are clear positions for Taranaki Iwi, so we'll take those are read. But within Taiao Taiora and the issues which are causing an adverse effect impact Papatūānuku, so that's the section of our report which refers to Papatūānuku, who is our guardian of lands. So, one point, so go to the Papatūānuku section for a start and one point we address is poorly designed subdivision and development that can lead to unsustainable and inefficient land use, destruction of wahi tapu and other important sites, loss of access to areas, an increase in pests and more pressure on water resources through abstraction and direct and indirect discharges; that is one section in the Papatūānuku section.

 We also have a list of policies in respect of subdivision and land use. One point from that is ensuring that the development does not result in increased levels of pests and predation in the area, including the consideration for excluding cats and other domestic pets with the potential for harm. We understand that some of those have been dealt with in the application regarding domestic cats. So, that is an example of --

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** It is quite helpful, thank you.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Yes, of what Taiao Taiora provides.

**COMMISSIONER:** You have mentioned in your submission that the applicant has a proffered and worked with the hapū in regards to a few opportunities to recognise, acknowledge the relationship with the land. From memory, it is our street naming and perhaps a kowhato(?), a stone carving.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Yes.

**COMMISSIONER:** These appear from what we have read off the minutes or the summary of the meetings, that those were received positively.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Correct.

**COMMISSIONER:** Are there other things that you think would be appropriate to be recognised as part of a plan change and then later on obviously subdivision and earthworks consents and those types of things? But the proposal in front of us, what would be the types of things that you would normally expect to see that are tangible recognition and acknowledgement of the relationship of the hapū and iwi?

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Should the application proceed?

**COMMISSIONER:** Yes.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Should the application proceed, it's an intimate engagement throughout every aspect of the development and not just the aesthetic and symbolic but every aspect. Because you would be surprised at the knowledge that people have, which is not just cultural, as I said before, but technical because they have lived there, like many people in this room, been brought up there, seeing the changes in the land. So, yes, an intimate connection throughout every aspect of the development. Don't work on the assumption that they won't have something to offer the way in which the development is implemented.

**COMMISSIONER:** Just on that, and these questions are in the context if the proposal is granted but how would that intimate engagement be reflected or given effect to? Is it some more formal structures? Is it some type of ongoing relationship? I would just be interested in your view on that.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** We were just talking earlier, Tane and I, so we have MOUs in terms of reference and frameworks, working parties and committees coming out of our ears and we need to understand that -- I mean I'm employed by the iwi, this is my job but for a lot of our hapū marae pā representatives they do it in a voluntary capacity, an inherited voluntary capacity and they have day jobs, so their time is more limited. But in saying that they will make themselves available with good resource and time is the biggest of those resources.

 So when there's a finite period of, okay, we've got a month, give us all your matauranga Māori and your cultural good stuff and then what do you want? Hang on, it requires time. As I said in my submission, working with the representatives to ensure they understand every aspect of the application, not just here's the ecological report, read that. There were some 2,500 pages of reports. For me, that is my role but for our hapū marae pā representatives, the picture I painted earlier about that's a big expectation to put on them within a very short timeframe.

**COMMISSIONER:** The next question, it might be a sensitive question, it may not be but I am just wanting to understand a little bit more of the dynamics between the iwi authority and the hapū representatives because it seems to me, from what we have read so far, there has been engagement between the applicant and hapū representatives. There has been a few meetings. We have got a summary of the notes but I do not really get to the nub of --

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** (Māori spoken)

**COMMISSIONER:** where the hapū and the iwi sit in terms of this particular application. I think you are being very clear in your submission but the dynamics, if you could explain that to me.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Absolutely and with Tane here he'll add, that would be much appreciated. I shared in a conversation with Colin about this very point and it is that mana whenua come first. The views of the mana whenua, people working on the ground come first. It is our role, as iwi, to support that. The times when we stand apart are when Taiao Taiora dictates. It's an iwi environmental management plan that we work through with our people, was approved by our people and our board. We stand firm in our position that it's within 5 km of the National Park boundary, therefore, we can't support it, so that stands.

 But does that mean that we are then in conflict with our mana whenua? That there's this divide and rule going on, which, let's be honest, if this application wasn't on the table wouldn't be an issue. We continue to work together, grieve together and do all of those things in our space, regardless of processes like this. But one point I do want to raise is that I don't like it when our people are put in a position where they're expected to be the knowledge on all matters; that is an unreasonable expectation to put on mana whenua, unless they are skilled or in a professional position like I am.

 So, I say to applicants and the planning community and I'll be frank, don't do that to our people. Ensure that they are 100 per cent familiar with every aspect of the application, so that they can then have the confidence to share their cultural values. Because if they're not confident with what's in an application, then how can they and why would they provide personal important information? I don't know if that answers the question but I'd like Tane, on behalf of hapū and marae, to have a comment too.

**MR MANU:** I can't remember the question.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** About the different view of iwi and hapū, where hapū might have a view and iwi might have a view.

**MR MANU:** Yes. (Māori spoken) We have been establishing a solid working relationship alongside the iwi and it actually started with creating this document. For a number of years, 2016, three years now and we look forward to working with the iwi again on these matters. We do support Puna in her role. We have endorsed her korero here in the letter. Other than that really there are, I guess, at times expertise that we rely on in a professional matter and we will always look to work through those together.

 From a mana whenua perspective, I'd just like to support Puna's korero. Sometimes we do need time. We do need time to work through that understanding and at times we need to ask applicants too for our time to work through what we have to work through alongside iwi. Also, we ask the applicants also for that understanding of our view.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Ka pai.

**MR MANU:** Kia ora.

**COMMISSIONER:** When you say, well, we support the letter from Taranaki and I am assuming you are meaning the original submission. Who is we?

**MR MANU:** Ngā Mahanga.

**COMMISSIONER:**  Ngā Mahanga.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** So Keith Manukonga, who the applicant is working with directly and Mike Ure are trustees of Oākura Pā. Keith Manukonga is the current Chairperson. Now, when I read the MOU after it was signed late last year and I said to Uncle Keith, "In the MOU you've committed yourself to appearing at a hearing like the one today, do you fully understand what that means?" And he didn't. The impact of, I guess, signing an MOU and what that would mean in terms of presenting to a group of people like this today and it's a very vulnerable position for our leaders to be put in.

 As I say, unless they understand intimately every aspect of the application and my role is to sit alongside him so that he can understand that but he realised quite quickly, well, goodness the impact of this is a lot more than he'd understood when he signed the MOU and I say that honestly and with respect to Keith.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay. I have just got a few questions on the submission and that will not take too long.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Right.

**COMMISSIONER:** One of them is just in terms of the iwi management plan, I have assumed that it has been received by New Plymouth District Council and, potentially, Taranaki Regional Council --

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Correct.

**COMMISSIONER:** -- and it has gone through, their formal processes have been received.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Yes, yes.

**COMMISSIONER:** That was done --

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Last year, from July last year.

**COMMISSIONER:** July last year.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** NPDC, late last year I presented to all staff on how to implement and apply Taiao Taiora.

**COMMISSIONER:** Those two sections that you have pointed out for us regards Taranaki Mounga in section 11 of the iwi management plan, would you consider them to be matters of principle or are they firm statements of position?

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** The latter.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Those firm statements of position, as we went through developing the plan, they weren't taken lightly. For example, subdivision, so Taranaki Iwi are holding themselves to the same standard. To put it into perspective, 100,000 hectares confiscated in the Taranaki iwi rohe, 800 acres provided for Taranaki Iwi in settlement. We are, essentially, a landless iwi. So, any opportunity for us to have a place for our people to live within our rohe is gold. Yet, in Taiao Taiora we have firm statements and positions that we hold ourselves to, as much as we hold anyone to, that we ourselves won't have any subdivision with 5 km of the National Park boundary around our entire rohe. So, it's not used as a stick to wave and defend, oppose but it is something that we hold ourselves to as well.

**COMMISSIONER:** The second to last question, it is at paragraph 12 --

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Yes.

**COMMISSIONER:** -- of your submission today and you have just set out those matters which are in the MOU and a commitment to a cultural impact assessment. It seems a little after the fact that you would have an impact assessment done later after everything has been agreed to, rather than before, so it could have input into perhaps changing, amending, mitigating, avoiding the effects on the environment. Would you be of that same view?

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Correct. I don't want to take away from the relationship developed between the applicant and Keith and Mike; that relationship is a genuine one. When it comes to the development, the commitment to and a development of a cultural impact assessment; that does require more time, as I've said today. That window that we had from the time the applications were formally lodged in the June of last year, please correct me if my months are wrong, that window from then until even now to develop a comprehensive cultural impact assessment is a very short one.

 Then the MOU in October of last year, which committed to the CIA, October until now, a very short timeframe. As I say, these documents aren't just cultural, they have to overlay every aspect of the application using Taiao Taiora and our cultural values. So, yes, it is a bit late in the piece and Taranaki Iwi certainly commit to developing that, even though the proposed development has been fully developed. I mean put it simply like this, if a CIA had been done at the same time and as early as the ecology report, the landscape architect report, that early engagement that iwi often talk about is essential, so that the cultural issues aren't a tag-on to the fully developed and substantial application. They are a part of from the beginning.

 As you've heard today, just to underscore, it's because it's not just a cultural issue, we have concerns about wastewater, fresh water, biodiversity, all of those things. Looking at Mounga kia at the moment, I heard a good statement which was it's not about this clash between science and culture because science and culture are actually hugely complimentary. It's the clash between science, culture and development; science, culture and business, that is the issue.

**COMMISSIONER:** The last one is not a question so much as a request, you have mentioned the Wakatipu decision and it would be helpful if you had provided us a copy and if you wished --

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Certainly.

**COMMISSIONER:** -- to highlight the particular parts of the decision you wanted to draw our attention to.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** A pleasure.

**COMMISSIONER:** If you can provide that to Jane, then she can ...

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Certainly, with two copies of Taiao Taiora.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** I'll get Tane to autograph it for you.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you. We do not have any further questions, so thank you to you both.

**MS WANO-BRYANT:** Thank you. Thank you, everybody. Kia ora.

**COMMISSIONER:** It is an appropriate time now that we will adjourn for morning tea and we will reconvene at 11.40 am. Thank you.

(A short adjournment)

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay, we will reconvene. Mr Coffin and I just wanted to signal that we are prepared to sit until about 7.00 pm tonight in terms of getting through the schedule of submitters that we have before us today. I just wanted to signal that. As with a hearing, there are ongoing changes and if you need to change anything, please do not hesitate to see Jane. Okay, Mr Rollins, are you here? Okay, we will go to Toni Howison who is presenting for Toni Peacock. I will take you now, thank you, and then I will come back to Mr Rollins. You missed the call, Mr Rollins. I am going to hear from Ms Howison. Thank you. Welcome.

**MS HOWISON:** Kia ora. (Māori spoken) I would just really like to acknowledge the people of Oākura who have turned up to speak against this proposal over the last few days and the days to come. It is great to see all your faces here today and listen to your passionate speeches. I sat through yesterday and I was just --

**COMMISSIONER:** Can you just turn this way a bit in terms of ...

**MS HOWISON:** This way? Sorry. I sat through yesterday too and I was just so impressed by everyone's passion speaking. So, I sit here today in support of their speeches and in support of the disagreement with this proposal, PPC48. A bit mihi to all the people speaking this week with such strength and I'm sure that the Commissioners must be impressed by the level of opposition raised by such a small community. It certainly indicates just how much we care for and cherish this special and unique place we live in.

 It also illustrates and highlights that there needs to be significantly better community engagement and understanding if any major developments are being proposed and especially on such a small community. So, thank you for all your time and tears and effort you have put into making this stage and I'm so proud to be a part of this fantastic Oākura community. (Māori spoken) Don't die like a octopus but die like a hammerhead shark. Basically, stand up to what you believe in and fight hard for it, don't just lie down. (Māori spoken)

 So, Ko Toni Peacock, Ko Toni Howison. I have lived in Oākura now for ten years with my husband and two children, who both attend Oākura School. I come from Wanaka from a small town called Albert Town, which is about five minutes outside of Wanaka. So, not too dissimilar how Oākura is to New Plymouth. I was born there, grew up there and my family lived there for about 32 years. They loved small-town living, enjoyed walking down the street and knowing most of the people and enjoyed the small community feel of the area and the serenity and ease of small-town living.

 Wanaka has seen a large boom in development so fast and so huge. Now that locals are often complaining some can't afford to buy a home, even though they've lived and worked in the area all their life. Many have moved out into the surrounding towns or away from the area, in general due to such price hikes. Development is on a huge scale, subdivision after subdivision. You would think that would make the sections cheaper but they are not. They are grossly expensive and my family eventually moved out. Wanaka had changed so much from what it was that they knew and loved. They walk down the streets and not hardly recognise a soul.

 So I just wanted to just a little bit of the background but just to say that we live in Oākura for it's our choice. It's our choice to live in a small place where these values are so high. I live here because I love small-town living, the fantastic community feel and the shared values of the community. It is a beach-loving community, an outdoorsy community and everyone is looking out for each other. It feels like good old traditional values are still live and well in Oākura.

 I often laugh to myself that you can never do anything quick in Oākura, despite your best intentions a five-minute job always takes 15 minutes, as you always run into people you know and have a quick chat. This, in itself, is invaluable and provides a feeling of close social connections and community spirit, which is so precious and often rare or missed in larger-scale living. Don't get me wrong, I am not against growth. I understand that all places grow but I certainly am not going to sit back and watch an over-scale and unsuitably located development come in when it is largely against what our community want.

 There are already set aside areas which have been earmarked for the development. The council have this in their FUD areas and I cannot understand why we are considering this huge development on top of that and why is it that we have had to go through this long, lengthy and expensive time-taxing hearing process when it is so totally against what our community want? So, a fantastic part of living in New Zealand is that you can choose where you want to live; urban, rural, small town, village based. If you want to go live in bigger places then go live in bigger places.

 We make the drive into town sometimes quite arduously and sometimes two or three times a day because we love living in this small place and we love it because of the easy living, the strong community spirit and we feel the drive is worth it. I'm going to skim over the rest of my thing because I know that the time is short and precious and a lot of it has been pointed out already. But in terms of parking and traffic, it's already quite an unsafe road, Donnelly Street where the school is. I live at the very end of Donnelly Street with my family. We walk to school every day.

 I am always amazed at how many cars are coming up that street, even though the school are trying their best to get people walking and riding but there are still occasions where people are driving. Certainly on the rainy days, good luck trying to get a park and, let's face it, New Plymouth has quite a few wet, strong, heavy rainy days. It's already hard to get a park around the Four Square. Certainly down at the beach, it's hard to get a park in summer. One of the things we value so dearly is going to the beach. You go to the beach and you see so many families there.

 But adding another 400 houses on top of that with what, say, 800 cars or say a car each even going to the beach, they won't be walking to the beach, it's too far out, so they will be getting in their car to drive. What a different place it will be when our families have to park a block or two away trying to walk to the beach with surfboards, boogie boards and sand toys in tow. It certainly is going to take a lot of fun out of going to the beach for families when it becomes such a mission to even get a park.

 The schooling, again, they've talked about the schooling. Let's not be naïve, if the Ministry of Education makes room for that many kids, it's all about losing green space and we don't live in a small town and a small community to have no little, small back fields and once that diminishes you'll never get that back. I have concerns over the water supply and the infrastructure to support the development, the aquifer not being sufficient. However, I will leave that to the experts to go over. Then the mountain ranges, the mountain ranges are taonga and we should really be protecting them as such. We need to be preserving the view up the ranges. We don't need to see 400 houses as we look up to the ranges. That has been farmland and is still sown farmland and should stay exactly that.

 Also, with being so close to the Kaitake Ranges and National Park, it also goes against all that we are trying to achieve with a predator-free Taranaki. The mountains are a real treasure and should be treated and respected as much. In terms of The Paddocks, I feel very strongly for the people of The Paddocks who were sold the land, thinking that they would be living rurally with rural views. If this subdivision were to go ahead they'll be more like living in suburbia, which is such a contradiction to the applicant's original sales pitch.

 Saying one thing to get the project over the line and then turning around and changing his position. Why are we even considering this change of zone plan when he promoted to the people buying land and living in The Paddocks that they would be rural living with rural views? Today outside of school I ran into two people, both who actually live in The Paddocks and they just asked how the hearing was going. So I was talking to them and then they said they couldn't believe it because when they bought it they were like, "Yes, we're doing this organic farming and it's going to stay a farm" and then, literally, a few weeks later then in the post they received something about the proposed development.

 Another person said almost the same thing, so talk about shifting the goalposts to suit your own goals and not being fully forthcoming. It is obvious the applicant's intention was always to subdivide lot 29 further. It's currently farmland, let's leave it this way. I love Oākura because it is small. It's an easy lifestyle and very rewarding and you know so many in the community. How can the council even contemplate this subdivision going ahead when it's not what the community wants? Is that not what we set out to do and work with the council to come up with a strategic plan, the Oākura Structure Plan and the Kaitake Community Board of a 30-year vision?

 A development like this is certainly not within that scope, so how has this proposal even managed to make it this far and consume so much of our time and energy, when it's quite simply not what our community wants? I'm no fan of public speaking but I feel I must. (Māori spoken) My strength is not that of an individual but that of the collective. If the council let this go ahead they're failing their community, just for the profits of a single man. We should determine it is or at least involved in our community future. With over 450 submissions against this plan change we are telling you loud and clear exactly what we think of this proposed subdivision. Thank you for your time in hearing what I have to say.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you and you're presenting a statement on behalf of Gina Milestone.

**MS HOWISON:** I am, she's --

**COMMISSIONER:** If I can just, when you're finished that, if you can leave those statements with Jane, copies of it, so we can be provided with those.

**MS HOWISON:** So I'm reading this on behalf of Gina Milestone, who was unable to attend today. I am opposed the proposed plan change 48. Other than going to university, I have lived in Oākura my whole life. I very much feel it is my home and could not imagine living anywhere else. Over my life I've seen many changes to Oākura but none of those changes have changed it as much as I believe the proposed plan change will do. Currently, Oākura has a great sense of community. I like that if I go to the Four Square or for a coffee I can almost certainly see someone I know, many people are familiar faces of families I have been seeing for the last 40 years.

 If the proposed plan change goes ahead these people will still be here but so will a lot of other people and I am fearful that Oākura's sense of community that is so important will be lost. As a resident of Surrey Hill Road, the proposed plan change will also have a negative impact on my daily travel. Currently I negotiate the intersection of Wairau Road in the main road at least once a day and often up to four times daily. I regularly find myself telling my children in the back to be quiet so I can concentrate on making a safe turn right towards town and obviously have concerns that should the plan change go ahead this intersection is going to be very busy and dangerous, as will be the rest of Oākura.

 Where will all these cars, from the increase in population change, park when they go to the village or to the beach in the summer? My other major concern is, how is the school going to cope with the increase in children to the area? The school is already at its limits and classroom space and is going to lose important green space should any classrooms need to be built. How are the rest of the services in Oākura going to cope with such an increase in population? I know it would be naïve of me to expect the Oākura my kids grow up to be the same as the Oākura I grew up in but at the moment it is a very special place with a great sense of community, something that I think will be lost should another 400 sections be developed.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay, thank you very much for reading out both those statements. Now, we are going to hear from Jacqueline Kearns and then I will go back to Mr Richard Rollins. Jacqueline Kearns, welcome.

**MS KEARNS:** My name is Jacqueline Grace Kearns. I have a diploma in environmental management and a diploma in social work. Currently I am a mother and a part-time farmhand on farmland adjacent to our property on Ahu Ahu Road. I have lived in the Oākura area for 12 years. For two years I lived in the village and for now ten years down Ahu Ahu Road, which is approximately 5 km from my house to Oākura.

 One of the reasons for choosing this area to live in is for the rural location and character of the Oākura village and outerlying rural areas and proximity to the coast. I am a mother of three, all of my children have attended our community playcentre adjacent to Oākura School, Kaitake Kindergarten down Wairau Road and now Oākura School. I drive to and from Oākura at least twice a day, often three times and sometimes more, depending on extracurricular activities and sporting commitments, et cetera.

 The drive to and from Oākura is lovely. The neighbouring National Park, Kaitake Ranges and rolling farmland are always enjoyed by me and my family. Oākura has a unique and highly impressive location; a village community, proximity to a lovely beach, set within a rural setting and a National Park all on our doorstep. I watched with massive interest how The Paddocks subdivision would impact on our location and whilst I was not wholly supportive of this going ahead, I was relieved to know that the sub-divider applicant, Mr McKie, promised to the people of Oākura, New Plymouth and New Zealand that the surrounding farmland, not included in The Paddocks subdivision, would remain in perpetuity as farmland, which made The Paddocks subdivision slightly more palatable.

 I trusted and relied on Mr McKie to keep his work and promise and that the New Plymouth District Council, the Resource Management Act and case law would ensure this promise would remain. Is that not how it works? Is this subsequent application not a breach of agreement? It appears to me now that this was all a ploy to do what I've already stated, to make The Paddocks subdivision more palatable for those directly affected by the changes to our local environment and subsequently get a foot in the door to alter the natural environment we live in.

 Since my children have started school over a period of the last five years I have noticed a massive increase of traffic in our quiet, rural, seaside village. I have witnessed many close calls for our children in our area, resulting from cars and traffic. I have observed that our main street can become congested with traffic. I am aware that our school has been trying to accommodate an ever-increasing roll. The road to and from school, Donnelly Street, has got to the point where it has become dangerous with the number of cars driving up and down to pick up and drop off children.

 I now park down The Outlook on the opposite side of Donnelly Street, as advised and recommended by the school to ease traffic congestion. However, the level of school traffic on The Outlook has now almost reached the same level as Donnelly Street. It can be a struggle to get a car park on our main road to simply grab something from our local Four Square. My concerns with the application are further substantial increases in traffic, our children are already at risk. Oākura School, where would the new families look to send their children to school? My children's concern is that it would potentially mean the school requires more classrooms and would that mean another school field and play area would be sacrificed to accommodate this? Where would they play? There wouldn't be enough room for everyone.

 Water, it's not an infinite supply. Oākura has had water restrictions through the past summers. What does that mean for current village residents? If there has already been water usage and conservation concerns regarding the current population, how can there be an adequate supply of water for a further few hundred households? Proposing that 60 to 70 households would be able to have a water tank for their general supply is all very well but how would that look in the proposed setting? A complete eyesore is how it would look.

 I know now from my experiences living rurally that one 30,000 litre water tank is very unlikely to sustain a household over a prolonged period of time without rain and that to ensure your household has enough over a period of four to six weeks, two tanks are required and even then there have been three occasions over the past five years where we have had to buy water due to running dry during drought conditions. So that would mean not 60 to 70 water tanks but, potentially, 120 to 140 water tanks popping up on all of the proposed water tank properties, which, as we know, neighbours a beautiful national landmark, our very own National Park. The current rural vista and landscape would no longer exist.

 This proposal from Mr McKie could potentially double our current population. How can Oākura accommodate this? Is Mr McKie proposing to mitigate effects by providing Oākura with further car parks, somehow doubling the size of our school without depriving our children of their outdoor areas, changing or adapting our local roads to address the effects of potentially 400 to 800 more cars on our roads? How can Mr McKie propose a subdivision of this magnitude and expect the ratepayers of New Plymouth and the taxpayers of New Zealand to foot the bill for one man's vision; to foot the bill for all the infrastructure that is required to accommodate all of the needs that will arise?

 This isn't a proposal to dot a few houses around with large rural lifestyle properties, rather a condensed urban residential area. With the number of house sites proposed that would mean a need for street lights. From my home I can see a night-time glow from New Plymouth city, is that what will be for Oākura? No more twinkling lights of a small rural village, rather the glow of an urban town. This is not what I moved here for. Skylight pollution, we don't have that here yet but it will with another 400 or so houses built up on the hills adjacent to the Kaitake Ranges in a specified condensed area.

 The National Park, how does this affect the flora and fauna in the area? Millions of taxpayers' dollars spent on 1080 and pest control and then welcome in a further potential 400 cats and dogs. I refer to Mr Gladstone's evidence dated 25 June 2019 and, more specifically, illustration 2, the proposed route to school via Wairau Road. This route is by no means an easily accessible walking, biking path. It is steep, has a multitude of steps and has driveway accesses on it, which the neighbouring properties all use.

 This track is not family-friendly, apart from the obvious dangers of the steep paths and steps and vehicular access, it is also very private. Visibility from either end of the track is very limited. I would not feel safe for my children to walk along this track alone, who knows who could be lurking in the shadows and out of visibility? I refer to Mr Skerrett's evidence dated 17 June 2019. I do not accept that Mr Skerrett can say it's acceptable for parents to sit in traffic, waiting for up to 15 minutes to simply get back on to the main road. I have read the evidence from Mr McKie dated 17 June 2019 and I wish to respond asking, who are you to say what and how the future should be for Oākura?

 This application should not be about the world according to Mr McKie and how you want it to be for all in Oākura. I do not accept your vision to change our environment and turn it into what you want and think is acceptable. This vision of Mr McKie's is not mine, nor of the Oākura community, nor the New Plymouth District Plan. The rural character of this land would be lost for ever and the rural character of Oākura would be lost for ever.

 If I had wanted to live in suburbia I would not have chosen a quiet, rural coastal community to live in. How can Mr McKie say we, Oākura, need this subdivision? Because, quite simply, we don't, I don't. I don't need another 800 cars on our local roads. I don't need to see our natural environment being carved up, littered with street lights, water tanks, houses, garages in an area that has natural rural character neighbouring a protected national heritage park. I don't need another 800 cars vying for a car park at our local sports grounds, school, skate park, beach and library.

 Who is Mr McKie to say what the future holds for Oākura and how the future will come about? The consequences of this are the rural character of Oākura village gone for ever, undermining the beauty of our National Park for ever, threatening our unique native flora and fauna at a potential catastrophic level with household pets and invasive plant species. Putting all of Oākura's infrastructure under immense pressure and expecting the people of New Zealand to pay for it.

 Putting our children in an uneasy situation with having to deal with all of the above and taking away their sense of space and freedom and belonging. I do not believe there is a way to mitigate this subdivision proposal. I believe this proposal does not comply with the Resource Management Act. I believe this proposal does not mirror the Oākura community vision. Therefore, this proposal, in its entirety, should be declined.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you. I do not have any questions, so thank you.

**MS KEARNS:** Cool.

**COMMISSIONER:** Mr Rollins. Okay, thank you, Mr Rollins.

**MR ROLLINS:** Are you ready?

**COMMISSIONER:** We are, thank you.

**MR ROLLINS:** Yes. All right, good morning. My name is Richard Rollins. Yesterday I presented here as an expert on the specific consequences of this development if approved. Today I'm here as a non-expert to briefly present personal observations of problems with the urban development of California over the last 30 or 40 years and how they might apply in this plan change application.

**COMMISSIONER:** Can I just check, Mr Rollins, in terms of what you are going to outline, are they related back to the matters that you have submitted on?

**MR ROLLINS:** Generally not.

**COMMISSIONER:** That provides us with a wee difficulty.

**MR ROLLINS:** Okay.

**COMMISSIONER:** Because at the end of the day this is about discussing and picking up the matters that were in each submission that was lodged.

**MR ROLLINS:** Yes.

**COMMISSIONER:** So, that is why I am raising the issue because other matters that are generally not covered in the submission --

**MR ROLLINS:** Yes.

**COMMISSIONER:** -- cannot be raised, so that is why I raise my question --

**MR ROLLINS:** Well --

**COMMISSIONER:** -- just in terms of how you are relating, if at all, these matters and are they referenced broadly in your submission?

**MR ROLLINS:** In the original submission.

**COMMISSIONER:** Yes, in the original submission.

**MR ROLLINS:** Yes. Well, I think I haven't memorised my original submission, since it was some time ago. It had to do with the quality of the stream and these things have to do with the quality of the stream. I have a copy of it if you want me to go and find it.

**COMMISSIONER:** No, we have got that here.

**MR ROLLINS:** But I'm happy to pass as well.

**COMMISSIONER:** Happy if you do a brief overview because --

**MR ROLLINS:** Okay.

**COMMISSIONER:** -- I will need to consider, as part of not right now but further on in terms of whether what you are presenting is out of scope or has some relationship to your submission. Having a quick look at your submission, the detailed attachment focused essentially on pesticide matters.

**MR ROLLINS:** Correct.

**COMMISSIONER:** You did have some general comments on the proof(?) on the foam(?) --

**MR ROLLINS:** Correct.

**COMMISSIONER:** -- which talked about a range of matters, which is probably different to what the lessons from California.

**MR ROLLINS:** Okay.

**COMMISSIONER:** Because those matters, I take from that, relate to the subject site Oākura and the surrounding area, so I am just raising those concerns.

**MR ROLLINS:** Right, I guess, let's see ...

**COMMISSIONER:** In terms of do not use the sea for waste disposal and type of thing, I think we are getting a wee bit beyond what is in your submission.

**MR ROLLINS:** Okay. So, the sort of generic first couple of pages of the original submission --

**COMMISSIONER:** You need to be addressing those matters that you raised.

**MR ROLLINS:** And those would be in -- that's fine, I'm happy to pass here.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay.

**MR ROLLINS:** Yes, thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** All right, thank you. So I will move to Layne Greensill. Welcome, Mr Greensill.

**MR GREENSILL:** Good morning.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay, thank you and if you would like to take us through your statement.

**MR GREENSILL:** Lovely, thank you. My name if Layne Greensill. I am here representing the Greenhill Family Trust family partnership number 1 and 2 dairy farms. In November 2015 the Greensill Family Trust purchased the property at 1303 South Road, Oākura. The property was purchased as to be run in tandem with our existing dairy platform at Ōkato to enhance our business model. At the time of purchase due diligence was done on not only this property but also the surrounding neighbours, as one of our concerns was the direction in which local land was being used or changed.

 It was brought to our attention that the property to the north of us, being that of which is seeking to a plan change approved, had already had part of it sect for development, i.e. The Paddocks. Part of that consent process for this development meant that the rest of the farm would remain as farmland in perpetuity. Owing to the constraints of farming a small property, our property is 70 acres, a similar size, I believe, to that remaining of the applicant's property and the constraints that are applied to us by the Taranaki Regional Council, we have certain conditions that apply to our consents to discharge effluent by spreading to pasture.

 This consent has conditions like no contaminants shall be discharged within 150 m of any dwelling, nor within 50 m from any bore, well or spring used for water supply purposes, nor within 25 m of any surface water body. The return period of application of effluent shall be at least 20 days. I have here a copy of the resource consent, which I'll leave for you guys to have a look over. There are some other conditions in here as well. For this resource consent our discharge shall not exceed 6.26 cubic metres per day of effluent and as a dairy farmer now we are finding it more restrictive to be compliant, so that we are not going against the conditions of our consents and, therefore, contaminating soils or waterways of any type. As you'll be well aware, as a supplier to Fonterra, we are under a huge riparian planting process of which they hope to have all streams and waterways on rural land planted out by 2020. Currently our application area is 2.76 hectares.

 If you turn to the map at the back of the evidence, what I have done there is I have outlined the boundaries on our property in blue, with the applicant's property north of us there. The pink zone is 150 m exclusion zone from the boundary, which, potentially, if the approval goes ahead would mean that people could build close to that boundary, therefore, giving us that exclusion zone. Due to the topography of our property it would mean that we have about 1.5 hectares of land that we would be able to spread our effluent on.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** Sorry, what was that number again?

**MR GREENSILL:** The area that we could spread?

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** Yes.

**MR GREENSILL:** Approximately about 1.5 to 2 hectares.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** Okay, thank you.

**MR GREENSILL:** But --

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** Where physically would that be?

**COMMISSIONER:** We would normally ask questions at the end but since ...

**MR GREENSILL:** Yes, yes, no, that's cool. So that area is going to be basically in here.

**ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER:** Okay.

**MR GREENSILL:** But then we have water exclusions around these streams here and I'll talk to that further.

**COMMISSIONER:** Can you show Mr Muldowney that location, please? Thank you for that.

**MR GREENSILL:** That's all right. If the proposed plan change was to be approved it would mean that 150 m buffer zone between the applicant's property and ours would reduce the area on which we'd be able spread effluent to a point that we would not be able to comply with our consents, which would mean that we would have to cease dairy farming on this property. Due to the topography of the property with a rise of over 100 m from State Highway 45 to the Kaitake Ranges boundary, any land that we own that is not within the restrictions of our consent, i.e. housing, water, is of too steep a gradient to safely apply effluent as run-off into streams. This would be highly risky, remembering that both the streams on our property end up flowing on to the Oākura beach at either the surf club or the camp store.

