Submission from Geoff and Alison Gore of 156 Petley Road, RD1, Paparoa 0571

Re: Proposed changes to the Kaipara District Plan – specifically the proposal to re-zone large areas of Rural land into "Rural Lifestyle", allowing for 4000M lots

We have concerns regarding the proposal to re-zone 'Rural' to 'Rural Lifestyle' for the following reasons:

In Kerikeri which currently has almost 400 properties for sale, many of them have land sizes ranging from 4000m² - 6000m². The difference is that in Kerikeri they are classified as 'Large Lot Residential', and in most cases the properties are fully reticulated with underground power, water supply, sealed roads and footpaths. Hence, it is difficult not to view this Kaipara proposal with some cynicism, since there is evidently no accompanying plan to provide any of these services in locations like Pahi and Paparoa. Retaining the designation of 'Rural' on this land implies that all issues arising from establishing new residences would be the responsibility of the owner entirely, since the Council has presented no plan to establish shared infrastructure in these areas.

In the case of the Petley Road peninsula, perhaps the most glaring omission is any mention of upgrading the existing gravel road to a sealed surface. Petley Road sees a significant amount of traffic, and giving it a light grading once a year fails to cope with the sustained increase in the volume of traffic on the Road due to both building work and recent sub-division activity.

The Council's maintenance obligations in respect of the Road are referred to in:

- 1. The Kaipara Council Unsealed Roads Maintenance Strategy (the "Strategy"); and
- 2. Local Government Act (the "Act").

The Strategy contains detailed recommendations for the management of unsealed roads, including the pertinent suggestion by your management consultants on page 6 that unsealed roading costs may be minimised by up to 75% with a grading, re-gravelling and dust control <u>programme</u>. On Petley Road, the main issues are: corrugations, scouring, depressions, potholes and excessive dust. The material occasionally added to the Road during the grading process contains little metal and is mostly brown dirt which exacerbates the dust problem already plaguing the Road. It comes as no surprise to see that according to the consultants' assessment, the Road has a '2' rating which is "poor" and one step above "failed".

The sealing of Petley Road must be achieved prior to a potential increase in housing density such as is outlined in the proposed New District Plan. To any fair-minded observer, the reasons for this are obvious. The intersection of Petley Road with the State Highway is an angled, dangerous intersection with visibility less than 100 metres towards Paparoa, and no pull-over lane for traffic entering Petley from either direction. Many residents have reported near-misses on numerous occasions. The school bus turns around here, and there are always potholes to negotiate where vehicles exit SH12. Pull-over lanes similar to that employed at the Matakohe junction should have been constructed years ago. Given that extensive conditions are usually applied to all developments along a State Highway, it is hard to understand why this intersection remains sub-standard. Lives are at stake here.

We assert that pursuant to the Act, it is the responsibility of Council to maintain the network infrastructure and to monitor the quality and delivery of outsourced road maintenance, and in respect of Petley Road, the Council is not compliant with its obligations under the Act. (The major slip on the Pahi Road has borne testament for six years now to the inability of the Council to even maintain an existing sealed road in fair condition.) The Council has not adopted the Strategy for unsealed roads recommended to it by its own management consultants, yet this new plan proposes to exacerbate the situation further by allowing for the addition of potentially scores more dwellings on a gravel road which, with around 50 existing properties, already generates a high volume of traffic.

To summarise, our recommendation is that:

- 1. The establishment of a new Rural Lifestyle zone on the Petley Road peninsula be predicated on the establishment in the first instance, of a sealed road and an appropriate State Highway intersection.
- 2. Further subdivision should be limited to a minimum lot size of 2ha

Yours sincerely,

GN & AJ Gore 156 Petley Road

022 150 4828

gngore@hotmail.co.uk

Meagan Walters

From: District Plan Review

Sent: Monday, 30 June 2025 11:39 am

To: Geoff Gore

Subject: RE: Submission: Gore, 156 Petley Rd

Much appreciated – please accept this email as confirmation that your submission has been received.

We will be in touch again once all submissions have been summarised.

Ngā mihi Meagan



Meagan Walters | Planning Administrator

Kaipara District Council, Private Bag 1001, Dargaville 0340 **Freephone**: 0800 727 059 | 09 439 3123 | 021 392 218

mwalters@kaipara.govt.nz | council@kaipara.govt.nz | www.kaipara.govt.nz

In the Office =		Working from home =		
Rāhina Monday	Rātū Tuesday	Rāapa Wednesday	Rāpare Thursday	Rāmere Friday
~	~	~	~	~

From: Geoff Gore <gngore@hotmail.co.uk> Sent: Sunday, 29 June 2025 8:43 am

To: District Plan Review < district plan review@kaipara.govt.nz>

Subject: Re: Submission: Gore, 156 Petley Rd

CAUTION: This email originated from outside Kaipara District Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

You don't often get email from gngore@hotmail.co.uk. Learn why this is important

Re submission, we can confirm that:

- 1. We could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission
- 2. We do not require to be heard at hearing in support of our submission

Kind regards, Geoff & Alison Gore

Sent from Outlook

From: District Plan Review < districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz >

Sent: 27 June 2025 15:45

To: Geoff Gore <gngore@hotmail.co.uk>
Subject: RE: Submission: Gore, 156 Petley Rd

Thank you Geoff and Alison

We just need a couple of answers to some questions that are required to be answered by the Resource Management Act 1991 please before we can lodge your submission:

Trade Competition

Pursuant to Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission may make a submission only if directly affected by an effect of the proposed policy statement or plan that:

a) adversely affects the environment; and

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

Please select the option that applies to you:

I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission; or

I **could** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

If you have selected this option, please also select one of the following:

I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission

I **am not** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission

Also, do you wish to be heard at a Hearing in support of your submission and if so, would you consider presenting jointly with others who may have a similar submission?

You are welcome to insert your answer/s at the bottom of your submission and re-send it through OR just advise via email response.

Ngā mihi Meagan



Meagan Walters | Planning Administrator

Kaipara District Council, Private Bag 1001, Dargaville 0340 Freephone: 0800 727 059 | 09 439 3123 | 021 392 218

A

mwalters@kaipara.govt.nz | council@kaipara.govt.nz | www.kaipara.govt.nz

In the Office =		Working from home =		
Rāhina Monday	Rātū Tuesday	Rāapa Wednesday	Rāpare Thursday	Rāmere Friday
~	~	~	~	~

From: Geoff Gore <gngore@hotmail.co.uk>

Sent: Friday, 27 June 2025 9:12 am

To: District Plan Review < <u>districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz</u>>

Subject: Submission: Gore, 156 Petley Rd

CAUTION: This email originated from outside Kaipara District Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

You don't often get email from gngore@hotmail.co.uk. Learn why this is important

Submission attached.

Kind regards,

Geoff & Alison Gore

Sent from $\underline{\text{Outlook}}$