

SUBMISSION 219

Name (Please use your full name)

Karen Wallace

Postal Address

1291 Akatarawa Road, RD 2 Upper Hutt

Agent acting for submitter (If applicable)

NA

Telephone number

0274849066

Email address

karenwallaceneu@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

The entrenched view of UHCC that the valley floor in Akatarawa Valley should be "protected : as it is "Productive" land. The approach is to overly restrict smaller land owners in a rural area from doing things on their land. Too prescriptive, eg can't subdivide when there is a capacity and demand for it, can 't put a 2nd dwelling more than 100 m from the main house, even restricting the sqm of garaging. There is no evidence that these issues are a problem The changes are trying to solve problems that don't exist. The basis of all this change was a poorly done report with little evidence - it was a high level traffic light report that painted Akatarawa valley very negatively and when questioned the council officers couldnt provide evidence or supporting information for the conclusions The lack of respect and protection for existing business in Akatarawa Valley, namely Staglands, a significant regional economic and tourism activity that should be supported nit constrained and Bluebank Blueberry Farm, a 30 year plus horticulture business that is very popular and the sort of activities that people expect to see in a rural area. The provisions are very complicated, the summary documents don't cover enough information for people to see that they may be adversely affected. eg people running accommodation businesses, people

running home business etc.

My submission is that

1. I object to the seemingly entrenched view of UHCC that the valley floor in Akatarawa Valley should be "protected" as it is "Productive" land. Our property was part of a 100 acre dairy farm 40 years ago. As a 10 acre property, which is what a lot of the valley floor is, there is no production activity that could be described as economic. What are you protecting the land for when no-one can make a living off production on 10 acres? There is capacity and demand for small rural lots- and this would see no reduction in production activity as there isn't any other than hobby level activities. It is frustrating to see other poor quality subdivisions in rural and urban areas when we are prevented from doing so. We want to do a modest subdivision, 2-acre lots, to allow our children to build a house and own a small rural lot. There are many families in this valley who have a long history of living here and have multi generational homes. We have our Dad living in a separate dwelling, one of the previous owners did the same. We can't have a dwelling for us when one of our kids moves in the house as the number of dwellings is restricted and we are exposed to risk with the inability to have separate titles. The plan change even restricts how close the 2nd dwellings can be 50- 100m when we have 10 acres to spread over!. It is even more frustrating to see poor quality subdivision on the hills on the other side of the road that can clear fell the land, add to the run off onto our property and cut it up to their hearts content with no concern about traffic noise and reduction in amenity.

2. The PC 50 approach appears to overly restrict smaller land owners in a rural area from doing things on their land where there is no evidence there is a problem. Too prescriptive, eg can't subdivide when there is a capacity and demand for it, can't put a 2nd dwelling more than 100 m from the main house, even restricting the sqm of garaging. There is no evidence that these issues are a problem. The changes are trying to solve problems that don't exist.

3. The basis of all this change was a poorly done report with little evidence - it was a high level traffic light report that painted Akatarawa Valley very negatively and when questioned the officers couldn't provide evidence or supporting information for the conclusions. It said there are no walking tracks in the vicinity- completely omits Kaitoke regional park. One of the few supposed positives, green traffic light, says there are no high class soils. This isn't a positive feature but given this assessment why does the productive land need to be protected? The engagement process with the focus group was poor with high staff turnover, it went on for far too long and wasn't brought to an end, it just stopped and wasn't communicated with when the final proposal came out. The final proposal has material never seen during the process and has left the focus group participants feeling like their time and contribution wasn't valued and that the outcome was preordained.

4. The lack of respect and protection for existing business in Akatarawa Valley, for example Staglands and Bluebank Blue berry Farm. Staglands is a significant regional economic and tourism asset that should be supported and championed, the provisions will restrict their future business- what is the problem you are trying to solve, why were these provisions added? We can't afford to not support these business. Similar but of a lesser scale is the Blueberry Farm that has been operating for many years and should be supported. The definition of rural productive activity needs to allow for and support their operation so

it can prosper and add value to the locality and Upper Hutt.

5. Lastly the provisions are very complicated, the summary documents don't cover enough information for people to see that they may be adversely affected. eg people running accommodation businesses, people running home business etc. I think there are many people who won't realise they are impacted by these provisions. And to repeat the earlier point I can't see the problem you are trying to solve with prescriptive conditions for some of these things.

I seek the following decision from the local authority

I want the PC 50 process stopped , it is so flawed the consultation process needs to begin again

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.