 Throughout New Zealand dairy farmers are already feeling the heat from the public where residential is meeting rural with a lack of understanding from the public as to how and why best practices occur on farm. One of the effects of urbanisation next to our farm would be a raised concern security for our asset, a concern for biosecurity in terms of spread of diseases from domestic dogs and cats and generally complaints from townies in regards to noise and smell, remembering farming is a seven day a week 24 hour a day business.

 This farm has been set up as a spring calving farm and whilst is profitable as a standalone unit, it's currently operated in tandem with our larger all-year-round dairy unit in Ōkato and several run-offs. So we have six other properties that we use as run-offs, all of those properties are run together in tandem, as we call it, providing bulk milk in spring or as a spring-calving farm and then our Ōkato farm runs all year round. So we calve three times here on that farm and we provide milk through the winter for domestic consumption, as well as some of that possibly goes into other products.

 So, what happens is that we have stock being exchanged from one farm to another, depending at times of year when it's profitable to have those cows going into winter supply or into just standard spring supply. So, we have built our business upon now knowing that we can interchange between farm stock and also feed that we grow on these units. If we are unable to operate as a dairy unit on this property it will severely impact the Trust's ability to run its business operation as efficiently and profitably as it is doing currently.

 A plan change in usage on the applicant's farm will have severe detrimental effect on our ability to farm this property at Oākura, meaning that we will not be able to service the $2 million debt on the land, which is why, since we purchased this property, it has been run as a dairy unit. What are our options if approval is given? We have considered since the application began what we are able to do with this property and the only conclusion that we have come to is that if this property north of ours is given the status of residential, we will be forced to either apply for a plan change of our own or talk with the council with the new District Plan coming out to also gain the ability to subdivide our property into residential lots, so as to be able to recover our costs on this property.

Does this mean also, in time, as other people would feel the effect of urbanisation on rural land properties to the south of us, would also wish to get on the bandwagon and subdivide their properties for residential lots as well? Remembering that as you travel south from our property, the belt of land between State Highway 45 and Kaitake Ranges narrows to approximately 300 m at the start of Lucy's Gully, meaning, if residential lots were applied to this area, that housing would again move closer to the Kaitake Ranges.

Our family has had connection with Oākura for over 40 years, having always had a family bach and now, owning our own home within the village. Part of the reason we've brought the farm here in Oākura is that it is very close for us to operate our business, while living in Oākura in our home, which is in the -- which is the hub for our four children and our friends and family.

The experiences I have had whilst living in Oākura over a lifetime of summers is what we are endeavouring to give to, not only our children, but to those that choose to live in the village. As it would have a huge detrimental effect on our business and lifestyle, I strongly oppose land change application. Thank you.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Thank you. Mr Coffin?

**MR COFFIN:** My (inaudible) it would be good to get a copy of your consent.

**MR GREENSILL:** Yes.

**MR COFFIN:** I just think it would be really helpful. And I think you've already confirmed for us that your -- you'll sign up to the accord and the Fonterra requirements for the riparian management and other things on farm, which you'll be familiar with?

**MR GREENSILL:** Yes.

**MR COFFIN:** Just on the consent, the 150 m distance; in your understanding, is that a standard type condition imposed by the regional council in these -- well, in terms of effluent and disposal?

**MR GREENSILL:** Yeah, I think it's a standard clause that they have. We have it on this property. On the other property that we have a dairy farm, we don't have a discharge to water consent. It's a -- sorry, a discharge to pasture. It's currently through a two-pond discharge to water system but that's currently going under a new consent so we will then have to apply these same conditions to that farm as well. So they are a standard as far as I'm aware.

**MR COFFIN:** Okay. No, thank you.

At the fourth paragraph. You just -- you mentioned one of the effects of urbanisation next to the farm, is complaints from the townies.

**MR GREENSILL:** Yeah.

**MR COFFIN:** Do you currently receive complaints on your farms?

**MR GREENSILL:** We haven't received -- yeah, I have received a -- well, not so much a complaint, but a concern from somebody who arrived on farm one day when we were in the middle of calving. We had some cows in the front paddock by the main road calving and their concern was that there was a calf had been born down by the road and that it was coming up nightfall, that calf might die in the cold.

**MR COFFIN:** Okay. But certainly, in terms of this particular farm unit, we've -- you're mentioning, you haven't received any complaints about noise or stock?

**MR GREENSILL:** We've had complaints and we've actually put some complaints in with the council over dogs.

**MR COFFIN:** Okay.

**MR GREENSILL:** Which is part of that security and biosecurity. As you'll be well aware at the moment, we're in a billion-dollar Mycoplasma bovis problem so we have had to step up our biosecurity. And part of that is domestic animals coming on property and also people coming on property, who may have been on other properties. So we have a clear clean-boot policy so every time somebody comes on farm, they have to wash vehicles, wash boots, any of that. And of course, with urbanisation on your doorstep, it doesn't always mean that people adhere to boundaries.

**MR COFFIN:** Right.

**MR GREENSILL:** And, you know ...

The -- I -- your comment about complaints over smell; in regards to use of fertilisers now and especially organic or, you know, chicken manure, that sort of thing, which is used in cropping, which we do on that farm. We usually crop at least 3 ha a year of turnips and so, you know, some of those organic fertilisers are used. And the smell can be, if applied at the wrong time, it can be quite substantial, especially drifting ‑‑

**MR COFFIN:** Ok, okay.

**MR GREENSILL:** -- over households and things like that. Also, the application of lime, which does tend to drift.

**MR COFFIN:** Just on this map that you showed us -- and you showed us the area where -- that's where you think that you'd have to discharge the effluent.

**MR GREENSILL:** Yeah.

**MR COFFIN:** If you were to use an alternative method of, let's say, treating the effluent, what might that be? (overspeaking)

**MR GREENSILL:** So one of the potential ways of applying effluent to pasture is by using a slurry tanker and the new technology in that is that you use a injection process, which means that the effluent is -- you -- we would put ponds in, which would collect the effluent. We would then pump from the ponds into a slurry cart and that would then be driven over the paddocks and injected directly into the soil. That also helps ilatration(?) ‑‑

**MR COFFIN:** Like tile beds or something like that or ...

**MR GREENSILL:** Yeah, it's only put in an inch ‑‑

**MR COFFIN:** Oh, okay.

**MR GREENSILL:** -- into the -- into the soil but it helps stop the volatilisation of nitrogen and it also helps with the uptake of the effluent by plants so that you don't get run-off into streams or waterways, things like that. So that's one way. Cost of that, you're probably looking at 150, $200,000 set up to do that.

**MR COFFIN:** Okay.

**MR GREENSILL:** And you'd also have to be aware of the topography of that property as well because it, as I say, you know, it's flat at the front but it's extremely steep at the back.

**MR COFFIN:** So 150 to 200k to set it up and then operational costs of that? Is it time and -- time and effort?

**MR GREENSILL:** Yeah. Yeah, I mean, on those amounts of effluent being -- what did we say they were; 6.26 m3 a day. Yeah, that's 700 l a day. You might not do it every day but you might be doing it once a week, therefore, you've got to have somebody to operate that. Apparently, that farm has a contract milker on it so that would be not within their contract to have to do that. So we'd have to employ somebody else to do that work.

**MR COFFIN:** Yeah. Okay. And have you -- do you use that method on any of your other farm units at all?

**MR GREENSILL:** No, but we are looking at it for the home farm at the moment, under the new consent process.

**MR COFFIN:** Okay. Thank you.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Mr Greensill, in terms of the area that's shaded pink, so is all of that area currently utilised for effluent disposal (overspeaking)

**MR GREENSILL:** Yes. No. Due to topography, the top part of it towards the ranges is not used but a lot of the area from the road up to there, as we build ‑‑

**MALE SPEAKER:** Yeah. Is that roughly up to where the dog leg is? Where the ‑‑

**MR GREENSILL:** Yeah.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Okay.

**MR GREENSILL:** Yeah. And just as we add capital to that effluent system, we, you know, we'll put more piping in and then we're able to take more effluent or spread more effluent to more parts of the farm that, you know, so as we grow feed on those parts, it's good to be able to put that effluent back as a natural resource rather than continue to put it onto, you know, two or three paddocks.

**MALE SPEAKER:** And just clarification; so you note that the farm's been set up as a spring calving farm?

**MR GREENSILL:** Yes.

**MALE SPEAKER:** So is that undertake -- is that type of activity undertaken currently?

**MR GREENSILL:** Yes.

**MALE SPEAKER:** It is?

**MR GREENSILL:** Yes.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Together with its use as a dairy unit?

**MR GREENSILL:** Yeah, so the spring calving -- so we've just -- we're in the middle of calving right now and because the farms work in tandem, at the moment, all of the cows that are calving are going back to Okato and being milked there ‑‑

**MALE SPEAKER:** Okay.

**MR GREENSILL:** -- until we have a number, which will allow us to shift back to that farm, which we will then be able to supply Fonterra. Because they have minimum amounts of milk that can be supplied every day and so we will ‑‑

**MALE SPEAKER:** From each particular farm, is it?

**MR GREENSILL:** Yes.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Okay.

**MR GREENSILL:** Yes, that's right. And so those cows will be going back, contract milker that's on that property, my daughter. She's planning on having stock back there, hopefully by Monday and she'll start supply as of -- for this season as of Monday. And then she'll continue to calve the rest of her herd on that farm until they're finished in mid September.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Okay. No, thank you for that.

Just a (overspeaking) from my little scale here, that I'm using on the map. That 150 m currently, it doesn't appear that any of the dwellings that are in the paddock's subdivision are within that 150 m area ‑‑

**MR GREENSILL:** Yes. That's correct.

**MALE SPEAKER:** -- on my reckoning.

**MR GREENSILL:** Yeah.

**MALE SPEAKER:** That's what your understanding is?

**MR GREENSILL:** Yeah, that'd be right.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Okay. We don't have anything further.

**MR GREENSILL:** Okay.

**MALE SPEAKER:** So thank you.

**MR GREENSILL:** I would strongly recommend a site visit if you're able to book that into your ‑‑

**MALE SPEAKER:** Yes. We are heading out that way tomorrow. Thank you.

**MR GREENSILL:** Yeah. Great. Thank you very much for your time.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Is Tobias Looker here at the moment? Okay, no. So we'll move to Craig Williams. Welcome, Mr Williams.

**MR WILLIAMS:** Thank you.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Do you have a statement for circulation? (inaudible) provide that to Jane and she will ...

Please take us through your statement, Mr Williams?

**MR WILLIAMS:** Kia Ora, everybody. Living in Oākura is great. We have a friendly community, we have a safe community, we have a fun community, we have a very picturesque community. We have our own beach, we have our own Four Square and shops, we have our own local restaurants. We have our own surf club and we have our own skate park and we have our own school. We also have a lot of craft-beer brewers. Like I said, it's a fun community.

We're small; we take less than a minute to drive through. We're close to town, we're close to the sea, we're close to the mountain. We love our rural and coastal views. Views of the ocean, views of the Kaitake Ranges.

We love our proximity to the countryside. We like the fact our neighbours are from all over the village. We can all walk to the beach, we can walk to the shops.

We have hidden paths and tracks behind streets. It reminds me of the New Zealand of my childhood; a local environment full of adventures to be discovered.

There's a reason we all refer to Oākura as we. We're a collective, a close-knit community. Our village has character. My partner and I always tell our kids, "Just remember, whatever trouble you might think you can get away with around here, we will find out about it". We know and everybody knows who all the local kids are.

We think that Oākura is truly one of the modern -- is one of them few modern villages in New Zealand, and in a world fall of large, anonymous sprawling metropolises, subdivisions and developments. This village character is something that the Oākura community has consistently expressed its desire to keep. So we, in the Oākura community want engaged, adaptive planning as described and engaged in by the Kaitake Community Board and other Oākura planning groups over the last ten or more years.

 Adaptive planning that looks to the future, regarding the natural environment, traffic flows, stormwater, school size and visual impacts. We want to be positively involved with the New Plymouth District Council in determining an effective future plan for our community that benefits all of our community.

 This proposed development doesn't feel like it has Oākura's best interest and our character at heart. Like many other members of the Oākura community, I'm opposed to the plan change 48 request and we feel that this proposed subdivision is not beneficial to character and future development of Oākura village. We feel that the Oākura community has not been adequately consulted with over this proposal and we feel it will have a negative impact on the quality of life in Oākura.

 It is plain to see from the hundreds of responses to this request plan change, that the Oākura community overwhelmingly wants the New Plymouth District Council to reject this request.

This proposed development is huge. It would increase the size of our village by 60 per cent or more and by what seems to be a startling amount of omission of detail, it feels like this request assumes we, the village, are expected to deal with the impacts and its associated costs, such as the stormwater management, drinking water supplies, river water quality, air quality, traffic management, safety, access to amenities and management of the school, to name but a few for many years to come.

it appears to our community that there has not been a huge amount of thought put into these things. Rather, there has been a reactive Band-Aid type approach, a sort of stemming the leaks philosophy, as the community's concerns have been raised, with the main aim of shoving the paperwork through. This may have adhered to some legal process but legal does not mean it's what's best for our community.

Infrastructure and amenities in Oākura are presently stretched to capacity. Traffic is already a concern on State Highway 45. There are frequently vehicles entering and travelling through the township and main intersections above the speed limit. The main area of shops are very busy at peak hours and parking is limited. And earlier this year, a student at Oākura School was hit by a car travelling, luckily, at a slow speed.

This proposed development would supposedly see around 4,500 extra trips by vehicles per day through the village. Across the 18 waking hours of each day, that's an extra 250 vehicles per hour through State Highway 45, Wairau Road intersection. Those cars will also come through the State Highway 45, Dixon Street intersection. Both these areas are already very congested. We need solutions for these sorts of increases before they occur, not as an afterthought with the associated costs, human and financial, to be ultimately borne by our community.

Over recent years, a huge amount of work has been done around pest control in the Kaitake Ranges and the Oākura area via the Kaitake initiative. The proposed development is going to significantly increase potential for both animal and plant pests to become established in the neighbouring reserve areas, undoing this good work.

 And like many people in the Oākura community, I'm also an avid beach user and I'm all too aware of the changes to water quality of the ocean, due to run off after heavy rains. A development of this size would see huge amounts of additional stormwater destined to go into local streams and onto Oākura Beach.

The people of Oākura community live out here because we like being in a small village, nestled in a rural area. We like having small issues that we can manage, adapt to and deal with. This proposed development will simply burden our community with large issues that haven't been planned for. Larger issues that we don't want or need.

And at this point, I would like to acknowledge the representatives of the Taranaki iwi, who spoke earlier and, you know, we really appreciate their support in our resistance to this plan change request. And the irony is not -- the irony is not lost on me that a small village full of white people essentially, is relying on the local marae and iwi to stack them up after the history of New Zealand. So, you know, in this case, there -- well, generally, this -- their wish is my wish and they also oppose this request.

 We understand that there is already sufficient land earmarked for Oākura's future development on the seaward side of State Highway 45. The proposed development's plan to drip feed lots to us over the next 20 to 30 years, seems to be offered as some sort of concession on the developer's part. To me, my family and our community, it feels more like one person dictating when and where Oākura will grow; solely and conveniently for their profit.

 The same feeling applies to a reduced or compromise solution, where a smaller version of this development might be allowed to proceed. This would be a grossly cynical step and seems to be an approach of, ask for far too much, then pretend to compromise for a little less.

This plan change request process also seems unfairly weighted in favour of the developer. The onus has instead been placed on the Oākura community to go to great effort and expense to engage with council and offer proof as to why the request should not be approved. This should not be the case. This proposed development is solely for the enrichment of one individual, while passing on the associated costs, stress and inconvenience to the rest of the Oākura community.

We, in the Oākura community feel it is reasonable to expect there should have been a huge amount of preplanning, mitigation planning, consultation, especially between us and New Plymouth District Council, for a proposal of this large scope. In short, it should have been clear to the Oākura community, that the developer, and New Plymouth District Council have had adaptive planning at the forefront of this request and any similar or other request for such significant change. Community approval absolutely needs to have been sought and absolutely is not there in this case.

We think our Oākura village is special and we want it to remain special. This plan change request is not concerned with that and it is not beneficial to Oākura village as we look towards the future.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Thank you ‑‑

**MR WILLIAMS:** Thank you.

**MALE SPEAKER:** -- Mr Williams. Mr Coffin?

**MR COFFIN:** Just at your very first paragraph, we've been hearing consistently from submitters, and most of them residence of Oākura, around what I'm calling the community social infrastructure. That's my term and not theirs, but the -- that -- what is I suppose, physical elements of the community and you've mentioned those; Four Square, the surf club, skate park, school and perhaps craft-beer brewers perhaps. Do you see those as, even though they're -- they'll be owned by a particular, you know, the school owned by the ministry and the Four Square owned by its owners; do you see those as community -- they're physical community infrastructure? They're an important part of the (overspeaking)

**MR WILLIAMS:** Yeah, absolutely. I mean ‑‑

**MR COFFIN:** -- and they gather -- interact with each other and they're more than a place of transaction?

**MR WILLIAMS:** Yes. Absolutely. I -- you know, I go into one of the larger supermarkets in town, it's more a place of transaction, whereas in Oākura, you've got these little shops and amenities and you kind of feel like they're, you know, they're part of the deal. They're part of the village. They may not -- may not have everything or they may not be as big or as flash or whatever, but they're, you know, they're part of --

**MR COFFIN:** Thank you.

**MR WILLIAMS:** -- it's part of being in the village.

**MR COFFIN:** Just at the bottom of page 2; it's the very last two sentences there, where you mention the 4,500 extra trips, 18 waking hours, 200 vehicles. Where do you -- where did you reference that from?

**MR WILLIAMS:** I thought I saw that in the -- in the initial report.

**MR COFFIN:** Okay. You've taken that from the (overspeaking) yeah.

**MR WILLIAMS:** In the -- in the 400-plus pages I had mailed to me. Should have provided an email.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Okay. We don't have any further questions so thank you, Mr Williams.

**MR WILLIAMS:** Thank you.

**MALE SPEAKER:** So we'll move to Jacqueline Molloy? Welcome, Ms Molloy.

**MS MOLLOY:** Shall I hand out my papers to you?

**MALE SPEAKER:** Jane will come and collect those.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Here she comes.

**MS MOLLOY:** Thanks, Jane.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Just before you commence, I'll just let everyone know; after we have heard from Ms Molloy, we will then adjourn for lunch.

**MS MOLLOY:** Okay.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Over to you, thank you.

**MS MOLLOY:** Hi. My name's Jacqueline Molloy. I'm a local rate-paying resident of Oākura and have been for the last ten years. My three young children are third-generation students of Oākura School and it is through my time in Oākura and through my partner and his family cycle history, that I feel strongly that Oākura and its unique village living needs to be protected from unplanned and ill-planned development for now and future generations.

I want PC -- PPC 48 declined in all its entirety. Some of my reasons are as follows. This development seeks to basically double our village and turn us from a community that has grown slowly in population and thus able to maintain OUR strong sense of family as a community, into another suburb that pops up overnight, that has not had the foundation to support the tightknit community connections that already exist in Oākura.

 The part I love about living here is that it is a village, the children know each other, we are still small enough to have and maintain our village history.

Oākura has already designated future urban development areas, identified through rigorous community consultation in early 2000, that has resulted in the Oākura structure plan 2006. The largest area being on the seaward side of State Highway 3; access to be off the already wide enough Cunningham Lane in Oākura. This area is boarded by residential on two sides. It's already on the seaward side. People can walk to the beach without cars. It has easy access, wide enough -- our wide enough lower Wairau Road and the development would be -- would be infilling areas within the existing footprint of the village. It is by far the best area to be developed next and this is why it was identified, and as a community, agreed on.

 The cumulative adverse impacts this subdivision would have are many. The community of Oākura recognises this and are against this development. It is disturbing to think that there is not a process in place that recognises this earlier on and that it has come down to the individual community rallying together to try and fight this no-conscience developer. The proposed subdivision is simply in the wrong location for future growth.

 Impacts are many. Some I feel strongly about are; the rural landscape character on the south side of State Highway 45 up to the Kaitake Ranges is a spectacular view and needs to be protected. The biodiversity threats to the Kaitake Range from residential cats, associated vermin et cetera that come from humans, are genuine and need to be recognised and considered. We are trying to bring back biodiversity and cannot do this by allowing development on the ring plane of a national park.

Traffic would be a big issue. For a start, Upper Wairau Road is quite narrow and if cars are parked on the side of the road, then this stops traffic flowing both ways right now. And this is the access to the proposed subdivision of nearly 600 house sites. I wouldn't want to park there any more, nor would I want my kids travelling down that road taking our dog for a walk. Imagine all the village occupants as it stands right now, exiting and entering via one road. Not good planning.

 Oākura Beach in summer can become quite busy from tourists and from locals. One can only imagine how doubling the village or increasing the village would -- by this amount, would impact more. Parking is already a nightmare in the summer peak.

 The stormwater run-off to the beach would increase vastly as less ground infiltration and more concrete and ‑‑

(Transcription ends)

(Transcription begins)

... Oākura already has a problem with stream discharge levels eroding our beaches, especially beachside properties north of Wairau Road. We simply can't allow our beach to be eroded even more simply because a landowner wants to develop his productive lands for no better reason than making large amounts of money to the detriment of the people who live in the area. The land should remain rural and productive.

 Oākura School would have to grow and the students would lose their green spaces and the school would be overcrowded. What kind of village school would that be? Needless to say it would no longer be a village school. Overcrowding of Oākura School would lead to a deterioration of educational outcome for its students and it is my opinion that kids need green open spaces and compromising this for a developer's pocket is again not okay. The subdivision will compromise the community's natural and social environment and endanger the rural character and the associated amenity values of Oākura. This developer does not care about the community. He does not live here. He does not understand our sense of community or pride or our lifestyle that we have in living in this unique village. The developer has shown our community that he is not to be trusted. He has gone back on many of his statements he used to get the Paddocks subdivision through in Oākura. Any word of his is purely a financial interest. His past actions have proved he does not have any real ethical or moral consideration for our community wellbeing.

 It is the opinion of myself and many that the adverse impacts of the environment to public amenity values, to sense of place and to lifestyle enjoyment will be borne by the residents and not by the developer. He will simply ruin our community because he wants more and more. When do people like this ever really stop and are satisfied with their already affluent lifestyle.

 I have explained to my young children that this developer is like the Once-ler from the Lorax. He won't stop and we, as a community, are the Lorax. We need to speak for our village and our lifestyle choice.

 I can only hope and pray in this case the Lorax and the obvious better choice of canning this development wins out. I reiterate I, Jacqueline Molloy, want PPC48 declined in all its entirety. I do not support this at all. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. Neither of us have any questions so thank you.

**MS MOLLOY:** Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN:** So at this point we will adjourn for lunch and we will reconvene at 2.00 pm. Thank you.

(A short adjournment)

**CHAIRMAN:** We will reconvene. Before we hear from the next submitter -- Mr Coffin and I have had a discussion over lunch. We've now heard from a range of submitters, including a very comprehensive submission from the Kaitaki Community Board. So we've heard and we've had placed before us a number of issues in terms of those submissions we've heard to date. We are now getting into, in our view, a repetition of matters that have been raised previously by submitters. So you may have noted as part of that that some our questions are also decreasing in respect of when submitters present. I'd just like to make the point that repetition is not required. If you are going to present a statement to us; that is fine. In taking us through that where the matters have already been covered please just acknowledge that and then move on to the next matter.

 I do have an ability to intervene in the process when people are presenting. In terms of where there is repetition I can require submitters to then move on to the next matter. So please don't think there is a need to repeat matters that have already been outlined. The issues are the issues and whether they've been raised by one submitter or twenty they will be considered. If I can use an example; prior to lunch Mr Greensill outlined a concern he had. We hadn't heard that issue raised in the hearing so we will give that consideration. It doesn't need anyone else to raise that issue. So it'll be considered in terms of all of the matters related to the private plan change and the consent notice.

 So I just wanted to outline that situation. Please do not feel offended if I do intervene and ask you to then move on to the next matter. It's no indication at all that we are ignoring anything but it's just in terms of the running of the hearing and given we also have a number of submitters to hear from at this point. We've endeavoured to give everyone who is presenting - and whether that's the applicant and witnesses and submitters - a very reasonable amount of time in which to present. So we certainly want to hear from everyone but just, please, recognise if matters have been dealt with, just acknowledge that and move on to the next matter you wish to highlight.

 Okay. We will now move to hear from Richard Shearer. I understand, Mr Shearer, you're also reading statements for Ed and Max Shearer.

**MR SHEARER:** Yeah, that's correct.

**CHAIRMAN:** Okay, and then just to reiterate, if there are matters that are common in those submissions just please acknowledge that and move on to the next issue.

**MR SHEARER:** I accept and respect that and also respect the time you have given to submitters. However, the reason we're here today is not of our making and a huge amount of anxiety and effort from our community, as you can see, has gone into this. We've lost sleep for the last year and a half over this and we have encouraged our community to come out today and say what's on their mind. So I encourage you, don't repeat if you don't really need to but on the other hand this is our chance. This is our day in court.

**CHAIRMAN:** Yes. I appreciate that, Mr Shearer, but at the same time, as I just outlined before, and we do appreciate the interest. It has been very clear to us in how people have presented their submissions, the concerns they have, the work that has gone in by submitters in terms of preparing submissions for lodgement and then preparing for this hearing. We understand all of that. All I'm clearly indicating is that -- and, for example, in a written statement just acknowledging it's been covered. We will be reading all of the written statements that are presented so it's not as if the matters are being discarded at all so --

**MR SHEARER:** Yes. No, I accept that.

**CHAIRMAN:** Please proceed.

**MR SHEARER:** So my first submission is from my 14-year-old son, Ed, who would have been here after school but he took one look at the waves this morning and decided that he was going straight out surfing again.

 I believe this subdivision is a bad option for Oākura as it would put pressure on the school as the school would need expanding. I realise there's some repetition already. It's a very short submission. Over population in Oākura; this would take away the village feel that Oākura has. It would be a busy town so there would be more cars on the road making it quite dangerous for school kids.

 Building 400 new homes in Oākura would also be bad for the environment. There would be more cats and more people that litter. That could also affect our waterways and make them unswimmable.

**CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

**MR SHEARER:** This is from Max Shearer. He's 18 and in his first year at university at Wellington. Yes, most of his submission is repetition but there is one point that I was quite proud of him for having thought. He goes on to say:

 "The proposed plan would also have negative environmental impacts. The Wairau River runs through where the proposed subdivision site is located. This river ends up entering the sea right near the middle of Oākura Beach. The river is beloved by young children who are not yet ready to venture out into the sea and I admit this little stream is not very clean even now due to it passing through so many farms and near a residential area but it is still at a level where it is safe for these children to play in."

So he's worried about that. He says at the end of his statement:

 "That I feel quite strongly about this place even though I have moved on to university now. The connection I have to this small village is so great. If this plan moved ahead Oākura would never feel the same to me or a lot of other residents. Recently I was lucky enough to travel overseas with my family. This was an eye-opening experience staying on a coastline full of small little villages. Even the little village that I stayed in five years ago never had cranes in it and this time when we returned there was a crane busily building a new apartment block. Another town, Lloret del Mar, a previously small village with a stunning beach just like Oākura had been completely transformed. As soon as one big development occurred it was the catalyst for a lot of development that has ultimately ruined this town. In the city there is spray painting everywhere done by residents that are very passionately against the influx of people into their town. What this showed to me is that a large development can ultimately destroy villages as I saw in Lloret de Mar."

He just describes that as being a negative impact.

**CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Thanks again.

**MR SHEARER:** So that was from Max. There's lots of points that are in my -- of course coming to the end of these submissions that will be repetitive so I will try and skim.

 I also want to say that I feel for the extended family of Mr McKie here and, you know, in some ways this isn't personal so, you know, I think you've been very brave sitting there listening to this.

 So my name is Richard Shearer. I am the sixth generation of our family to live in Oākura. We come from Thomas Mace in 1852 who came to New Zealand from Madeira and my mother's side, we are whakapapa to Te Atiawa and Ngāti Roroa(?). So we've lived continuously on the same site in 1870 near Oākura Beach. I have been a trustee of the Oākura School Board of Trustees for 12 years, almost a quarter of a my life, and our family have associations with Oākura Boardriders, Kaitaki Golf Club, Kaitaki Rugby, Oākura Cricket, Oākura Junior Sports Club, Oākura Athletics, Oākura Bowling Club, Oākura Tennis Club and I'm the chairperson of the Oākura Beach Carnival Trust. I have been a member of the Oākura Focus Group, a subgroup of the Kaitaki Community Board established by NPDC, to explore further development options for Oākura Village. I've also been involved in numerous other fundraising or community help groups, eg skate park, mountain biking, music events and others. All of these involvements are as a volunteer.

 As per my written submission, I reject this plan change in its entirety. Firstly, I would like to comment on Mr Muldowney's submission for the applicant on Monday when he stated there were 14 submissions supporting the applicant's proposed plan change. This is not correct. There were 14 submissions that supported the proposed plan change in part. Thirteen of these fourteen are from a single interest group known as the Taranaki Equestrian Network which does great work to grow and connect equestrian networks in Taranaki. Their support in part related to equestrian matters only. Not a single submission was received in total support of the proposed plan change.

 All other submissions were against. Surely this is an overwhelming opposition.

 Oākura is a village. It is not viewed as a suburb of New Plymouth but more of a destination like Urenui to the north. As such, there is a certain balance to how life and the village works. Living in Oākura is a choice people make and it is usually for active lifestyle reasons. It seems strange to those of us who live in Oākura that New Plymouth residents consider Oākura a long drive away while we residents find the 12-minute drive as a reset between our working and family lives. Like most villages most residents know most residents. Residents keep an eye out on other residents' children and property and it is normal for groups of kids to be seen walking, biking or skating around the village and crashing in the waves together.

 Residents love the wide range of activities on their doorsteps and appreciate the nature and environment around them. Yes, it is a privilege to live here but you only need to look around the village and talk with residents to know that it's very much valued and respected. An outsider to the village might call the overwhelming rejection to this private plan change a NIMBY thing. NIMBY relates to "not in my backyard". I have no issue with my backyard. This is not a NIMBY thing because it affects an entire village not a few individuals.

 I talk about the 62 per cent increase and that that breaks the balance that I've referred to. Particularly worrying for residents is the impact on Oākura School. In the 12 years I've been a board trustee holding the property portfolio the school's role has increased from 200 to 400 students and 5 new classrooms have been built.

 While you will hear from the current board of trustees and principal I am sure they will carefully word their comments in regard to the Ministry of Education's comment that Oākura School could cater for 1,000 students. Since I'm no longer a trustee on the board I don't have to be so politically correct. The assertion from the MOE that the school could accommodate 1,000 students is ridiculous as is the mention of this assertion by Mr Muldowney in his submissions on Monday. This number comes from a calculation similar to how you would determine how many hens can be placed in a battery hen cage or the size of a pig sow crate as it is a square metre per child calculation and at 1,000 students a prisoner in New Zealand would have more space than an Oākura school student. I won't continue with that.

 Just schools don't look like they seem sometimes. The MOE Property Department is not the MOE Curriculum Department and teachers and principals work really hard to deliver a great curriculum. From my experience that side of the MOE works really well. Property is a mess.

 The proposed plan change has no positive effects for Oākura or New Plymouth district. It is not balanced. It is not why we live here.

 I would say the existing amenity values that we enjoy will be diminished, for example views to Kaitaki Ranges, night light pollution, traffic congestion. I'll skim the next bit.

 As we speak there is one further 35-lot subdivision - this is consented - on residentially zoned land already consented on the seaward side of SH45, access from Cunningham Lane, and a further approx 120 sections on adjacent land to this already zoned residential. In recent weeks a letter signed by the owners of this residential and FUD west land has been delivered to NPDC confirming their intention to develop.

 I go on to say that development on the seaward side has less negative impact. Further, should you develop there then those sections can be linked with existing walking and cycling paths to the school, beach, shopping area. There's also a proposed link road between Cunningham Lane and Russell Drive which I hope you'll visit tomorrow which would ease congestion along the beachfront as well, which is currently the only way the western part of the village can be accessed.

