

Additional Supplementary Document for Submission

Resource Consent Application No: SUB-2021-75 and LUC-2021-247 **Applicant:** A Nailard and V Cullen

Site Address: 140 Three Mile Hill Rd

Description of Application: Two lot rural-residential subdivision, and land use consent to establish residential activity.

We are aware that there are ruins of an old stone building on the site of platform 1. This is noticeable in the photos from Mike Moore's report (Figure 4: View Southward from near the Lot 1 building platform) above the green shed. We understand from previous conversations with the applicant that this may have been an old scout building. I'm unsure of the age of this or this is accurate however I believe this needs to be investigated and potentially preserved. Building material & fill has built up above this building over time. I propose an inspection of the loads of top soil on this building platform be completed as I have witnessed more than just top soil on this building platform in the form of old furniture, building materials and rubbish.

We disagree with reports from Mike Moore & Emma Spalding that the visual amenity effects will be (less than minor) on effected properties at this site. Both parties do not live here and in such cannot offer their expert opinion that it will have minimal effects on us as it's effecting our lives not theirs. Yes we have lived at our addresses for the past number of years which as per Emma's notes we have "enjoyed the benefit of living next to a vacant site" however we purchased our property while the adjacent land was deemed as a rural lot. Therefore, the proposed two lot subdivision is opposed. We are happy for a single dwelling to be built on the property on Lot 2 however as there has never been a residential house on the site we have never had to deal with the usual 8 VPD and its because of this that we are concerned over the extra 17 VPD that we will eventually be having to deal with. If this proposed 2 lot subdivision is granted then we propose that we have screen planting established on the verge of the shared driveway or where possible to help block the noise and visual impact from the increased traffic on ourselves and our stock who are currently used to only approximately 14-18 vehicles per week.

We agree with Robert Buxton that all proposed landscaping, driveway improvements, entrance way improvements and screen planting is completed in full as part of the subdivision consent.

We agree to section 49 of Robert Buxton's report that entrance to our properties has not contributed to any reported crashes however our comments and concerns are that the increased 17 VPD NOT 8 VPD could have some future effect. We would expect the Transportation Planner to review this information based on an extra 17 VPD and see that further safety precautions be taken into consideration. Such as cutting/benching of the road edge embankment on the inside bend or installation of a large mirror, especially as they have acknowledged that this is an existing issue and could have safety benefits.

We agree on parts of section 52 & 53 on Robert Buxton's report that there is a requirement to widen the entrance way culvert crossing to minimum 9 metres and that the surface is sealed to 8 metres. We agree that this will have safety benefits however as noted "the actual works and cost would be something for all users to agree to" How is this going to be possible when two effected parties of this entrance way have not been included in this resource consent?

We disagree with Mike Moore & Emma Spalding that the proposed 2 lots are within character for the current area. The two smaller neighbouring properties were subdivided prior to 1990 and the District Plan and the 2GP 2ha min rule. The reason why the rules were set with 2 GP was so that it would

preserve the lifestyle and hobby farming ability. Because of this the smaller 1.87ha property DOES undermine the integrity of the 2GP District plan. Granting this application will create undesirable precedent with future parties in and around the area for the same reasons as this notified resource consent.

We would be interested to know why Robert Buxton thinks that animal boarding activities would not appear to be likely established on this site. Especially as a resource consent for a cattery has previously been granted to a past owner of our property, 136 Three Mile Hill. Any animal boarding activity would greatly increase any VPD to possibly double that of any normal residential activity.

Our opinion is that all properties that either share a boundary with the proposed 2 lot subdivision or share the entrance way from Three Mile Hill Road are affected parties and as such should have been notified. Discussions with all 6 boundary property owners including ourselves are clear that none of us want this subdivision to occur due to the increased traffic, noise and visual impact on our lives and properties.

Finally if this resource consent is granted we will investigate creating a Land Covenant against the two Lots.

Kind regards

Mark Rietveld & Ngaire Hannah-Rietveld