

Mary Bishop, 8 Ekuarangi Place, Paddocks Subdivision, Oakura

1. Thank you for hearing me today. My name is Mary Bishop and I live in the Paddocks subdivision. I would like to note my comments today are supported by my husband who was a late submitter and thus could not speak. I want to start by saying that I am here today with an extremely heavy heart. This issue is very personal to me. I am anguished about the impact this proposal would have on my community and I am aggrieved by the actions of the applicant -- someone who I consider to be a friend and who's family will move in next month. I hope and intend -- despite this process -- that we will be great neighbours and great friends for many years. I hope and intend that we will care for each other's children, each other's dogs, each other's properties and share food, wine and keys to the front door just as I do with my two other adjacent neighbours and friends. I too value relationships, but I also value integrity and feel it's important to respect differing opinions. And that is why I am here today.

2. My message today is that I am passionately pro Good Growth. This Plan Change is not Good Growth and I oppose it in its entirety. I oppose it for 6 reasons:

i. Commitments and Intent Matter. Twenty years ago, I made a commitment to my husband, like an earlier submitter, to return to Taranaki to raise our children. We moved to Oakura because the beach, the mountain and the community all held special meaning for us and we knew it was the place we wanted to build a home, raise our kids, and retire in later years. After living on 4 continents -- it was time to ensure we placed some deep roots and became a part of the fabric of a community. That's the mindset we came here with 7 and a half years ago on New Year's Day 2012. The Resource Consent had been issued for the Paddocks the previous March 2011 and we were unaware of any controversy. We fell in love with the property, the views and Mr. McKie's views for a sustainable and positive environmental impact. We signed our first of three contracts that year in March 2012. Over the next two years, as I became aware of why there was opposition to the Paddocks, I actually became one of its biggest supporters. I believed the Paddocks was Good Growth -- it located development between existing housing on both the upper mountain side and lower Wairau Road, it used a QEII to form a natural boundary, an unknown pa was identified and protected, and most importantly, the impact of new housing was being offset by a promise to not develop the farmland. Mr. McKie emphasized he had the right to develop the farmland into unregulated lifestyle blocks but with the Paddocks would now keep it as a productive farmland. Over the next two years, we stuck with the decision to buy our property. We became actively involved in providing feedback on the additional covenants that would be in our purchase contracts to protect our environment. I enrolled in an Organics Course at WITT and my enthusiasm grew as Mr McKie talked about the tremendous success of eliminating UREA and working towards organic farming. I became a staunch defender for the appropriateness of the Paddocks -- because of all the commitments he was making -- in front of detractors and our new friends. We bought the property on 15 July 2014. We, along with our adjacent neighbours and _____, were the three investors that had stuck with him for 2 years and enabled the Paddocks to move forward. We celebrated. Mr McKie thanked us -- "without you this would never have been possible" he said then and has repeated that many times over the years. We moved in a year later in Sept 2015, the second house to be built in the Paddocks. We continued to have conversations about the development, including the commitment to trade the Paddocks for the farm. I and he shared this with other buyers. He arranged for me to be interviewed to talk about the Paddocks for publicity in a local magazine which I willingly did and of course, I discussed the benefits of the Paddocks development instead of the developing sprawling farmland.

Friends along Wairau Stream noted surveyors on the farm as the esplanade was built, and I defended Mr. McKie, reiterating he had made a commitment to not subdivide in the resource consent. Surveyors appeared again awhile later and then the sales house was moved to an odd spot on the farm. About a year after I moved in, Mr. McKie mentioned he might develop some small senior housing down by Highway 45, far away that would not affect us. I said it sounded interesting and kept an open mind. But shortly thereafter, a plan for 399 Lots for Wairau Estate appears. Not just a plan, but architect drawings and in-depth studies on traffic, the environment and more. It became clear that less than 2 years after he received the Resource Consent for the Paddocks he had begun planning to develop the farmland against everything he had been saying since our first meeting in 2012. While I now understand there is a back door to allow the Resource Consent to be cancelled, and this was attached to my 32 page buyers contract, I still believe that the intent of the Resource Consent and Mr McKie's repeated verbal commitments to not subdivide the farm, that I and many others made their decisions on, should be considered and cause for you to reject this Plan Change. Commitments and the Intent of those commitments should matter. Yes maybe a principle of 'Buyer Beware' applies and maybe we should have understood that the implication of the three little words 'unless a Plan Change' would provide a back door for Mr. McKie to reverse his commitment in a court of law — but I would submit Mr McKie's repeated representations to me and other buyers and even the offering of the 2015 Consent Notice itself clearly demonstrates an intent not to sub-divide. Intent matters. To my knowledge, he declared this to my friends in 2017 who did not buy. In late 2018 he also reassured another new Paddocks owner that if he ever did develop the area "it would be just like the Paddocks." This is a misrepresentation of his intentions at best, and as a former Real Estate agent, isn't it reasonable to expect he would adhere to the duty *"not to mislead a customer or client, nor provide false information, nor withhold information that should by law or fairness be provided to a customer or client."* Commitment and intent matter. Half (6) of the existing Paddocks owners have submitted against this Plan Change, 4 are speaking, 1 has been trying to be able to speak and sent me an email and 1 has chosen to only submit. I believe all echo my experience. I won't repeat everything that has been already stated quoting Mr. McKie's statements at the Resource Consent hearing as its been done. My anguish has increased as I have sat here this week and listened to all that was said and promised and agreed. An approval of this resource consent I think would make a mockery of this process and a mockery of me. Commitments and intent should be recognised and I would urge you to reject this Plan Change.

