

SUBMISSION 200

Name (Please use your full name)

Merryl Eileen Park

Postal Address

322 Moonshine Hill Road

Agent acting for submitter (If applicable)

N/A

Address for service (If different from above)

No Answer

Telephone number

0276922652

Email address

merrylpark300@gmail.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

Changes to the general rural zone. -that will allow subdivision to 1 hectare. -that have in my opinion weakened the environmental protections of our indigenous biodiversity -that remove adding additional building from a discretionary to a complying activity

My submission is that

The change to the subdivision rules for general rural in the Moonshine valley will significantly change the rural character and lead to significantly more vehicle movements. This change is also inconsistent with the council previously turning down subdivision

applications for the Moonshine Hill road general rural area due to the fact that Moonshine Road already have more vehicle movements than is recommended for a road of its quality. The council themselves undertook a study to look at the traffic flows and used this to say any increase in housing in the Moonshine area was not feasible due to the road. There was an assumption that most people living in the Bulls Run Moonshine intersection area would use the road that lead to the Porirua side but this was not supported by the councils own study which showed higher volumes on the road towards Upper Hutt than would be recommended for a road of this size and quality. At that time it was considered whether Moonshine Hill Road on the Upper Hutt side could be double laned. However this was not thought to be feasible due to: - the fact that the cuttings on the uphill side are all mostly higher than is recommended - the down road side is a valley of protected native bush with a tributary of the Hutt River in it - the cost was if I remember rightly about 7 million dollars and that was in the 1990s or early 2000s so would be at least double that now. I do not understand why if adding an additional dwelling is a discretionary activity why the council are not turning some of these down. Many are clearly not complying with the discretionary rules and are adding traffic movements. Perhaps instead of making another dwelling a complying activity as the council is not turning any down the council should instead leave this as a discretionary activity and actually enforce its own rules and turn down applications that clearly do not meet the rules both in size of the dwelling and use of the dwelling. By continuing to require that the minimum size is 20 hectares this means that some properties are not easily able to be subdivided due to their topography and so less additional houses and less additional vehicle movements are likely. By allowing the division of, for eg a 40 hectare block to one 39 hectare block and one 1 hectare block a lot more properties will be able to be subdivided. Currently although people can add a dwelling this is meant to be for family and its size is limited and it cannot be subdivided off, this reduces the number of land owners who would chose to do this. By adding more 1 hectare properties by the road it is likely that these will be more manicured properties and so a significant visual change to the rural area. There is also the likelihood that some of the people buying these will not appreciate all the effects of the farming activities that may occur. After subdivision of this sort occurred in Flightys road in the Porirua area some farmers found themselves the respondents of numerous complaints that they were keeping dangerous animals, the animal in question was a bull and it had never escaped its paddock, however the neighbours wanted it removed to make it safer for their children. The ease with which so many properties could be subdivided is highly likely to cause an increase in traffic. How is the council taking into account its own precedent in turning down subdivision applications in the pasts. I know you might say that you can do this as the overall sub dividable total is still 20 hectares so a 40 hectare block is not becoming 8 properties but still only 2 which it could become now but in truth a lot of the general rural land is not easily sub dividable now and that is what is pushing this change is wanting more houses in the general rural zone and so more traffic and more pressure on the rural environment. I am also concerned that a lot of the references all through the document to protection of indigenous biodiversity seem to have been made weaker than in previous version.

I seek the following decision from the local authority

To not change to way that rural general land can be subdivided, so to leave the minimum sub dividable size of land in the general rural zone at 20 hectares. To not change adding an additional dwelling to a general rural property to a complying activity but to instead leave it as discretionary and to enforce the rules around the use and size that were in the previous plan. To increase the protections for indigenous biodiversity in the whole document.

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.
