

Submission on publicly notified proposed district plan

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Privacy Statement

Your submission must include your name, and an address for service (preferably email, but you can use a postal address). All information you include in this submission, including your name and address for service, will be provided to other submitters and published on Hutt City Council's website. Paper copies may also be made available. Hutt City Council is required to collect and publish this information to carry out its functions under the Resource Management Act 1991 and to enable others to take part in the district plan process. The Council, other submitters, and the Environment Court may need to contact you during this process.

If your submission does not include your name and an address for service, it will be rejected.

While the Council will retain all information provided in your submission in secure council systems, all contact details will be removed from any documents published on Council's website once the district plan process is complete. However, your name and the contents of your submission will still appear in these documents.

You have the right to ask for a copy of any personal information we hold about you, and to ask for it to be corrected if you think it is wrong. If you'd like to ask for a copy of your information, or to have it corrected, please contact us at contact@huttcity.govt.nz, call 04-570-6666, or write to us at Private Bag 31912, Lower Hutt 5040.

To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council

Via email to district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz.

1. This is a submission from Dr Tingdong Guo on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025.
2. My email address for service is tinguo6@gmail.com
3. I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
4. ~~I am/am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:~~
 - a. ~~Adversely affects the environment, and~~
 - b. ~~Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.~~

5. The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to, my submission on those provisions, and the decisions I seek are shown in the below table. I also seek all further, alternative, necessary, or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission.
6. I wish to be heard in support of my submission.
7. If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Decisions Requested

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
---	---------	-----------	----------	---------	---------------

1	SCHED6 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Individual Sites: Puke-Tiroiro (category 3)	Oppose	<p>We strongly oppose the proposed inclusion of our property (or adjacent private land) within the Puke-Tiroiro (Category 3) designation in Schedule 6 of the District Plan. While we acknowledge the cultural significance of historic sites to Māori, this classification creates unreasonable constraints and uncertainty for private landowners without clear justification or sufficient evidence.</p> <p>Primary concerns:</p> <p>1) Lack of proper consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No direct notification. Despite our property being categorised as a Category 3 site of significance to Māori, we were never directly contacted about this change. We received an informational letter regarding the Medium Density Residential Zone changes, but the Māori heritage site designation was conspicuously omitted. Reactive discovery. We only learned of this proposal by proactively 	<p>Firstly, we suggest that the Council should extend the consultation submission period (acknowledge this has been extended) to ensure all affected landowners can participate. Secondly, the Council should mail detailed info flyers to every affected landowners/households including: a map of the proposed potential impacts, clear explanation of potential impacts, contact details for the Council staff to address concerns.</p> <p>We urge the Council to consider the following options:</p> <p>Option 1: Remove private land from the designation (Category 3): Specifically in my case, exclude all privately held land from the Puke-Tiroiro (Category 3) classification.</p> <p>Option 2: Limit designation to public land: Restrict Schedule 6 listings to reserve or Crown land, where cultural significance is undisputed and management aligns with public stewardship.</p> <p>Option 3: Voluntary purchase by the Council: If the Council believes the site's protection is imperative, we are willing to sell our property at price</p>
---	---	---	--------	---	---

				<p>visiting the Council's consultation page. Had we not done so, we would have missed the opportunity to provide feedback – an approach that contradicts the Council's commitment to transparency and equitable engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No direct unfair burden on affected landowners. When a small number of properties are impacted (as in this case), the Council should ensure targeted consultation – including clear explanations of the implications (e.g. future development constraints, valuation effects). This did not occur. <p>2) Impact on private property rights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category 3 designation, even with "limited" effects, sets a precedent for future regulatory encroachment (e.g. consenting hurdles, valuation impacts). Such status introduces ambiguity for land use, subdivision, or development, disproportionately 	<p>we purchased to avoid inequitable losses.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
				<p>burdening private landowners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affected landowners should be provided more details on physical evidence (e.g. archaeological finds, reports, surveys, historical records) and the cultural significance of specific parcels. 	