

Response No:
14

Contribution ID: 7938
Member ID: 645
Date Submitted: May 09, 2026, 10:49 AM

Q1 Name of submitter

Short Text Kit Jensen

Q2 Contact person (if different from submitter)

Short Text Kit Jensen

Q3 Postal address

Short Text 33D Airport Drive

Q4 Email address

Email kitandcellia@gmail.com

Q5 Phone number

Telephone 021967289

Q6 Can you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?

Select Box No

Q7 Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

Select Box No

Q8 Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?

Select Box Yes

Q9 If others make a similar submission would you consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing?

Select Box Yes

Q10 ~ DEV1-Policies

Single Checkbox

Q11 Do you support/support in part/oppose the provision?

Select Box

Q12 Submission

Long Text

Q13 Relief sought

Long Text

Q14 ~ DEV1-Rules

Single Checkbox

Q15 Do you support/support in part/oppose the provision?

Select Box

Q16 Submission

Long Text

Q17 Relief sought

Long Text

Q18 ~ DEV1-Structure Plan Figures

Single Checkbox

Q19 Do you support/support in part/oppose the provision?

Select Box

Q20 Submission

Long Text

Q21 Relief sought

Long Text

Q22 ~ DEV1-Structure Plan Guidance

Single Checkbox

Q23 Do you support/support in part/oppose the provision?

Select Box

Q24 Submission

Long Text

Q25 Relief sought

Long Text

Q26 ~ DEV1-Planning Maps

Single Checkbox

Yes

Q27 Do you support/support in part/oppose the provision?

Select Box

Support in part

Q28 Submission

Long Text

Concerned about the future viability of the indicative road sweeping through our small parcel of land. (appendix 2)

Q29 Relief sought

Long Text

Generally happy with Plan Change 2 but on the north side of our 8555m2 block, (33D Airport Drive), less than an acre when creek is taken into account, a new indicative road curves through this section, leaving some awkward spaces for future subdivision. If we are to contribute to the road construction the viability of the exercise become questionable. It would certainly affect the value.
Is this link necessary, or can it be modified?
Under the old plan, we had made provision for a ROW up the west side of the property to access this block from existing ROW/paper road, although to provide waste fall for any lower sections, closer to the creek, these would best be drained out along the creek valley. Although one could under bore back to the existing paper road if necessary? Anyway, please keep us in the lop.

Q30 ~ DEV1-General

Single Checkbox

Q31 Do you support/support in part/oppose the provision?

Select Box

Q32 Submission

Long Text

Q33 Relief sought

Long Text

Q34 Attachments

File Upload

