

Submission on Plan Change 13

Good Morning, my name is Jade McNally and I am the property owner at 89 Garnett Ave – McMac Properties Ltd and also the tenant of that property through our business Prestige Collision Repairs. We are a Collision Repair company and employ approximately 24 staff.

We are very concerned at the proposal for the racecourse land. We oppose Plan Change 13. Its common sense that Industrial land with industrial activities will not be compatible with residential properties being plonked next to them. There will be without doubt complaints about noise and other activities, even it is within legal limits.

Just imagine being woken at 4-30am by a compressor that gets turned on and hums at a legal limit constantly every day when you are trying to sleep or get your baby to sleep. Its one of those noises you can't get away from and can quite literally drive people mad. If a morning is a still one, that sound will carry no matter how far away the house is, or what acoustic treatment it has. Or a rubbish truck at 6am and then a tow truck at 9pm the following night, or a car being moved around a site mid repair that does not have a muffler due to accident damage. These activities are all common and legal use of the industrial sites but not compatible with residential sites.

A lot of the items in the submissions are very technical and its very easy to be lulled by the legalise into a sense that its all covered off and the rules will deal with everything.

However, I would point out that the experts are not the be all and end all. Hayden Vink in his Three waters submission in Point 56 on page 16 states

I also note that the existing HCC Rapid Flood Hazard Modelling (RFHM) shows 100 year ARI flood flows are generally flowing in a south to north direction, with flood flows discharging from the McMac Properties and 6 Ken Brown Drive sites into the PC13 area.

I am not an expert on three waters, however I can say quite emphatically that whatever form water takes, it does not flow uphill naturally.

If you view our site we have a retaining wall that is well below the site of the proposed development. Water from our site does not ever discharge into the PC13 area and any water from increased hard surfaces and roofs will flow towards our property. With global warming all over the country stormwaters systems that have been designed for 1 in 100 year floods have failed in 2023 creating massive destruction and economic loss.

I believe we are the lowest lying property adjoining the PC13 site and we have a very valid concern in relation to surface water and where it will end up.

For that reason alone submissions by experts need to be looked at carefully.

We are also concerned about traffic and parking in the areas. Upon reading the experts reports they seem to have relied on google earth for parking spaces and reported crashes. As a collision repair shop I can advise the amount of crashes in the area outside us exiting and entering spotlight and also at the lights at Garnett and Te Rapa Straight are considerably more than is reported.

Mr Balachandrans conclusion is that google earth shows 43 car parks on our site. Firstly those numbers are incorrect and show little understanding of how our business works. We repair damaged vehicles and these are all stored onsite. Similar to most work places any spare car parks are for customers and all our staff park off site in the surrounding areas. I don't have a lot of faith in an expert who does not visit a site or understand how that business works and relies on google earth images as a basis for their expertise.

Upon View Chow Hills plans its very apparent they have not visited the site, for some reason they have our site noted as a Suzuki Car dealer and they have proposed a gate at the back of our property into the PC13. For a start we are not a car dealer, and our access is not off 405 Te Rapa Road. Secondly there is an approx. 2 metre drop at that point currently with a retaining wall. We would not be agreeable to a gate there.

Car parking has not been dealt with adequately in the proposal. The housing proposed will not have garaging or driveways. Each house will most likely have at least two if not more cars. It's proposed to be medium density. Where are these

cars going to park? Issues surrounding car parking on roads leads to issues with emergency vehicles and also attracts criminal element to the area. Most vehicles involved in a stolen and recovered crimes are parked on the street. Why open an area up to this type of activity?

It is common knowledge in the racing industry that Te Rapa Racecourse will be relocating to another site in the near future. We were even advised that by Mr John Oliver when he visited us. It makes sense that the racecourse site will be developed in the future, however it would be wise to do that in an orderly and commercial manner.

It would be much more sensible to have gradual rezoning within the racecourse to ensure industrial sites can operate how they always have. If the PC13 site and the site towards the Avalon Drive boundary was zoned light industrial/ commercial and once the race course moves away to their new premises, rezone the balance land into residential. This would provide better buffers for noise and be a more integrated approach to the entire racecourse area. Long term this would allow for better planning for traffic, noise and water concerns.

In the event that it is decided to proceed with this then it is important to have protection for the industrial site owners and provide for a reverse covenant. Regardless of what experts say, a covenant on a title is notice to the world and any prospective purchaser that there is industrial land next door, there will be noise and other activities, and they cannot complain about it. Its very shortsighted and convenient for a developer to say covenants are not worth the paper they are written on. There are many examples through the courts where covenants are upheld. Developers will rely on covenants when it suits them around house sizes, whether you can have a clothesline in view of the road and other matters. So why do they have such an aversion to a reverse covenant protecting and notifying of existing property owners rights.

If this proceeds any set back needs to be at least 60 metres if not more with very strong acoustic fences and treatment, any building areas need to take into account flood hazard areas and those areas should not be built on.

I thank you for your time in listening to me today, I hope I have given some background to how this could affect how we operate our business and the effect our industrial business would have on residential neighbours if this proceeds. I would like you all to think "would you like to live next to an industrial site that operates all hours."



Jade McNally
24 August 2023