

This document is respectfully submitted on behalf of Claire Jackson for review in the proposed District Plan 2025.

Email address for service is [jackson.lloyd@xtra.co.nz](mailto:jackson.lloyd@xtra.co.nz)

I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

I wish to be heard in support of my submission.

If others, make a similar submission I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing

### **Introduction**

We as a local family represent seven generations spanning back 170 years who have owned & continue to reside on a substantial portion of the Coast Road area in rural Wainuiomata. I have lived & worked here for over 70 years & feel I have a noteworthy amount of awareness & knowledge about our local history - land & environment.

### **Highly Productive Land.**

#### **GRUZ-HPLO**

#### **OPPOSE IN FULL**

1. Restrictions are irrational.
2. Overlays are very inaccurate and outdated as is well known by officials.
3. Land in the Hutt Valley is clearly not Highly Productive.
4. Should not be on Private land.

#### **ONLs Natural Environment Values**

#### **OPPOSE IN PART**

1. ONLs **should** apply only to public land. Never private land without consultation and consent.
2. Again, outdated mapping lacks accuracy and consistency.
3. Regulations are highly restrictive Creating health and safety issues.

#### **NFL\_P2**

1. Customary harvesting rights should **NOT BE PUT ACROSS PRIVATE LAND**
2. Insufficient evidence no clear definitions:

### **NFL-S2 Building in ONLS**

1. The allowed building activity in ONLS is limited to 50 square meters every five years, or 10 square meters per year.
2. Completely unfair & disheartening for a property with 90% ONL covering 460 hectares

### **NFL-R3 indigenous vegetation removal.**

- 1 The maximum allowable clearance from the building is 3 meters.
- 2 The clearance required on either side of fence lines is 1 meter.
- 3 track clearance, 2.5 wide on public tracks only.
- 4 **Creating Major fire Health & safety risk.**

### **Earthworks. EW Rural Support in Part**

#### **EW S .4 support**

- 1 The transport of 400 cubic meters of cut and fill is approved.
- 2 Reducing track mileage will lessen carbon emissions.

#### **EW S .1 OPPOSE**

- 1 1,000-square-foot area I would like to see extended to 2,000 square feet in rural areas for soil disturbance.

#### **EW S 2 Support**

- 1 Cut and fill 1.5 meters.

#### **EW S 10 OPPOSE**

- 1 **Exclude** off Private land

### **Subdivision General Rural**

#### **SUBS. 1 OPPOSE IN PART**

The average size of general rural zones should be reduced from 15 hectares to approx. 7 hectares for sensibleness open space been Key.

## **Rural.**

### **GRUZ R.6 Support**

The site includes one principal residential dwelling and two minor dwellings of 80 square meters each. Each of the two dwellings is situated on an average of 15 hectares per site.

### **GRUZ R 12. Support**

visitor accommodation 10 people.

### **FC- S3 OPPOSE**

Reserves contributions should not apply to general rural zones.

\$7,500 + GST is completely excessive & unjustified.