

Name (Please use your full name)

Harriett Sowman

Postal Address

123d Johnsons Road, Whitemans Valley 5371

Agent acting for submitter (If applicable)

N/A

Address for service (If different from above)

As postal address

Telephone number

0273169500

Email address

Harriett_sowman@outlook.com

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

No

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows

Mutiple areas, mainly Berkett provision

My submission is that

The proposed plan PC50 raised several serious concerns for myself and the wider Whitemans valley community. On page 3 of the s32 report, it states that the degree of risk involved with the proposed change is low. I disagree with this level of risk for the following reasons: 1. Safety of the community should always be the highest priority when proposing changes to an area. The Berkett subdivision proposal raises a high level of risk for the area. With the proposed 103 new houses, this would then lead to an increased demand for emergency services in the area. The current roads and infrastructure are already suffering considerable damage from the existing traffic, and there are several one-way bridges to navigate. Should emergency services be required in the valley, there would be likely significant delays to reaching people in need as the roads are currently, which puts human life at risk. To mitigate this risk, there would need to be significant investment in the current roading and infrastructure so that the safety of the residents could be ensured. 2. On page 30 of the PC50 document, it states that there would likely be 250 vehicle movements per day. This is a significant increase from the existing traffic movements, and as mentioned above, the roads are currently not suitable for the current level of use. In addition, due to being a rural community, a lot off vehicle movements are from trailers and trucks containing livestock. Due to the latter, there are near misses due to narrow roads and one-way bridges on a daily basis, and accidents occur on an unreasonably frequent basis. The government recently launched a "road to zero" policy to ultimately aim for zero deaths on our roads. The current proposal completely negates that policy. 3. The proposed "250 vehicle movements per day" seems to be significantly underestimated. If there are 2 cars per household, plus visitors and contractors/workmen this is already going to be over the 250 vehicle movements per day proposed on page 30. In addition, it appears from the proposal that there will be provision to build another dwelling on each section. This would bring in another 1-2 cars per household, which would far exceed the 250 vehicle movements proposed per day. Given the latter, I would like to see how UHCC arrived at the 250 vehicle movements per day. 4. In addition, the Berkett subdivision proposed presents significant risk to waterways, native bush and the generally peaceful environment of the valley. In 2018, UHCC led a prosecution in court regarding water disturbance due to 4wd activity at the Berkett property. In this case, it was emphasised by council how significant the area was to native wildlife. Could you please explain how the proposed settlement does not impact this very environment UHCC was so interested in protection in 2018? Despite the above, I do recognise there is a significant need for more housing in the region and that development in Whitemans valley is likely inevitable. The UHCC should consider, as a counter proposal to the changes, that there is no provision for a settlement or small block sizes, but instead half the minimum lot size of Rural production. This allows for more housing to be developed without as significantly impacting the infrastructure and would be a more gradual change over time. This would then allow time for the roading and infrastructure to be developed to a point where it is sustainable for residents and not risking delays in emergency services. As a general comment, the PC50 document is extremely hard to read and has multiple contradictions. Because of the volume of changes, the council should have provided a simple markup document or clean version to compare to, so that it is simpler for the community to understand the changes.

I seek the following decision from the local authority

I wish to be heard in support of my submission.

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission (tick appropriate box)

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission.

please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission (tick appropriate box)

I do not wish to make a joint case.

If your submission is over 500 words, please upload a word document with your submission. Please provide the questions as your headers before

each paragraph.

https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/fe3bb911e04dfe8166dc221225af830583515aa8/original/1700179371/4d923ce847a7643eb565a9d9312fc1ce_Submission_Harriett_Sowman.docx?1700179371

Harriett Rose Sowman

123d Johnsons Road, Whitemans Valley 5371

Harriett_sowman@outlook.com

Declaration: I do not stand to gain commercial advantage from my submission.

I wish to be heard in support of my submission.

I am seeking the following relief:

The proposed plan PC50 raised several serious concerns for myself and the wider Whitemans valley community.

On page 3 of the s32 report, it states that the degree of risk involved with the proposed change is low. I disagree with this level of risk for the following reasons:

1. Safety of the community should always be the highest priority when proposing changes to an area. The Berkett subdivision proposal raises a high level of risk for the area. With the proposed 103 new houses, this would then lead to an increased demand for emergency services in the area. The current roads and infrastructure are already suffering considerable damage from the existing traffic, and there are several one-way bridges to navigate. Should emergency services be required in the valley, there would be likely significant delays to reaching people in need as the roads are currently, which puts human life at risk. To mitigate this risk, there would need to be significant investment in the current roading and infrastructure so that the safety of the residents could be ensured.
2. On page 30 of the PC50 document, it states that there would likely be 250 vehicle movements per day. This is a significant increase from the existing traffic movements, and as mentioned above, the roads are currently not suitable for the current level of use. In addition, due to being a rural community, a lot of vehicle movements are from trailers and trucks containing livestock. Due to the latter, there are near misses due to narrow roads and one-way bridges on a daily basis, and accidents occur on an unreasonably frequent basis. The government recently launched a "road to zero" policy to ultimately aim for zero deaths on our roads. The current proposal completely negates that policy.
3. The proposed "250 vehicle movements per day" seems to be significantly underestimated. If there are 2 cars per household, plus visitors and contractors/workmen this is already going to be over the 250 vehicle movements per day proposed on page 30. In addition, it appears from the proposal that there will be provision to build another dwelling on each section. This would bring in another 1-2 cars per household, which would far exceed the 250 vehicle movements proposed per day. Given the latter, I would like to see how UHCC arrived at the 250 vehicle movements per day.
4. In addition, the Berkett subdivision proposed presents significant risk to waterways, native bush and the generally peaceful environment of the valley. In 2018, UHCC led a prosecution in court regarding water disturbance due to 4wd activity at the Berkett property. In this case, it was emphasised by council how significant the area was to native wildlife. Could you please explain how the proposed settlement does not impact this very environment UHCC was so interested in protection in 2018?

Despite the above, I do recognise there is a significant need for more housing in the region and that development in Whitemans valley is likely inevitable. The UHCC should consider, as a

counter proposal to the changes, that there is no provision for a settlement or small block sizes, but instead half the minimum lot size of Rural production. This allows for more housing to be developed without as significantly impacting the infrastructure and would be a more gradual change over time. This would then allow time for the roading and infrastructure to be developed to a point where it is sustainable for residents and not risking delays in emergency services.

As a general comment, the PC50 document is extremely hard to read and has multiple contradictions. Because of the volume of changes, the council should have provided a simple markup document or clean version to compare to, so that it is simpler for the community to understand the changes.