 The recent Oākura Focus Group concluded that staged growth was the correct approach for Oākura; that way the balance of the school infrastructure and facilities can be matched.

 Now, these points following are the kind of things that we lay people wonder. So we're here at a plan change hearing and I have to ask; what is the point of having a district plan if it can be changed on such a scale by one individual especially in the face of total opposition with no benefit being apparent? Why have councils produced plans for decades, employed people and resources to explore appropriate development and based the future needs on the very plans they create and manage? It seems to me a huge waste of time if a district plan can essentially just be ignored in this way.

 Another factor I want to point out to the commissioners is the huge anxiety and worry caused by this private plan change to many hundreds of residents. While it is the day job of Mr Muldowney and Mr Comber we submitters are not skilled in responding to such matters yet we are now involved in a highly technical and costly process involving specialists and legal representation. It is difficult to understand what parts of what we have to say have relevance to you, commissioner, in this technical environment. We have had to raise at least $40,000 to fund the experts. Even the delay the other day has probably cost us a few thousand dollars with having our council sitting here that we have to find the money for. We have to establish an incorporated society, develop statutes, open a bank account, hold numerous meetings, answer hundreds of emails, operate a Facebook group and spend time when we should be enjoying our lives here rather than working out how to defend them.

 The next bit is definitely repetitive with amenity effects like views and so on.

 I say that should this plan change be approved it would alter to dynamic of movement around Oākura by creating a large residential area in a place that generates difficult to mitigate congestion and traffic effects.

 I talk about the previous resource consent. You know, these are one of these things -- we're lay people. How can this consent condition, the lengthy hearing process that took place then and the process itself be overruled by this new plan change and it even makes me wonder what you must think about that. I know you weren't sitting on that but, you know, what would that commissioner think? I've asked that. What does it say to your colleagues, commissioners, if you effectively override their carefully considered judgment?

 I also feel for owners of the Paddock sections. We've had the promise and undertaking of developer blown apart. It is disturbing the flip flop of Mr McKie and Mr Bane on this private plan change application as compared to the evidence in the Paddocks consent hearing. It's a shame because we don't feel we can trust these people.

 My next point is, I'm wondering is this normal for the commissioners to be considering a private plan change that has such a massive effect, like increasing a village by 62 per cent. I don't know if you can answer that or if I can ask you questions.

**CHAIRMAN:** No, you can't.

**MR SHEARER:** Okay.

**CHAIRMAN:** But you can make the point and --

**MR SHEARER:** Okay. So, finally I appeal to you to reject this plan change in its entirety. I go on to say there's land that can be developed elsewhere. I'm sad to be here defending my village that's been home to my family since 1870. I don't think we should have to be doing this. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Mr Shearer. Mr Coffin.

**MR COFFIN:** I just have one question here, this is on page 2, paragraph 7, last line and you just give examples of amenity values and you talk about nightlight pollution. I'm assuming you mean if a subdivision occurred; that street lights and other lights from the residential dwellings would occur. What do you think the nightlight pollution would be?

**MR SHEARER:** Well, it's, I think somewhere else that I had to skip over. I pointed out that you can literally see how nature works if you are at State Highway 45 you look up, you see our mounga, which had a beautiful cap cloud on it this morning. You see the National Park. You see the farmland. Even the Paddocks sections. The dwellings look kind of nice in that area. It comes down to the farmland. You can see where our nature is coming from. We can imagine the water comes from the mountain.

 In terms of lights, you know, should this go ahead there would be quite massive light pollution from 200, 300 or 400 dwellings; whatever it may be on that site. So the twinkling light effect that you get from the houses on the Paddocks and further up the hill would be dominated by a massive light at the base of the hill.

**MR COFFIN:** Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN:** Just on the top of your page 3, Mr Shearer, in your first paragraph there you talk about the 35-lot subdivision has already been consented and then you reference a further 120 sections on adjacent land to this already zoned residential. Are you indicating that there is a consent for the 120 or that zoned land has capability for 120?

**MR SHEARER:** Just that it's residentially zoned land.

**CHAIRMAN:** Okay, all right, thank you. I've got nothing further but I just make a comment in terms of some of the matters you've highlighted and when you talk about questions and that. Some matters could well be responded to in whatever our decision is so whilst I'm not answering your questions now our decision could well respond to matters.

**MR SHEARER:** Yeah. Am I allowed to comment? I kind of wondered if the private plan change process is the appropriate mechanism for something this large. That's what I was getting at. Is there another council process that should be engaged?

**CHAIRMAN:** I will respond here and now. In other parts of the country there have been private plan changes which are much, much more significant in terms of scale and I'm talking about residential lots probably run into thousands and also private plan changes that cover significant business and commercial development.

**MR SHEARER:** Okay.

**CHAIRMAN:** Thanks very much.

**MR SHEARER:** Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN:** Now, I've got Yvonne Peacock and then I've got Jason Peacock. You're both welcome to come up to the table. Mrs Peacock, welcome. Over to you if you take --

**MS PEACOCK:** Please interrupt if you need to.

**CHAIRMAN:** Yes, but given what I've outlined and for example you're talking about Donnelly Street and car parking and that type of thing; we have heard about that issue so that's just an example where you're more than welcome to skip over. It's taken as read. It's not ignored.

**MS PEACOCK:** My name is Yvonne Peacock. I live in the village of Oākura, an island, with a mountain and ranges on one side, the sea on the other and a narrow highway with a small bridge, causeway entering and exiting. There is no other way in or out.

 As we approach our village from the north with the mountain on our left gaining height and width we are presented with an amazing sight. The Pouaki Ranges and our Kaitaki maiden lying at the foot of her maunga. The legend tells us that she left Mount Taranaki for another and the Pouakis were sent to bring her back. On her return her feet were removed and so now we see her; her head, her breasts, her body and her legs trailing down the foothills towards the ocean, which is why I'm sitting here today.

 It is said that growth is inevitable. That capitalism is a person's right but if we study the world around us today growth has stopped in many, many places and perfect harmony has been restored with historic preservation, protection and sensitivity towards the natural elements and wildlife. Since humans appeared on the earth 77 per cent of the wildlife has disappeared. Since 1990 10 per cent has also gone.

 After reading the planner's report I, as a lay person, with no engineering or specialist qualifications whatsoever, realise that these professionals who are in favour of the subdivision proposal reached their conclusion by using cold calculated facts, figures and measurements without spending substantial living time in our village going about normal alternative lifestyle living. Walking, cycling, surfing, skateboarding, stopping as we cross the road for a quick, "Hi, how are you?" Teaching our children independence by gifting them the freedom to roam our village with their friends whilst knowing that everyone else is watching out for other children besides their own.

 I'll skip the little bit at the top as I live on Donnelly Street. Halfway down the street is a wide corner which curves to the right with the school spanning around it. During this short period buses drive up the street and use this corner to reverse and turn to head back down in the direction which they have previously travelled. On a Friday rubbish trucks also come into the equation creating a multitude of dangers as the driver of the truck is on the left, his right-hand side is blind as he jumps out frequently to collect rubbish with the truck starting and stopping all the way down our street. Another disaster. Another recipe for disaster.

 Yes, only for a short time. It takes five seconds to kill a child. It takes five seconds to kills two children. It takes five seconds to kill a parent and a child. There's no more room on our street for students, teachers, cars, buses or trucks. There is no more room in our village to build a town.

 If a consent is given for this huge subdivision our mountain and ranges will be scarred forever with this creeping paralysis of urban sprawl. There will be no turning back.

 How simple is it to say no? Let's protect what we have by not rezoning the stunning rural ranges all around Mt Taranaki and protect the heart and soul of our province.

**CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. No, we don't have any questions but thanks very much. Mr Peacock.

**MR PEACOCK:** Kia ora. My name's Jason Peacock. I am a six-year resident of Oākura. I grew up in New Plymouth and my wife and I moved out to Oākura to have a family. We have two young children at the school and we also live on Donnelly Street at present.

 I think you'll find that much of my submission is repetition in some formal fashion to what's been presented today and yesterday already so I'll be quite quick I think to save you time.

 I would like just to make a couple of points and just a very few specific ones --

**CHAIRMAN:** That's fine. No problem with that.

**MR PEACOCK:** I guess my initial and overarching statement would be that the applicant refers in his evidence and I quote:

 "For anyone living in the Oākura Farm, including the Paddocks development, there is a sense of peace and calmness that cannot be bought."

I make particular reference to the use of the phrase "peace and calmness". I think given the magnitude of this development, of the number of houses, the number of additional properties I would question that this proposed development will be anything other than not peaceful and calm.

 Through my evidence I also refer to the fact that the previous consent granted to the Paddocks seems to be at odds with this latest application and again to carry on with a theme I think that the current residents of the Paddocks may question as to whether or not their properties are close to being peaceful and calm if this development were allowed to occur.

 I think a few of the submissions today and yesterday referred to the fact that properties were purchased in the Paddocks with the expectation that it would be a rural property, not one that overlooked a significant development.

 I'd also like to make brief reference to and comment on the 2017 study that the Kaitaki Community Board did and developed to produce the Kaitaki Community Board plan and if you don't mind I'd like to reference something specifically from the executive summary of this report which I think is very clear in what the community wants. This states:

 "That the central message to the council is that the village requires managed, staged and targeted growth. Rapid and widespread expansion would negatively affect the special character of Oākura and adversely impact on the educational services, traffic and parking and access to affordable homes, recreation and environmental assets."

I personally feel that this is a very powerful message from the community and one that's been developed with robust consultation from the Kaitaki Community Board. If the council were to largely ignore this message I think it could have a significant detrimental effect on the confidence that our community has with the council and on the planning process in general.

 I make reference in my submission to a number of issues around water and storm water management which I think have been covered at length already so I'll skip over that. I also make reference to road safety and the issues that have been discussed at length as well so I'll skip over those. I don't think I have anything I particularly need to add there other than to suggest that perhaps the applicant's consideration on the additional effects of traffic on the school is overly simplistic. I live on that street at the moment and I can attest to the problems that there are and the problems that much of the submissions have referred to.

 I also think that the applicant's proposal to remedy some of these traffic issues are a little bit simplistic and a little bit insulting to be honest. For example, to reference or to suggest that a through road from Hussey Street to Butlers Lane may help alleviate possible school traffic is very simplistic. Again, if I refer back to a comment I've made before, I think it would significantly degrade the peace and calmness of this area as well.

 I've mentioned that the development is very much at odds with Taranaki Regional Council's Predator Free Taranaki and Restore Kaitaki projects. I won't repeat all of those. I think that's been well discussed as well.

 Finally and to summarise, I'd like to conclude by stating that I'm not adverse to organic growth that's in line with the long-term plan and recognises the desires of the community, this being a growth that allows opportunity for all of the population that is controlled and does not result in rapid, intensive and material changes to the lifestyles of the community.

 Oākura is a special community as you've heard from a number of people and in some ways it represents much that is good about living in New Zealand at the moment and much that's good about living in this wonderful province that we're very fortunate to live in. Oākura provides our children with a safe environment to grow in and for them to develop an understanding of the importance of the environment and to appreciate the space. Oākura is currently a place that is very peaceful and calm. The applicant's proposal is manifestly different from this. It's intensive. It soaks up all of the growth opportunity in the area and has no consideration for the current lifestyle of the residents. It takes no responsibility for the detrimental effects that 395 high density properties would have on the people and on the region of Taranaki. For these reasons I believe the application should be declined.

**CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Mr Peacock. Mr Coffin.

**MR COFFIN:** You mentioned you're resident on Donnelly Street.

**MR PEACOCK:** At the moment I am, correct, yeah.

**MR COFFIN:** Are there particular parts of the day that are more busy than others?

**MR PEACOCK:** School pickups and drop offs is busy. As my mother referenced before, when some of the council activities occur, like picking up rubbish and those sort of things, it can get very busy. It's a wide road in areas but it's very narrow in a couple of other areas and --

**MR COFFIN:** Any other times?

**MR PEACOCK:** I'm at work most of the day so I cannot comment on 9.00 to 5.00 so -- what I would like to say as well is that the Oākura School is already -- I think it's a very unusual and special school. It's a community amenity. It's used regularly throughout the weekend so there's soccer played on the fields in the weekends, there's basketball trainings throughout the week and there's always kids playing there on the weekends as well so the school can actually also be a very busy place on the weekends and traffic can be busy on the weekends. At the moment we're living across the road from the school so we see that first hand.

**MR COFFIN:** Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN:**  I'm on your paragraph 9, Mr Peacock, on page 2 and you talked about the work that the community board had undertaken. Then you talk about in your view it was "a very robust consultation process". Can you just tease that out a wee bit in terms of what you mean by "robust" and what were the key elements for your point of view?

**MR PEACOCK:** I wasn't involved in the process of developing that process but I participated in the response to that process. As I mentioned in here there was a number of meetings that were held and a huge number of people consulted individually and in groups. The community was provided an opportunity to review the plan and reflect back on what the Kaitaki Community Board was proposing for our community. In that context I think we were given the opportunity in advance to agree to something as opposed to having to defend it after the fact.

**CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Was that a draft plan that was put out for --

**MR PEACOCK:** Yeah. There was a draft plan that went out that was provided for consultation for all of the community. That's correct.

**CHAIRMAN:** I note on your paragraph 14 - so I'm on your page 5 - and the third line down you talk about not being adverse to organic growth that's in line with the long-term plan and desires of the community.

 "This growth allows opportunity for all of the population that is controlled."

What do you mean by that?

**MR PEACOCK:** I think as has been discussed by a number of the submitters so far there appears to be enough land at present available for growth of a community. I know a number of representations yesterday indicated that there was available growth for up to 30 years at the current growth rates.

 I think that this particular development would result in a large number of properties being made available on the market at one point and that change would be rapid and uncontrolled in terms of the effect on the community. I think if you were adding ten sections a year over a number of years that integration can happen in the community over a longer period of time and can be assimilated. The changes are slow and people can come to grips with those.

 Obviously Oākura hasn't always been a population of 54 residencies. It started off much smaller than that and it has grown so for us to say that growth is bad would be incorrect but I think this type of growth and the intensive manner that is being presented is not helpful for the community.

**CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. We don't have any further questions so thank you to you both.

**MR PEACOCK:** Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN:** Dennis Green. Welcome, Mr Green.

**MR GREEN:** I have my submission and submissions for five other people.

**CHAIRMAN:** Yes.

**MR GREEN:** I will try and precis mine in the first instance. I have resided in Oākura for 39 years and live on Kaitaki Road, tucked into the Kaitaki Ranges. There are no Taranaki Regional Council weather stations on the Kaitaki Ranges and no figures for rainfall. Rainfall gradient lines on rainfall charts show the Kaitaki Ranges westerly and northerly foothills expect a rainfall of 500 millimetres more than the village.

 I have experienced first-hand the rainfall we receive at times of monsoonal proportions and the damage the sudden downpour creates and the inability of infrastructure to adequately cope.

 Verbal ad hoc comments from the applicant's engineer about 60 millimetres rainfall in an hour once every ten years is based on speculation, not from hard data because there is none.

 I have experienced rainfall in excess of 60 millimetres in 20 minutes where the hills above me becoming a moving sheet of water, too much rain to form rivulets and channel along and down the cattle track contour paths. As a consequence my driveway suffered deep scouring and a need for truckloads of gravel to rebuild it. The driveway being washed out had happened on previous occasions. I would arrive home from work and wonder why my culverts and channels had failed and further works had been to no avail.

 It was being home on the one occasion that helped me realise the sheer volume of downpour and the works needed to minimise the damage to my driveway. These downpours can follow a week of wet weather or be totally independent, summer or winter, and will happen every three years or so.

 The runoff from the proposed subdivision cannot be mitigated by soak holes; they don't work in saturated ground. Bunds or mini dams will be overwhelmed. The downstream effect will be disastrous and the ratepayer left to pay for remediation.

 Town water; I'll just precis that because it is covered somewhat. The supply is inadequate as it is and there's been no testing done to prove what levels of extraction the aquafer can sustain. We have had periods where there has been no rainfall for in excess of six weeks and testing will only be relevant if done during such periods.

 Modelling doesn't work as there is no knowledge of the source of the aquafer water nor its rate of replenishment.

 There was a suggestion of dwellings collecting rainwater. Well, firstly the tank sits on the ground so it needs a pump to supply the house and then backflow preventers to stop contamination of town water and the council will not approve that.

 Roading has been well covered but basically the Upper Wairau Road is too narrow and with parked cars, it is down to one lane.

 The walkway: there is new track proposed from Pukeiti through to Carrington Road to the top of Surrey Hill Road with vehicle movements of 82 vehicles per day predicted. These will include buses, people movers and commercial vehicles. There will also be an increase from pedestrians and cyclists and all of this will impact further on the Wairau Road, South Road intersection. Once again, the Upper Wairau Road is too narrow for parked cars, buses, shuttles, pedestrians, horses and cyclists.

 The slow and natural increase in housing through infill subdivision, and in time the development of the Holdom Estate, all being on the sea side of the main road will more than adequately meet the demand for new housing for the next two decades.

 I oppose Plan Change 48 in total.

 Thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Thank you. Mr Coffin, any questions? No? There are no questions, Mr Green. So, yes, if you can take us through those other statements.

**MR GREEN:** Yes. These people are all absent. Four of them are absent from the country. I feel obliged to read them in full.

 This is a submission from Jennifer Brown.

"My earliest days in Oākura were as a child when my parents would rent a bach for a summer holiday for a week or more and we would enjoy the wonderful beach. As a young adult I was a regular beach user as I lived in New Plymouth. From 1975 I have lived either in the Oākura village or rural environs. This is home.

Yes, things have changed, which is only to be expected. However, the change has been at a sustained, measured pace with input and planning between local residents and their representatives, and the local council. One of these plans is the Oākura District development plan which we can all partake in and take ownership of, if we wish. And many of us do.

The Kaitake Ranges behind Oākura are a significant area of natural bush and birdlife which many locals are involved in protecting. It is an important aspect of the locality and needs to be protected.

We watched the sale of Marsh's farm and the development of The Paddocks subdivision, giving input and believing that was where it would end. This now proves not to be so."

I think the rest has been pretty well covered: infrastructure.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Thank you.

**MR GREEN:** John Freeman:

"My name is John Freeman. I have been a resident of Oākura for 40 years. I oppose Plan Change 48, not only the 400 sections but also the 186, for many reasons. I would like to highlight just three.

Firstly, the reason residents come to live in Oākura is the beauty and proximity of the Kaitake Ranges to the sea. These rural views, the National Park, must be reserved. When The Paddocks subdivision was approved, the applicant wisely stated that the balance would remain farmland.

Secondly, I spend many hours as a volunteer with the Kaitake Conservation Group doing pest control in the Kaitake Ranges. The thought of high density housing so close to a national park is horrific. Even if cats and dogs are prohibited in the subdivision, who will police that in the long term?

Thirdly, future residential development should be on the seaward side of SH 45, as in the present District Plan, where residents are within walking distance of the beach.

On the inland side of the highway, it is too far to walk to the beach for families with small children. Therefore, they will drive there. At the moment, parking in summer is full up.

Many New Plymouth people visit the beach in summer. If this badly planned subdivision goes ahead, they will have to be prepared for a long walk.

Finally, the future subdivision should be on the seaward side of the main highway, stay within the District Plan.

Thank you."

Brigitte Freeman:

"I have lived at Oākura for about 40 years.

I am opposed to Plan Change 48, both the original 400 sections and the 160 section options. Many reasons underpin my thinking. Two important ones relate to social and environmental aspects of the community as it has developed and is today.

One reason is the safe and family-friendly community we have now where children can grow into responsible and confident young people.

My now adult children went to Playcentre and Oākura School before eventually moving onto Spotswood College. Growing up they enjoyed a good level of trust and independence in their community. For me it is clear that this was possible because families got to know each other, interacted and looked out for each other and created a safe atmosphere in the village, at sports, at the beach. As pupils at Oākura School until the end of intermediate level, they also had opportunities to begin taking on responsibilities and become mentors for younger children.

I fear that vastly increasing residential numbers will jeopardize the safe-village feel, will put pressure on the school roll and, who knows, possibly mean the end of the intermediate level to create more space for a larger primary roll.

I also fear that high traffic volumes will be a safety risk for children moving about between home, school and leisure activities.

I particularly object to Mr McKie further developing land that he stated, at the time he proposed The Paddocks subdivision, '...would be able to be retained as a productive farming unit' and, '... would serve to enhance corridors for native species linking from the National Park to the sea. See The Paddocks subdivision New Plymouth District Counsel docs page 23/2010."

I feel it is not honourable to break one's promises and even less so within such a short time span. Therefore, I now question any statements or promises made in the current proposal."

Shirley Fisher:

 Now, Shirley does not say that she was actually born in the village or on the outskirts, but she was:

"Change, expansion and progress is inevitable and can be positive for a community. In Oākura we want to ensure that change is measured, sustainable and considerate of our community and natural resources.

As a fourth generation resident of Oākura, I have seen change over the decades. There has been development. There has been change in the numbers and backgrounds of people choosing to live in this village to enjoy the beach, the semi-rural lifestyle and access to the nearby city. The change has been gradual and enjoyable for the people and businesses in this community - largely because it has enabled the character of this beach village to remain intact, or evolve slowly."

I will jump a paragraph:

"A teacher for some years at Oākura School, I have seen the school grow and add classrooms to the point where it is a very vibrant institution, but it is also at maximum capacity. How can the school or the village provide education for hundreds of new children in the area?"

She expresses concerns about the intersections, stormwater, sewage and water supply, and the run off, invasive plant species, light pollution, and so on:

"There are also plans in place for sustainable growth in Oākura with input from our community. These plans include measured sub-division of ample land on the sea side of the main road, which seems far more practical and less invasive of our views, our infrastructure, our protected parkland and our way of life.

For these reasons I oppose the proposed development."

This is a submission from Jenny Wells:

"To begin with, I do not believe that large subdivisions should be allowed so close to the native bush."

There is comment on traffic along with the predicted 30,000 vehicles per year with the bike trail up Surry Hill Road:

"The traffic amounts will be massive for our once peaceful rural area. Mid Wairau Road is a two-lane road which is rendered a single lane at the moment when cars are parked on the kerbside. There will be horses, runners, bikers all with this extra traffic two ways plus the Wairau Road residents' vehicles.

Morning rush hours and school times will likely see much congestion near the main road and at the Four Square intersection as there are already hold ups. The township already struggles with parking and congestion. Some years back, angle parking was removed from opposite the hotel and parallel parking put in. Hence, we have less space for parking. As it is, more often than not, the main street carparks are all taken so if one needs the chemist one is often out of luck to park nearby.

Surrey Hill Road is becoming a dumping area for car rubbish and of course, with extra people comes more rubbish and pollution. Why can't we fix up these existing problems before creating more?

I am picking there will also be plenty of animal excrement along the roadsides to be stepped on as well as on the bike trail through the native bush.

With all this extra local population comes extra visitors also - undesirables, criminals, druggies, pot smokers and meth addicts and crazy drivers, rubbish dumpers, all of which will no doubt be utilising the isolated car park at the end of Surrey Hill Road affecting all of us one way or the other. Our little patch of paradise is about to be desecrated the same as Cowling Road and other secluded spots. An acquaintance in New Plymouth who recently upgraded from single to double carport had to get the required permits and consents, but also a survey had to be done to determine if one extra car coming out onto a very wide street in New Plymouth, with numerous ways in and out, would cause problems. Yet here we are with 30,000 extra vehicles both ways, with bikers, horses, runners and so on all sharing these roads - some parts of - that may be never overly wide, and will there be a survey here to show the fiasco it could become?

If this subdivision goes through there will be a glut of properties on the market for sale therefore impacting negatively on the value of all other properties in the area.

How it affects me: my few minutes' drive from home to work and back again through the township could well turn into a long, drawn-out affair. Sunday drivers all the way into New Plymouth on weekdays on the way to work; weekends will become a nightmare at my house on Surrey Hill Road with many of these newcomers wandering on up the road. With this possible subdivision and the new bike trail, life will never be the same. Seclusion and privacy as well as feeling safe in our own house will be lost to a large degree.

My fifty or so years on the Surrey Hill Road, in the place I always expected to retire on, I did not foresee traffic jams and copious amounts of traffic coming past my house on my once quiet road. Privacy will be under threat, as well as feeling safe in my own home with doors and windows open. Gates will have to be properly installed.

Our once quiet lovely peaceful road is being invaded and it seems we have no rights to maintain a semblance of our past lifestyle.

The end of an era."

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Thank you, Mr Green for taking us through those statements.

 We will move to Graeme Duff. Welcome, Mr Duff. Please take us through your statement.

**MR DUFF:** Thank you. Commissioners, I have your message loud and clear regarding repetition. I do just want to start off by saying that we bought a section in The Paddocks two years ago, we have built a home there, and we have substantial investment and, I think, are particularly affected by this application. I just give you that background. I will try to avoid repetition.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Thank you, and just to let everyone know, whilst we are undertaking a site visit tomorrow, we have already visited The Paddocks area and around there.

**MR DUFF:** My name is Graeme John Duff and I live, with my wife Marion, at 3 Ekuarangi Place in Oākura. Ekuarangi Place is part of The Paddocks subdivision completed by the applicant. We purchased Lot 6 in June 2016 and have built a new home which we occupied in June 2018. I was born in and spent my first 19 years in New Plymouth.

 My association with Oākura dates back to 1953 when in the summer of that year I spent six weeks in the family bach at Linda Street one of the original holiday home streets of Oākura Beach. This was a holiday pattern that was to continue with my parents and siblings annually for the next 15 years. I remember when there were few baches on Messenger Terrace and when lower Wairau Road was farmland. I also remember the wonderful views that we enjoyed from our bach, of the beach, and on from there to Parititu and the Sugar Loaf Islands.

 While having lived out of Taranaki for approximately 40 years until 2018, I have always remained closely connected through family, commercial interests and close and life-long friends. Rarely would I visit Taranaki, which I did about four times a year, without taking the time to visit Oākura. I have watched its development since 1953 and this culminated in us buying our section in The Paddocks which we view as our retirement home and our retirement location.

 Oākura has always been very special to me and it has been a never-ending pleasure to witness Oākura's natural development over the last 65 years to what it is today, a beachside village providing a high-quality lifestyle for all ages. It has a busy and appropriately sized commercial centre on SH 45, a quality primary school, and a diverse and participating population which all go to providing a high quality and rewarding community.

 This is a true community with its spirit and fibre built by the qualities of the inhabitants, but this community is seriously under threat from this application. The proposal is inappropriate, it is unwelcome, and not required and is useful by no one other than the applicant company and the McKie family, and shortly I will outline the reasons why. This community is seriously under threat and that is clearly recognized by the 400-plus submitters opposed to this Private Plan Change application.

 Before moving on to the specifics, I should mention that my professional career has been in the finance industry and since the early 1980s, I have been self-employed and specialized in commercial property finance. Over the years, many of these projects have included the financing of residential subdivisions and I am presently involved in a financier role on a large 550-lot subdivision in Auckland. I mention this only to indicate that I have some knowledge of the social, cultural, and economic considerations that are needed for a successful resident development. Let me now address the negative aspects of this application.

 Landscape and Visual Impact:

 The proposed plan of 400-plus sections is entirely inappropriate for a town which has developed naturally over time with its citizens recognizing and capitalizing on the rural hinterland and the pleasures provided by a quality beach. It was these commanding attributes which attracted us back to Oākura after all these years. I first viewed The Paddocks subdivision when on vacation in Oākura in about 2013 and was very impressed by the achieved combination of a rural residential community affording the owners and occupiers outstanding views both of the ocean and the surrounding rural landscape. From our home, our views to the east feature established farmland and to the north views encompass the village and the Tasman Sea, both of these being outstanding. They do not compare however to the views to the west which includes Lot 29 which is proposed to be subdivided by the applicant. On from there to the views of the golf course, Ahu Ahu Road and beyond, and to the south from our home we have the priceless and non-negotiable vista of the Kaitake Ranges. It is for all these reasons that we bought our section and built our home. As cautious people, we sought the comfort that these views would be protected and in deciding to buy, relied on the verbal undertakings given by the applicant in the hearings for The Paddocks consent in 2010 and contained within the consent that was granted. I quote from Page 75 of The Paddocks consent - I will not quote that, Commissioner - you know what it says. It says that Lot 29 would remain as a farm forever.

 Further, I was comforted by the advertising that accompanied The Paddocks where there was much emphasis placed on the rural outlook, an outlook that the granting of this application would destroy. Let me quote from The Paddocks website -

"The Paddocks offers the best of both worlds, a stunning rural outlook positioned on the edge of a beautiful seaside village."

I repeat those words - "a stunning rural outlook".

 The granting of this application would have a dramatic negative impact on all, but particularly those living in The Paddocks, upper Wairau Road, south of SH 45, and would simply ruin the attractive views of the Kaitake Ranges from SH 45.

 Let me also quote from the applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment as prepared by Blue Marble in September 2017. I will not quote it in great detail. I will simply say that it says:

"Significant effects are more likely to occur from the proposal on the neighbouring rural environment including the lifestyle area named The Paddocks."

On page 16 of that report, the applicant's own consultant says that the impact on The Paddocks will be "high adverse".

 Richard Bain of Blue Marble makes numerous attempts in his assessment to mitigate the high adverse impact. Let me assure you as one who enjoys these views on a daily basis, no amount of mitigation or rationalisation will justify the destruction of these views which is what the approval of this application would give the opportunity to do.

 Social Impact:

 As mentioned earlier I have had links to Oākura since 1953 and have watched as it has developed from a small seaside holiday location to the quality and energetic community that it is today. Oākura has developed naturally over those 65 years, small subdivisions have been done as and when the demand justified and the expansion has resulted in the present Oākura population of 1,380. This application, if granted, would enable the developer to immediately increase the population by 1,065 people. Assurances that the 411 new sections would be staged gives no comfort. If this application is granted the land will have the consent attached with no limitations regarding the programme.

 As I have mentioned Oākura has developed naturally over the last 80 or 90 years. What this application does is give licence to one landowner to totally control the development process with the option to immediately increase the population by 80 per cent. This would only provide the platform for a social disaster.

 The social impact on the community services, education, retail facilities, and infrastructure would be unacceptable and socially artificial. An example of the consequences of forced and accelerated development is the town of Turangi on the southern shores of Lake Taupo. I have owned a holiday home there since 1982 so am well informed on that community. It was essentially developed to accommodate the construction of the Tongariro Power Scheme and the hundreds of workers arriving for that project. With that project long completed, like 30 years ago, the consequences of the exploded community remain today with its well-reported serious social, economic and community problems. Please don't create an opportunity for this to happen in Oākura.

Intensity of the Development:

 Quite apart from my comments to date regarding the irreparable damage that this application would cause, the intensity of 399 sections over 19 hectares would give an intolerably small average section size at 476 square metres. Further, the application seeks a 55 per cent usage ratio. This is a ridiculous proposal for density compared to the 35 per cent presently part of the District Plan. If allowed the result will only be seen as it will turn out, that being an appearance of a big city residential suburb, and as I have said inappropriate for a quality, semi-rural and beach location. I remind you that no amount of mitigation will rationalize this proposal. There will be nothing but a sea of roofs. There is no justification for this application to have special treatment or favoured status.

 I can go on and talk about the Egmont National Park, the impact on the Kaitake Ranges and the effect that this development would have on that. I will not repeat it.

#  Stormwater Risks:

 I have already covered a number of important negative effects if this application was granted. The most important matter I will raise however is that of the abnormally high stormwater risk and the associated flooding risk. Because of the sloping nature of the land from the Kaitake Ranges to SH 45, surface water from natural climate events creates serious flooding risk to existing homes, let alone the accompanying risk of another 411 homes.

 The engineers for the applicant both in 2010 and now in 2019 rabbit on at length about how the stormwater can be handled and seem to justify all ills by a cute engineering phrase "hydraulic neutrality". This would indicate in my limited knowledge that there would be no adverse or multiplying effects. As I say, this was argued and presumably believed in 2010 and apparently will also be the saviour in 2019. Let me tell you the facts, and show you the facts.

