

# Submission on Hutt City Proposed District Plan

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council Via email to [district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz](mailto:district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz).

1. This is a submission by Geoffrey Rogers on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025 ("PDP").
2. My contact phone number is [REDACTED] My email address for service is anubis1@orcon.net.nz
3. I cannot gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission. I am 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.
4. The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are any provisions that will or may apply to subdivision, development and land use at 30 Benmore Crescent.
5. I am concerned that the PDP does not include the most appropriate objectives, policies and rules / methods to manage the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, that enables the existing Manor Park community to continue to provide for our social, economic, and cultural well-being and health and safety. More specifically, I seek that the PDP provisions be retained or amended as required to ensure that any subdivision, land use, and development at 30 Benmore Crescent occurs in a way that avoids adverse effects on the natural environment and the existing residential Manor Park community, including its people, property, the transport network and public spaces. I seek any 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 our submission.
7. If others make a similar submission, we will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
8. Kia ora. I have lived in the Manor Park-Haywards area for 37 years, and I am very concerned that the Hutt City council would consider allowing a waste transfer station to operate at the edge of a residential area. The proposed location, I believe, is not suitable. For the reasons which I will outline below:

The area is adjacent to a Regional Park and has many positives in terms of green space. Though a mostly manicured area, I believe it is still a valuable asset, and is a much better first impression of Hutt City for people travelling down State Highway 58, than a series of industrial buildings was, and again would be, visible under the proposed development. Additionally. As this proposal is to put a significant industrial activity adjacent to an area where houses already exist. It is inevitable that homes in this will lose value as a result. I firmly believe that the effects of heavy rain run-off at the proposed site would be serious. I was a fifteen at the time of the December 1976 floods. Old enough to have quite a vivid recollection of this event. The onslaught of rain ultimately resulting in mud and detritus being washed into Te Awa Kairangi. Blocked culverts, identified as a significant problem following these floods, caused water to bypass the storm-water system, and spill across the land. From what I saw at the time, and have since seen through contemporary photographs, I believe that it is unlikely that any on-site

water storage would be able to cope with these volumes. Any extreme rainfall from this waste transfer could, and probably would, ultimately be discharged into the awa. With climate change, and as has become self-evident through recent weather patterns, there is more potential for this situation to arise, and more frequently.

By far the greatest danger which I believe is posed by the location of a waste transfer station, is fire. Particularly given the quantity of plastics used in modern packaging, and the common use of Lithium batteries. Obviously, most plastics give off toxicants when burned, and a fire involving lithium batteries would have the potential to be very difficult to put out. Any fire at this site - and given the right circumstances most rubbish is flammable - would result in a significant amount of fire fighting water needing to be safely contained and disposed of. Such a fire at this site would probably result in the closing down major transport links because of potential toxic fumes. Even if the noxiousness of these fumes is considered minor, I would expect the area to be closed off as a precaution. As there has to be a high degree of caution exercised by emergency services if any members of the public are likely to be affected. This also raises the question, of where do the residents go if a fire is considered to be an imminent threat to health and stay in place is considered not suitable? Through my, albeit limited research, I have been surprised as to how common waste transfer site fires are around the world. There have been numerous fires, both internationally, and at Waste Transfer Stations in New Zealand. The most recent New Zealand event being on 5th February this year in Onehunga.

I believe for the reasons above, that generally allowing waste transfer stations near residential areas, and specifically allowing a waste transfer station at this location, can pose a serious risk to the health and wellbeing of residents.

Te toto o te tangata, he kai; te oranga o te tangata, he whenua.

Ngā mihi nui

Geoffrey Rogers