

SUBMISSION 254

Bruce and Theresa Stevens
2306 Akatarawa Road
RD 2
Upper Hutt 5372

31 October 2023

Upper Hutt City Council
Private Bag 907
Upper Hutt 5140

RE: PC50 Staglands Precinct

I make this Submission in support of Staglands in regard to the PC50 Staglands Precinct Proposal.

I am saddened and angered by Upper Hutt City Council's stance and approach to this matter.

Staglands has been in operation for 50 years and now you are trying to impose restrictions to their operation which could affect their ability to continue to operate as they have been. Your approach feels like it is Anti-Business. Upper Hutt City Council should remember that it has a responsibility to encourage business in Upper Hutt, not discourage it. If we don't have businesses we don't have employment. If we don't have employment we don't have rate payers. Staglands has always employed many local people. If you restrict Staglands operation like you propose you will limit the number of people that they can employ.

Staglands is a valuable attraction to bring people to Upper Hutt from all over the Wellington region. Upper Hutt needs all the attractions that we can have. Anything that brings people to our city should be encouraged and supported. It all benefits the city and the community.

We are Staglands immediate neighbour on their South boundary. We have lived here for seven years. As such, we have possibly the best insight into the activities at Staglands.

With regard to noise, the only noise that we hear is that of people enjoying themselves. There is no noise issue. Staglands are very considerate of their neighbours and their responsibilities with noise. If they have evening events the noise is controlled and all activity is finished at a reasonable time. If there were ever to be any issues with this then there are already measures in place to deal with this. Why do you need to seek to add more layers of rules that would restrict reasonable activity.

Staglands is a community hub for this area. They are very good to all of the locals and many community events are held there. I would find it hard to believe that any of the locals would ever have any reason to complain about the activities at Staglands.

You seem to be seeking to restrict the amount of traffic that is using the road to get to Staglands. After 50 years of people travelling to Staglands you now seem to think that this is damaging to the road? What is damaging to the road is the volume of logging trucks that are heavily loaded and travelling at speed on the road. I don't hear of any proposal to limit the activity of logging trucks. Also what is damaging to the road is the amount of slips that are damaging the road and then further damage occurs during the clean up. A more proactive approach to the maintenance of the road would surely be of the most benefit.

Other things in the Proposal also defy common sense and logic. Where have some of the ideas come from? Who has proposed all of this? I am pretty sure that you have not consulted with the members of the Community that are directly affected, that is us the residents of the area.

“The role of local authorities is to lead and represent their communities. They must engage with their communities and encourage community participation in decision-making, while considering the needs of people currently living in communities and those who will live there in the future.”

It seems to me that your proposal will only add more layers of rules that are already covered in other areas of Legislation. While we do need rules and plans to operate under it should not be more than is reasonable and necessary. The Council should not act in a way that will limit growth, reasonable development and innovation in the area. Individual proposals should be considered on their own merits. At the very least existing businesses and residents should not be punished with the unreasonable, unrealistic and unworkable proposals that you are making.

Kind regards
Bruce Stevens