 We moved into our new home on 7 June 2018 and 11 days later our home was flooded from excess water, some from the adjacent Wairau Road, but particularly from the applicant's land to the south of our property, being Lot 6. The applicant's land included the unsold Lots from stage I of The Paddocks, the land containing the water reservoir and the land subject to this application. I have repeatedly tried to engage with the applicant as the developer of The Paddocks to solve the problem. Mike McKie has refused to engage to resolve the problems. The District Council has been involved spasmodically and are presently re-engaged. Let me assure you that the stormwater problems are not caused by any shortcomings as us. Our home was architecturally designed, our grounds developed by a landscape architect and our drainage provided by us installing no less than 23 soakholes.

 I have supplied photos of the flooding of our property in 2018. I particularly want to draw to those who have the luxury of having the photos in front of them, the photo taken with two beds, taken out the bedroom window - sorry about that - you will see the water pouring across our property, down an area that had been excavated for a retaining wall, and you will see the water pouring from there towards our house. All that water came from the land to the south of our home. There are four other photos, including the Fire Brigade there. There are photos of the water in our home. I can produce no better example of the serious stormwater risks on this land.

 Be assured as this event was happening we desperately wanted to know all about hydraulic neutrality. Based on my experience of the developer's work in The Paddocks, the possibility of over 400 more homes poses significant flooding risks. Worse still, in my opinion, if this application is consented it will create an unacceptably large liability risk for the District Council. The potential liability would rank with the millions of dollars being paid out by local authorities around New Zealand in the leaky homes saga.

 I really do need to repeat and emphasise that from our experience this land, from the ranges to SH 45 cannot handle the existing stormwater. The applicant and their engineers have failed miserably. Today there continues to be excess uncontrolled stormwater in even moderate rainfall.

 In closing I want to say:

 If granted, this application would be a disaster for Oākura and has the potential to totally destroy a wonderful community. My assessment of the submissions indicates that some 97 per cent of the submitters were strongly against the application and asked for it to be declined. While understanding that submitters are not limited to residents, to receive 400-plus submissions from a population of 1,320 carries a very strong message and a message that should be heeded by the Commissioners. The application is unwelcome, the proposals contained within it inappropriate for a small community, and the future development of Oākura should not be placed in the hands of one man and one family. Let us enjoy what we have, protect it and continue to develop it in a natural way as has worked well for 90 years; that is the Oākura way. It has been successful for 90 years, but has not precluded sensible and planned development and there is no reason why this natural development cannot continue.

 The message you should receive from me today is that I strongly oppose this application and strongly support the views of the other 400-plus other submitters who are against this application. The response from the community with an overwhelming No vote must be the final consideration.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Thank you, Mr Duff. Mr Coffin?

**MR COFFIN:** In terms of The Paddocks subdivision and your property, Mr Duff, are there any particular protections regarding the view shafts and those types of things?

**MR DUFF:** Yes, I will give you the short answer to the question, if I can.

 Initially there was a covenant on the properties, a restriction of 4.9 metres from original land height on habitable buildings. I drew the attention to Mike McKie at the time that I was looking to buy the section to say to him that did not preclude someone from building a 10-metre-high grain silo in the property immediately in front of me. As a result of that, we negotiated and Mike succeeded in getting covenants imposed on properties that could impact on our views and there were another three or four properties that had total construction limited to 4.9 metres, including those immediately in front of us. I think I would be correct to say that he probably then put that height limitation right through stage II. Our section is in stage I.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** My final question: in paragraph 7,

"...in deciding to buy, relied on the verbal undertakings given by the applicant in the hearings ...2010 ..."

I take it you were not present at the hearings.

**MR DUFF:** No.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** But in terms of relying on those verbal undertakings, did you read the result, reading Commissioner Tobin's decision on the application?

**MR DUFF:** I read hundreds and hundreds of pages of evidence from the 2010 hearing. I got those from the District Council.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Right. Thank you. We do not have anything further, so thank you very much, Mr Duff.

**MR DUFF:** Thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** We will now move to Kate Evans. Welcome, Ms Evans.

**MS EVANS:** Thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** We have both your statement and your husband's in front us, so if you can take us through those, just noting my earlier comments, that if there was any repetition, take those matters as read.

**MS EVANS:** I will endeavour to do that.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Thank you.

**MS EVANS:** Of course, there is repetition because there are so many submissions. I will try to not be too repetitive, but some things are good to say more than once.

 My husband and I came to live in Oākura from the UK 20 years ago.

 What attracted us was the sense of community in this small village. We wanted to live a simpler life and of course were very attracted to the natural beauty of this area.

 We had left a very busy part of the UK and loved the quieter pace of life with less traffic and happy positive people.

 In addition, we knew that we were ready to start a family and the idea of bringing up children in this close-knit community with a wonderful school and the kids being able to walk barefoot to school seemed amazing to us.

 Over our time here the village life has been amazing. We now have three children, amazing Kiwis who have had the joy of growing up in a safe community where we all look out for each other. They say it takes a village to raise a family and I believe this to be true.

 In addition, my children have had the amazing experience of going to Oākura school. My youngest is in year 7. I do not know if we all really realise just what a blessing this school is. The low numbers, the open fields, the sense of community amongst the kids, wonderful teachers and the amazing leadership from Lyn Hepworth.

 This is where, of course, my opposition to this subdivision starts. I know you have heard it but with, you know, a potential of now possibly 600 new houses, because we already have another proposal of 200 houses planned in our District Plan, but to add to this, a subdivision of this size with the potential for 400 houses, will impact the school catastrophically. The two sets of development would create 600 new houses. A conservative calculation may put children in half of those houses, with the average family having two children. This means potentially 600 more children at our school. I know the Ministry of Education says the school can accommodate 1,000 pupils, but this is at the cost of those wonderful green fields. This is where they will put the classrooms. This means the kids will have no green space to run around in, it will drastically change the nature of the school and I am so, so sad about that. These kids are our future.

that. These kids are our future.

 In addition, we actually live at the end of Donnelly Street - further along than the Peacocks who spoke earlier - the cul de sac where the school is. Aside to the children and the change in our wonderful school, the impact directly on our personal lives with this many more cars will be great, and I believe will affect the value of our house. People will not want to buy in an area where they are having to fend their way through such a lot of activity on a daily basis. It is bad enough at school times to get around the cars. The school have had to educate parents to drop their kids by the local shop, as it is, and walk there as there is already not enough room for the cars.

 I would also like to question why we need this subdivision. It is not like there is a housing shortage in our area. There are houses sitting on the market not being sold. There is a house on Wairau Road that has been for sale for over a year. I do not believe there is a demand.

 This subdivision is only about one thing. It is to line the pockets of a group of greedy developers who have already benefited -0

**THE COMMISSIONER:** No --

**MS EVANS:** I am angry.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** No, excuse me.

**MS EVANS:** Sorry.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** No. I have already dealt with the word "greedy" earlier on in the hearing.

**MS EVANS:** Okay. I will take it back.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** I would appreciate it if you would withdraw that. Thank you.

**MS EVANS:** Thank you. Withdrawn.

 They have already benefitted from turning the beautiful view of green fields at the foot of the Kaitakes to an ugly subdivision called The Paddocks. It has lost is rural appeal and now just looks residential.

 This proposal seems even worse with small sections and houses crammed in. It will be a blot on the landscape and it is so sad to see that happen, for once it is done it cannot be reversed.

 If this subdivision goes through and we as a community have to bear the brunt of extra traffic, an overcrowded school with no green space, extra waste in our waterways, extra rubbish, extra people filling up our beaches, and a ruined view of the Kaitakes, I will be forever angry that the only people set to gain are the developers. We as a community gain nothing from this and I hope this hearing will see this as important. This is the question: why do we need it - we do not.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Mr Coffin, any questions?

**MR COFFIN:** I do have a question. You live at the end of Donnelly Street.

**MS EVANS:** Yes.

**MR COFFIN:** I asked another resident earlier if there are other times, outside of the 8.30 am timeframe and the 3.00 pm timeframe, when that road is particularly busy. He was working so he was not there during the day. I wondered if you had experienced anything like that.

**MS EVANS:** Yes. Also there is the tennis club on the part of Donnelly Street where we live. Currently there is a house being built there, opposite that tennis club, yet that is busy all the time, around there, right now. It is very busy on Saturday mornings when soccer is happening and on Sunday afternoons there is netball going on. When there are tennis games going on, on Mondays, it is really busy, and there are lots of cars that are just parked there - obviously teachers - during the day anyway. So, yes, it is always pretty busy down Donnelly Street, yeah.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay, thank you. Nothing further? Thank you. Do you want to ‑‑

**MRS EVANS:** So I'll read out my husband's ‑‑

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Yes, and bearing in mind you have made some comments already.

**MRS EVANS:** Yes, okay:

"My wife and I came to live in this beautiful area 20 years ago. I was personally attracted to the amazing waves and incredible opportunities for anyone interested in water sports. I am a surfer, windsurfer, and more recently a kite surfer.

When we left the UK, I mainly windsurfed. The sea where we lived, the English Channel, was filthy. I regularly had ear infections, upset stomachs and on more than one occasion I would surface to find a used sanitary product floating past my face.

I came here to get away from that and to enjoy a clean and relatively empty sea environment. It's been an absolute joy and pleasure to spend all this time soaking up this wonderful life.

I have, however, noticed that the beaches are getting more and more rubbish on them and the waves, particularly at Oākura Beach, are starting to get more crowded. I'm not a selfish man. I don't expect to keep it for myself, but this subdivision does not seem to have an adequate understanding of the impact on the water and our environment.

My understanding is that the submitters have not done adequate studies on the impact of the water beneath the land and I am here to tell you that an increase in population will increase the impact on our water quality in the rivers and sea. I'm not an expert, but a user of this environment, and it stands to reason that more people will have more impact."

He also talks about Donnelly Street and he talks about the school, so I won't say those again, but he's obviously against, and his last paragraph he says:

"In some ways, I already feel defeated with this submission. It has the ring of big business overshadowing people's lives, big money being more important than people's lifestyles. The only thing I can do is raise my voice and urge you to listen to the ordinary people who don't want it here."

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay, thank you, Mrs Evans.

**MRS EVANS:** Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** So we will move to Jane Dove Juneau. So we will hear this submission and then we will take an adjournment for afternoon tea. Jane. Thank you, if you can take us through your submission and, where appropriate ‑‑

**MS DOVE JUNEAU:** Skip.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** ‑‑ we can take matters we have already heard as read, then move on. Thank you.

**MS DOVE JUNEAU:** Okay. So I'm representing for myself and my partner, Rick Riccitelli, and I'm a freelance photographer and writer and have lived in Oākura since the early 1980s, apart from time living overseas. And I'm passionate about the environment, which is one of the most critical issues facing the world today.

 With this in mind, our decisions for future planning of our communities must take this into consideration. We need sustainable walkable communities that don't overload or impact our fragile coastal ecosystems. Not only do the Oākura residents enjoy this coastline, beach visitors from New Plymouth, Taranaki, around New Zealand and overseas all come to Oākura Beach. We have a special coastal resource and need to plan our village, taking not only our needs, but visitor expectations and the environment into consideration.

 People are passionate about Oākura. We have a roomful of people wanting to speak on their submissions today because they care about their small beachside community, and because we care about community, people get involved and participate in activities related to the village, creating a cohesive network to support the successes and the difficult times we experience. Therefore this sense of community provides a good safe place for our children to grow up and for our elders to live independently. In planning terms, these are our amenity values, the qualities that make Oākura great.

 Now, if you surveyed people before this development proposal and asked them where they saw the village in ten years, not one of them would have suggested, "Let's build 400 houses". It's not in anyone's vision of our village. Now, I go through the red flags and some of these topics of course have been covered, but I'm just going to mention them briefly. The red flags are the size of the development; 400 houses almost doubles the size of the village and would completely change the small village that now exists.

 The second red flag is the location of the development. Oākura is a walkable village. The Kaitake side of Highway 45 is too far from the beach, so even though a walking route is proposed, kids with surfboards, beach toys et cetera will want to be driven to the beach. Now, I live on Linda Street, which is the far end of the beach. It is beyond where everyone parks, past the surf club, so parking at the beach is already a problem on a busy summer day and I can attest to that. There's cars everywhere, people walking all over the place and there's just basically no space. If half of the families in this development want to go to the beach, there's no room for 200 extra cars or even 100 if the subdivision size was reduced.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** If you can summarise your third and fourth red flag, because we have ‑‑

**MS DOVE JUNEAU:** Okay, yeah. Schooling we have already covered quite thoroughly. My concern was that if the school district couldn't cope that our children would have to be bused to New Plymouth to go to school, which I think is not why we are living in Oākura.

 Traffic congestion, which 400 houses will likely have 600 cars, the addition to the traffic as well as the daily coastal traffic will make it dangerous.

 Now, Mike McKie says this development is going to happen over 30 years, but there's no safeguards to enforce this. Developers are like politicians, they change their mind often and don't keep their word, as we have already seen with this developer, who advertised his Paddocks development with a rural view shared. He promised buyers the areas around the Paddock will be run as a farm. Now, if you're selling property, like anything, if you make a promise in your deal of selling, isn't it a legal and binding agreement? I know you can't answer that now, but I would like that actually answered in the response.

 The development could happen in ten years or McKie may not have the financial resources to build this large subdivision and quite likely will on-sell his Wairau Estate project to another developer. Now, that's a concern I have, if this development is on-sold, there will be no regulated timeline, the development will happen quickly and it will overload the infrastructure. And as we've talked before, there's already land zoned for housing on the lower side of Highway 45 and the beachside, and I think that's the appropriate place for development because it will be a walkable community. Plus there's infill and 150 sections or so, bringing close to 300 properties available without this development.

 I would suggest if Mr McKie has a passion for development, as he has expressed at one of the meetings I went along to, that he would buy land in New Plymouth, where there are numerous schools, empty shops in the downtown area, parks and infrastructure for the 400 houses his development will create. I'm not saying it's a bad idea, I'm just saying that Oākura is not the right place for this particular development.

 So I see Wairau Estate subdivision as one man's dream. We here living in Oākura village do not support Mr McKie's dream, as you can see by all the submissions against it. And I've listed again the points that I think are the most important points: traffic congestion, the view of the Kaitakes, parking at the beach, his broken agreement, so we don't have trust in this developer to keep his word as a gradual development. And then I also found that in his submission he described the Paddocks - and we've already had this, but I'm going to repeat it one more time - describes the Paddocks and Oākura Farm:

"The sense of peace and calmness that cannot be bought that goes with the land."

Now, think 400 houses on that development. It is not going to be a calm ‑‑ quiet, calm place that we enjoy now. We're now a community of strong values and integrity. We have our own vision for the growth of Oākura and it's not in line with the value of Mike McKie and his Wairau Estate.

 On behalf of my partner and I and our neighbours, Heather and Stuart McKinnon, and most of the village, we strongly oppose the application for the proposed plan change in any shape or form; 400 houses or the reduced size of 160 houses, it is a no.

 And I just had something at the end that I wanted to bring up. I believe the council has some responsibility for the situation we are now in. This submission process has cost the developer, a large range of experts, the community, the council considerable time, money, stress, sleepless nights. Our coastal plan and district plan need guidelines as to the number of lots in developments for our small coastal towns. For example, the Thames Coromandel District Council have a 120 lot size development restriction with a variance required for a larger subdivision as a recommendation.

 I talked to planners at New Plymouth and asked why we don't have any restriction on the number of lots in new developments in our rural area. They said current regulations are self-restricting. I don't see this as being very successful, because we now have a proposal for 400 lots, more than double the size of ‑‑ or double the size of a small village.

 Councils need to think carefully about coastal planning in New Zealand, as our coastlines are unique and of value as a local and international resource. New Plymouth District Council needs to have lot size guidelines and coastal and district plans for the future so developers will be in tune with local communities.

 This is just an example of what's happened around another part of New Zealand that I have observed. At the southern end of Mahia Beach on the east coast, a series of roads with no houses. It is an old development, built against the wishes of the local community. Each time a new house it was built, it was burnt down. The council didn't listen to their community. I'm not suggesting this will happen here, but we who live in Oākura are speaking in great numbers loud and clearly as to our thoughts on this development. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay, thank you. No, we do not have any questions, so thank you.

**MS DOVE JUNEAU:** Great, thank you.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay, so just before afternoon tea, I have had a request, which I will agree to, so we will hear from Jane James and then we will break for afternoon tea. So welcome, Mrs James.

**MRS JAMES:** Thank you. Hi. Okay, cool. Hi. Thanks for letting me in. I'm speaking to you today on behalf of the Oākura Playcentre and I'm speaking to you as someone who was born and raised in Oākura. I have lived there for most of my 32 years and I also attended Oākura Playcentre and Oākura School, so I'm a local.

 The Oākura Playcentre has a few ‑‑ two really main areas of concern in regards to this proposal. Our first ‑‑

**CHILD:** I want to do it, Mum.

**MRS JAMES:** Yeah, you can later. Our first main concern is ‑‑

**CHILD:** I want to do it now.

**MRS JAMES:** Come and sit on my knee. The first main concern is ‑‑ I might be repeating a little bit, sorry, I'll just try and whip through it quickly so I can get out of here.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay.

**MRS JAMES:** Our first main concern is due to increased traffic and the safety of our children. Oākura Playcentre is located adjacent to the school and the library. It's accessed via Donnelly Street, as you already know, directly off State Highway 45. As many will know and have experienced, there is already an extremely high flow of traffic on Donnelly Street, which creates a substantial hazard for our families when they are arriving or departing from our playcentre. The families that walk or bike to playcentre already need to be extremely vigilant when crossing the road on Donnelly Street and we believe that the influx of traffic would further escalate the high danger surrounding this crossing. So that's something we are worried about.

 Currently at peak times, which is mainly around the school drop-offs and pick-ups, Donnelly Street, Hussey Street, the main road and the Outlook are at full capacity, with it often being hard to find a park and having to circle around until you get one.

 The children at Oākura Playcentre range in age from newborn to 6 years and many of them do also arrive walking or in prams, capsules, baby carriers, often with many road crossings to navigate on their way and we are concerned that if this proposed subdivision goes ahead, there will be an added flood of people, causing a surge in both traffic and pedestrians, and that's why we're worried, because there's potentially going to be severe implications for the safety of our children.

 Another major concern from the playcentre is that our site and centre are in jeopardy of being lost because currently the Ministry of Education leases the land on which the centre is situated. This allows us to provide a service that is unique to the village, offering a child-centred environment or hub, if you like, on Donnelly Street, which is inclusive to zero to 5-year-olds with the playcentre there and it's a place where our whānau and our community are enriched on a daily basis.

 If the proposed plan change was to occur, there is no doubt that Oākura School would rapidly grow and extra space would be needed for this expansion. We are concerned that the site of our playcentre would be needed for the growing school and that it would be lost, which in particular is very concerning, as our site holds a lot of history. For example, I attended the playcentre there where it is now and I now take great joy in seeing my children do the same. It's a very special privilege growing up Oākura and watching our future generations come through the ranks.

 Also members of our community will then have to travel elsewhere to get the same opportunities, experiences, services and education that Oākura Playcentre offers.

 And finally, on the last note, our playcentre's strategic plan has a strong environmental stance. As a centre, we value our natural environment and the national park and there's a concern here that the proposed development would encroach on the national park and also be detrimental to the existing ecosystems. You've heard all of this. We've watched our community embrace the Restore Kaitake project and the proposed plan change seems to negate this whole initiative. That's all. Thank you for your time. Thanks.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Thank you.

**MRS JAMES:** Sorry about my little assistant.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** I do have some questions and I am going to ask them real quick. Number one, do you have a lease with the Ministry of Education for the playcentre?

**MRS JAMES:** I don't know the answer to that. So the Ministry of Education leases the land on which the playcentre sits on, so ‑‑

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay, and you lease from the Ministry?

**MRS JAMES:** I don't know the answer to that question. I can find ‑‑

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** It might be something you can follow up.

**MRS JAMES:** Yeah, I can find out.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** But the questions are do you have a lease with the Ministry and for how long, that is the first one.

**MRS JAMES:** The school might know that. Yeah, Lynne will know those questions, sorry.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Excellent. All right, and then the next one is have you received any correspondence from the Ministry of Education to say that there might be a change of circumstance?

**MRS JAMES:** No, that I am aware of as a playcentre.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** And have you contacted the Ministry about would there be any change?

**MRS JAMES:** Not that I'm aware of as a playcentre.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay, that is all.

**MRS JAMES:** Yeah.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Thanks very much, good work.

**MRS JAMES:** Thanks for letting me in.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** That is all right. We will now adjourn and reconvene at 4.05 pm.

(A short adjournment)

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay, if you can take a seat, please, we will reconvene. So we will now move to the submission of the board of trustees of Oākura School, so we have got Paul Veric and Lynne Hepworth. Welcome to you both.

**MR VERIC:** Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay, thank you.

**MR VERIC:** Thank you. Kia ora koutou, everyone. My name is Paul Veric, board of trustees' representative for Oākura School. I have spent the majority of my life in Taranaki and have been a resident of Oākura for seven years now. I have two boys who currently attend Oākura School. My most recent and relevant role was headmaster of New Plymouth Boys' High School, a school with over 1,300 students.

**MS HEPWORTH:** Kia ora. My name is Lynne Hepworth and I'm principal of Oākura School. I have been in this role for the past 18 years. I was born in Taranaki and have lived most of my life in New Plymouth. As a child, my family holidayed in the Oākura Campground every summer. We were always members of the New Plymouth Old Boys' Surf Club and in my role as principal at Oākura School, I have had the opportunity to be the New Plymouth Principal Association - or NPPA - president and the NPPA representative on the MOE Property Sector Reference Group, the Taranaki representative on the NZEI Principal Council and have been contracted by the MOE to support and mentor principals in Taranaki. I've also been fortunate to be seconded by the Education Review Office to be an ERO reviewer, which has given me many opportunities to visit a range of New Zealand schools.

 After 18 years in my role as principal of Oākura School, I am totally invested in and passionate about providing a quality learning environment for the current and future children of Oākura.

**MR VERIC:** It's important to note that this presentation is delivered on behalf of the full board of trustees of Oākura School, the elected body empowered to govern and represent Oākura School.

 Since 1886, Oākura School has been providing quality education to the community and now has a roll of over 360 students, spanning year levels 1 to 8.

 I think it's important to note, and with respect to the Commissioner mentioning about repetition of points, and also acknowledging the number of people that have spoken about Oākura School and the impact that this subdivision would have on our school, that it is important to hear the actual school's position as well and as such we will detail our thoughts. The presentation does detail our full opposition to the proposal, which is the proposed private plan change 48 to the New Plymouth District Plan requested by Oākura Farm Park Limited - or OFP - for the proposed rezoning of land lot 29 at Wairau Road, Oākura.

 The presentation is organised into four key sections. First, (1) lack of meaningful consultation with Oākura School; lack of diligence around key infrastructural and environmental requirements; (3) lack of alignment to existing agreed plan strategies for managed growth; and (4) previous breaches of integrity by OFP.

 (1) Lack of meaningful consultation with Oākura School. There are many comments about community engagement and community understanding from OFP throughout various documentation, ie:

"We have listened to and have a very good understanding of the Oākura community's concerns."

This is concerning, as Oākura School has had only one meeting on 17 November 2017, where a proposal was tabled. As a key community stakeholder and a multigenerational representative of the community, it was disappointing to not have been engaged in the proposal at more regular stages by OFP on the many different aspects of the proposal which this directly affects us.

 For OFP to use the following line:

"The Ministry of Education is responsible for ensuring communities are provided with sufficient school capacity"

Is disrespectful and shows a lack of genuine community duty of care and interest. Given OFP has said they will consider a whole community approach to the question of rodents, mustelids, cats and dogs, lack of time devoted to - and in our view, a lack of interest in - the education of the children of the village is disappointing. Care for the future children of the proposed subdivision is clearly not a priority for OFP either.

 Oākura has formally consulted its community ‑‑ Oākura School has formally consulted its community and 86 per cent of respondents were against the proposal in its entirety. This therefore has to and does determine the board of trustees' full opposition to the proposal.

 (2) Lack of diligence around key infrastructure and environmental requirements. Many others will no doubt comment on infrastructure and environment requirements and many have before us, but for us specifically, they fall into three key areas: (1) traffic; (2) water and waste; (3) green space.

**MS HEPWORTH:** For traffic, managing the health and safety of our students is an important part of my role as principal of Oākura School. Having a school situated on a no-exit street and close to a state highway brings challenges when considering the risks involved in students travelling actively to and from school, parents dropping off and picking up their children throughout the day, students travelling to and from education outside the classroom opportunities, our community members visiting the school for school events, other schools visiting for inter-school activities, school and community buses travelling up and down Donnelly Street and using the turning point next to the school on Donnelly Street, the challenge of rainy day management and ensuring that school traffic does not interfere with residents' access to their driveways.

 We have many safety procedures in place to ensure the safety of our students within this high-risk area. We are part of the New Plymouth District Council Let's Go programme and continually promote active travel to and from school with the intent of improving student wellbeing, but also to assist in reducing traffic on Donnelly Street. We supervise the crossings near the school in the mornings and after school. Volunteer parents are rostered on the main road pedestrian crossing from 8.25 am to 8.55 am every school morning and senior students and staff are rostered on both the main road pedestrian crossing and the kea crossing by the playcentre every day between 2.55 pm and 3.15 pm.

 Although these initiatives have enabled us to cope with the managed increase in the number of children actively travelling to and from school and a reduction of traffic in Donnelly Street, we simply could not safely cope with the level of increases created by the proposal.

 We are fortunate in having a community that is actively involved in all aspects of the school. We regularly hold events during and after school hours that parents are encouraged to attend, such as sports events, whānau lunch days, grandparent lunch days, open days, learning conferences, environmental projects, assemblies, fundraisers et cetera. Community engagement is extremely high on all of these occasions. Because most of our parents are coming from work to attend these events, they are travelling by car and park on Donnelly Street and the surrounding area. During these times, the congestion and pressure on Donnelly Street is a real concern.

 In my professional opinion, backed by 18 years of experience walking up and down Donnelly Street on duty, the increased number of local residents and school students that would come about if the proposed subdivision went ahead would significantly increase this risk and compromise the health and safety of our students. This coalface assessment, over almost two decades, surely counts for more than someone coming to our school once and counting car parks and observing the intersection at the end of Donnelly Street for 15 to 30 minutes, which is our understanding of the rudimentary level of assessment undertaken so far.

 For me to hear statements like, "There is still significant capacity for car parking" is ludicrous and it's actually insulting and misleading about the reality of our school, not just at peak times, but during the many school and community events during the day which we host and are required to travel to. I challenge anyone to drive a bus down Donnelly Street and turn it around during one of the above occasions I have mentioned. It's very difficult and requires careful management on everyone's behalf.

 If the proposal went ahead, the consequences just don't bear thinking about. With a community library and playcentre located next door to the school, how are parents with small pre-schoolers and babies and the elderly, who regularly use the library during the day, expected to negotiate the sorts of volumes the proposal would create? OFP's submission proposes a solution for this problem of opening up the paper road between Butlers Lane and Hussey Street. This is a totally unrealistic suggestion, as it will redirect some congestion from the end of Donnelly Street and the main road and take it to the high-risk intersection beside the Four Square, where Butlers Lane, Dixon Street and the main road meet.

 We already actively promote the parking area behind Butlers Bar and Café as a pick-up/drop-off zone for our students and parents and many of our families take up the suggestion, with children using the footpath to walk through to this area to meet their parents or to get to school. If the paper road was opened up, it would add pressure to an intersection that is already very dangerous and complex. Cars approaching Oākura from New Plymouth have just left a 100 km per hour area and often travel through this intersection too fast.

 There is also an issue with sunstrike for drivers at the beginning and end of the day, making visibility at this intersection difficult. Only three months ago, one of our 12-year-old students was struck by a car as she attempted to cross from the corner of Dixon Street to the Four Square on her way to school. We actively discourage our students from using this area to cross the main road.

 We also understand that there is an archaeological site which would make the suggested through road problematic, if not impossible.

 Water and waste: Oākura School is a proud Enviroschool. We have a long tradition of being involved in environmental initiatives within the Oākura community and our local curriculum has environmental philosophy and themes woven throughout all learning areas. We promote citizenship, sustainability and care for our environment with all our students. This can be seen with the longstanding involvement in community environmental projects such as spinifex planting on the beach, native tree planting in local reserves, programmes to support the ongoing establishment of the little blue penguin colony and our work with our local hapū, Ngāti Tairi, on the stream monitoring project and predator tracking and trapping in support of Taranaki Taku Tūranga towards Predator Free Taranaki, to name a few.

 The changes in our school in local environment that this proposed subdivision would bring about goes against the values that we have been instilling in our students for years. We have always valued the Kaitake Community Board and NPDC consulting and working with our students on environmental and recreational initiatives in our local community. This consultation has shown that they value and recognise the important role the younger generation have in the development and care of their community. I believe this proposed subdivision has not considered the true and long-term effect it will have on the children of Oākura and the local school. The fact that we had one consultation meeting with OFP that simply outlined the project supports this assumption.

 If our school grew to the capacity mentioned by OFP, I would also question the water capacity in Donnelly Street in the event of there being a fire on the school grounds. We have been directed by the Fire and Emergency Service to keep our school pool water in the pool over the non-swimming season for as long as I have been at the school. This is due to the hydrant on Donnelly Street outside the school only providing 15.8 l of water a second, which is well below the required capacity to put out a fire in one of our larger school blocks.

 To put out a fire in this building in that particular block requires between 25 to 50 l of water a second, using three hydrants for a sustained fire attack, according to the Fire and Emergency Services regulations. Because they would be using the dead-end main on Donnelly Street, they can potentially only use one hydrant and therefore need to use our pool water as an alternative water supply. This is the up-to-date information from the Fire Service regarding our current school size. More school buildings will make this another risk for our school community.

 Green space: our school board has actively managed our steady roll growth for the past 18 years. We implemented a school zone in 2005 so that we only enrolled students from within this area. We have always been proactive in analysing data relating to this growth and forecasting our needs. We have developed a future master plan that maximises our recreation and green space and we always keep the Ministry of Education informed of our roll growth and related issues.

 However, it has not been easy communicating our needs to the Ministry and gaining classrooms we have needed on a timely basis to prevent overcrowding and large class numbers. It has been a time-consuming and complex balance between leading learning in our school to managing ongoing property projects due to the continued growth. For OFP to state that it is up to the Ministry of Education to provide enough school capacity shows a lack of understanding of the Ministry of Education's processes and available resources.

 The Ministry of Education comment, which was a guide, that our school could take up to 1,000 students is absurd and goes against all Government policy relating to student health and wellbeing. It simply comes from a Ministry of Education property rep inputting our roll number into an MOE calculating table. It does not take into account the reality of the situation. When I questioned the MOE property rep about this 1,000 student figure, his emailed response was:

"My intention was not to alarm, but rather give you an idea of the guide we apply with new schools or those which need more area, which is often the case in Auckland, for example. I can think of no other primary school in our area which approach such numbers."

Comparing our school to one in Auckland, which MOE property reps have done, is not appropriate. The schools in Auckland that have had classrooms built on their school fields are in densely populated areas with community facilities nearby. We do not have community facilities nearby, which is totally inappropriate, for reasons I'll explain soon.

 One of our legal requirements, the National Administration Guideline number 1 states that we have to provide opportunities for students to achieve success in all areas of the curriculum, giving priority to literacy and numeracy and regular quality physical education. If our roll was 1,000 students, we would be unable to provide quality physical education because our sports fields would be non-existent, having been used for classroom sites.

 The suggestion for us to use local sports grounds is totally unrealistic. The only sport ground close to us is Corbett Park. To take classes there by walking would take about 15 to 20 minutes one way and they would need to walk along a grass verge beside the main highway with cars travelling 100 km per hour about 1 m away from the children, which is obviously extremely high risk. If we got buses, we would have to pay for them to come out from New Plymouth to drive us five minutes down the road. We are a decile 10 school with limited funding provided from the Ministry. Who would pay for these buses?

 Therefore our physical education opportunities would be greatly restricted, if not impossible, and the physical and social development that comes from being involved in physical activity and sport, which are our curriculum obligations, would be severely compromised or non-existent. Who wants to be signing off or supporting a proposal that removes all green space from a school in New Zealand and requires negotiating a state highway for all our recreational activities?

