

We live on the property located to the southwest of the development site and share a boundary with it. As I outlined in my submission last year, I support the application in principle but oppose the manner in which it is being allowed to progress as not enough consideration, analysis or planning has been undertaken to examine the effects on the neighbouring area, the district as a whole or on us as a bordering neighbour.

While almost all of the issues I raised in my submission were “accepted in part” as outlined in Appendix 3 of the Section 42A report – the Table of recommendations on submissions and further submissions, dated the 5<sup>th</sup> of December 2025, I cannot see any indication of those being moved forward. I understand that this has been explained as being able to be or better addressed at the resource consent and planning stage, but it seems unfair to have had them deemed valid concerns only to now let them be kicked down the road. I do feel that having them form part of this zoning change would lend more gravitas and expectation

about something needing to be done and not left to yet more hearings.

My original submission was focused on the different stages of the development, being the earthworks and construction stage and then the long-term effects on us and on our property.

During the earthworks and construction stage, we request that you require the developer to do 3 things:

1. ensure that mitigations are put in place to limit the noise, sand and dust flow as our property lies immediately in the direction of the prevailing wind
2. wash our house and windows on a regular basis
3. undertake ongoing rabbit control to stem the invasion of rabbits that will inevitably be displaced onto our land.

As part of this planning stage, we ask that there be assurance that the following 4 things will be required to be done:

1. that volume of water that is allowed to be discharged into the drainage stream (Drain ID PPD016-4), which runs through our property from the site in question, does not increase from the current manageable volumes, as that could be problematic for us and could cause us insurance premium issues. It is hard to imagine that covering 12 hectares in buildings and roads and paths won't concentrate more flow into the drainage system which currently only handles the overflow from paddocks.
2. that any development that is allowed on our boundary is limited in both use and height so that it doesn't preclude us from using our land as we wish either now or when the zoning of our property is changed from lifestyle to residential. It would be unfair that limitations or expense could be imposed on us in the future because limitations were not imposed on this development as requested at this early stage.

3. that visual buffers will be required to be put in place to limit what we see of the residential area from our lifestyle area and to limit what can be seen of our property from the village or from the development site.

While there is currently a stand of very tall overgrown pine trees, these have not been cared for in the 30+ years that we've lived on our property and they have become dangerous with heavy branches dropping off. These trees need to be required to be removed, preferably as part of this zoning application, and once they are removed, there will be no barrier or visual separation at all between our property and the development site. A planted continuous 5-metre buffer seems the least that could be required in order to provide the separation needed.

4. ensure the sewage network and water intake is required to be extended to our and other boundaries from the proposed development in order to enable future public service connections to adjacent properties such as ours.

I heard reference yesterday to a second entry/egress to the site being possible. What I'd read from previous responses appears to reference our private shared ROW driveway being upgraded and used for this when the zoning is inevitably changed. How will this be effected? We have not been approached about this and are not aware of the other 4 owners of our private driveway being contacted either.

The last point I wish to make is about how current owners and ratepayers are treated in contrast to how this application is being treated.

We met with Council in May 2025 for a pre-application planning meeting where we were told that an application for the subdivision of our 1.5 hectare property, allowing for 2 new properties, would be refused due to the loss of the rural land resource and the loss of "rural character and amenity". Why does this application by Welholm that relates to a bordering property get a different response from the one we were given only a few months ago? Why is the loss of a greater

sized area deemed to be an acceptable loss of a rural resource where changes to our smaller section with a far less densely proposed development was refused?

If this application for a zoning change is approved, our property will be bounded on 3 sides by Residential zone. What are Council plans for our remaining small pocket of lifestyle zoning? What is the timeframe for this to be also changed to Residential zoning? Why is this application for this solitary piece of land being heard in isolation and not as part of a wider review of zoning? Kapiti deserves a district-wide or at least an area wide review and not this piecemeal application review because a wealthy developer requests it. If Council accepts the applicant's statement that according to the KCDC 2022 Growth Strategy, this area is a medium priority greenfield growth area, then why is any proposed change being limited to just the 2 sections being developed by the applicant? Why does that same thinking not apply to the neighbouring properties and area? The entire area deserves a revised plan comprising roading, drainage, access, infrastructure, and other

facilities that will result in a cohesive and connected environment and not this piecemeal change which will result in further fragmentation of the immediate area.

Thank you.

