

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 farm hand on farmland adjacent to our property on Ahu Ahu k

I have lived in the Oakura area for 12 years. For 2 years I lived in the village and for now 10 years down Ahu Ahu Road, which is approximately 5 km from my house to Oakura.

One of the reasons for choosing this area to live in is for the rural location and character of the Oakura village and outer-lying rural areas and proximity to the coast.

I am a mother of three, all of my children have attended our community playcentre (adjacent to Oakura school), Kaitake kindergarten (down Wairau Rd, and now Oakura School).

I drive to and from Oakura at least twice a day, often three times and sometimes more depending on extra-curricular activities, sporting commitments etc etc.

The drive to and from Oakura is lovely. The neighbouring National Park, Kaitake Ranges and rolling farmland are always enjoyed by me and my family.

Oakura 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 subdivider applicant - Mr McKie - promised to the people of Oakura, 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 word/promise and that the New Plymouth District Council, the R.M. 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 have 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 5 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 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 carpark 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.
- Oakura 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/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. Oakura 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 60-70 households would be able to have a water tank for their general supply is all very well, but how will that look in the proposed setting? A complete eyesore is how it would look.

And, 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 4-6 weeks - two tanks are required, and even then there have been three occasions over the past 5 years where we have had to buy water, due to running dry during drought conditions.

So that would mean not 60-70 water tanks, but potentially 120-140 watertan popping up on all of the proposed waterto properties. Which as we know neighbours a beautiful National Landmark, our very own National Park.

The current rural vista / landscape and location would no longer exist.

6

This proposal from Mr McKie could potentially double our current population. How can Oakura accommodate this?

Is Mr McKie proposing to mitigate effects by providing Oakura with further carparks?

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 400-800 more cars on our roads?

How can Mr McKie propose a subdivision of this magnitude and expect the rate-payers of New Plymouth and the tax-payers 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 house around with large rural lifestyle properties, rather a condensed urban residential area.

With the number of house sites proposed, that will mean a need for streetlights. From my home, I can see a night time glow from

②

New Plymouth city. Is that what will be for Odekura? No more twinkling lights of a small rural village, rather the glow of an urban town.

This is not what I moved here for.

Sky-light 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 Rang in a specified condensed area.

The National Park - How does this affect the flora/fauna in the area. Millions of taxpayer dollars spent on 1080/pest control - and then welcome in a further potential 400 cats and dogs.

I refer to Mr Gladstones evidence dated 25/06/19 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 know who could be lurking in the shadow and out of visibility.

I refer to Mr Skerrett's evidence dated 17/06/19.

I do not accept that Mr Skerrett can say its 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 17/06/19 and I wish to respond asking:

Who are you to say what/how the future should be for Oakura? This application should not be about "the world according to Mr McKie" and how you want it to be for all in Oakura.

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 McKies is not mine, nor of the Oakura Community nor the New Plymouth District Plan.

The rural character of this land would be lost forever. The rural character of Oakura would be lost forever.

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 - Oakura - 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 a natural rural character neighbouring a protected National Heritage Park.

I don't need another 800 cars vying for a carpark at our local sports ground, school, skatepark, beach & library.

Who is Mr McKie to say what the

(12)

future holds for Oakura, and how the future will come about, and the consequences of this are:

- the rural character of Oakura village gone forever.
- undermining the beauty of our National Park forever.
- threatening our unique native flora/fauna at a potential catastrophic level with household pets and invasive plant species.
- putting all of Oakuras 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 R.M.A Act.

I believe this proposal does not mirror the Oakura Community Vision.

Therefore, this proposal, in its entirety, should be declined.