 Our school fields are also a community asset and are used for sports practices and sports games out of school hours year round. On Saturdays during the summer they are used for inter-school and club cricket games, and in the winter sports season the fields are used as a community hub for under-eight football, catering for coastal and New Plymouth teams. It is also used for under-12 football teams for their games, and this includes teams from the coast, New Plymouth, Hawera, Stratford, Inglewood and Waitara. There is nowhere else in Oākura that this could be held, as Corbett Park is being used for the older football teams at the same time.

 We have also heard comments that schools in Auckland and other main centres have less green space than Oākura School. Oākura is not a main centre, it is a town, a town with approximately 1,500 people and 549 homes. We are not against managed growth. We support it, just as we have in the past. We don't support the ad hoc growth that would come about if this subdivision went ahead.

**MR VERIC:** Point 3, lack of alignment to existing agreed plans and strategies for managed growth. The proposal cuts across all known and previously consulted and documented community strategies, including those endorsed by NPDC and implemented into the long-term community plans. While this process is a legitimate mechanism to usurp all that work, given the scale of opposition, it is clear to our community that it is not palatable, nor a better alternative to existing and previously formulated plans for managed growth, not limited to land already zoned for residential development, ie the Holden lots.

 As a school, we are near capacity right now. We have coped with the steady growth of Oākura over recent years. The school could simply not cope with the type of growth in this proposal and the scale of the numbers in this proposal are not tenable. While it is acknowledged that there are some solutions proposed from the Ministry of Education to accommodate such growth, none of these are palatable to the board of trustees, nor have been tested or proven to us as a board of trustees, for the many reasons we will outline below.

**MS HEPWORTH:** The Oākura School roll has gone from 200 in the year 2000 to the current roll of 363 actually students, a steady growth of about 8 to 10 students each year. This year we are already 20 students above the roll of this time last year. Next week our roll reaches a figure that should trigger - and I say "should" - our 16th classroom. We then begin the challenging negotiations with the Ministry of Education to firstly access and gain approval and then plan and oversee the placement or build of this new teaching space. From previous experience, we know that we cannot assume that it is automatic that we receive funding or approval for a classroom even when we have the roll numbers to trigger this. It is totally dependent on available funds within the MOE budgets, not on our needs.

 We have already made many compromises to accommodate extra classroom spaces over the years. Recently, following negotiations with the Ministry, we agreed to one of our multipurpose spaces being transformed into a teaching space or classroom, thus losing a valuable indoor room previously used for technology, art, music, drama and small group activities. Then more recently we were forced into locating a modular classroom on to a much-loved junior soccer field. Even the placement of one classroom on this previous sport/recreation area changed the social dynamic of our students' play during interval time.

 During the planning process, we did our best to ensure that duty teachers still had the line of sight to all play areas, but the more buildings that are added to our site makes this an ongoing challenge for our duty teachers. We have a space planned for one more classroom but any more students and therefore classroom spaces will seriously compromise the safety of our students and the curriculum we can provide for our students on our current site.

 The lag between roll growth and actual approval from the Ministry of Education for classrooms is not seamless, nor is it guaranteed. Any other assertions around this are naïve and not representative of the reality. We've heard comments that a solution to our roll growth would be to decapitate and become a year 1 to 6 school. Being a full primary with year levels up to 7 and 8 is very important to the special character and culture of Oākura School and removing these year levels is not tenable to the school, nor the Oākura community.

 If we compare the size of the Oākura School site, which is 2.65 ha, with the only two Taranaki schools, which happen to be secondary schools with rolls over 1,000, it is really interesting. New Plymouth Girls' High School has 11 ha and New Plymouth Boys' High approximately 14. It makes a suggestion of our school, with 2.65 ha, being forced to take 1,000 students. Unbelievable. 2018 MOE data shows that no Taranaki primary school has a roll in excess of even 500 students. Highlands Intermediate is the biggest intermediate in Taranaki with a roll of 697, still a long way off 1,000, and the only intermediate over 500 in Taranaki. Wait for it: Highlands Intermediate actually has 6 ha. In case everyone missed our point, we have 365 students and are near capacity right now and have 2.65 ha with no opportunity to acquire more land.

 With the MOE's own emphasis on the network of schools, it seems contradictory to promote or even support overcrowding at a school already at capacity on such a small site when there are so many other schools around the region that have capacity and empty classrooms. The only way we can spread students around the network of schools effectively is for agencies to work together and stop imbalances - such as the one in this proposal - occurring.

 When you look into other large schools around Taranaki and even New Zealand, there is not only more than adequate access to green space, excluding the requirement of navigating a state highway, but significant infrastructure to support their size. Simply saying, "The MOE will sort it out and it will be okay" lacks foresight and commonsense.

**MR VERIC:** Oākura School has regular and open dialogue with key community groups, the Kaitake Community Board being one of those, for example. We have invested in regular open dialogue and consultation and therefore plans for managed growth, developed in conjunction with such groups, are the only ones that we support at this time.

 Our last point, point 4: previous breaches of integrity by OFP. In our view, there have been serious and clear breaches of integrity by OFP which unfortunately provide Oākura School with low confidence pertaining to the many personal undertakings in the proposal. Some of those breaches include a previous promise, verbal and in writing, that lot 29 would remain farmland in perpetuity; (b) a previous requirement to undertake ecological testing, ie first monitoring report for wetland birds and gold-striped gecko was nine years late and only came after pressure to produce them; and (c) in our view, the inability of OFP to participate in previous forums about growth in the region through known community channels. This seems surprising to us for an applicant that is providing us with, in their words, a smart growth solution.

 This is all very relevant to us as a key community stakeholder. Maybe we're a bit old school - yes, pun intended - where your word and written undertakings count for something. Yes, there are legal considerations and formalities, but what about good old-fashioned values-based conduct? We believe this also should be relevant to the hearing commissioners, because there are many future undertakings and statements of personal belief, ambiguity, opinion, guesstimation and goodwill that the community are requested to accept on behalf of OFP through the proposal. This does not even account for what could happen if the land is on-sold to out of town developers. Ultimately, the best and only accurate predictor of future performance is past performance.

 Summary: the Oākura board of trustees oppose the proposal in its entirety. Reducing the number of lots for sale by way of a compromise should also be declined because of all the reasons we have stated above. Our school motto is, "Learn to think, learn to care" and nothing that we have seen shows that this proposal aligns with our motto. It flies in the face of great collaborative community thinking already completed and it certainly does not show the right care for the environment. Most importantly, it does not show the right care for our tamariki and their families.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Thank you both. Mr Coffin.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Thank you very much. Firstly, I just noticed, Ms Hepworth, that you're a member of the Ministry for the Environment ‑‑ sorry, not Ministry for the Environment; it is late afternoon ‑‑ Ministry of Education Property Sector Reference Group.

**MS HEPWORTH:** I was, yeah, for two years.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** You were. So you are experienced in terms of property management?

**MS HEPWORTH:** Yeah.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** And I just wanted, at page 3 ‑‑ oh sorry, no, it is not page 3. Just give me a second, I will just try and find it again. Here it is. This is under point 3, the third paragraph down, and that is just a very short explanation of the triggers for the classrooms that might be required as part of your master planning and your capacity. I am just wondering if you can explain to me a little bit more about when you have reached capacity, the processes that you will go through and the effort and the time and resources required and then perhaps what the outcome of that might be.

**MS HEPWORTH:** Okay. And it does differ on ‑‑ you know, on lots of different occasions, but from past experience, we continually update the Ministry on our roll. They collect it twice a year officially, as all New Zealand schools give in their rolls, but because we're a growing school, we actively give them the heads-up of the growth that's happening. We ‑‑ there is an online calculator that you can input your year numbers in, which gives you an indication of it triggering the next classroom, which is what I've been using for this data here to show that we're close to our 16th classroom.

 Once we do that, we then contact the local Ministry reps here, property reps, and go through negotiations with them how we're going to do that. However, at present, the Ministry have signalled and made public their next lot of new classrooms and new schools that they're going to be investing in and so we have to take ‑‑ you get into the queue behind those ones.

 Part of the process has varied over the time that we've had it. As I mention in here, we negotiated with them and compromised and used a multipurpose space and turned it into a classroom rather than get funding for another classroom being built.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** So repurposing existing infrastructure.

**MS HEPWORTH:** Repurposing. They wanted us to maximise every space we had before we went further. Then they approved another classroom space, our latest one. That was put onsite 18 months ago, and that ‑‑ at the time they were ‑‑ had signed a contract to only deliver modular classrooms rather than to give us a bulk amount of money to build our own, which we'd always done previously. This was really complex for us, because these modular classroom couldn't be placed anywhere within a 6 m distance from any other building in our school due to fire risk.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** When you say "modular" ‑‑

**MR VERIC:** Prefab.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** ‑‑ I think probably in our minds we are thinking of the prefab.

**MS HEPWORTH:** Like a prefab, yeah.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Is that what you are talking about? Yes.

**MS HEPWORTH:** Yeah, prefab I guess would be the old term for it, yeah, and very high-tech prefab. And so we went through extensive negotiation trying to move to at least 4 m closer to sheds that we had so that we could maximise a play area next to it and they eventually agreed to it. That classroom has now been placed and it's been placed with enough space for one room next to it.

 To give you an indication of how the Ministry's guidelines can change, that was delivered 18 months ago with the idea that we zip off the end of the building and put a replica of that one on the end of it to make a two-classroom block. The project manager who oversaw that project visited us at the beginning of this year and tells us that that type of modular building is no longer recommended or provided by the Ministry. And so I'm not sure where that leaves us for that small space that we have left. We're hoping in a way they'll give us the amount of money that they normally give us for a classroom and we can build to suit our needs and adjust it and build it on to a block that we have already.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** So a hypothetical question, notwithstanding we have received a number of accounts in terms of how many students may come to the school, if you had a significant increase, much more than you have had in previous years, what would be the things you would need to do that are different from this current process? We have made an assumption that you would probably need to amend your master plan and that would involve consultation with the community. Are there any other things that you would have to do over and above what you have just described to us?

**MS HEPWORTH:** Well, there'd have to be a lot of ‑‑ we have to actually apply for more staffing as well. That's another process to go through, and so that's called extra roll growth, unexpected extra roll growth. That's not always as straightforward as possible either. We may be predicting what's coming, but we have to have children sitting on seats before we actually can have that approved, so they have to be there ‑‑

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Be there, then that triggers ‑‑

**MS HEPWORTH:** We can't just prove that we've got the list of them there, they've actually got to be enrolled and onsite. So again, there's corridors of growth right through New Plymouth and for some schools they've got children ‑‑ classrooms in modified dental clinics, they've got them in tiny little rooms that aren't suitable for classrooms because they're waiting for the roll growth classrooms to be approved. And that could be us, but we don't ‑‑ we've maximised every single multipurpose space in our school and we don't have any facilities like that left.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Thank you.

**MR VERIC:** If I can just add, Lynne, that the key thing is that the Ministry of Education don't have unlimited funds and so, you know, for us it's extreme time lag between students arriving and any decisions being made, but also it doesn't account for extenuating circumstances. And during the Christchurch earthquakes, for instance, that then changes the whole playing field for additional classrooms and resources from the Ministry and that affected every school in New Zealand's allocation during such a time.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Okay, thank you. That's really helpful. I just had a question, you have noted - this is under heading 2 - quite a number of activities, tasks, roles that roll out each day to manage traffic and pedestrian issues. I just wondered whether you had a traffic plan for the school.

**MS HEPWORTH:** We do. We're part of the Let's Go programme that's run by New Plymouth District Council that has a traffic plan. It has ‑‑ we collect a lot of data based on our children who are travelling actively to school, it's about drop-off/pick-up areas, trying to keep traffic circulating through the Donnelly Street area and obviously all of RAMs that we ‑‑ or our risk management systems that we put in place when we're having trips to and fro from the school.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** In the traffic management, is there any commentary about future car-parking or other types of measures that could be implemented that are outside of the school?

**MS HEPWORTH:** Well, over the years with the board of trustees, we actually invested tens of thousands, actually, into turning a grass verge at the end of Donnelly Street ‑‑ if you're coming out for a visit, we'd love to be able to point that out, where we've ‑‑

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** I've put it on our list ‑‑

**MS HEPWORTH:** Good, good.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** ‑‑ to pick up the 8.30 time, yes.

**MS HEPWORTH:** Invested - yes - in conserving the parking of our staff and parents at drop-off time. Once you go up Donnelly Street, turn a 90-degree turn, you'll see the sealed area that we've done right along that distance through to the tennis club to provide that extra parking and that was a big investment by the board at that time. There is no extra space now to put parking anywhere.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** You will have to excuse my naivety, what is the nature of the school bus service?

**MS HEPWORTH:** So it's run by Tranzit and it's contracted to the Ministry of Education, so they review and set their ‑‑

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Tranzit?

**MS HEPWORTH:** Tranzit is a bus company.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** It is a bus company.

**MS HEPWORTH:** With a Z. That they are contracted by the Ministry and they review their pathways and bus routes each year based on our roll, so we have to submit our rolls to them, and so for children within a certain distance from the school get free service and they must travel to their closest school. And as I mentioned in here, we have an enrolment zone, so we only enrol children from within our school zone. We do ‑‑ we very rarely advertise for spaces in it and it would only be on the occasion that we want to be able to, on occasions, have like a staff member, their child to attend, so they can actually do their job or a sibling of a family who are already in attendance at the school.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** How far away does the bus service go? Does it go up the top of Wairau Road, for instance, or that is not (overspeaking)

**MS HEPWORTH:** It's a route ‑‑ there's two routes and one that comes right out to Okato, so it goes up Plymouth Road and Koru Road, so it weaves right around. One arrives at 8.00 am in the morning and the other at 8.10 am, and one comes at 3.30 pm in the afternoon and the last one leaves school at 4.00 pm in the afternoon. And that takes high school ‑‑ several high school pick-ups along the way and primary schools. It's also ‑‑ it's combined as a public bus service.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Oh okay, they are doing the dual?

**MS HEPWORTH:** Yeah.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Okay. We perhaps should declare we have some experience. We have both been on boards of trustees, so ‑‑

**MS HEPWORTH:** Oh right, okay.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** But not of rural schools. Okay. Now, just at the top of page 3 here, in the first paragraph, but the last sentence, you say:

"We simply could not safely cope with the level of increases created by the proposal."

And what we have heard over the last few days is there has been what has been referred to as natural growth or small incremental growth over many years. We understand there is potential growth in areas that have already been zoned residential. Are you saying that you cannot safely cope with the level of increases created by this proposal and also the potential increased growth in Oākura as already zoned?

**MS HEPWORTH:** We're working on about eight to ten more students each year with the managed growth that we know about within the already zoned residential areas. More traffic is going to add more complexity to Donnelly Street no matter what, but that is why we have been putting in initiatives around getting children to travel actively to school to try and reduce that traffic down so that we can actually cope with that growth as it happens. But it is at capacity. Donnelly Street, I think you've heard from the residents today, it just isn't about pick-up and drop-off time at school, it's an incredibly busy street. I'm not sure if I've made it clear enough there, but our ‑‑

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Maybe this is a good time to say we have heard that loud and clear.

**MS HEPWORTH:** Yes, good. But we do have a community library onsite. It's a ‑‑

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Yes, I saw that.

**MS HEPWORTH:** You saw that, so that's ‑‑ that has traffic coming and going throughout the day as well. It's Saturday morning, it has a late night Wednesday night, so, you know, it's outside of school hours.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** I just had two other questions and then perhaps I will leave it to Mr Wasley. I am wanting to know exactly what is the capacity of the school at the present time. So we have heard about what the roll is, but what is the capacity?

**MS HEPWORTH:** We're full now with the buildings that we've got. That's why next week we trigger the 16th classroom. We sort of know that probably within the next eight to ten years we'll be likely to meet the 450 mark, but the reality is, as I said to you, when the Ministry came and saw our site, they've put this classroom on there, we've got one spare space for a classroom, so that's another 30 children.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Okay. So at the moment you have currently got 360, is that right?

**MS HEPWORTH:** 363 today.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** 363 today, that is the one. My last one is slightly not related, a bit unrelated: you were here for the very quick submission of our submitters from the playcentre and I had asked whether they had a lease and what the length of that lease was and you said, "I can answer that". So here is the question.

**MS HEPWORTH:** It was interesting. I don't want to panic Jane by saying this, but actually when we were negotiating with the Ministry our next classroom, we did talk to the Ministry about the playcentre's land, which is on Ministry ‑‑ it's actually the school land is Taranaki iwi land. That was part of the land agreement, so they lease it to the Ministry of Education and so the playcentre has a ‑‑

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Oh, it is a leaseback arrangement from the settlement?

**MS HEPWORTH:** Yeah, it is a leaseback arrangement.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Okay, I can remember all those.

**MS HEPWORTH:** So yeah, and when we talked to the Ministry about the playcentre site, which would be a natural growth place for the school, they clearly said, "No, we want the playcentre to be there" and we really value the playcentre there. It provides a ‑‑ you know, a zero years through to our years of 13-year-olds, you know, a community-type feel. So we do value it, but it's certainly an area that we looked at at the time, but the Ministry are committed to keeping the playcentre on that site.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** And the board of trustees' view on that is that the same?

**MS HEPWORTH:** Sorry, I was speaking from that view.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** No, that is fine. I am just clarifying.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay. I just have one question after Mr Coffin. You mentioned the implementation of the school zone in 2005. What is the extent of that? I take it goes beyond just the Oākura urban area.

**MS HEPWORTH:** We're probably one of the fairest zones actually in Taranaki, and the Ministry state that, that's been stated by them, because we ‑‑ our zone goes halfway between our two neighbouring schools. We don't overlap. Omata does overlap with our one, but closer towards us, but we understand why, you know, some of those children ‑‑ parents work in town, so they drive that way. So it's halfway between.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** It goes out with Omata and what is the other school there?

**MS HEPWORTH:** And Coastal Taranaki School. So the zone is ‑‑ and that's in Okato.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Is that at Okato?

**MS HEPWORTH:** Yeah, it is, and so the zone goes from Plymouth Road, which is closest to Omata, and then to Timaru Road and all land in between up to the mountain boundary and out to the coast. And actually the Ministry have discussed with us about even reducing that greater to see whether that would help with our growth, because they know it's a real pressure point for us, but in fact we analysed all of our data on it using the Ministry's tools and found that the majority of our growth actually comes from the village itself, not our outskirts.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** That was going to be my next question.

**MS HEPWORTH:** Got you.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay, most from the village. Would there be a percentage? I was just trying to get a bit of a feel for ‑‑

**MS HEPWORTH:** Yeah, that's hard to ‑‑

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** ‑‑ what the rural area contributes.

**MS HEPWORTH:** Yeah. I could probably find that out, but it's mostly the village. And in fact, it's interesting, because we would have thought differently because, you know, you hear, "Oh, people are moving in because they're building" or whatever, but actually, whether it's natural turnover in the village or infill building, it's definitely coming from the village itself in most of the built-up area.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay.

**MS HEPWORTH:** Yeah. We actually have very few rural families now.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Is it your sense that that is people who are having children and are growing up and returning to the school or is it families who are emigrating into Oākura with ‑‑

**MS HEPWORTH:** Both, both.

**MR VERIC:** A bit of both, yeah.

**MS HEPWORTH:** You know, we've got multigenerational families within our school. That's part of the special character of it, but we've actually become a very diverse school, with many families coming from outside for the oil industry or particularly the hospital on contract and tend to stay. Once they come under contract, they then become residents.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** I was not meaning any offence by using the word "immigration". It is just the population term.

**MS HEPWORTH:** We love it. It makes it diverse and interesting.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Okay, thank you.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay, we do not have any further questions, so thank you to you both.

**MS HEPWORTH:** Thank you. And we do invite you for a visit. I hope you'll be able to make it out to have a look at the school.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** We will be looking at Donnelly Street and the school and all around.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** So we don't want parents coming out to look for the car that's driving around.

**MS HEPWORTH:** We won't put on a special event for you. Okay, thank you.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Thank you. We will move to Catherine Lennox. You are speaking on behalf of yourself and two others, according to my list.

**MS LENNOX:** Yeah, yeah. Hilarious, because I actually am an immigrant, so ‑‑

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Sorry?

**MS LENNOX:** Hilarious, because I actually am an immigrant, so following on from Lynne, yeah, so that's ...

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay, thank you. So if you can take us through your statement. Were you here earlier on when I spoke about minimising repetition of all matters?

**MS LENNOX:** Yes, yes.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay.

**MS LENNOX:** I'll do my best to cut out as much as I can.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Thank you.

**MS LENNOX:** Or, yeah, paraphrase.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** And I may intervene if I feel you intrude on that.

**MS LENNOX:** Sure.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** So I presume you are going to go through your statement first?

**MS LENNOX:** Yeah.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Okay. No, thank you.

**MS LENNOX:** So kia ora. My name is Caitie and I came to ‑‑

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Can you pull that a wee bit towards you? Thank you.

**MS LENNOX:** It's the soft Scottish accent. My name is Caitie, and I came to New Zealand in 2008 to work at Base Hospital as an occupational therapist. At the time I was offered positions in Perth, West Aus and Melbourne, but chose New Zealand, and specifically Taranaki, because I am from a rural farming background and preferred the idea of living somewhere with a sense of community. I chose to live in Oākura because of the pristine surfing beach and beautiful ranges and I later built a house at Tui Grove, met my Kiwi partner and we now have a 5-year-old son.

 Buying a section on Tui Grove, I would never have envisaged a massive subdivision such as the proposed Wairau Estate being built on the neighbouring farmland. The proposal has brought about a great deal of stress for our family, as it threatens the quiet existence of our home. When it was first submitted, we looked at other options, selling up and moving somewhere else, but this is the home that we were hoping to raise our family in, walking distance from a great school, and feel angry that this will be a possibility if this goes ahead.

 There are so many reasons we are against a development such as this in Oākura. I say about the balance allotment was to be retained; you've heard that all before.

 The Wairau Estate application has a large area planned for medium-density housing alongside the tributary to the Wairau Stream. They state that they want the rules amended to take the minimum lot size down from 700 to 300 m2 to enable some retirement accommodation. However, I do not see anywhere in their submission whether they have consulted with Age Concern, aged care experts at the DHB or occupational therapists to establish whether this is in fact a viable location for an ageing population. I do not see anywhere any statistics on whether there is enough medical services, access to GPs or Allied Health in Oākura.

 The access for emergency vehicles would be through the middle of Oākura, unsafe for children at the only pedestrian crossing, and then a long-winded approach up upper Wairau, again unsafe for pedestrians, horses and cyclists, to the planned retirement area.

 As an occupational therapist I have considerable experiences with the issues the elderly face. Socially isolated adults are at risk of poor health and wellbeing. In a study carried out in 2017 by a group of American occupational therapists, it was found that lack of transportation appeared linked to social isolation. According to Transport Ministry figures, nearly half of all senior drivers referred by doctors for on-road competency tests fail. So I would argue that this location is not suitable for retirement accommodation as it is too far from the village centre to enable community engagement and participation by potential residents. A more suitable location would be more central.

 One of my biggest concerns is about the increase in traffic on Wairau and within Oākura itself and that has been said before, so let's move on.

 Currently with my 5-year-old, on a nice day we are just walking distance or are able to cycle to school. An increase in traffic would make this extremely unsafe with a child so young, so we would become confined to using the car. I cannot imagine being able to cycle with large building vehicles going up and down Wairau over the next 10 to 20 years, so this is a threat to our way of living and bringing up our child to be less car-dependent. I feel strongly that this subdivision proposal in any form is unfair on current Wairau residents, and on top of the proposed cycleway from Pukeiti to the top of Surrey Hill Road, the traffic increase will have huge safety implications.

 According to NZTA, senior road users - that's passengers, drivers, cyclists and pedestrians - aged 75 and over accounted for 711 injuries and 43 deaths. This age group make up 60 per cent of road user population, but 12 per cent of fatalities, and NZTA reports that health problems can make driving more risky. Going back to my previous point about the suitability of the location for a retirement village, it adds to my anxiety about the safety of traffic movements on Wairau Road and in and around Oākura.

 I am concerned about the proposed traffic management ideas put forward by the development. Knocking a road through to Butlers Lane from Hussey Street takes away valuable non-traffic walking space, which is the essence of small-town living. Bulldozing our town to suit the needs of one subdivision and one developer is strongly opposed.

 Another big issue that you've heard is the future of the school, so I'll skip over that, because they've covered it.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Thank you.

**MS LENNOX:** My concerns about the boundary being on the national park, which I'll skim over, but I do feel that Oākura people have a strong responsibility to protect the Kaitake ranges, both the view and the natural habitat. This is a view which is even reiterated by my 5-year-old, who learnt about Predator Free Taranaki through preschool and he's worried that the kiwis will be eaten by rats and mice if there are a lot more houses on the fields below the mountains. I think if a 5-year-old can understand that, then we as adults should be able to. So I'll skim over that.

 But something that I haven't heard - it might have come up already, so correct me if I'm wrong - but the developer proposes an equestrian zone on the boundary of the subdivision to act as a buffer between town and national park. An equestrian zone on the boundary of a national park will be problematic for the biodiversity. I grew up with horses and can vouch for the fact that rats and mice love the buildings of the equestrian environment. Of course we had farm cats to keep the mice and rat numbers down. Again, this will be a problem for the future if this subdivision goes ahead. How will the cat covenants be policed as properties are bought and sold? I feel that this makes Predator Free Taranaki a waste of time, effort and money and I think there is far more better sites in Taranaki for keeping horses, with access to beaches not being through a town and over a main highway. I do wonder if this subdivision goes ahead whether we will be back here in another ten years or less disputing why more houses shouldn't be built on the promised equestrian zone.

 Many countries are currently declaring a climate emergency, meanwhile we are here debating the merits of a completely car-dependent subdivision. Wairau Estate subdivision in any form, big or small, is unwarranted, unnecessary and unethical and I ask that private plan change 48 be declined.

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** Thank you. Mr Coffin.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Just at page 2, three paragraphs down, and you quote the NZTA statistics for those who are aged 75 and over accounted for most of the injuries and deaths. Are you aware of any of those occurring at Oākura at the present time?

**MS LENNOX:** No, but if we are putting in a retirement village, then what I'm saying is I'm worried about the safety with the increase in the traffic, about the safety of my movements in Wairau with my 5-year-old and the safety of the junction at Wairau as well.

**COMMISSIONER COFFIN:** Thank you. Anything?

**COMMISSIONER WASLEY:** No further questions, so if you want to proceed to the next statement.

**MS LENNOX:** Sure. So Rene did ‑‑ he's a builder and he did take the time off to come to work ‑‑ to come here this afternoon, obviously unpaid because he's a contractor, but he had to go and pick up our 5-year-old, so I'm now presenting for him, so:

"Kia ora, my name is Rene and I am a builder by trade. I moved from Kapiti Coast to settle in Taranaki in the beautiful Oākura village. The pristine mountain ranges and coastal environment brought me here with my love of outdoor activities.

As a builder, I have been involved with building some of the new houses in Oākura and particularly at the Paddocks subdivision. I have seen a steady growth rate of new properties in Oākura and surrounds over the years and feel that there has been a natural growth rate which is healthy for the town.

This private plan change has left me stunned that one man's ambition can put so many people's way of life and wellbeing at risk. Being a builder, you would think that a new subdivision such as this would be an exciting proposition with the potential of lots of work ahead. However, my love for this community and the natural environment has to be thought of first."

And so he said about the volume of traffic on Wairau Road. He took the figures from the traffic impact assessment prepared by AMTANZ Limited, estimating that there would be 4,150 vehicle movements a day on upper Wairau Road and the fact that there will be heavy construction vehicles. And he crunched the numbers down over a time of ten hours, between 8.00 am and 6.00 pm, and worked out that there would be a vehicle on Upper Wairau Road approaching the Wairau Road/main highway intersection every 6.79 seconds.

 If you take 500 cars away from this calculation to allow for other hours, it brings it to every 7.5 seconds for a vehicle approaching this intersection, so you could expect a car between every 5 to 10 seconds throughout the day at any given time. And he's worried about that if a roundabout was put in place, it would stop the flow on the main highway and the safety to motorists, cyclists and pedestrians and then adding horse riders into that equation.

 And he's stated that the numbers on the highway are between 4,000 and 6,000 and that the highway is designed for fast car movement, and in comparison, Wairau is not a highway, it's a 50 km zone. It's a residential road and it's expected to take similar amounts of vehicle movements:

"As a builder, I know of other sites in Taranaki more suited to development with good access to amenities and less car dependence, which have been refused because they don't have the backing to invest. There is also the famous example of the Fitzroy Golf Club, an area far more suitable for development, rejected on public outcry.

Meanwhile, a proposition such as this can be put forward and even get to hearing when so many in this small community will be adversely affected ‑‑"

(Transcription ends)

(Transcription begins)

... just because something can be made to look good on paper doesn't make it a solid idea.

 I am reading this submission on behalf of Birgit and Matthew Kuriger. I will read it in its entirety and just stop me.

 We oppose the proposal to rezone 58 hectares of rural land to mainly residential. Our property is one of many along Wairau Stream that overlook the farm, and in particular we are directly opposite the proposed residential area of medium-density housing. Based on the currently proposal we will suffer significant loss to rural outlook and privacy which we currently enjoy and was one of the reasons we purchased this property six years ago. We believe that a development of this magnitude will fundamentally change the character of Oākura. What makes Oākura unique is its semi-rural landscape, closeness to the beach, green space and the national park.

 The effect of the loss of rural outlook is amplified by the planned area of medium-density housing along the Wairau Stream. Amending the rules to allow the minimum lot size from 700 m2to 300 m2 would change the rural outlook and dramatically alter the current view of the Kaitake Ranges which if this proposal goes ahead will be obstructed by buildings. Sections of this size are not in keeping with the rural environment or with the rest of the sections within the vicinity of the proposed development. There appears to be no strong reason to allow medium-density housing in this area. Furthermore, an increase to the area of the site that can be covered by a building to 55% from 35% and 50% under the current rules will destroy the open landscape and rural appearance and will no longer protect the views of the Kaitake Ranges, a view that Oākura people love.

 The plan change contradicts previous information; but we know about that. We support the evidence provided by Boffa Miskell at paragraph 3.47 which suggests an open-space corridor along the edge of Wairau Stream to protect the stream. They also note on page 41, paragraph 13.67, that the current location of the medium-density zoning, positioned on rising land, has the potential for significant adverse landscape and visual effects and they do not support the medium-density area.

 Mr Bain submits that the landscape structure can be dealt with as part of the subsequent subdivision applications. We disagree with this. As stated at paragraph 3.67 of the above report a higher level of certainty of outcomes is required to ensure planting and landscaping is implemented as part of this development. Landscape planting measures to the gullies and waterways should be carried out prior to any development. There is currently only minimal provision for riparian planting along Wairau Stream. It is noted that currently no planting has been carried out following the Paddocks development. Given the proximity to existing houses and the stream significant planting should be mandatory. We are concerned about the lack of green space and communal areas for a development of this magnitude. The lack of green space and communal areas will affect the usage and availability of local amenities such as the playground, Oākura River, the beach and Matakai Park. The proposal allows for a significant increase in population without providing any firm commitment to equivalent improvements in services or amenities.

 The fringes of Oākura need to reflect the existing environment. There is very little in the proposal with regards to landscaping in streets and reserves to enhance the quality of the environment and reduce the visual impact of the development.

 We are opposed to the entrance to the development off Wairau Road. This road is narrow and unsuitable for an increase in traffic to an estimated 4,500 cars per day. Despite housing on both sides of Wairau Road there is no footpath, guttering or adequate parking on the east side of the road. Furthermore, the east side of the road is breaking up and falling away on the lower busiest section of the road near State Highway 45.

 We are not opposed to change or in fact development per se but we believe any development needs to preserve the natural environment of Oākura while ensuring appropriate public roading, safe pedestrian and cycle movement, landscaping and further services and amenities which reflects the character of the area.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much for your own statement and reading the other two statements. Hayley or Alex Ingram.

**MS INGRAM:** My name is Hayley Ingram. The first paragraph I talk about the assurances that we were given about the development after the Paddocks and about that it's one man's vision for Oākura.

 It is hard for the community outside of Oākura to not view our response as the residents wanting to pull up the drawbridge and stop others from experiencing a life in Oākura. I don't believe that the community fears change. If that were the case then I would not have been able to have called Oākura home for the past 13 years, having moved here from England in 2006. I feel the community is well aware that change is inevitable and has been involved, with the encouragement of the Kaitaki Board and Council, in the development of the Oākura Structural Plan and other community-minded projects.