ii. Community matters. This proposal is anti-community and that is a threat to the amenity I most value. I agree with the many points that have been raised about how this proposal would negatively impact on our community. Submitters have given a wide range of examples about the village look and feel, the friendliness and always seeing someone you know, the generosity and support that our smaller, tightknit community enjoys. I share those concerns. However, for me, I believe the core issue is this: Our community is thriving because people work together to build and maintain it. Not a few people – most. I want to underscore that again: our community is thriving because most of the people who live here have worked together to build and maintain it. You heard from Fay Looney yesterday about how the original farmers in their off hours moved and built our local church, the Crafty Fox and the firehouse. Today, is no different. The people of our community worked together to establish Matekai Park and every year people volunteer to maintain it; our community planted the sand dunes at the beach to stop erosion and work with the schools to clean them up every year; our community saw a slip by cliffs at the beach and 150 adults and kids helped replant it; our community donated time to and money to build the first and then the second skate parks; our community runs a vibrant Boardriders, Surf Life Saving, Bowls Club and sports programs for all

primary students entirely with volunteers. Our community has a vibrant open gardens stall so no food goes to waste and is shared with others. 300 families in our small community showed up to get traps for their backyards when the TRC put out a call for volunteers to launch a predator free zone. More had to be ordered. And maybe this example demonstrates just how collaborative and connected this community is: 668 women in our community have joined a Facebook group called The Tribe of Oakura in just over three years – that's 48% of Oakura's population in an online community that works together to support one another. And finally, I think it needs restating that a significant majority have participated in one or more of the planning documents to help shape the vision and direction of this community. My point: Oakura is thriving and succeeding because our people work together. This is the heart of Oakura and it is what I most value about living here.

Yet, this morning I looked out my kitchen window at the slip in the McKie QEII that appeared over a year ago. No one has volunteered to help fix it. The Woolley Nightshade has taken over every direction that I can see. No one has come to help clear it or the other pest plants. No one helps because no one was involved in its formation, no one shares in its ownership and no one feels it has anything to do with our community. And therein lies the problem of this whole proposal. Our community thrives because we work together, we work ideas through, we value our relationships. That is community. That is how we are so successful. And that is what is threatened by increasing a village in one swell swoop by 60% - in a process where concerns and impacts on this and many other resources have not been addressed.

I have 4 other concerns that have been expressed by others. I just want to give a few specific examples that hopefully illustrate the challenges and highlight some facts that I believe should be taken into account in any mitigation efforts to solve problems should this Plan Change be granted.

iii. Our Water Supply

I am not an expert but listening this week there is clearly considerable uncertainty about Oakura's water capacity. The applicant's experts argued that more water should be available than the NPDC estimates because water consumption should be based on historic take rates. I would point out that new houses have increased the traditional one toilet/one bath home to a minimum of two. We have 3 toilets/2 bathrooms and an outdoor shower in our new home. It's not just the new houses, but also numerous homes in Oakura that have been renovated to add space, new kitchens and bathrooms. Given this trend, I don't think past data is indicative of future use.

In addition, concerns about water availability have meant that Oakura has had mandatory water restrictions for at least the last 4 summers. Uncertainty about the water supply is also underscored by the NPDC decision to schedule an investigation in the bores. All this uncertainty, plus previous testimony that one of the bores is unreliable, increases the probability of future problems. My understanding that adding some storage tanks hasn't really been studied sufficiently.

iv. Water Discharge

Again I am not an expert on the water flows but I share the concerns stated by experts and submitters regarding the Wairau stream, pesticides and discharge impacts downstream. You should be aware prior to the Paddocks, there was considerable flooding at the Wairau /SH 45 intersection

when the stream overflowed and rose an estimated 10 meters in height flooding into the corner property. Because a second tunnel under the road has been long planned but never developed, NPDC insurance had to pay out significantly for damages. Road surface water was an issue as well in that event.

I would like to ask if the proposed mitigation efforts have considered actual user activity. Significant flooding on my one and a quarter acre property, despite 6 soak holes, caused me to remedy the situation by constructing a 30M x .4M wide x .5M deep drainage channel along the south side of our property that now directs water into the QEII and the Wairau River. This collects rain coming down the hill from the Kaitakes as well as off our 40M drive. During heavy rains, which are often in Taranaki winters, the channel fills up and has overflowed on several occasions.

