

# SUBMISSION 202

**Name (Please use your full name)**

Karen Pearce

---

**Postal Address**

207 Colletts Road, Upper Hutt

---

**Telephone number**

0272451594

---

**Email address**

karenpearce12@hotmail.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**

Settlement zone Maymorn/Parkes Line Road Home Business

---

**My submission is that**

Firstly I'd like to say how un-user friendly this PC50 document/process has been. There are multiple documents that co-exist with each other however you don't realise it until you have stumbled upon it. The 136 pages of the PC50 is fine until you realise there is a 311 page Section 32 document that you have to read as well. This is extremely cumbersome and clearly not designed for anyone wanting to know how the PC50 affects them unless you have hours and hours of free time and energy. There are no links to click on when you're trying to work out what references like RED-P2 means. There are no definitions obviously available for terminology used eg Rural Industry. You find them in separate documents by googling! This is extremely annoying and makes submitting a submission near impossible for busy people that just don't have the time. The council's lack of consultation on how the PC50 may affect current landowners/small business owners boils down to very poor communication and facilitation of the document itself. The proposed settlement zone on the western side of Maymorn Road and Parkes Line road will be subdividable to 2000m<sup>2</sup>. This would allow hundreds and hundreds of homes to be built without the necessary infrastructure, affecting traffic congestion, noise pollution, visual pollution. The noise from the Gabites farm subdivision is already constant and relentless

all day every day, with machinery operating developing the land. I anticipate this will be years of noise for this subdivision and the proposed settlement zone on the opposite side of the road. We look down on this area with the noise travelling up to our house. We purchased our property to get away from suburbia, to live amongst nature, with only the noise of wildlife and livestock. We did not anticipate having to live with constant construction noise all day every day bouncing up the hill. We purchased our property for the beautiful view which will obviously be impacted if hundreds of homes (multi storied) are to built below on the valley floor. The settlement provision for Building reflectivity is N/A. Why is this so? We along with the homes in Mt Marua who look down on this area will clearly be affected visually. The reflection off the windows and roofs, the noise travelling when its a prevailing northerly wind or windless day, will be constant and relentless. Once these homes are built these suburban people will be living in an existing rural area. Are they going to be letting off fireworks at guy Fawkes, not understanding that there are horses/livestock very close by and the ramifications for this. This is a constant issue within the valley already with idiots last week driving their car through the valley firing rockets out the car window. A horse was degloved because of fireworks a couple of weeks ago costing the owner thousands of dollars in specialist vet bills at Massey University. This issue will only get worse introducing people who do not understand rural needs, costing the livestock owners dearly. The second issue I have is the Home Business Provision. What is the reasoning behind "No more than two full time....employed."? I do not understand this rule or its limitations. Your PC50 states that you want to increase employment opportunities but here you are limiting the number of people we can employ. If your home business is operating out of your home it doesnt necessarily mean your staff will be there also. Small business in Upper Hutt is needed and should be encouraged however if you place limits on employment levels etc business will go elsewhere. The rule of 'Ancillary retail activities a) majority of products or goods produced entirely on-site'. So if your a hay contractor buying other landowners hay... then this means you cannot store it on your property. Maximum vehicle movements shall be no more that 30 vehicle movements. This rule is ridiculous as when you live rurally owning a home business, with active kids you are constantly going up and down the road. I do not understand the limitations imposed. This would mean Mangaroa Farms are only allowed 15 staff and customers on site any day. How can anyone run a business with this ridiculous limitation imposed. I object to these rules where you are dictating what I can and cannot do on my own land. I would like to see the 30 vehicle moments removed, the employees rule removed and the ancillary rule reassessed to cater for small existing business's. Regards Karen

---

**I seek the following decision from the local authority**

As per my response

---

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

I do not 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 wish to make a joint case.

---