 Then I talk about the lack of community liaison. The experts that have represented us have already told you of the impact this development will have on Oākura. On a personal level, this development is quite literally at the bottom of my garden and should it be granted permission I can look forward to the next 30-plus years experiencing the land being chipped away at and the dust and noise that will come with houses and roads being built. I don't agree with Mr Bains's statement that he believed that only the Paddocks residents will have their views affected by the development of the Wairau Estate. As you can see by the photo included in my statement we are fortunate that the position of our house grants us views of the ranges and farmland, as do most on the south side of Upper Wairau Road.

 However, losing a view is not my main issue with this large-scale urban development. Then I say about it being so close to the Kaitaki Ranges and blah-de-blah. I don't see this proposal having much thought given past its impact at development and building stage. I wonder how the next generation of Oākura residents will view the decision, if it was made in favour of land resource change, when they inherit the potential issues caused by water, sewage, more blah-blah-blah, water effects. They may ask themselves, "What were they thinking by allowing this large-scale estate to be given approval in being built so close to a national park when other options were available and had been identified?" Therefore I oppose this plan change in its entirety.

**MR INGRAM:** My name is Alex Ingram and I live on the southern side of Upper Wairau Road. My property overlooks the applicant's land. We settled in Oākura by a fortunate turn of events when we first moved to New Zealand from the UK in 2006. We started our New Zealand adventure in a rental down at the beachfront. What we envisaged as a short-term location has led to us buying and putting down roots at our current home. During our search for a permanent home we looked all around Taranaki and the Tasman district of the South Island but came to realise that Oākura had everything we were looking for. We loved the low key, easy living, beach-side small settlement vibe. We liked that we wouldn't need to drive into New Plymouth unless really necessary with the shop, pub, restaurants, cafes and petrol station within easy reach. We liked the very Kiwi, relaxed, easy to park, no controlled parking situations near the beach, with no limited time slots or fees. The same goes for the easy accessible community-developed parks and walks.

There has been talk of the land availability and people wanting to downsize and cash in etc. This is exactly how our home came about, by infill and the big house downsizing their plot. Our house and four others are built on one original plot and we are still over 1,000 m2. It has been discussed of the potential loss of the 23 ha for future urban development due to plots being considered too hard basket with respect to building. There are many houses within Oākura built on very challenging sites.

 There's a bit I talk about leapfrogging over sort of like natural boundaries which I think the Wairau tributary behind us forms; how the proposal is very vehicle dependent. There was talk from the Green School -- I will just read that bit. There has been talked of the demand for housing due to the development of a Green School, not very environmentally friendly when you need to drive 7 km each way several times a day for a school run.

 Community plans have already been developed over the years. Lots of time, effort and community engagement have gone into this for one person to come along and tear it up. The proposal has talked of community benefits, but no examples have been given to the wider community behind the estate's own bridle(?) ways.

 The one owner situation has been tabled as a huge benefit, might I point out that it could also cause a huge issue with one entity controlling the release and/or availability of building lots and also the effect to the local land and housing market. I have already witnessed the applicant drop prices of lots in the Paddocks by approximately $225,000 between October 2018 and May 2019, whether this was to try and shift the remaining lots to show it as successfully sold out I'm not sure. Then I've got a couple of pictures showing the lots and the price changes.

 I can skip the next couple of paragraphs, I just worry about the applicant paying lip service to do with what he talked of with the Commissioner for the Paddocks hearing and also about the funding for the carvings.

 I suggest use of existing Oākura allotted development plots first, particular the west FUD and infill. These have been planned for with regards to infrastructure etc and maybe revisit this request once these are completed but I bet appetite for the proposal will be even less then due to changes in society. A little bit about noise bunds not being required in west Fud and infill.

 I must admit I had a slight giggle at Mr Comber's suggestion that developing further back from the ocean, due to sea level rising, was a good idea. While I'm not saying things are not changing, I don't believe the FUD west zone is immediate danger if at all. May I also remind people of the tornado path of 2007, diagonally directly across the applicant's land, and therefore suggest that the west FUD is a safer option.

 Then again a few points on roading, mainly to do with funding. I mean there's a lot of places in the region that are struggling to get accident black spots dealt with and even the New Plymouth mayor's open letter to the Minister of Transport in August of 2018 highlights the funding issues.

 Site coverage and lot size, I think that's been covered. You know, I really don't think going down to 300 m2 will fit in at all.

 Community spirit, I think that's been discussed. Future proofing; the original request includes a portion of land to be purchased from Powerco. Is the loss of Powerco land a little short sighted, will local grid capacity suffer in the future when everyone wants to plug in their electric cars at home?

 If farmland is removed and concreted over we'll never see it again. The same can be said for developing in close proximity to the national park and potential side effects that it may have on the native flora and fauna.

 We need to take a step back and think about the long-term future and not just one entity's gain in the short term. People from outside Oākura may just see numbers and think, "What is the issue? Ministry of Education, NZTA -- just build more schools, roads, buildings, doctors, fire stations etc." I don't believe this is the route Oākura should be taken. I would like to finish by saying I object to this plan change request in its entirey.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Mr Ingram, you mentioned in terms of living on the southern side of Upper Wairau Road. What number are you?

**MR INGRAM:** 122A, so we are about 300 m up from the intersection with the state highway and our property overlooks the applicant's land.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** I do not have anything further so if you would like to take us through the statement?

**MS INGRAM:**

 "Penny Holdcroft, 100 Wairau Road. My name is Penny Holdcroft and I have lived in Oākura for ten years. I live on the south corner of Wairau Road and State Highway 45, directly beside the planned roundabout. The diagram is hard to understand, however it looks like the road will be right through my current fence and be approximately 5 feet from my deck and front door. This will impact substantially on my family. There are obvious hazards like noise and lack of privacy, but as I have a son with cystic fibrosis I worry about how the carbon emissions caused by the increased traffic flow will impact on his lungs."

Then she talks about the increase in traffic:

 "My section also backs on the Wairau Stream and I am concerned that more development of curbing, roads and driveways will increase the flooding of the stream."

Then she talks about the water, sewage and other factors. Then she just says, "I ask that the PPC48 be declined in its entirety."

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Glenys Farrant(?).

**MS FARRANT:** I oppose the plan change in its entirety. I find it incredulous and abhorrent that one person thinks they have the right to determine the growth of a whole community, let alone for a period spanning some 30 years.

 We have a system in place of consultation with the community as a steady collector of the needs and wishes of our community reassessed every ten years. This provides a voice for the whole community and recognition that things do change as the needs of the community change. Our current system allows for change to be carried out gradually in response to the community needs.

 There is already land zoned Residential C on the seaward side of State Highway 45 which I know has been talked about, but because my statement's very brief I'll continue. I understand there is a proposed residential development on the Holdom property that will provide a link from the western side of Oākura via Russell Drive to Wairau Road. This alone is a very important issue because of the current concerns with global warning. In the event of the beachfront road being impassable residents from the western side of the village will have an alternative route to evacuate their homes. As it currently stands the only way out is through the Oākura farm which goes from the end of Jans Terrace through to Ahu Ahu Road and that would be having to travel through, you know, the race that goes through the property so not a really accessible pathway, it has to go through a paddock first then to reach the first race to take them through.

 People make up communities and it must be people that determine the direction of their communities. I oppose this, again, in its entirety for that reason and many others.

 I present this submission on behalf of Olive Walyn(?):

 "Tēnā koutou. General: The submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety. The following points are concerning me and are speaking against the planned development.

 There will be an increased risk of accidents, especially at intersection Wairau Road and South Road."

He goes on to say about no roundabouts, which I know you've discussed. He mentions we don't have safe cycle ways so even more people will drive with their cars to the school and day cares. No parking space will be available and chaos will be a consequence.

 He also expresses concern about the Kaitake Ranges and suffering from increased population with predators, which has been discussed.

 He is against intensive development which will change the surf beach and village into something none of the existing residents want.

 Also, the Paddocks were advertised as rural paddock living by the same owner, who now wants to turn the whole area into a residential area with small sections which turns the village into a proper town. Olive Walyn.

 The next submitter is Moira Conaghlan(?). She opposes the plan in its entirety. I think a lot of Moira's points have been covered. If you wish me to read it through I can.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** I am just looking through that now. Probably the second-to-last paragraph, please.

**MS FARRANT:** She covers the traffic etc, and the services.

 "Oākura residents take on many initiatives to ensure that Oākura has an attractive environment. These initiatives include activities such as tree planting, safety strategies and maintenance of walkways around the village. The council is not currently doing enough in this regard in Oākura. The proposed subdivision will put increased pressure on the environment if it goes ahead. Is the council therefore prepared to increase their efforts and investment into the beautification and maintenance of Oākura's environment?"

Then Moira, in summary, states about insufficient quality infrastructure, the conflict with the current structure and plan of a small village, and insufficient public services.

 "The Oākura community are passionate about the local environment and its presentation and invest significant personal energy and money into managing it. The council has benefitted from the locals' contribution in this regard."

Her closing statement is:

 "Do not abuse the beauty of our village and the enthusiasm of our community by approving a subdivision that is not in keeping with the appeal and uniqueness of Oākura."

Signed Moira Conaghlan.

 On behalf of Rachel Schaeffer(?) I am giving her submission:

 "General - the submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety. We have chosen to make Oākura our home because of its size. I have many concerns, some of which are the intersection at Dixon Street, Main Road and the 4 Square area is already under pressure. It's already hard to park in the village retail area. In the summer beach parking is also premium."

She's concerned for older locals that drive to the beach to swim or walk, it is hard to get a park:

 "The bird life here is prolific. With more houses there are more cats, dogs, rats and mice and less of the natural environment.

 We have chosen Oākura to live because it is a small village with less crime, and a safe place to bring up our family. There are only a few to gain from this, the developer, the council and the lawyers at the locals' expense. Rachel Schaeffer."

On behalf of Manu Schaeffer(?), I am giving his submission:

 "General - the submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety. I chose Oākura as home because of its beauty and small community. I think Oākura residency is at an ideal capacity, allowing another 400 sections is going to put pressure on school, car parking, roads and intersections will even be more dangerous with the influx of people.

 Oākura has a great feel for it because it's safe and the people here respect it. A lot of places in New Zealand have expanded and have lost the unique New Zealand community feeling so I don't want those sections here because once those houses are built we can never go back to our lovely small community. Manu Schaeffer."

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Mr Farrant.

**MR FARRANT:** I'm Craig Farrant from 5B Tui Grove. I was born and bred in Oākura, it's been 63 years now. I left for 20 years. I lived in North Queensland with my wife and had two children in Cairns, which you know is a lovely place. We decided to bring them back to be back in Oākura. It's a lovely little village and after about a month our kids thanked us. They loved the school, they loved the freedom that they got.

 Well, actually 5B Tui Grove overlooks the Paddocks, why we bought the place there. It's great. You know, the pukekohes, the hares, the rabbits, the bloody ducks, everything else and it would be a shame for us personally to be looking into other people's backyards across Wairau Stream.

 So, yeah, I'm totally against it with the stream and everything else that is good about Oākura and that is about me.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** In terms of I think your sixth line up, is that infrastructure?

**MR FARRANT:** Infrastructure.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Helen Ivers(?).

**MS RYAN(?):** I'm not Helen Ivers, I'm Diane Ryan(?).

**THE CHAIRMAN:** You are going to give your own statement second?

**MS RYAN:** Yes, I am and, again, I will abbreviate it as much as I can. Reading on behalf of Helen, who is in the South Island.

 Her family have lived in Oākura since 1950, 70 years and 4 generations. They are not against change but have seen the village grow considerably from a little country village to a vibrant caring and environmentally conscious bigger village. They do have considerable concerns about the McKie subdivision. They don't feel there's any need for it. They feel properties have already been met by the infill of around 100 in the Pinewoods development. These have been approved under current legislation, they did not need to change any rules to gain approval and worked within the current guidelines.

 Her concern is also that this is on the wrong side of State Highway 45 which is going to cause problems; roading, which we've actually all heard about.

 She's talking about the parking down at the beach:

 "Many children wander across the road from the board riders' club to the surf shop and changing rooms to the beach for their surf lessons, surf club practice etc. There is an accident waiting to happen here already, let alone having more vehicles driving through the space.

 Our view of Kaitake Ranges is priceless and will be seriously compromised. This is our view of the Egmont National Park. One of our favourite walks is up Wairau Road to the bush line, it will be a sad day if this goes forever.

 The current aquifer supplying us with our water, which is well known for its purity, may not be able to cope with this extra demand. Over summer we constantly have to cope with water restrictions. There has not been any in-depth research into the volume of water that this aquifer can supply and this is a serious potential issue.

 Another major concern is the impact a subdivision of this size will have on our beach. Oākura beach is the best beach in Taranaki. Not only a popular swimming beach, it is the teething ground for some of New Zealand's well-known surfers, including Paige Hareb. It is also used for windsurfing, kayaking, kite surfing, paddle boarding and fishing.

 Several rivers feed into the sea and a subdivision of this magnitude is going to have a negative impact on the amount and quality of water which will make it to the sea. It will also have an impact on the private properties the rivers border. We have already seen rather a lot of land erode with storm water in past years.

 To me, Oākura means a clean, green space for my family which I have always called home. We support sensible and necessary change but not ..."

We won't use that:

 "We would also support not support or accept a reduced scale plan as it is not in accordance with the district plan. If a smaller scale is approved there is nothing to support McKie applying for another 100 within time and then another 100 and so on."

My name is Diane Ryan, I am married and have three sons. We have resided in Oākura since 1978 and been a property owner since 1979. We currently reside at 8 Wairau Road. Our property is the lower end of Wairau Road and borders the Wairau Stream.

 I have three sons that have been through the local playcentre and school also.

 We are not opposed to growth but are of the understanding there is currently sufficient supply to meet the projected demand.

 Living on the lower end of Wairau Road, one of the only two accesses to the beach in Oākura and Oākura Beach, the summer months see a huge increase in traffic in this areas, especially when there's something on at the surf club or the board riders club. Parking is at a premium at the beach and also both sides of Wairau Road. Most families that live on this side of the State Highway 45 walk to the beach and it can be hazardous for biking, walking with lots of little children when there's so many parks obscuring the road, whereas if there's going to be more families on the other side of Wairau Road they're going to be driving down. Again, parking is such a premium at that area. We have struggled getting in and out of our driveway actually because people park over it.

 Although we do have walkways from the main road to the beach these are ill maintained and slippery when wet. I walk my dog several times a week to the Upper Wairau Road and find the intersection of Wairau Road and State Highway 45 hazardous now at peak times, with drivers taking unnecessary risks entering onto the highway. Roundabout or not, this intersection and situation can only be further exacerbated with heavy trucks during a subdivision construction and then with 300-odd extra families heading to the village, school, beach and New Plymouth.

 As I mentioned earlier, our property borders the Wairau Stream and this is a major concern for us if a subdivision goes ahead with the added burden of extra flow and erosion on our back section. With such changeable weather patterns and increased heavy rain we have noticed substantial erosion with the loss of bank plantings and soil to the extent of at least a metre of our land lost.

 I beg to differ from the New Plymouth District Council findings that it is unlikely the properties downstream from State Highway 45 will be affected by an increased flow. It would be my understanding that should lot 29 have the added burden of 399 dwellings, with less available soakage that stormwater by natural osmosis would flow directly to the closest waterway which is the Wairau Road stream.

 We can just hope that sense prevails and lot 29 can remain an environmentally green belt that will enhance and build a better and cleaner future for the children and families of Oākura. We are against any size subdivision of lot 29 and believe if a smaller number are initially agreed more will follow in time. Protect our village from overcapitalisation and preserve the village ideal.

**MR COFFIN:** Just one question. You noted in your second-to-last paragraph in terms of against any subdivision of lot 29, so do you see that remaining --

**MS RYAN:** A green belt.

**MR COFFIN:** -- as is, as per the consent order for time?

**MS RYAN:** Yes, I do. Yes.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Rodney Martin; welcome, Mr Martin.

**MR MARTIN:** Thanks for the opportunity to speak to you today. My name's Rodney Martin. I've lived in Oākura since 2006, along with my wife and three school-aged children. We're all actively involved in the community and our kids have all been to the local school, the surf club, the rugby club, etc.

 I oppose the plan change, including the more limited recommendation of 167 sections, as it will significantly change the nature of the Oākura village and is not required to support the planned growth of the village.

 The proposed development will result in a significant - I figure more than doubling - of traffic in the village. The traffic impact will be far greater proportionately than the proposed number of dwellings as the new dwellings are beyond walking distance; so instead of walking to the village centre or to the beach as most residents now can do, and do, they'll tend to drive.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** The next two, we can take those as read because we've heard (overspeaking)

**MR MARTIN:** So all of these things are going to reduce my family's enjoyment of the place we've chosen to live. I expect that the developer and the council will suggest that there are many measures they'll impose on the development via consent conditions that would reduce and manage its negative effects. However, history shows that neither the developer nor the council can be relied upon. The last significant development in Oākura, the Paddocks, was consented with conditions including that there be no further development of the adjacent farm - and that's the very same land we're now talking about - and secondly that the QEII areas would be created, planted and managed and these are now infested with gorse and weeds.

 For me the greatest frustration with this whole process is that it should never have been allowed to get to the stage it has. We now have got a week-long hearing, hundreds of thousands of dollars spent by both the developer and the council and those opposing the development when it is just so far outside what possibly could have been expected to be acceptable to the community. I say that because the district plan already clearly outlines where significant growth should take place in Taranaki and it's not in Oākura. There's already ample land available for the expected growth of Oākura now surplus, as I read the council reports, so there's no need for any additional zone changes or additional sites.

 The development is completely inconsistent with the existing Oākura Structured Plan and various other plans that the community's developed and the development will have a significant and detrimental impact on the rural nature of the land surrounding the village. The developer and the council in the Paddocks conditions acknowledged that the land should not be developed further. The developer said it would remain a protected farm regardless of its zoning. What's more, the fact they've got 450 people who have opposed it, with not a single person fully in favour of it, is something that you would guess the council should have been able to understand. The question for me is how the council let it get this far. It's inconceivable the developer would have proceeded to this point and spent the money he has if he hadn't had an indication from the council that he had a better than fair chance of getting the plan change approved.

 My family and I chose to live in Oākura because we like the small coastal village. Both my wife and I have lived in larger cities and we understand that larger cities can have advantages, particularly in terms of business and work opportunities, but we made a conscious decision to live in Oākura, a coastal village next to a small city so that our kids could grow up in a version of New Zealand that we ourselves enjoyed when we were kids. Kids can walk to the school, they can walk to the local shop alone, they can ride their bike to the beach in safety, all the time surrounded by a community of locals that we know and trust.

 I oppose the proposed plan as it will significantly change the nature of the village, is not consistent with the existing plans and rules and there is already ample land and sites available to support the expected growth of the area. I further oppose the proposed plan on the basis that the council has shown that it will not enforce conditions imposed on developments to mitigate their negative effects.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** We do not have any questions so thank you, Mr Martin.

**MR MARTIN:** No problem, thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Rowan Oldfield.

**MR OLDFIELD:** I thought it better just to read it through, it's under 4 minutes but there is, of course, repetition in there. I'll try and be as quick as I can.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes, and if you come across repetition if you can just move on.

**MR OLDFIELD:** I'll leapfrog through. My name is Rowan Oldfield and I have come 13,489 km to be here today. Why 13,489 km you may well ask? Well, that's the distance that I and my family travelled from the UK 20 years ago to settle in Oākura. Why Oākura when we had the potential to live in Europe, Australia, USA and Canada? We chose Oākura because of the community and the special character that exists within it. To convey that special character to you now is not easy but I will attempt to do that for you.

 The village is an extraordinary melting pot of nationalities combining together to create a cohesive functioning unit. The sight of children walking alone barefooted about the village is not uncommon and the sense of safety that exists within the village is palpable.

 The beach, of course, is a major attraction for all and is used throughout the year as is the heart of the village, slowly developing into a successful commercial centre where families and individuals regularly gather to catch up and hang out by the 4 Square or the cafes. The natural beauty is stunning with the Kaitake Ranges providing native bush with walking tracks and the surrounding undeveloped rural land combines to create what can only be described as a quintessentially New Zealand coastal village.

 The land proposed for the development is a beautiful addition to the landscape of Oākura, providing a gently rolling vividly green blanket approaching the stunning national park. To think that this land might possibly be permanently modified for the financial benefit of a few individuals is staggering.

 I am a school teacher with 18 years' experience across three countries and I can tell you that the pressures within a school to accommodate students within classrooms is a very real issue, not only for the young learner but for those expected to deliver and manage a learning environment. This proposal will utterly change the dynamics of the school and as most living within the proposed development will drive their tamariki to school the congestion, which is already considerable, will become unbearable. I can see the school from my house and hear the fire alarm when it goes. There are already distinct times of the day that I cannot effectively move from my home due to the congestion of the school run. I can only perceive that if this proposal were to go ahead this problem would indeed become even more of an issue for myself and those living nearby.

 It has been interesting to have read and listened to the proposal with the various sides offering their pluses and minuses on the issue over what seems like a considerable length of time. I have used this exact situation with various classes at my secondary school in New Plymouth where I work as an exercise in decision making.

 Being a geography teacher I could not have asked for a better lesson plan, complete with various expert reports, to land in my lap. I wish to thank the McKie team of experts for creating this wonderful resource. In doing so you have saved me hundreds of hours and considerable expense so that I can now spend that time with my family, enjoying the wonderful natural environment and views as I walk up Wairau Road looking out over the rural land towards the sea and on into the national park.

 The students are given the opportunity to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed development and the responses are very interesting. Overwhelmingly the students, aged between 14 and 18-years-old, choose to reject the development with justification based upon the environment and the negative impact on the residents' quality of life including, but not limited to, road congestion, pollution, runoff in the waterways, light and noise, loss of natural habitat, overcrowding of facilities such as parking provision, schools etc.

 There is, however, a twist in the tale of this lesson. If the exact same lesson is delivered but this time the students are given a role such as landowner, lawyer, school teacher, council member, long-term resident, local farmer, builder, property speculator, etc, etc, the outcomes are very different.

 We, as teachers and parents, try our absolute best in not only providing access to knowledge, learning opportunities and experiences but more importantly we all want our children and young people to develop values that focus upon what is right and just. To be able to place others needs above our own we expect our young people to be able to share, to now adversely affect others by their actions, to think of others, to show empathy and understanding. It has been very difficult to explain and justify what is being proposed in these terms to our young community members. If the development goes ahead I, for one, would struggle to explain how this decision came to be. No longer does it wash to just fob off our future leaders of the country with the line, "It's complicated adult stuff". It is not complicated at all. It appears to many to be very straightforward. To use the parlance of our time, it's a 'no brainer', clearly not needed and not wanted.

 I have been a member of the volunteer fire brigade in Oākura for 14 years and have been involved in some major events - including the gentleman that spoke earlier with this house - that have affected the village such as the tornado in July 2007. It is during these events that you truly get to see the heart and soul of the community, the way people share a common goal to help and support neighbours, to have faith in others to do the right thing for those unable to help themselves.

 The community shines its brightest in the darkest of times and, as should be glaringly apparent from listening to those standing before you this week, the proposal is indeed a looming threatening darkness, the magnitude of which we have never seen before.

 I struggle to find any benefits as there is already sufficient land allocation on the seaward side of the highway and with the spaces available within the village itself to satisfy any projected demand. I therefore request that the panel reject the proposal in its entirety and clearly signal to our young people growing up in a community that considered reasoning and the combined will of a community can make a difference, that the will and needs of those living in such a community can, with the tools of honesty and integrity, win through.

 I would like to finish with a whakataukī that I believe sums up what I've tried to say today and it is this: He aha te mea nui o te ao? He tāngata, he tāngata, he tāngata. What is the most important thing in the world? It is people, it is people, it is people. Thank you.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Mr Oldfield.

**MR COFFIN:** Just a quick question for you, you mentioned the village is an extraordinary melting pot of nationalities. Am I meant to take that there is quite a large number of people who perhaps are born or immigrated from other parts of the word?

**MR OLDFIELD:** Absolutely, I think it is extraordinary in that respect, yeah. For the fire brigade, to give you an example, we have 20 members and of that there are 8 New Zealanders, born New Zealanders.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Nothing further. Thank you, Mr Oldfield. Brian Clark? Welcome, Mr Clark. You are going to speak on behalf of yourself and your wife?

**MR CLARK:** Yes, thank you. Good afternoon or maybe good evening now. My name is Brian Clark. My wife and two daughters and I moved to Oākura village 12 years ago. I am a surfboard shaper and manufacturer. I am a current member of the local board riders club and a former committee member. My youngest daughter attended Oākura School. My wife is a librarian at the school for the last 11 years.

 We moved from California and found the lifestyle we were seeking here in our small village of Oākura. I am not a 'NIMBY' - which is not 'not in my backyard' - or against growth and development in our community but I want it to be undertaken in a manner that follows the community's vision of future growth. Coming from (inaudible) California I've seen the results of rampant growth without consideration to maintaining the local community's character; that's why we left. Capitalist ideals evolve around one main structure, return on investment: but at what cost? You cannot return to the past once the genie has been let out of the bottle.

 The statement of evidence of the Kaitaki Community Board: I stand behind the KCB. It showed that the community's needs will be met through pre-established long-term community plans; the Kaitaki Community Plan, the district and regional plans.

 I am concerned about the lack of clarity in much of this application. The council technical assessment - waters, landscape, traffic - all echo the same theme in all of the summaries; poorly resourced, if any at all, from the applicant. Therefore I wholeheartedly reject this proposal in its entirety. Thank you.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. You note you stand behind the KCB evidence. Were you involved or contributed to the engagement that the board undertook in respect of the evidence and the various plans that they have been involved with?

**MR CLARK:** I read through what their documentation is, what they presented and how they presented it. So that's how I've formed my opinions, what they've represented to our local community. That's just how I feel about what we should be going with, is what is already pre-established. The community and the council have always been working together over the years and I have always followed those notes and plans they have made at the committee meetings.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Thanks very much, Mr Clark. Graeme Mitchell?

**MR MITCHELL:** My name is Graeme Mitchell. I live in Dixon Street, Oākura. I've lived in Oākura for 25 years. My submission opposes the proposed plan change PPC48.

 While I understand and accept that development is required in communities from time to time I wish to use this hearing to question the appropriateness of the proposed plan change which comprises some 399 sections.

 I question how this change could be deemed appropriate given there is already sufficient supply of zoned and allocated land in Oākura to meet projected demand in the short, medium and long term.

 I also question how the proposed plan change could be deemed appropriate given that managed growth was a recurring theme from community feedback in the Kaitake Community Plan, the Oākura Community Engagement Project and the Oākura Structure Plan 2006. In my opinion the magnitude of the proposed plan change seems completely at odds with managed growth.

 I would also like to stress that I oppose an approval in part with regard to the proposed plan change. I am not confident a partial approval would still truly reflect managed growth as requested by the community. I do worry that the applicant is asking for the stars and may be given the moon. I therefore request that PPC48 be rejected in its entirety. Thank you.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. Just in terms of your comment about concern about a partial approval, not confident that would truly reflect managed growth. In your view is a partial approval related to the number of lots or do you have a concern about growth occurring in that locality in its entirety?

**MR MITCHELL:** My position would be I would oppose what was suggested in here to start with in terms of partial. My opinion would be to stick to the current plan, I understand a bit of that is FUD.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Mr Mitchell. We move to Max Gillespie.

**MR GILLESPIE:** Hi, my name is Max Gillespie. I oppose the plan. My family and I moved to Oākura two years ago from Auckland. I have a young family and the village and everything surrounding it has given us the most amazing lifestyle. Moving to a smaller community has seen our children grow more in the last two years than has been in the rest of their lives.

 It is a unique little town. My wife and I grew up in a small town in Auckland similar to Oākura. At the time you had the sea views and farmland etc. Over a period of years or so we saw it transform into an overpopulated high-density housed area and hence the move to Oākura.

 Before moving to Oākura we came down looking for some land to buy and build our dream home on. We found that piece of land in the Paddocks in Oākura. Before we purchased the land we looked at it a few times and met with the developer, discussing the village, the farms he owned, etc. During one of these conversations it was brought up about the piece of farmland for which this development is proposed. We were told while being looked in the eye - and this was at the beginning of 2017 - that nothing was planned for the land that we look at in front of us and if in the future he was to look at doing anything the lots would be no smaller than 2 acres and there was a discussion of a possible retirement village he was thinking about down by the main highway. Completely deceived is how we feel and this makes us continually question what the developer is assuring will be done is just a ploy to get the proposed development through.

 The situation is the same with regards to the gorse within this area. It will be taken care of; avoidance is all we have seen, extremely disappointing from a developer who appeared to be so proud of what he had done with the Paddocks. It seems it is all about the money and no regard for the people who live there.

 Also I have note here about the infrastructure. If this development was to go ahead there's obviously planned -- what is the planned infrastructure to sustain this sort of development or possible developments in the future? If this development was to go ahead what is in the future the proposed development from the past, if that also goes ahead, where is Oākura heading and what is the infrastructure to sustain this sort of development? Supermarkets, gas stations.

 Traffic; our community has enough problems with speed coming through and into the village and the amount of cars passing through, especially at school times. It is safe at the moment to look the kids walk and ride to school and we encourage it with an outside lifestyle. But with more traffic being created with the proposed amount of houses how will the roads cope? One road in and one road out. Having access only on to Wairau Road and not on to the main highway is one of the many reasons why the proposed site area is not logical.

 We love this little place. Oākura is special. It is special for many reasons but one of the main reasons is being a smaller community. In no way am I opposed to growth but growth of this scale in one spot just seems absurd and unfair. Thank you.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. Dorrien Andrews.

**MR ANDREWS:** My name is Dorrien Andrews. I am a resident of Oākura and I am against plan change 48. We live directly opposite the school, down Donnelly Street. My family and I love living in Oākura because of its small, beach-town community and for its close connection with the coast and the Kaitake Range behind.

 I accept that Oākura is going to grow, so with this inevitability I would like to to be the right growth. For me, the development of FUD south is the wrong growth for our community. I believe this because the mountain, the Kaitake Range, is an incredibly valued asset of the region. It is treasured by Oākura and the Taranaki community for its rugged, unspoilt natural environment and beauty. Development of the FUD south will encroach into that surrounding rural area, which is all part of the Kaitake Range vista which we love. The green belt around the base of the mountain in Kaitake I believe should be left rural and green, not surrounded by dense housing like the FUD south proposal.

 Some of the lots they are proposing are as small as 300 square metres and I think the community has already indicated there is a desire to keep the lot sizes no smaller than 600 square meters. FUD south goes against this thinking.

 The FUD west development is what I prefer, as it keeps Oākura compact on the sea side of State Highway 45. It more than meets Oākura's projected future growth and it completes the link of the east and west side of Oākura. The fact that Russell Drive and Cunningham Lane are dead-end roads indicates to me that it was always intended that that would be the next growth area for Oākura.

 I have concerns over the FUD south for its size and density, which could cause excessive population growth which Oākura School and the infrastructure will struggle to cope with. Oākura School is the backbone of our community and if the school role grows too fast it will add excessive pressure to the teachers and resources. This will have a negative impact on the community's kids.

 I accept FUD west could also cause this to occur, but for the reasons already stated, if Oākura is going to grow I would much rather FUD west be developed over FUD south. I would hope that FUD west being developed could be developed in a more sustain and sympathetic manner to the community than what FUD south development is proposing.

 For me, FUD south jeopardises the short- to medium-term viability of FUD west, which is where I think the new growth should occur. I do not think you can have FUD south and FUD west developed at the same time successfully. FUD south will cause unnecessary urban sprawl. Oākura is a small beach village, not a large growth town. To me FUD west makes sense. FUD south, however, makes no sense to me and all and I believe it will negatively impact the Oākura community. That is why I would like plan change 48 to be rejected in its entirety.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you. Mr Coffin?

**MR COFFIN:** Just at your paragraph 4, bullet point 4, you said:

"I would hope that FUD ‑‑ if you do west, could be developed in a more sustainable and sympathetic manner to the community."

What do you mean by more sustainable and sympathetic manner?