Equally, my adjacent neighbour to the East put in an 80 meter driveway a few months ago and again, they also added a new channel on both sides and under the drive to do the same thing. The applicant has also in the last six months created two channels on the front and back of property to redirect water flows to the QEII and Wairau Stream – which again is the property behind me. I have been surprised by the amount of water that still flows over my property. I am extremely concerned about the increase in water run-off from lot sizes of 300sq meters and that have increased coverage from 35%-55%. This latter point has not been highlighted enough – if you cover 55% of your property with your house, add a driveway, fences, decks – what realistically will be available for the ground to absorb water? I would add that my reading of the proposal – other than changes of lot sizes – does not encourage any other building type than a stand alone home – meaning that small lot sizes with significantly increased coverage creates a concrete jungle more appropriate for a CBD and with significant water run-off that I question if it has been adequately included in the experts models claiming to ensure such a large subdivision will have no impact.

v. Traffic Safety and Parking

I echo all the concerns that have been made about traffic and parking issues in the village. I believe that the traffic impact assessment fails to assess how everyone is using the roads – particularly pedestrians and cyclists - and fails to understand that the Oakura Schools initiative to walk, ride or park + walk has fundamentally kept cars off Donnelly Street but creates other parking issues. My experiences with my two children commuting from upper Wairau Road for 6 years is that at:

- 45/Wairau Road: Those who lives on upper Wairau Road and Surrey Hill makes their way to this intersection to get to Oakura School as well as to catch 3 busses to the 5 high schools in New Plymouth. The distance means kids going to Oakura School bike or are driven. Safely crossing Wairau is difficult because there is only a sidewalk on the South side of the road, cars are often parked on both sides and the turn coming down the hill from the village is a blind corner. In addition, the high school bus stop is on the seaside of Wairau Road requires students to cross 45. Most walk or are dropped off there. My concern is that crosswalks are needed in these directions which are unlikely to be granted and represent a significant safety concern if there is increased traffic. The upper Wairau Rd to Donnelly track that was installed is not used as young kids cannot bike and the hills are very steep. The proposed roundabout has not considered this adequately. And the traffic movement on Wairau Rd exacerbates the situation. It would make more sense if anything were approved that the exit be exclusively on SH45 in a way that considers FUD West development.

- Donnelly Street: I believe the Traffic Initial Assessment fails to realise that the Oakura School has long 'strongly encouraged' students to walk or cycle to school. As a result, only parents of the youngest children or those with an appointment actually drive on Donnelly Street. The rest of the children do walk, cycle or 'park and walk' – which means their parents are trying to park at the Hall, on the Outlook, or in the few parking spaces by the church so their children can walk down Donnelly. A half hour earlier, 3 buses are parked outside of the hall and parents are dropping their high school students off there before the 8am departure. Traffic increases at 3pm when the primary school students finish and at 3:45 when the high school buses return. The current congestion and safety issues will be dramatically increased with this subdivision and has not been adequately addressed.
- The Beach: There is limited parking at the beach that is primarily an issue between Dec – February and weekends in March and April. Locating a subdivision on land side of state highway 45 will increase this pressure as everyone needs to drive.
- Parking in the village has been an increasing issue. Our local pub, Butler's Reef, had wanted to convert their back room into a wine bar but were refused by Council because they would have needed to add parking spaces which they could not do. An added subdivision of this size and at this location would require people to drive. without a means to increase parking

vi.QEII and Ratepayer Costs

Finally, I want to talk about the QEII. This was created to promote birdlife, protect the geckos, and for the benefit of the community. I am privileged to have the QEII on both the west and north side of my property. Although there has been none of the required monitoring. I do believe that it has encouraged birdlife. A definite positive. My concern is the overgrowth of Wooley Nightshade that has taken over the QEII and what I perceive as a failure to protect the QEII as established in the Resource Consent. MTwo summers ago I talked to Mr McKie about the problem. He was focused on the roadside plantings and said that he would not be able to address the issue. I called the TRC and had three meetings with them on my property. I initiated the conversations to get the TRC to enrolled in a program to eradicate the Wooley Nightshade. In my final meeting, the TRC representative told me they had begun at the north end of the QEII and managed to get only 1/3 of the way up because the money had run out for the season and there was no help in the end from Mr. McKie's workers. I was given an education on what to do, even though I am not suppose to enter the QEII and a fleeting promise that they had hoped to return this summer. They did not and again the Wooley Night Shade is so prevalent it dominates the coverage of the QEII along with some gorse. I am concerned about the increase in costs to ratespayers to deal with this issue and other costs that would be incurred because of any new subdivision activity.

I object to the Plan Change in its entirety and oppose even housing in FUD South. I think this is the biggest elephant in the room. The timeline of events makes it clear that the applicant's intention was always to develop the entire property. If FUD South is developed, he will continue his planning creep strategy and simply keep coming back to ask for more. There are far too many outstanding issues with negative consequences as I have outlined above. Thank you for taking the time to listen.