

From: Gary Scott [REDACTED]
Received: Tue Jun 24 2025 21:09:31 GMT+1200 (New Zealand Standard Time)
To: FastTrack Substantive <Substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz>;
Subject: Maitahi development Application comments

Maitahi Village Substantive comments

substantive@ [fasttrack.govt.nz](mailto:substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz)

We are Gary Scott and Catherine Harper long time residents of [REDACTED] who are going to be massively impacted by this huge development. We are a retired couple who live a sedentary life and don't go out much. I am also disabled after two brain tumour surgeries, which has restricted my mobility to the extent that I can no longer walk down our driveway. The peace and quiet of our small holding is going to be shattered by 6-7 years of noise, construction activity, tradies vehicles from 7am to 7pm daily and traffic volumes after completion will be a constant hum.

Point 1. Standard freshwater fisheries activity paragraph (c)(i) (iv) works that require active disturbance to a water body, plus repeated disturbance of a water body.

I believe there will be massive disturbance over several months, or years, during the excavation and creation of building sites, the realignment of Kaka Stream and the building up of the flood plain in the initial stages. The run off and sediment will be impacting the Maitai River on a daily basis. Does the application have penalty clauses and recovery cost imposition for the developers? I doubt any insurance company would be happy to insure such an event.

I therefore believe they should apply to seek approval for the above activity and want to ensure that there are penalty clauses for any breaches.

Point 2. NES FW (Natural wetland standards)

The whole of the southern area, which is where all of the Kianga Ora houses are to be built, is a natural wetland and definitely a flood zone. I have photos and video of flooding over the past few years that gives an indication of how detrimental this will be to ensuring everyone will be provided houses that are safe, warm and dry. Once again I am sure no insurance company will want to insure properties that will be impacted twice a year by a flood event. I understand this flood zone is to be built up by three meters and compacted. This will only divert the water directly into the Maitai River and exacerbate the downstream events. Just like the council did when they released the dam at the height of the 2022 floods. Nile Street residents watched as a tidal wave came down the river and entered their properties.

The impact of thousands of tons of soil being trucked in will also be detrimental to our lifestyle and indeed the Maitai Valley as a whole. We can't imagine what the impact of raising the flood plain by three meters will have on us, as the dust and noise we experienced last year, when 10 trucks doing 10 trips each per day, supplying gravel to form a 'farm track' was horrendous, and the empty trucks rattling back for another load nearly drove us mad. A hundred trips a day tore up the road, and the street sweeper had to be employed daily as well. Our house and windows were shrouded with dust.

We have now fitted double glazing to mitigate the noise of any future construction activities, but it still means we have to live behind closed doors and windows.

The earthworks will definitely be within 100m of the wetland and not just be limited to Kaka Stream. This activity will impact the river as in point 1, and also permanently change the ecology of the wetland that absorbed the water and captured the silt deposits during severe rain. There is a small gully alongside our house that becomes a raging stream that runs for days afterwards. Where is that going to be diverted to since the flood plain, which I term a swamp, will be built on and therefore unavailable to soak up the water and contain the sediment?

Point 3. Construction activities and noise

As mentioned in point 2 the trucks delivering gravel for a farm track was bad enough but the whole valley acts as an amphitheatre and conversations can be heard from the shearing shed to the north and the cricket pitch to the west. Sound travels in this valley and I believe it is even heard up at Cleveland Terrace. The sounds of construction, the constant beeping of several excavators, especially when the truck reverses up our street at 4.00am to deliver one, will be intolerable for us. We have never been approached for our input as to the effects of the acoustic nature of the construction which is disappointing. What time constraints will be placed on the developers? Start and finish times would be important for us as we are retired and mostly at home.

Point 4. Roothing – timing and staging of off-site works

Improvement works at the intersection of Ralphine Way and Maitai Valley Road.

I fail to understand why the developers want a shared cycle path and walkway down the eastern side of Ralphine Way. For one it impacts five (5) driveways as opposed to two on the western side. And two, it would be almost impossible for someone on a normal bike to cycle back up Ralphine way without zig-zagging up the road. When I was fit that's what I had to do. It just doesn't make sense. Has anyone attempted to cycle up there yet to ascertain that it is feasible? I suspect the gradient is not compliant with regulations and wish to object to this path in its entirety and revert to the earlier suggested route around the back of Dennes hole. A much more scenic and safe route so the developers won't have to pay for two bridges, as the path won't cross the river at all and no pedestrian crossing will be needed at the bottom of Ralphine Way. There was a suggestion one of the reasons this was rejected was that this option would impact on the privacy of swimmers in the river, but what about the existing path around the other side of Black hole, Sunday hole and Girlies hole? Why wasn't privacy a consideration in those places? Besides it would only be seasonal so the rest of the year the objection regarding privacy is mute.