**MR ANDREWS:** I suppose I would hope that it would be developed slowly, that the sections would just be developed slowly as they are needed, whereas when I look at the FUD south development, it just looks like a huge development that if they can sell as many as they can, they probably will. If they could sell all of them tomorrow, they probably would.

**MR COFFIN:** Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you. Thanks, Mr Andrews. Kate Whittaker. Okay, we move to Grant Stewart.

**FEMALE SPEAKER:** Grant Stewart has rescheduled.

**COMMISSIONER:** Jackie Keenan.

**FEMALE SPEAKER:** Jackie Keenan is on at 6.30 pm.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Helen Shearer. Welcome, Ms Shearer.

**MS SHEARER:** Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** If you take us through your statement, please.

**MS SHEARER:** Yes, thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** Can you just pull the microphone a bit closer, thank you.

**MS SHEARER:** Thank you. I am Helen Patricia Shearer and I have been holidaying at Oākura for the past 60 years, and my late husband, Monty, and I have owned a beach property for over 45 years. During this time I have attended meetings involving the early sewerage schemes for Oākura, when large subsidies were offered for the development but no satisfactory agreement could be reached and so the scheme was never developed. My husband and I submitted opposition to the 1989/90 Beca Carter 40-year developmental report proposed by the North Taranaki County Council. This proposal never eventuated.

 I have attended meetings held by the New Plymouth District Council regarding car parking and dune concept, the development of Shearer Reserve and landscaping, as well as meetings when visions for the future of Oākura were invited. My lasting impression has always been that the residents wish to retain a certain village atmosphere, the height of buildings to be no more than three storeys high and future development be restricted to the area Corbett Park to the golf course. The thought of a possible bund wall along State Highway 45 is repugnant, blocking out that lovely southward view of the Kaitake Range and ring plain.

 In 2015/16 the Kaitake Community Board and focus group called for discussion and submissions for the New Plymouth District Council District Plan review. It was known that following the consent for The Paddocks subdivision there was an understanding given that lot 29 would be retained as a productive farming unit and would remain this way regardless of any future rezoning. An up-to-date and comprehensive 30-year plan was produced, showing that successful future development as well as allowance for growth could be achieved on the seaward side of State Highway 45 for the foreseeable future. This plan also allows two existing entry points on to State Highway 45.

 I believe this was when Oākura Farm Park Ltd should have been taking part in those important discussions. Instead, their 2018 application for a New Plymouth District Council plan change as meant a tremendous amount of voluntary work, along with associated costs, has had to go into opposing a scheme that could have been included in the 2017 District Plan review. I believe the village residents have been lied to.

 My concern now is that should this subdivision be successful there will be problems for the Wairau Stream. Twice in the late 1990s I saw the bridge at the bottom of Wairau Road and Tasman Parade closed by floodwaters. In 60 years I have never seen Oākura Beach change so much as it has in the past 12 to 18 months. Call it climate change or whatever, but the amount of sand deposited from avalanches on Mount Taranaki/Egmont has drifted down the Stony River and littoral drift has seen so much sand deposited all along the coastline. All stream and river mouths have been silted up and altered. Regular digging to their courses back to normal have often silted back up overnight or within days. The lakes and deep pools that have formed get stagnant and there seems to be no answer on how to overcome the situation. Nature is surely having its way.

 Therefore, until this can be fully remedied, any additional discharge through the Wairau Stream would be problematic. I am not convinced that, despite all engineering expertise put forward in the documents, additional runoff and peak flows of storm water from this subdivision can be averted, and especially the effects should a king tide and high rainfall happen coincidentally.

 I am totally opposed to a consent being given for this proposed and unnecessary subdivision, given the previous undertakings by the landowner. This land is a working farm and should remain that way.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay, thank you Ms Shearer. Mr Coffin? No, we do not have any questions of you. Thank you very much.

**MS SHEARER:** Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** Howard Reid

**MR REID:** It is going to be hard not to repeat what has been said.

**COMMISSIONER:** Please endeavour not to repeat, but you do have quite a short statement.

**MR REID:** I do. My name is Howard Reid. I live at 51 Jans Terrace, Oākura. This has been my residence for almost 30 years. I also have had a lifelong association with Oākura. I oppose the private plan change 48 on numerous grounds. I also have no expert witness statements but rely on my own observations and those that are set out in the comprehensive documents provide by New Plymouth District Council.

 Oākura does not need this plan change, as it will enable the applicant to developer a subdivision totally out of character with the environment and affect Oākura as a place to live. Oākura is a unique coastal township that should be allowed to grow at its own pace. New Plymouth District Council has assessed total anticipated demand for the next 30 years at 210 dwellings so there is no requirement for the proposed huge subdivision on Wairau Road.

 I ask why they want to do this. There are many reasons why they should not. Primary reasons are the effect on rural character. The District Plan states that it is important to ensure that the character of the rural environment is maintained both to protect amenity values and to ensure sustainable management. The result of the proposed plan change will forever modify the character of the local environment. Even a cursory read of the documents is enough. Negative effects on the infrastructure are outlined on the plan change documents, being traffic, water, sewage, storm water.

 In the current environment, is the plan change a sustainable development, is it needed, is it wise? The answer is a big no. I also oppose the plan change in any other form or type. The developer may try to advance his proposal as a smaller subdivision or modified lots. This should be regarded as a subterfuge in their long-term plan. The developer has only one goal and it will not benefit Oākura residents or the visual aspect of the Kaitake Range viewed from the township.

 In conclusion, I would hope that intelligent minds will see this proposal for what it is and not allow it to proceed.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Thanks, Mr Reid. Mr Coffin? We do not have any questions, thank you.

**MR REID:** Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** Mary Bishop.

**MS BISHOP:** Thank you. Mine is quite a long statement. I am not going to read it, I am going to summarise it for you. I have been here all week and heard all the arguments. I have listened to both sides with intent and I am well aware of what you are hammering in on. I think I have addressed some of them.

 I will start just by saying that I am in huge support of the 400 submitters, particularly the KCB in their statement. What Lynne Hepworth and Paul Veric sated I am absolutely in support of and absolutely in support of my fellow Paddocks members. I think my view might be a little bit unique in that I am a Paddocks owner, not only a Paddocks owner but the very first Paddocks owner. I think my experience in the formation of The Paddocks is relevant and my experience in the process that we went through, the statements that were made, the relationships that were formed and what happened subsequently. I want to touch on a couple of examples that I think illustrate what many of the submitters are saying. That is really what I am focused on.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you.

**MS BISHOP:** I have already told you that my name is Mary Bishop. I did want to say one other thing before I preface my comments. My husband is in support of these and I want to say that most of these comments are made with a heavy heart. This issue is really personal to me. I feel anguished about what is happening to my community and I feel aggrieved by the applicant's process.

 I consider myself to be a good friend of his, and I am aggrieved. His daughter is about to move in behind me and I hope, I really hope and I intend to make sure, that I have the great relationship with my other neighbours that I have with her, that we will be able to take care each other's children, that we will walk each other's dogs, that we will have keys to each other's houses, because that is what I do with my other neighbours and that is the kind of community we live in.

 I value relationships, just like he said he valued the relationships, but I also value integrity and I feel it is important to respect differing opinions and that is why I am here today. I think the biggest message that I want to leave with you is that I am really pro good growth. This plan change is not good growth and I oppose in its entirety. I opposed it for six reasons.

 The first is that commitment and intent matter. We came here 7½ years ago. I came here on the first day of 2012. It was just after The Paddocks consent was given. I had no idea about the controversy around The Paddocks. We came up to The Paddocks, we fell in love with the land, we fell in love with the views, we fell in love with the community. This community had very special meaning to us. We had lived on four continents, dragged our children all around and we really wanted to settle down and put roots in a place where we could build a home, we could raise our children and we could really begin to be a part of a community like Oākura.

 I signed that March, three months later, for the first Paddocks contract. That was the first of three. Two years went by and I stuck with Mr McKie to be able to develop The Paddocks. I believed in what we were doing. I believed in his views for a sustainable and positive environmental impact. I believe that The Paddocks subdivision was good growth. It was sandwiched between growth that already existed up at the mountain and down in the lower part of Wairau Road. It had a natural boundary and set up the QEII that would be a natural boundary for it. It set up the QEII, it identified a pond, protected it and most importantly it balanced the growth of The Paddocks subdivision with keeping the rest of the farm as a working farm.

 In my process I was going through this and we thought over these two years we actually got involved in what the additional special conditions were going to be and were entered in on our contract that were in addition to the consent notice that eventually came out. I suggested things to him, he incorporated them. I had all the stuff from Bluemarble in terms of the landscape and what it was going to be. I loved the idea that I was going to add to the native bush and I was going to plant 10 per cent. I have plated 500 native plants on my property.

 We started to talk about it. We talked about how developing The Paddocks and not developing the farmland was a good idea. I enrolled in an organics course. I was very much pro learning how to take care of the environment. His farm was going organic. He was super proud at getting rid of the urea and the incredible development that he had and success that he was having by going organic and getting rid of that urea.

 We finally signed on 15 July 2014, so we are now adjacent neighbours and Mr McKie's daughter were the three people that enable The Paddocks to go forward. I then became a huge advocate for The Paddocks. I defended the decision. I had lots of friends that I was beginning to make along Wairau Road who said, "No, no, no, he's going to come back, he is going to subdivide it again". "No, no, that is not what we are doing here. This is a good, good development", I said. He had me interviewed for the live magazine so that I could talk about The Paddocks development and what it was going to do. I was a spokesperson for him.

 It goes on and on about it. My point is that after two years we moved in and surveyors were happening. It seemed that the consent notice was put in in 2014. Two years later he is developing 399 lots in this entire subdivision, so it seems that all of that was a lie. It seems like everything that I was out there standing for was not correct. I think the commitment and intent should matter. I now realise that these three little words in the consent notice "unless there is a plan change" has given him a back door. But I think, I believe, that when you make statements, when you get out there publicly, when I stood by him and tried to help him sell another property to a friend of mine, and you make those statements, intent matters. You have to understand what intent is.

 One of the other ‑‑ in here I say at the end that six ‑‑ it is actually seven. I did not realise Mr Duff was going to speak, so it is 7 Paddocks members out of the 13 who are opposing this. All of them are telling you the same story. Mr McKie told us and we made our decision, that there would be no further development on lot 29. Intent matters. Intent matters a lot.

 I think him offering the consent, him making these statements, this is what is increasing my anguish here and the promise. Approval of this resource consent I think makes a mockery of this whole process and I think it makes a mockery of me. That is the major reason I oppose this.

 The second major reason I oppose this is I think community matters. I think this proposal is anti-community and that is a threat to the amenity I value most. You have heard everybody talk about how special this community is. You do not live here but let me tell you they are right. It is incredibly special. I have been thinking about this all week long and trying to figure out how do you explain how this community is so different. I told you I lived on four different continents before I ended up here. I have moved around a lot. There has never been a community that I have been in that is like Oākura. It moves together. It does things ‑‑ you heard people talk about all the programmes. The people in this community built it.

 You heard Fay Looney the other day talk about how the farmers moved the church, how they set up the fire department, how they brought the Crafty Fox there. What they did in the beginning of Oākura is what is being done today. People of Oākura volunteer their time to make Oākura run. They built Matekai Park and still every year get out and clean it and maintain it.

 You heard about the facts on the beach to prevent erosion and the kids at the school and the parents that volunteered to help clean the beach to make sure it is a good community asset. When there was a slip down at the beach and it needed to be replanted, 150 people showed up. When there was a call by the TRC to do the backyard Predator Free programme, 300 families showed up and took the traps. They had to order another 50 more. People show up.

 I have this one last little example that is kind of interesting to me, maybe not to you, but I think it kind of illustrates ‑‑ there is a tribe of Oākura Facebook group for women only. 48 per cent of the Oākura residents belong to it. It is an active Facebook group. 48 per cent. Think about that. 48 per cent of the people in this community are on an active Facebook group, working together to get things done. You would not believe the amount of things that get done there.

 My point is Oākura is thriving and succeeding because our people work together. This is the heart of Oākura and it is what I value about this place. This morning I was looking out my kitchen window. There is a slip. I am bordering right against the QEII. A slip happened about a year ago. Nobody has come to fix that slip or put any plants there. No one has volunteered. The woolly nightshade, and the gorse by the way, have taken over the QEII. No one comes to help.

 I have thought about this. Why? No one helps because no one was involved in its formation. No one shares in its ownership and no one feels that it is a community asset. They just do not think it has anything to do with our community, and therein lies the problem with this whole proposal. Our community thrives because we work together. We work ideas through, we value our relationship. That is what our community is about. That is how we are successful and that is what is threatened by increasing a village in one swell swoop by 60 per cent in a process where concerns and impacts on this and many other resources have not been addressed.

 I have listed four other concerns. We talked a lot about it. I would only say these things about them. The water supply. There is a huge debate between the experts and a lot of people have highlighted it. I am concerned and it is a real question how the applicant's experts can argue for using a lower number when houses are growing. The old traditional one toilet, one bathroom, does not exist. The amount of houses that have been renovated, people are putting in more toilets and more bathrooms. That uses more water. I have - maybe I am a little bit embarrassed to say this - three toilets, two bathrooms and an outdoor shower in my new Paddocks home. Sorry about that, that is a lot of water usage. You have heard somebody else talk about the fact that the last four summers we have been on water restrictions. There is uncertainty around the water supply.

 Discharge. Again, I am not an expert but the key question that I want to ask is if the proposed mitigation efforts have considered how people actually use their property. I have an acre and a quarter. Flooding on my acre and a quarter is a huge problem, like it was for Mr Duff. I only have six soak holes. I was shocked to hear that he had 23. Water runs on to my property. It comes over the bank and it comes down the driveway and I had to remedy this by constructing a 30-metre, 0.4-metre wide by 0.5-metre deep drainage channel around the whole south part of our property. What this does is it takes the water that runs over from the mountains and from my driveway and puts it into the QEII and down into the Wairau Stream.

 Three months ago my neighbours adjacent to me did the exact same thing, only they have an 80-metre driveway. In the next month I said that Mr McKie's daughter will move in behind me. He has apparently constructed two drains to do the same thing, pour it into the QEII the front of our property and the back of our property. There is an amazing amount of water crossing our properties, as Mr Duff pointed out. Has this been considered within the mitigation? Do the formulas calculate that? I would like to know that.

 I will not go into traffic safety and parking. You have heard so much about that. I would just say that the biggest point for me is that the traffic assessment that was done did not include anything about pedestrians and cyclists. I would concur 1000 per cent with the problem that the location of this development requires people to drive.

 My last point that I will just say is about the QEII. It is a problem. It is overrun with gorse, it is overrun with woolly nightshade. I am the rate owner, I am not the owner of the QEII. I am the person that I feel like I have done the most work on trying to help him get that under control. I was surprised to hear in the opening statements that he has been working very hard with the TRC to improve the QEII. It is one of my big issues with Mr McKie, that he does not, because two years ago I called him and said, "This is out of control". My property is out of control because everything in the QEII, which abuts my property on both the north and the west is coming into my ‑‑ all the woolly nightshade, all the gorse is covering the bottom part of my property and everything six months I seem to have to clean it out. So I called the TRC. I worked with the TRC and got us enrolled with a programme so that they kept coming to my property - because they were like, "Can I have access to it" - and we kept discussing what needed to be done. I got us enrolled so that the TRC came out to the QEII, but they started on the far end of the ‑‑ the closest to 45. They ran out of money, they ran out of time that summer and they said they only got about a third of the way up to address the woolly nightshade. They do not address the gorse, this is just the woolly nightshade. I had hoped that they were going to come back this summer. They did not; the problem is worse.

 I object to this plan change in its entirety. I do not support even the FUD south being developed, for all of the reasons that I have said. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you. Mr Coffin?

**MR COFFIN:** I do not have a question for you but I want to acknowledge how difficult it would have been to come here and put in writing some of your concerns and the feelings that you have, particularly in regards to what would have been a significant purchase for yourself and your family. I just want to acknowledge that.

**MS BISHOP:** Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** I do not have anything either. Thank you very much.

**MS BISHOP:** Thank you very much.

**COMMISSIONER:** Just bear with us for a moment. We are just considering the schedule for the rest of the afternoon, or not afternoon, evening. Jackie Keenan, are you here? No, thank you. Alexandra Thompson, I understand you cannot come tomorrow. Is Catherine Chung here? No. In a moment we will here from Jackie Keenan and then we will go to you, Ms Thompson. Is there anyone else here who cannot appear tomorrow? You are all together? I have that list. Anyone else who cannot come tomorrow?

 Okay, we will hear from Jackie Keenan, we will hear from Gillian Gibbon and we will hear from the Thompsons. Mr Murray, you cannot come tomorrow? Okay, so then we will hear from you and that will conclude the hearing for today. Then we just need to confirm the site visit also, Mr Muldowney. We will talk about the site visit once we have completed hearing from those submitters who I have outlined. Ms Keenan.

**MS KEENAN:** Thank you. I will keep it short and sweet.

 Hi, my name is Jackie Keenan and I have lived on Dixon Street in Oākura for the past 25 years. Growing up in a rural community in the South Island before shifting to Oākura village meant I still had the feeling of wide-open spaces with the mountain, Kaitake Ranges and the beach on my doorstep. We have especially enjoyed raising our three children in the village lifestyle that Oākura offers. During our children's primary school years we saw loss of green space with the junior playing field.

 I would also like to outline that the Oākura School has a unique relationship sharing land with the Oākura tennis club. The courts on this land are a valuable playing surface in winter when the school fields are closed due to mud and they are well used in summer. As a member of the Oākura tennis club committee I feel this is a community asset that would be threatened by the school requiring land for classrooms if the current proposal was approved. As others have mentioned, parking within the village is at a premium especially over summer at the beach.

 The village lifestyle our family enjoys involves walking, running, skateboarding, scootering or cycling around the village or up to the Kaitake Range. The increased traffic volumes will impact on children being able to move around the village safely. Walking to the Four Square for bread and milk involves crossing the main road. The Dixon Street main road intersection will become more hazardous with increased traffic volumes as there is already limited view shafts when cars are parked either side of the road to visit the Four Square, pub, pharmacy, café, as well as traffic turning into and out of Butlers Lane.

 I am proud to be part of the Kaitake Ranges trapping volunteers who are helping remove predators from theses ranges. We have meetings at the pub, have bait and safety devices at the BP and have numerous trapping lines that are checked on a weekly basis and recorded on Trap.NZ. The increased bird life and hopefully the release of kiwi in these ranges in the near future is exciting. The proposed plan of high-density housing in such close proximity to our national park will threaten this habitat we are trying to protect.

 The Kaitake community plan was created in consultation with the community and allows for future growth and development of Oākura by providing plenty of land to meet projected housing demand, close to the village and away from the Kaitake Ranges. I am not opposed to growth and development and the 2017 community plan allows for this, with consideration of our unique environment, which is why I object to this proposed plan change. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you. Mr Coffin?

**MR COFFIN:** Just on the second-to-last paragraph, in regard to your role with the volunteer trappers, just giving us maybe an idea of the number of predators and the types of predators that you have been able to catch so far?

**MS KEENAN:** It is usually ‑‑ we have stoats. Rats are the main ones but some stoats. We all get very excited if anyone gets a stoat. I have not looked on the actual catch thing for a while but they have been the main numbers that we have.

**MR COFFIN:** And the actual numbers of those?

**MS KEENAN:** It is definitely on the Trap.NZ website. It is definitely in the hundreds if not in the thousands. We are doing new trapping lines all the time. In the last month there have been three new trapping lines. I do not know if anyone has spoken about the programme there before but basically the community has taken over now that DOC is not having ‑‑

**MR COFFIN:** Yes, we had someone talk about it but not any results of what has been caught.

**MS KEENAN:**  We can definitely send you the numbers. They are looking at releasing kiwi. We are in discussions about releasing kiwi Christmas time or early next year.

**MR COFFIN:** I suppose the direct threat to those would be predation from perhaps stoats but more specifically dogs?

**MS KEENAN:** Yes, dogs and cats.

**MR COFFIN:** Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thanks very much. We will go to Gillian Gibbon. Thank you. Were you here earlier?

**MS GIBBON:**  I have been here since 3.00 pm.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Looking at your statement, there are matters such as, for example, traffic and that, that we have heard ‑‑

**MS GIBBON:** Absolutely. I would like to mention, though, that I am in a house very close to the junction of State Highway 45. Being very selfish about it, if this subdivision goes ahead I will struggle to exit my drive safely, so I do support all of the previous submissions that have mentioned the traffic issues, because I do think it is massive, not just on Wairau Road but through the whole of Oākura.

**COMMISSIONER:** All I am seeking is if you can just summarise as you go along, thank you.

**MS GIBBON:** I know that Climate Justice Taranaki is going to speak, but one of the things that I am very passionate about myself is the environment. I am an organic gardener. I studied horticulture up to level 4 in organics and my property is going to be bordering an area that is going to be very densely affected by traffic.

 I will just paraphrase as much as I can but I would like to read this bit. I would also like to highlight how this development, if approved, will affect the health and wellbeing of existing residents, especially those with lowered immune responses, the elderly and the very young. In fact, Penny, whose submission was read for her, as you already know has a little boy who suffers from cystic fibrosis. She is very close to the junction too.

 It is widely documented that the waste products from our vehicles are harmful. By more than doubling the number of vehicles in Oākura, the health of its residents and the health of our Oākura may well be compromised. Most engines produce carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxides and particulate matter, which add to global warming, acid rain and damage our health and the health of our immediate and wider environment. Car pollution affects air, soil and water quality. Nitrous oxide contributes to the depleting of the ozone layer. Sulphur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide mix with rainwater to create rain which damages crops, my own included, forests and other vegetation and buildings. This may impact on the Kaitake Ranges, undoing years of restoration and conservation work. It is well documented how oil and fuel spills from vehicles seep into soil near our roads, and discarded fuel and particulates from vehicle emissions contaminate our waterways.

 Particulate matter, hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide and other car pollutants harm human health. Diesel engines emit high levels of particulate matter, which is airborne particles of soot and metal. This causes skin and eye irritation and allergies. The very fine particles lodge deep in lungs where they cause respiratory problems. Especially for the Holdcrofts that is something that really, really needs to be considered if we are going to have perhaps another 1,000 cars trying to exit past our properties.

 Hydrocarbons react with nitrogen dioxide and sunlight and form ozone which as we all know is beneficial in the upper atmosphere but harmful at ground level. Ozone inflames lungs, causing chest pains and coughing and making it difficult to breathe. Carbon monoxide and other exhaust gases are particularly dangerous to infants and people suffering from heath disease because it interferes with the blood's ability to transport oxygen. Other car pollutants that harm human health include sulphur dioxide, benzene and formaldehyde. Nose from cars is also harmful, damaging hearing and causing psychological ill health. Is this to be the fate of Oākura and its residents?

 We have talked a lot about the strain on our existing social infrastructure. Once place that I have not heard because I have only been here today and I apologise for that is that both our kindergarten, and we have touched on playcentre, are actually located on land that does not allow or permit them to expand their building footprint without them losing their much-valued outdoor play areas. Kaitake Kindergarten is on Wairau Road, as you know, and that is a very, very valuable part of our community. I was instrumental in rebuilding that kindergarten after the 2007 tornadoes hit, and it is very, very dear to the Oākura community and it will be very adversely affected.

 The other thing is, as Rowan was earlier, I was a geographer. I would like to say that many, many studies, especially done in America in larger cities that have expanded rapidly, prove that places die rather than grow. Expansion of a site of this size could see our CBD die rather than flourish.

 I am also concerned that extra strain will be placed on our volunteer fire brigade as they are called to respond to more emergency situations. I do admit I have a claim there as my husband is a volunteer fire fighter. This will not lead to a happy and contended village community but one that bemoans the lack of facilities and atmosphere and perhaps to people who reminisce and say such things as, "Oākura used to be such a lovely village. Oākura used to have such a great school where every child's name was known by the teaching staff. Oākura used to have such an amazing Four Square" and so on and so forth. It could turn Oākura into a dormitory village, providing a residential area for those who work in New Plymouth, and little else, rather than the vibrant, caring and community-orientated village it is at present. Please do not let this happen.

 In conclusion, I ask that you consider the wellbeing and wishes of the many rather than the request of one landowner. If development is permitted on this land, the negative effects will permeate many aspects of our village and community life. Some of our most stunning rural vistas will be destroyed, our environment polluted and ecosystems put at risk. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak and to express my opinion and concerns.

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you.

**MR COFFIN:** At the very top of your second page there are two paragraphs talking about range of contaminants that you expect from combustion engines, petrol and diesel.

**MS GIBBON:** Because basically I am going to have possibly 400 cars idling outside my property for quite a long time.

**MR COFFIN:** Yes. My question is whereabouts did you get this information from?

**MS GIBBON:** That is basic high-school chemistry. You will find that on any environmental website if you care to look it up.

**MR COFFIN:** So you have sourced this from a website?

**MS GIBBON:** No, I have sourced this from my in-depth research over the last two years, where I have undertaken organic horticulture up to level 4. But again it is something that most children are now taught in school. As I say, that was never, in the bits that I read, really looked into or considered.

 I am also speaking on behalf of my husband and my son. I do apologise my husband is unable to attend.

**COMMISSIONER:** There are a number of paragraphs there that I think you have already covered off and other submitters have read.

**MS GIBBON:** We will indeed. What would you like me to read from this?

**COMMISSIONER:** In terms of what people make from developments, it is not a matter for us to concern. The fourth and fifth down, after, "I am opposed". Those two paragraphs.

**MS GIBBON:** And if I talk about the fire station?

**COMMISSIONER:** Yes, yes, and down towards the bottom where you talk about Predator Free also. We will take the rest as read.

**MS GIBBON:** Okay, thank you. As I have already said, my husband is part of the volunteer fire brigade and has been so since 2007. He and all his colleagues ‑‑ and I know that lots of people who have been here were the people who founded it 50 years ago.

 A development such as this, would double the infrastructure required. Ian mentions the school but he then also goes on to say that a second fire truck will likely be required. The current fire station accommodates one fire truck and a small support vehicle. In a fire truck you can only take four qualified fire fighters. The rest have to follow in the support truck or with a volunteer fire brigade they take their own cars. That is what we do. That is how we deal with problems in Oākura.

 A second fire truck would require a new fire station. That is on Donnelly Street. Again, the footprint of land there does not permit that, so again that is a huge concern to my husband. There is insufficient land at the current site to allow for this. We would also likely need an ambulance station. As you probably realise, the fire brigade is no longer the fire brigade, it is now the first response for emergency medical situations too, hence that comment.

 Again, Ian is very much involved in the community. We have been on many committees and still are and we too are involved Predator Free New Zealand. Millions of dollars have been spent to ensure that New Zealand becomes predator free. This number of houses, in this location, will introduce a significant number of cats to the Kaitake and Pouakai Ranges.

 Ian concludes with:

"I am very much against the development as I believe it will have a significant impact on our quality of life."

**COMMISSIONER:** Thank you.

**MS GIBBON:** My son probably could have been here, seeing the time now. Michael came to New Zealand when he was three, so he has only ever known Kaitake Kindergarten, Oākura School and for a short time we lived in Western Australia so he had a couple of years there. Oākura, the school and its environs are very, very dear to his heart. These are his words. They are not anything to do with me apart from the last sentence.

"Hello my name is Michael Gibbon. I am 16 years old, I have lived in Scotland, Western Australia and Oākura. I am currently at school and cannot attend this hearing, so my mum is reading my submission in my absence.

Oākura is a small, homely village, with only a few streets, a pub, Four Square, petrol station and a few other small businesses. Everyone knows everyone else and it's one of the most connected places I have lived in. The proposed subdivision of land will ultimately remove that feeling and warmth. No longer would our home be a home, but a busy, polluted and congested town, with a clogged-up road system that was never intended to support the amount of traffic that would come with hundreds of new houses.

Right now, Oākura has the perfect harmony between man and nature. Wild bushland flourishes and pollution is at a low level, as our village has only ever taken what it needs.

From beach to dense forest in under a few minutes is one of the very special aspects of our village. It is populated by many friendly people, but it is not interfering with the natural world. I think this needs to be preserved, as so much of the world has become inhabited by man, habitats destroyed and wildlife threatened to extinction. Why should our village undergo a similar fate?

As well as the points I have made, I believe the value of property in Oākura will fall."

He is actually very materialistic, as many 16-year-old boys appear to be at the moment.

"Many homes here are part of peoples' retirement plans, their pensions, and represent years of hard work. Adding hundreds more properties to the village in this way would diminish the value of current properties, also stripping the appeal of our village. This place we call home should never be a town, it is not Spotswood or Whalers Gate, it is our small village home by the beach, filled with natural colour and happy faces."

I probably will not talk about the school as that has all been put there, but Michael did say:

"When I was a pupil there everyone knew everyone else. Bringing all these houses in to its catchment area however, will make it more impersonal and the size of a high school.

I also believe that our small businesses would collapse, as the amount of people would warrant a supermarket, making our Four Square obsolete. I also think our other shops would suffer. This development is not growing a community, it is collapsing one."

As I have said, I asked him to put at the bottom, "I oppose this private plan change in its entirety". Thank you. Thank you for letting me jump the queue. Thank you, my job did not allow me to come tomorrow. Thank you very much.

**COMMISSIONER:** Cam Murray. Thank you, Mr Murray. I presume you have been here for a while today?

**MR MURRAY:** I have. I was here the first day, I was here yesterday afternoon.

**COMMISSIONER:** Okay.

**MR MURRAY:** There are some points I will cut out as I go along.

**COMMISSIONER:** Yes, if you can summarise, that would be helpful, thank you. But certainly we consider the whole statement.

**MR MURRAY:** I was going to start out with good afternoon and then it became good evening, and now it has become good night. I think I am the last one on tonight, so it will be good night. I have to compliment you and the staff for the immense amount of stamina you have to sit through all of this. It is amazing.

 My name is Cam Murray and I live at 1325 South Road, which is a short distance south of the property in question. I neighbour the Greensill farm. I believe you heard from Mr Greensill. He lies adjacent to the Oākura Farm Park.

I am not an expert witness, rather an informed and concerned citizen with a little academic background in Urban and Resources Geography from Victoria University, Wellington, and Simon Fraser University in British Columbia, and a very lengthy involvement in citizen participation in urban planning.

While I applaud the design concept put forward by Mike McKie, I can't support the application because of its size and scope and the negative impact it will have on the natural and built environment.

My submission will address three main areas: the overall impact of the proposal; Key infrastructural concerns and provisions for lot 29 from the previous Environment Court hearing:

(1) The Oākura Structure Plan implementation in February 2006 identifies one of eight categories of action to be implemented in the plan as a "Sense of Place", which considers how the coastal environment and the natural character of the area and the special features make Oākura a unique place. This proposal would definitely have a significant impact on the sense of place. Furthermore, the draft district plan specifies under policy sub P4, number 4, that the site under consideration - that is 1225 South Road, property ID 114669 - must avoid subdivision in the rural zone, which reflects the patterns of development more typical of an urban zone.

 I won't go through the infrastructural issues because you've heard ad infinitum about the infrastructural issues. The only thing I would say is I hope in your site visit you plan for tomorrow, if you haven't already been so, that you would take the opportunity to have a look at the school and to see when the Ministry of Education -- and I believe I heard Mr Muldowney say on Monday that the Ministry of Education indicated the school roll could comfortably get to 1,000. I think that's unbelievable. I was a classroom teacher for 40 years. I've looked at the site. I know that site quite well. I just can't believe that the -- what the impact this would have on the overall character of the school, so I hope you'd have a look at it tomorrow to see what --

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes, no, we will be visiting there.

**MR MURRAY:** Thank you very much. So, as I say, I'll leave water and traffic. You've already heard enough about that.

 The final point though is lot 29 and the matter of consent. I have consistently, in my submissions and in my discussions with Mr McKie and Mr Comber, opposed the lifting of the covenant. I urge you not to accede to Mr Muldowney's quoting the RMA in support of his desire to see it struck down. It was an integral finding of the previous RMA hearing regarding the Paddock Subdivision, and in section 24.9 on page 109 Ms Tobin specifically ruled that:

"Lot 29 shall not be further subdivided while the land remains in the Rural Environment Area."

