



Subject **RE: FW: RM191251 RE: Resource Consent 12 Seaton Valley Road**

From Elena Meredith <elena.meredith@xtra.co.nz>

To 'Pat Russell' <patrussell61@gmail.com>
<info@ourmapua.org>, Aileen Connell <aileen.connell@gmail.com>, Bruno Lemke <bruno.lemke@xtra.co.nz>, Elena Meredith <elena.meredith@xtra.co.nz>, Esme Palliser <gandepalliser@gmail.com>, Marion Satherley <marionawayfromhome@gmail.com>, Mike Kinninmonth <warm_sand@xtra.co.nz>, Paul McIntosh <pmcintosh64@yahoo.com>, Robert Wilson <robt_wilson@hotmail.com>, Wayne Chisnall <wchisnall@gmail.com>

Cc

Date 2021-02-18 17:55

Kia ora Pat – ngā mihi mahana ki a koe – so sorry that you are still having to deal with this – I wonder if you also sent it to Anne Turley and Christeen Mackenzie who are our more proactive Ward Councillors ?

There is no indication in your cc's that this went to MDCA so I am forwarding it on to info@ourmapua.org which will mean that it will be received and addressed as correspondence to the Association rather than to an individual member and also to the Exec members as we are meeting this coming Tuesday

Kia Kaha ; Noho ora mai ra – Elena

From: Pat Russell [mailto:patrussell61@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, 15 February 2021 7:17 PM

To: Erin Hawke

Cc: Victoria Woodbridge; Info; Elena Meredith; Tim King; Forest & Bird - Val Clemens; Forest & Bird - Gillian Pollock; Damien O'Connor

Subject: Re: FW: RM191251 RE: Resource Consent 12 Seaton Valley Road

Hi Erin,

I am of course surprised by this. It is completely contradictory to the Nelson/ TDC document quoted as the reason for me personally being required to undertake public roadwork.

There is nothing that stipulates I as an individual have to undertake and pay for the preparation work for a cycle path - two-way cycle trail for goodness sake - past my 118m property frontage. All documents specified a residential footpath to mirror that on the other side of Seaton Valley Road. TDC can't just make it up as it goes along to get its own way when questioned. That isn't acceptable.

I've copied this to MDCA for their information. And to other groups and individuals. We are thoroughly fed up with such cavalier behaviour and I can't accept being bullied in this way. There is NOTHING that dictates I should pay for preparatory work for a 4.5m cycle path. For a 3m footpath at most and even in that TDC has chosen to assume that I am a Commercial Developer. It's outrageous but I'm too exhausted by the nonsense to be in a rage.

I do hear you Erin in that this totally unacceptable response has come from Bush-King and Kirby. Where it seems the majority of such brutal and destructive decisions are dictated. So I need to repeat, for them, my responsibility for a public two-way cycle trail - a residential footpath was previously and ONLY stated - is not acceptable. It was not documented or mooted during subdivision drafts, was never agreed. This width, 50% wider than across the road, is destructive to the mature native treebelt, which I'm required as a Rural 1 (ludicrous) property to maintain. Yet TDC demands it destroyed.

Daily I watch cyclists flying by on the existing road. There is zero issue with the current situation.

Regarding the light pollution from the incredibly bright white street light placed by my boundary a few months ago, yes please and thank you. I understand a reflective collar can be put on the sides and rear edge so the light falls only where it is meant to go. That would be wonderful.

Kind regards, to you

Pat

On Mon, 15 Feb 2021, 15:24 Erin Hawke, <Erin.Hawke@tasman.govt.nz> wrote:

Dear Patricia

How are you?

With the help of my Manager and Engineering I have looked into your questions.

The reason for the 4.5m width is to accommodate a two-way cycle trail – and this is not the case on the other side of the road.

The roading frontage upgrade condition was a compromise worked out with you and your consultants at the decision stage and only requires you to do the earthworks for a reduced portion of your road frontage – not the full formation for the entire frontage.

Council stands by the drawing and 4.5m width requirement.

Sorry about this but I hope you understand why it is different to the other side of the road?

Cycle safety is important to Council and Council is committed to sustainable communities where alternative forms of transportation are provided.

Cycling and walking are also seen as keeping our communities healthy and connected.

I understand you want to keep your trees – you have nurtured them and must feel attached to them – it must be sad for you to let them go.

And no one likes light pollution either.

Perhaps something can be done to shade the lights from your dwelling – would you like me to enquire into this on your behalf?

Regards

Erin

Erin Hawke | Environment & Planning

Consent Planner

Extension 578 | **DDI** [+64 3 543 8978](tel:+6435438978)

Erin Hawke

Consent Planner

DDI +64 3 543 8978 | Erin.Hawke@tasman.govt.nz

78 Commercial Street, PO Box 74, Takaka 7142, NZ



This e-mail message and any attached files may contain confidential information, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete

From: Pat Russell <patrussell61@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, 8 February 2021 3:37 pm

To: Erin Hawke <Erin.Hawke@tasman.govt.nz>; Victoria Woodbridge <victoria@landmarklile.co.nz>

Cc: Pat Russell <patrussell61@gmail.com>

Subject: Resource Consent 12 Seaton Valley Road

Hi Erin,

I am in receipt of your Final Invoice of logged hours, thank you.

I had thought we were done but an interesting circumstance has occurred recently. I asked Donaldson Engineering for an Estimate re Condition 9 work so to have a better view of what at least some of the costs might be. He had of course a copy of the Final Consent document so to give an informed response. And noted in passing the stipulated cutback - 4.5m in the sketch that became the TDC working model - differs from the dimensions across the road. He used his laser measure and said the other side is 3m. The first Draft Consent quoted "residential formation standards... 1m berm, 1.5m footpath, further 1m berm..." which, in anyone's addition is 3.5m. Not 4.5m. And even that does not exist across the road.

I just now went over the road with a tape measure and from gutter edge to far side of sidewalk is 2.6m, then about 30cm dirt to the slope edge. Where there is a layby - what could possibly be the reason for one on this side of the road? - it measures 3.8m gutter to far side of indented sidewalk.

The numbers changed when that sketchy little drawing was done and it somehow became the specification, the correct numbers were no longer quoted in the document at Condition 9. It was sketched without attention to the Draft Consent specification and without recourse to the Mapua Rise/SVRd sidewalk concrete reality I was required to duplicate.

I'm asking, can this be made right please? 3m being the concrete and berm *REALITY* across the road or at worst 3.5m as the "residential formation standard". You'll understand Erin that I have consistently been devastated by the massive destruction of tree belt along the frontage for this requirement. I care enormously about green outlooks for everyone's benefit. I am desperate to argue for every metre that would save more mature trees, and there are many at the end going toward number 20 SVRd.

The trees are now extra important there because a motorway standard light was put right at the edge of my property some months ago and about 30m of my garden and my living room are bathed in bright white light all night. Forget seeing the Milky Way! Devastating. When those verge trees are destroyed when/If going to Title, then the rooms in half my house will be light-polluted. The young chaps putting it in assured me the light would be on the road and my garden would remain dark!!

I look forward to your response please Erin. The little sketch, presumably from Engineering, sent the dimensions askew in a very harmful and incorrect way. I so wish this had been identified early on and I chastise myself for not going across to measure.

Kind regards,

Pat