

This is a submission on behalf of Donald McCreary for the Proposed District Plan 2025.

Email address for service is donmcc@outlook.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.**

I recently purchased our Pencarrow Lodge property, consisting of 205 ha with large future aspirations. Address Pencarrow Coast Rd, Lower Hutt.

I have serious concerns that some of the proposed overlay restrictions will breach our property rights, undermine any future aspirations I have and seriously devalue my property, placing pressure on my bankability.

My submission on what I support and oppose is as follows.

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

**Oppose in part** for the following reasons.

- **Outstanding Natural Landscapes** should only apply to Public land not Private land without permission from affected landowners.
- Mapping is inaccurate and inconsistent. The employed mapping professional's definition of 'landscape' being seriously flawed also.
- One so called professional has far too much power to map properties with a personal agenda and no accountability.
- Regulations are very restrictive rendering at least 2 private properties uneconomic.

### **NFL -P2 Oppose**

- Customary Harvesting Rights for Maori should only apply to public land not private land.
- No clear evidence for these rights.
- No defined terms as to exactly what Harvesting Rights mean.

### **NFL-S2 Buildings in ONLs Oppose**

- Permitted activity for Buildings in ONLs is only 50 sq m per 5 years , 10 sq m per year. This is very unreasonable on a property that is 90% covered with ONLs and is 460 hectares in size.

### **NFL- R.3 Indigenous vegetation removal. Oppose**

- Permitted activities as follows
- Clearance from buildings is 3m max
- Clearance either side of fence lines is 1m
- Track clearance 2.5m wide on public tracks only
- Track clearance for beehives or farm tracks only 2.5m.
- 50 sq m clearance for beehives per 12 mths

**These restrictions could potentially create serious fire hazards to properties.**

**MY RECOMMENDATION “ is to remove all private land from the ONL overlays unless they have landowners consent.”**

### **Earthworks. EW Rural.**

**Support in part.**

#### **EW S.4 Support**

- I support transport of cut and fill material of 400 cu3.
- Will help reduce truck milage which in effect will reduce carbon emissions.
- Will allow for recycling of materials.

#### **EW S.1 Oppose**

- 1,000sq m area should be expanded to at least 2,000 sq m in rural areas for soil disturbance.
- Or 1,000sq m per each 4 hectares of land in general rural , to keep the scale comparable to other zones

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

- Cut and fill 1.5m

#### **EW S.10 Oppose**

- Soil disturbance in ONLs of 100 sq m area and 1.0m height should not be included , as ONLs should not be on private property without landowners consent.

## **SUBDIVISION GENERAL RURAL**

### **SUBS.1 Oppose in part**

- 15 hectares could be reduced down to 7 hectares as an average size in general rural zones.
- There should be more flexibility under controlled or restricted discretionary to allow for more logical and practical subdivisions to suit the lay of the land, but also keeping the over all average minimum size of 7 hectares.
- This will allow for some subdivision but not too much, keeping the openspace feel in a general rural zone.

## **RURAL.**

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

- 2 Principal Residential dwellings , plus 2 minor 80 sq m dwellings per site with each 2 dwellings having an average of 15 hectares.

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

- Visitor accommodation 10 persons .

### **FC. S.3 Oppose**

- Reserves contribution should not apply in a general rural zone as it would actually take pressure off parks and reserve areas.
- \$7,500 +gst is over a 50% increase in cost which is unreasonable.

### **Sasm. Oppose in part.**

- No consultation with affected property owners
- Overlay maps introduced at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour.
- No evidence to back up some of these overlays.
- Mapping seems very over reaching and unspecific.
- I support Sasm where there is clear scientific or historical evidence.

**Proposed.** All areas that don't have clear evidence are put under category 3 until they are truly justified.

**Highly Productive Land. (although may not apply to my property I support the opposition to this)**

**GRUZ-HPLO**

**Oppose in full** for the following reasons.

- *Restrictions are unreasonable .*
- *Almost all activities within HPL areas will be non complying unless it's for food and fibre production.*
- *Overlays are very inaccurate and outdated as is well known by officials.*
- *Land in the Hutt Valley is clearly not Highly Productive.*
- *Government is committed to removing LUC 3 from Highly Productive land.*

**Recommendation.** *All associated costs with HPL consent applications should be waived until accurate mapping is completed.*

**Summary**

I would appreciate Council taking the time to consider my submission as these overlays and changes will have a considerable impact on the use and value of our properties.

I would suggest that HCC put ONLs / Highly Productive Land and Sasm overlays on hold as you have with SNAs, until you get clear direction from the Government due to the fact that the RMA is being dismantled this year. It would not be prudent to continue in it's present form.

Thanks, Don McCreary