This provision was put in place to ensure that open space would be retained over the balance of the allotment - you heard that very passionately from Ms Bishop earlier on this evening - and because the applicant, Mr McKie, expressed the intention during the hearing of retaining this lot - that is 29 - with a "Protected Farm Status in the longer term regardless of zoning", and surely the longer term is more than eight years.

Conclusion: from the foregoing, you can see I'm not in favour of the proposal as presented. I'm not convinced that the modifications presented by the applicant's team go far enough to meet my concerns and those of others I've heard. I can't support even the scaled down conclusions of the Boffa Miskell team; 167 lots of dwellings will still put considerable pressure on the natural and built environments, on the infrastructure and the overall wellbeing of the Oākura community. I also disagree with the final point in their report - 15.8, page 61 - which pertains to the consent notification in which they advocate an amended consent notice wording being prepared, a change that I think will overturn the important provisions of the earlier RMA report.

If I was sitting at your desk - and I'm sure that Mike is glad I'm not - I'd suggest he go back to the drawing board, and despite Mr Muldowney's dismissal of the triangular FUD segment as being unviable I'd start there: work up a small residential development proposal for that piece of land, put together an equestrian community on the southern fringe and extend the paddock's lifestyle blocks down towards the western edge of the state highway and then come back and consult with the community to see whether that in fact would meet the requirements. Thank you very much.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. No, thank you, Mr Murray. Mr Coffin?

**MR COFFIN:** A small question. Simon Fraser University, could you remind me which city is it?

**MR MURRAY:** Sorry?

**MR COFFIN:** Which city is Simon Fraser University in in British Columbia?

**MR MURRAY:** Which State is Simon Fraser?

**MR COFFIN:** Yes.

**MR MURRAY:** You are from Vancouver, are you?

**MR COFFIN:** I have visited there a number of times --

**MR MURRAY:** Oh, you have been.

**MR COFFIN:** -- but I went to Victoria University on the island.

**MR MURRAY:** Okay, yes. My daughter went to university in Victoria. I did a research for the South Surrey Plan.

**MR COFFIN:** Okay.

**MR MURRAY:** Surrey is, as you know, a municipality adjacent to Vancouver. I was asked to do the research and I sat down, and while I was doing the research I was asked to stay on if I was interested, after I presented the research to the committee, and inadvertently made a couple of comments to one of their people around the panel and they said, "You've hit exactly what you want, so you stay here", and so I finished up writing the first draft of the report. And the nice thing about it was they never did develop -- well, they developed it in a way that fitted in with what the community in South Surrey could handle.

**MR COFFIN:** Thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** There is nothing further, so thank you, Mr Murray.

**MR MURRAY:** Thank you very much.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** So we will move to Alexandra Thompson, Erica and Edward Thompson. So you can come up all together.

**MRS THOMPSON:** Three pages. I will try to summarise where I can without losing the essence of my --

**THE COMMISSIONER:** It would be great if you can do that. Thank you. I am just looking at your statement, where you talk about the school, so if you can please summarise because we have heard significantly on that.

**MRS THOMPSON:** Yes, I will do and there's also areas on traffic which I'll try to summarise as well.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes. But I am also suggesting, in terms of your statement, summarising what you have got here.

**MRS THOMPSON:** Yes, I will try my best.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Thank you.

**MRS THOMPSON:** Okay. My name is Alexandra Thompson and I live at 110A Wairau Road, Oākura, with my husband and two children. The rear of our home borders the Wairau Stream with the applicant's farm on the other side of the stream.

I have many concerns with this proposal, a lot of which have already been covered by submitters previously and also in the experts' reports that have been given to you. I have tried to just include the factors that are really strong and important to me, such as the school and traffic and community.

The location of our house on Wairau Road was an important factor in buying our home. We wanted our children to be able to walk safely to kindergarten and school as well as the other accessible amenities within the village. These amenities, as well as a strong connection with a community that knows each other well, has allowed our children to enjoy a freedom in their childhood that has sadly disappeared in other parts of the country and the world. I believe this is worth protecting from intense development that does not have the community at heart.

Both my children have been students at Oākura School for all of their primary years. You have heard the school obviously earlier report on what is happening with the space. I would just like to say that my children in their time there have seen the roll grow with a resultant loss in indoor and outdoor spaces to make room for new classrooms and storage. Due to the increasing roll my children have also experienced class sizes that exceeded 30 students.

As a primary school teacher myself, I understand the importance of space so that children can get outside and let off steam, especially when there are 30 plus bodies in a classroom.

I have heard mention that the Ministry claims that the school can cater to 1000 students. I can't bear to think what that would look like. One of my concerns is the pressure that this would not only put on space but on the intermediate facility that is available in the school.

I know as parents many of us have valued that our children have the opportunity to remain at intermediate locally and to not have to transition to a large school in town at an age that research shows is very fragile for adolescents. Having intermediate students within a primary school is a win/win from the oldest to the youngest. Having witnessed firsthand older students working alongside, guiding and caring for younger ones, it's clear how it helps develop caring citizens for our future.

I am concerned that the school will not be able to accommodate the growth that this development would bring, therefore changing both the physicality and the essence of the school.

Lots of people obviously have mentioned the traffic and the situation in Donnelly Street and have gone into great detail about that. The 'Let's go' initiative has been mentioned by the school. We as parents have tried to support that. We've wanted our children to walk to school, scoot to school, bike to school with that and we've supported that initiative. But it's taken a lot of time and training because I know my children have had to negotiate two busy intersections and a state highway, so to have the confidence to allow them to do that has taken a lot of time and effort, and with this development I see that only getting worse and harder for parents to allow their children to walk and scoot and bike to school.

 The traffic situation at the intersection of Wairau Road is a strong concern of mine. This junction has already been highlighted as ineffective for the volume of traffic using it, and I have many worries as the children approach this area where they're going to school or around the village.

Cars, vans, logging trucks, et cetera, all approach this area at high speed. A further increase in traffic at this intersection would be inevitable with the size of the proposed development. A roundabout has been suggested as a solution to this problem. Having lived in countries where roundabouts are in abundance, I have seen them used effectively to increase traffic flow, i.e. keep traffic moving in high density areas. The thought of a roundabout at this intersection fills me with dread. The thought of it helping the said trucks, et cetera, to keep moving just highlights the potential danger for anyone walking, scooting, biking around the village. I suggest maybe on your site visit stand at that junction or even sit in the car and see how busy it is there. Bearing in mind --

**THE COMMISSIONER:** We have been there already.

**MRS THOMPSON:** Bear in mind it is meant to be a 50 kilometre zone.

 You have obviously heard a lot of people this week talking about the uniqueness of the community. It's been a privilege to hear other people's submissions in the last two days or two afternoons. Unlike some who've had generations of family live here or others who have actually sought after Oākura as a home, my family arrived here by accident, with very little knowledge of the village, with an intention of probably moving on within a couple of years. We are still here 11 years later. It was soon evident to us that Oākura was a special place to live. We couldn't believe that we were lucky enough to have landed somewhere with so many accessible amenities on our doorstep. So when we bought our property ten years ago we believed we were making an investment in our family's lifestyle.

You have probably heard it said that -- many people have said so far that Oākura is unique. To me this means community, the people. It is at the heart of everything. Over the years I've been amazed at how the community operates on a mostly volunteer basis. I have seen residents use their skills and time to the good of the community, through events, buildings, the school and even the welfare of each other. The community has worked hard alongside the Kaitake Community Board to come together and plan development and changes that will suit the area that we believe can be steadily absorbed.

 The Oākura structure plan has already identified other areas for development on the seaward side. The Wairau Estate development was not part of these conversations. I am worried that if this plan is approved it would negate all that work, all those conversations that have been undertaken by the council, the KCB and the Oākura community. The Wairau Estate, therefore, appears to me to be opportunistic and one-sided. I'll skip the next bit.

 I would like to mention the building process. There's a lot of talk about the completion of a housing development of that size. We also need to bear in mind that we'll be living with a development, so I'm concerned about the impact that will be caused during that process. The building process itself would cause distress to many with the intrusion of noise, the coming and going of contractors' vehicles, and the traffic congestion over an extremely long period of time. When we bought our home this was something we didn't think we would have to face. In the time that we have been living on Wairau Road there have been numerous properties built on infill sites. We had quite a lot of spare land opposite our house and those have steadily been in-filled.

These properties, along with the Paddocks, have caused a big increase in traffic up and down Wairau Road, which can include an average of three to four trade vans per property. The building period of a development of this size will multiply this and I believe the infrastructure is not adequate to cope.

The last part I'd like to mention is assurances and promises. I've heard people talk about integrity, honesty and even lies. I was thinking about skipping this last paragraph but I think it's important that you hear that from each submitter.

Prior to investing in our home ten years ago, I contacted the council to find out if there were any plans for development on this farmland. I was informed that because this land was zoned rural nothing should ever happen and, if it did, it would take over 20 years for the land to be rezoned. Disappointingly, merely 12 months later, we received the first paperwork from the council regarding the proposal for the Paddocks. Suddenly we were involved in our first submission process. As with many other residents at that time, our main question and concern about the approval of the Paddocks development was what further development was to be sought later. The applicant stated verbally at a meeting at the time that if he was not granted the cluster development, known as the Paddocks, he would go ahead and subdivide the whole area with large scale plots that were allowed.

The applicant also stated that if he was granted permission for the cluster development, he had no desire to further develop his farm, and we have heard that mentioned. The KCB submission also refers to this in paragraph 23.

To conclude, I would like to stress that my submission is based on a concern to protect the wellbeing of the land, the environment and the community, not just for ourselves as residents today. This is a special area. Therefore, I ask that the plan change be declined in its entirety.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Thank you, Mrs Thompson. Mr Coffin.

**MR COFFIN:** I do not have any specific questions.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** No. We do not have any questions so thank you.

**MRS THOMPSON:** Thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Welcome, Ms Thompson.

**MS THOMPSON:** Thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** If you can take us through your statement.

**MS THOMPSON:** Okay. My name is Erica and I live on Wairau Road. I have lived in Oākura since I was 18 months old. This is my home. I am against the proposed subdivision called Wairau Estate on this particular area of land.

Presently, I am a Year 8 student at Oākura School and have been a student here for all my school life. Throughout the years, our school has grown at a steady pace but we have lost many playing spaces due to the increasing number of students. Firstly, we lost an adventure playground to two classrooms and, secondly, we lost a gallery room, which was converted to an additional classroom, and finally we lost a memorable junior playing field that was used to place one new classroom on.

The small grassed playing area was a favourite for the younger children who were sometimes scared to play on the large field with the older and bigger children. Unfortunately, since the field has gone, this is now the only area of grass available to them. Now we have a larger amount of students and less playing space for exercise and fresh air.

If this large amount of housing comes to be, there is no hope for our future school. Who will be responsible for building us a new school and who will be responsible for providing the green space for us to grow and thrive in?

I have seen developments in Oākura that have improved our village. For example, the new skate park where I enjoy skateboarding and hanging out with my friends. Also, both the surf club and Boardriders have been developed to include old and new members. A development of this size would ruin the village community feel that I and my friends enjoy so much.

My time at Oākura is coming to an end as I will be leaving for high school at the end of this year. However, I am submitting against the plan change as I care about the future students for Oākura School. I hope they will be able to enjoy the spaces to learn and grow as I have. Therefore, I ask for PPC48 to be declined. Thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay, thank you. Mr Coffin.

**MR COFFIN:** Ms Thompson, how old are you?

**MS THOMPSON:** I am 13, turning 14 on 14 August.

**MR COFFIN:** And you prepared this submission yourself?

**MS THOMPSON:** Yes, I did.

**MR COFFIN:** Well done. I did not have any questions for you but I would just like to acknowledge that you are a much younger person than I was when I did my first submission at the age of 23, so well done to you. Thank you very much. It was very clear and well presented. Thank you.

**MS THOMPSON:** Thanks.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** So just one clarification. Your major concern is to ensure that the existing amount of green space at the school is retained?

**MS THOMPSON:** Yes.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Thank you very much.

**MS THOMPSON:** Thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes, Mr Thompson, welcome.

**MR THOMPSON:** Thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** I am just making sure the paperwork stays together. Over to you.

**MR THOMPSON:** Thank you, gentlemen. My name is Edward Thompson and I ask that PPDC 48 be declined in its entirety. I have lived in Oākura since 2008, having raised both my children from the ages of two and four to now 13 and 15. I do not pretend to be an expert in the field of traffic, town planning or New Zealand law. What I do consider myself to be is someone who is honest, i.e. keeps promises, and considerate of others with my actions, so I thought I'd fit right in in New Zealand.

My wife and I purchased our house on Wairau Road for many reasons. Our house is bordered at the rear by the tributary of the Wairau Stream that separates us from the esplanade and the current farm. Amenities that made our decision to buy; raise a family and put down roots where we did include the ability to walk to the school, beach and the CBD areas of Oākura.

All four of us very much appreciate the work that has been done before and since our arrival by longstanding residents of the community. Surf clubs, tennis courts, volunteer fire brigade and an excellent school come to mind. We are very thankful to the members of the Kaitake Community Board for all the hard work they have put in drafting the long-term plan for our village. It was great to be part of the consultation for this plan and made us feel part of the community when our opinion was asked for. They have made our community a place where I hope my family will live for generations.

Shortly after purchasing our house it came as a surprise to be presented with the Paddocks development. The inclusion within this was the esplanade strip that would border the rear of my property. Although there are rules as to the use of this walkway - for example, no motorcycles, horses and dogs - I have seen many times where these rules have been broken and not respected. Any further urbanisation of the land on the other side of the esplanade will I feel increase the possibilities of nuisance, reduce the security of my property and increase my stress in years to come. Policing of this area is something that would be difficult and who would be responsible for this policing?

During the process for allowing the Paddocks development we in Oākura were promised that no further development of the McKie farmland would happen. Now in a few years' time we have the situation where the long-term plans of the village are wanting to be changed by an individual that we were supposed to trust. I would like to know how we can be expected to give any trust going forward.

Experts have presented how the negative aspects of the plan change can be mitigated. Based on past performance, I have very little faith that these mitigations will happen as promised. The responsibility and ownership of these problems can be passed from person to person and before we know it nothing gets done. I feel if the land was to be rezoned it would be mortgaging the safety and the future of our village and the people within it.

In November 2016, we all witnessed a terrible accident that resulted in the death of one gentleman on State Highway 45 approaching the Wairau Road crossroads.

Although we love Oākura and its environments, it is unfortunate in a way that there are few opportunities for employment here. This means that both my wife and I must head towards New Plymouth for work. I imagine any future residents of the proposed development would not be much different.

Over the years, the volume of traffic on the State Highway 45 Wairau Road crossroads has increased. The lack of knowledge of traffic rules and an increase in impatience, due to longer queues, increases the risk of further accidents.

The opportunity for my children to walk to school and around the village safely is one of the positive points of living there. An increase in traffic volume would greatly reduce this. So, please, Mr Commissioners, if you get the opportunity spend some time during rush hour at the crossroads or at the Donnelly Street intersection, especially on a rainy day at school knock off times, you can see how busy and congested and impatient people get.

Again, I am not an expert in road safety. I cannot see how a roundabout on State Highway 45 will increase safety and reduce the likelihood of an accident.

I learnt to drive in a British town with its fair share of roundabouts. I soon realised how people must be educated in their use. When I sit at the Wairau State Highway 45 crossroads and witness logging trucks and twin milk tankers fly by at much more than the 50 kilometres an hour speed limit, I can picture people in long traffic queues, who may be late for work or dropping their children off at the overcrowded school, taking chances to join the traffic moving eastward. I have listened and read the applicant's experts on how to deal with the increased traffic, but I am certain that it will not be these experts or the applicant that will be out there sweeping up broken glass or much worse.

The prospect of many years of continuous building work is something that gives us great worry. Any time the wind blows from the west dust will be sent over our house, garden, car, washing, et cetera. This will be a situation I'm sure people have to put up with from time to time. However, the duration of any urban development on the farm would be enough to affect the quality of life of the residents living on the west side of Wairau Road for many years.

Any person doesn't need to be an expert in town planning or psychology to see that any development of farmland will drastically change the village forever. I myself - and I am sure I will not be alone in having a constant fear of what will be coming next on the land, based on what we have experienced already with the Paddocks - am very worried that the quality of life for my family and our friends and neighbours will be affected and changed from what we have now. Off the top of my head, I can imagine that our safety, security, travel times, views of the beautiful Kaitake Ranges will be changed forever.

I ask again that this plan change be rejected in its entirety. Thank you, gentlemen.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Thank you, Mr Thompson. Mr Coffin.

**MR COFFIN:** Just at the bottom of page 1, the last paragraph you say:

"Although there are rules as to the use of this walkway, for example no motorcycles, horses and dogs, I have seen many times where these rules have been broken and not respected."

What was it specifically you were --

**MR THOMPSON:** I've seen horses. I've seen people walking dogs, many, many times. I've seen a four-wheel motorcycle on there too, so that's the three things that aren't allowed on there.

**MR COFFIN:** Have you seen a motorcycle once on there or many times?

**MR THOMPSON:** It was possibly the same motorcycle but for several weeks until he got the message that he shouldn't be on there.

**MR COFFIN:** Okay. And maybe a sensitive matter - this is just half way down on the second page - you said in November 2016 you witnessed a terrible accident. What was the nature of that accident? Was it a car accident?

**MR THOMPSON:** I think the Coroner has done a report on that. Yes, it was a gentleman on a - I hope I'm not upsetting anybody by talking about this - tractor travelling towards the village and he was clipped by an elderly gentleman in a car coming behind him. The tractor went into the ditch and the gentleman sadly died. So, I can only assume it was due to the danger of the intersection.

**MR COFFIN:** Okay.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Just one question, Mr Thompson: on your last page in your middle paragraph where you highlight your concerns about continuous building work, and you talk about the wind blowing from the west, the prevailing wind, is that the prevailing wind?

**MR THOMPSON:** It comes from all angles but, yes, more often than not it's coming from that way.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** All right. Just as a comment, it might be unusual for Taranaki but I don't know if it will be a rainy day for our site visit tomorrow.

**MR THOMPSON:** No.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Thank you. Oh, sorry --

**MR THOMPSON:** It's just we do try to get the kids to walk to school as much as we can but, yes, the rainy days where everybody is -- even like a 300 yard journey, it's like if it's throwing it down that much you go and get in the car.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Thank you.

**MR THOMPSON:** Thank you, gentlemen.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** I have just got one final addition to here. Jaynie McSweeney, I've been advised you have a short presentation and this will be the last submitter we hear from tonight. There might be one or two paragraphs here that we have already covered off on these matters, such as Donnelly Street so --

**MS MCSWEENEY:** Yes. I actually live on Donnelly Street, what I have put in there, so I don't know if that interests you or not so ...

**THE COMMISSIONER:** We are more than happy to take matters as read but over to you to take us through your statement.

**MS MCSWEENEY:** Yes.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Thank you.

**MS MCSWEENEY:** So my name is Jaynie McSweeney. I'm incredibly out of my comfort zone right now but I've made myself get up to oppose the subdivision and the outcomes it brings with it.

We moved here 13 years ago from Auckland, which was a big change in lifestyle. We've since had three kids who attended Oākura School. They're incredibly lucky to go to Oākura, a trusting community, enjoying an outdoor lifestyle which will be lost if the subdivision goes ahead. We might as well go back to Auckland, basically, if it goes ahead. I am not opposed to growth but growth on this scale I am.

I love it that I can go for a run, walk to the shops, say hello to people and they ask how I am back again and that my kids can also do the same thing. It's safe for them.

The school obviously is too big now. They're going to lose their green space and Oākura kids are about being outside. If you look at the fields at school time, at lunchtime, intervals, it's chocker with the kids running outside playing, all ages. They play together, five-year-olds out with 11/13 year-olds. It's not fair if you take it away from them.

I'm going to talk about the traffic. A dead end street, what goes in has got to come out. It's a disaster there at 3 o'clock and for Kelly(?) Club after school, when people go to pick up their kids, cars come flying down there. There's always kids at the school playing soccer, basketball, whatever, and people forget that kids are always there.

I don't know if you know that the trucks unload in the middle of the road on the main street because there's no parking for them. I don't know what else you've heard. Already there are lots of near misses.

 I work down at the surf club. Over summertime there it's disaster. Kids have to cross the road from one side of the main street to the other. There's traffic up and down there the whole time. We're so lucky that nothing has happened as yet, touch wood. It's hard to believe that we've put this structure plan together of how Oākura can develop. It was all agreed on and now -- it's hard to believe that this has got -- this amount of money and time has been spent never to be recovered on it. It shouldn't have got this far. I think it's ridiculous that a single person who does not live in Oākura has been allowed to take it so far when over 450 people who actually live in Oākura oppose the subdivision. Please listen to us. The people of Oākura do not want this to go ahead.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Thank you. Mr Coffin.

**MR COFFIN:** I do not have any questions, thank you.

**MS MCSWEENEY:** You can come and stand on my section tomorrow if you want and see the kids all playing out there, or try to leave my house at 3 o'clock during the day.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. No, I do not think I have anything either. No. Thanks very much.

 Mr Muldowney, if I can just outline Mr Coffin and I envisage two parts of the site visit tomorrow, so if I start with the 9.00 am part of it because we wish to go over the subject site and suggesting that is at 9.00 am. So the arrangements for that, if we met - because Mr Coffin and I will make our own way out to Oākura earlier than that - at 9.00 am and presumably, given we are going on to a farm, we will need to be escorted.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** Can I just enquire; I did send a note to the Hearings Commissioner with a suggested series of views to be taken tomorrow. Do you have that, sir?

**THE COMMISSIONER:** When did you send that?

**MR MULDOWNEY:** It was emailed at 4.45 pm today.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** No, I have not looked at it. Okay.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** I am told it will be in your inbox.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** What I can say is that there are a series of viewpoints that have been identified in that note. The first viewpoint is obviously in relation to the site itself. What I am suggesting is that there is an access point to the site up on Wairau Road north of -- when I say "north", upwards of the Paddocks subdivision.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** When you reach the end of the Paddocks subdivision and you hit the water reservoir you will know you are at the entrance point to the subject site and there will be -- Julie McKie of the -- is it still McKie? Yes. Julie, who is Mr and Mrs McKie's daughter, who is farming on the site, she will be there to meet you and she can take you on to the site, no doubt with a short health and safety induction.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. So, that is fine. I would also, given that situation, like a submitter representative.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** I am in your hands, sir.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** That does not worry me who that is but I just wanted to highlight that.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** Will you have a representative from council with you also?

**THE COMMISSIONER:** A timely question. Mr Wesney, is the council going to participate in the site visit?

**MR WESNEY:** I was not anticipating needing to be but if you thought that would be helpful we can (overspeaking)

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. I presume that we are being driven over or we are walking over, Mr --

**MR MULDOWNEY:** I am told a spare set of shoes would be advisable, so I imagine you will be doing some walking. There may be a combination. I mean we will be in your hands as to how you want to traverse the site. It is walkable of course but there may be some driving involved.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. No, that is fine. No, that is all right. Well, a council representative is welcome, Mr Wesney. I will leave that decision to you. I will liaise with Jane in terms of a submitter representative and, just for the clarity of everyone, this is not about the opportunity for everyone to be part of the site visit. The site visit is for Mr Coffin and I to look. I just want to make sure, in terms of being very open and transparent, there is obviously going to be someone from the applicant. There will be Mr Coffin and myself, a submitter representative and potentially the council.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** That is fine. I will certainly have a conversation this evening about the correct protocols for a site visit and the privacy that needs to be applied.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes. No, that is fine. Thank you for that.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** So, in addition to the site itself, there is a series of other areas that the applicant was keen to ensure that you captured in your site visit and - as I opened - it was the wider context really. What I have done is list a series of areas or milestones outside of the subject site, which we would like you to take in, and there are all the sorts of things that you would expect: the school, Donnelly Street, the relevant intersections, the wider urban environment in Oākura, so I do not imagine there will be anything of surprise on the list. The only thing that may catch your eye was the -- and these are nice to haves, bearing in mind that there is probably going to be some time constraints and they are at the bottom of the list, and one was the Green School on Koru Road. The only reason I have identified that was there has been some evidence led from other submitters questioning the progress of the Green School, and I am told that it is consented and is under construction. And so, if you wanted to resolve any factual issue around its progress, you could take a detour down Koru Road.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** But recognise that if timing is an issue that might be something that has to be parked. The other one along similar lines was the Surrey Hill termination point, which is right at the extension where the trail that we identified in opening, the biking and walking trail, terminates. And there is, I understand, a public carpark or some sort of car parking facility ultimately to be developed there which will accommodate people who are parking and hopping on bikes or hopping on the trail. Again, good to view if you have time but I would not want to see the site visit compromised just to get out there to see that, so that again is in that category of nice to have, really.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** What Mr Coffin and I have been thinking about is whether we actually start at 8.00 am and visit the more contextual points, and then at 9.00 am in terms of the subject site.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** Yes. Well, can I just check in with the family on that because we had talked about 9.00 am on site and I know that there was some milking to be attended to, but the 9.00 am was going to be accommodated so it may even be that it is more convenient for it to be earlier or is 9.00 am locked in?

**MALE SPEAKER:** No, if you --

**MR MULDOWNEY:** Would earlier be better or ...?

**FEMALE SPEAKER:** No.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** No, all right. I thought so, my limited knowledge of milking. But let us stay --

**THE COMMISSIONER:** You may have an opportunity, Mr Muldowney.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** Yes, indeed. Let us stay with 9.00 am as the rendezvous as we discussed.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. And then if we met at Donnelly Street at the school at 8.00 am and then start our contextual visits.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** In terms of the wider context, I had not intended that there be any representative of the applicant involved in any of that. You would be left alone to do that.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** So the only time that you will have a connection with someone representing the applicant will be in relation to the subject site. The rest of it is over to you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes. Now I know some submitters have made some suggestions to Jane, and if we did visit some points there would you like an applicant representative in that situation?

**MR MULDOWNEY:** No, no, I am in your hands, Commissioner, as to how you will manage the interactions.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes. Thank you for that.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** I am very confident in your experience on site visits, so there is no problem with that at all.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** What I would appreciate would be: when you return from the site visit will there be a report where you will capture what you saw? So, if there are these additional sites that I have not captured in my list (overspeaking)

**THE COMMISSIONER:** We can outline what sites we have been to.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** Yes, perfect.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** Thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** So we will commit to doing that.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** Does that mean we are reconvening when?

**THE COMMISSIONER:** We were intending to reconvene at 10.30 am.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** And sit through for as long as needed?

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes, that is correct, noting that your closing submissions will be in writing but, as I said on Monday - yes, Monday - there is the opportunity if you want to make any initial verbal comments at the end. I will leave that to you to decide.

 And then Mr Wesney will be providing -- we will provide him an opportunity, once we have completed hearing from the remaining submitters in terms of matters that he has heard since Monday, the issues that have been raised and any further advice and recommendations he may wish to provide to us. Do you have a feel for the timing, how much time you will need? I will not hold you to it right now, but just a gut feel, Mr Wesney, on that.

**MR WESNEY:** It depends on how much detail you would like me to go into and the team from the council because, obviously, we have a stack of information (overspeaking) --

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes, that is okay.

**MR WESNEY:** To help us - and I am not actually looking for any homework - if at this point in time you had any particular points that you would like us to respond to tomorrow, if you were able to provide them now that will give me an idea as to how long we might need.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. But coming back to, Mr Muldowney, yes, we would like to complete the hearing tomorrow, apart from the closing submissions so ...

**MR MULDOWNEY:** So you will not close the hearing tomorrow?

**THE COMMISSIONER:** No, we would adjourn because we have had an extensive amount of information also produced and submitted to us, so Mr Coffin and I want a wee bit of time also to consider all of that. So, no, we will not close. We will adjourn.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Excuse me, Mr Commissioner, can I ask a question?

**THE COMMISSIONER:** You can.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Thank you. Just in terms of tomorrow, time for tomorrow, as you are being led on site by representatives to be shown around the premises, do you also need to be shown around the sites that you'll be looking from, I guess, the other side as well? And also questioning the 8.00 am time to visit Donnelly Street, which will be outside of the peak time where traffic will be able to be observed, noting it will be a fine day tomorrow and a good day; 8 o'clock there won't be many cars.

**FEMALE SPEAKER:** Just be aware, the school is not a school unless there is a community(?) and the children are there.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Talking to Mr Coffin that might be around 8.30 am for the school. Would there be -- well, there would be someone at the school at 8.30 am if we needed someone to show us around?

**FEMALE SPEAKER:** It would not hold you up but it would be good to point out (overspeaking)

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes, happy with that and, you are quite right, it is on the proviso of pointing to features.

**FEMALE SPEAKER:** (several inaudible words)

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes. You would be surprised how often that can happen or an endeavour to have it happen. And then picking up, in terms of any other matters, if we need to get permission from a submitter to go on to a property we would seek that otherwise we would be undertaking the site visit from the public domain.

**FEMALE SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Mr Wesney, we will do this before we finalise. We have a list here. Here we are. These are in no particular order and you could well have them on your list: obviously some further clarification around the water supply matters that have been highlighted during the course of the hearing; we would be interested in your advice around the need for a cultural impact assessment; any commentary around effluent management and disposal, given Mr Greensill's submission; given the matters that have been raised regarding concerns about storm water and flooding, some further commentary there; we would certainly be interested in your view in terms of matters that, if we were minded to approve the plan change and matters related to the consent notice, what would be appropriate to be dealt with through the plan change, vis-à-vis any subsequent resource consent process on the range of matters that we have heard; we would certainly be interested in any further advice, in terms of our consideration of matters in respect of part 2, and any other related matters in terms of our consideration of the social and other impacts of the proposal, such as the impact on the school, which we have heard from a number of submitters, and whether there are any other legislative provisions in respect of the RMA in terms of that wider consideration. Mr Coffin, have you got matters to add to that?

**MR COFFIN:** I think you have picked up most of my ones. Just with regards to the social effects - and you mention the school - it would be good in terms of social infrastructure, and that could include the school, the reserves, public services, ambulance, fire service, police and potentially also health services.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** And the matter related to traffic, roundabout design, noting that we have not heard from NZTA and we are not going to be hearing from them. They have tabled --

**MR COFFIN:** Yes, we are all shaking our heads in combination here.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** That is in relation to both people have questioned the ability to provide for a roundabout physically in that intersection area but, more generally, in terms of matters that have been raised and whether the mitigation proposed is appropriate.

 Now, there was a reference to the ACOM(?) Traffic Review, appendix 7, and that related to design information. If you can run your eye over that and also, obviously, in terms of your consideration of the NZTA's statement. Now, Jane you have got --

**FEMALE SPEAKER:** (several inaudible words)

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Thank you. Coming back to iwi engagement, we would be interested in your advice in terms of whether you felt -- and I am just considering the submission made earlier today. Sorry, I will start that again, the appropriateness or need for any iwi engagement as part of the process and, also, any commentary particularly around section 6(e).

So that is a list of matters. No doubt you may have others, and certainly it is not restricted to the matters that we have just outlined. Do you have anything else?

**MR COFFIN:** I am just conscious that this is his homework (overspeaking)

**THE COMMISSIONER:** There is some time while we are having a site visit.

**MR COFFIN:** I suppose it is not 9 o'clock yet, so there is no (overspeaking). Let us go with that for now.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** The other request, Mr Wesney, we would appreciate as much of that as possible - I qualify "as possible" - in writing. Do you have anything else?

**MR COFFIN:** Nothing other than I am quite hungry now.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Mr Muldowney, do you have anything else at this point?

**MR MULDOWNEY:** No, sir. Well, I have just been handed a summary of submission which is I think from the planner representing the Transport agency. Has that just been circulated?

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** It may just be a matter that I need to close on, sir, in terms of the Transport Agency's position.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Yes.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** I think we are all feeling probably a little frustrated with where that sits and it is probably just best left for closing, I think.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. Thank you. Mr Wesney, do you need any further input?

**MR WESNEY:** No, thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Okay. On that note, thank you for those that are left here and we will reconvene at 10.30 am and, prior to that, we will be undertaking a site visit, so thanks very much. Thanks very much, Mr Muldowney, for the email and putting together those site visit matters. We will look at that tonight.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** Thank you.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Thanks very much.

**MR MULDOWNEY:** Thank you, sir.

**THE COMMISSIONER:** Hearing adjourned.

(Adjourned until Friday, 26 July 2019 at 10.30 am)