

While Taranaki newspaper reports quote:

“Its not the first time Oakura has been up in arms over development_ The Paddocks estate in outer Oakura also owned by Mckie, caused a similar outcry in 2010. Unquote.

I do not believe there was a huge outcry in 2010 anywhere near the volume of this objection much of it bought about by the applicants failure to keep good faith with his buyers , Jenny Blydes submission spelt this fact out clearly the applicant is completely untrustworthy.

The paper fails to quote the breaches of the final “Paddocks Sub Division plan” in 2010

There have been many.

A number of people who in good faith purchased sections at the paddocks were very vocal with regard to the failure of the applicant to safeguard Views (no further development was to take place)

Quote Brian Duff submission.

Page 25 Paddocks consent.

The condition with regard to future subdivision of the lot 29, relating to the no further sub division of the property as long as it remains in the Rural environment Area, has been retained as originally proposed. This condition will ensure that open space is retained over the balance allotment. It is also noted that the applicant expressed the intention during the hearing of retaining this lot with a “protected Farm” status in the longer term regardless of the zoning.

Unquote

If the hearing commissioners were to just re read this submission and that of Jenny Blyde the only conclusion they could come to is the consistent lies the applicant manipulated buyers of the paddocks sites with.

Why would anyone believe he will not do this over and over again.

My own submission did not include the deliberate failure to at no stage draw attention to the gas line which goes through the property I understand it was not even drawn on the plan., something I came to hear while present at the hearing. Another detail left out devious & deliberate misinformation.

I took a week out of my life to listen to all at the hearings knowing full well through personal dealings with the applicant that many would clearly indicate to the commissioners how they had been misled by the applicant on many levels, there were however no Councillor's at anytime I was there supporting the people whom they represent our two Kaitake Ward Councillor's in particular absent, there would be no need to revisit this hearing for them they only needed to "be there" to understand the objections.

Our Expert submitters made it very clear with excellent professional submissions (particularly the KCB's) based on science and fact that to continue this farce in support of one mans greed)(or is it Council greed?) flies in the face of all the carefull consideration & consultation that finalised the 2010 Oakura Structure Plan.

My question is what gives the applicant the right to extend the timeline of this decision?

When this was denied the Oakura Community Action group who requested the hearing not be held during the school holidays?

Why are his rights more important than those who live here and contribute much to the community, the applicants contribution to date is nil.

Fay Looney MNZM