I realise that the services need to get to the subdivision somehow but why does it have to come up Ralphine Way when it entails crossing the river twice? Following the bike path around Dennes hole would be less disruptive and less expensive and the resulting track would then form the bike path. Then it would be a council expense to build the bridges if they want them, not the developers.

As far as I'm aware only one resident wants to connect to the services, none of the rest of us want water or sewerage access, we are happy with the systems we have now.

This intersection is also prone to flooding and we have been trapped in our house for up to 5 days on occasion. The last time this intersection was flooded was in April this year.

Should this option be a fait accompli then consideration should be given to make Gibbs bridge two lanes with a cycling and walking path incorporated as the sight lines for giving way are very dangerous at the moment, and the queuing of traffic will frustrate drivers as traffic volumes increase. Building a separate cycle bridge could potentially restrict the construction of a two lane bridge to replace Gibbs bridge in the future.

The other issue is that our driveway, which is sloped and concreted, will become part of the shared path and reconstructing it may mean that the access to our drive will be made steeper because the 5 meter berm will have to be at the same level as the road. This would mean our motorhome, which bottoms out now, would not be able to access our property. What guarantees can you give that this will not happen?

We do not want street lights in Ralphine Way either, nor do we want the street name changed, just in case the developers were thinking of doing this.

Point 8: Geotechnical mitigations

Due to the gradients on the western side of the valley, several slips appear after every rain event. I have aerial photos of all of the slips that have occurred since most of the vegetation was removed from the farm. I certainly wouldn't want to build there.

I believe insurance companies need to be informed of this.

The earthworks required to form building platforms and resource consents for engineering work for constructing a stable site for each house need to be tabled in their application. The steepness of some of the roads will mean more traffic noise due to the lower gears required to negotiate them - another consideration in this amphitheatre of reverberated sound affecting the environment.

In this regard, can you confirm the road over to Bayview will be completed before construction starts? I have heard that it is not going ahead now. This would be a dangerous situation as there will only be one way in and out. The proposed rest home will have sick patients that require an ambulance most weeks and if the intersection has flooded no one can get in or out. Sometimes for days. Another exit would mitigate this.

Point 12: Air quality/dust

Our experience with the trucks bringing in gravel last year worries us as the dust and noise was horrendous. Even the birds disappeared for two weeks. We have Robins, Tui, Native pidgeon, Quail, Wax-eyes, Native Owl, Bellbird, Fantail, Swallows, Pukeko, and Weka, all contributing to our fantastic rural environment so close to town, which we want to preserve.

We would appreciate a water cart to be on site at all times to mitigate any dust distribution, and to make the road as smooth as possible so the empty trucks don't rattle so much, with a speed limit imposed. Perhaps the developers could pay for a house and window clean at some stage?

Point 16: Soil contamination

An independent review of the contaminated land management plan should be mandatory and an ongoing monitoring plan put in place to ensure no contaminants enter the Maitai River. The costly but effective decontamination of the Mapua fertilizer site should be an indication of the level of work that needs to be performed for Kaka Valley. The realignment of Kaka stream will involve the old sheep dip and associated chemicals therefore it is necessary to monitor the effects of doing this with the associated resource consents.

In conclusion, I believe the first application under plan change 28 has been significantly changed to the extent it is unrecognizable. It was accepted on condition of certain aspects of the subdivision which are no longer evident or additional construction has been included that are outside plan change 28 conditions that were considered by the panel of commissioners. For example the design changes include the addition of a rest home, the building of a marae, the relocation of the shared path, access to SH6 via Bayview and the number of dwellings.

I also question the need for such a large subdivision when all over the city and environs there is construction going on. The Bishopdale subdivision has not been completed, two developments in Nile Street and many more apartments that need to be finished and sold before starting on ruining the Maitai, or there will be a glut of unsold houses and no one makes any money, except the council get more rates. Was a study done to ascertain the need for another Care home for example?

We have been forced into this stressful situation and have been trying to sell our house, but have yet to find a suitable property with all of the attributes of this idyllic spot. Private, quiet, dark skies, rural views, bird life and proximity to town.

Kind regards

Gary Scott and Cathie Harper



Regards

Gary Scott and Catherine Harper