

**From:** [Juliette Lister](#)  
**To:** [District Plan Review Team](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED LOWER HUTT DISTRICT PLAN 2025  
**Date:** Friday, 2 May 2025 4:20:37 pm

---

You don't often get email from [juliettelister@hotmail.com](mailto:juliettelister@hotmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council

I, Juliette Lister, make this submission on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025 ("Proposed Plan") on behalf of myself, Anton Nadilo and Bianca Nadilo

My email address for service is [juliettelister@hotmail.com](mailto:juliettelister@hotmail.com)

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

I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that—

adversely affects the environment, and the specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to, my submission on those provisions, and the decisions I seek are shown below. I also seek all further, alternative, necessary, or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission.

I do not 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 the hearing.

## **Background**

We have lived in Lowry Bay for 13 years and plan to add a dwelling to our property. This policy has already cost us in extra compliance costs and we are alarmed at what extra costs and restrictions we may face as a result of these rules and policies, which we were not aware of or could have imagined to be a barrier when we started this process.

I am appalled by the Council's total lack of consultation with landowners before these changes took effect. I understand that the sites were not included in the draft plan that the Council released for consultation in late 2023. It seems that Council consulted with mana whenua before including the sites in the Proposed Plan, but didn't bother to consult with landowners.

This lack of consultation and advance notice is outrageous. I've been told that a section of the RMA says that the Proposed Plan is in immediate effect even though the Council hasn't voted on it. If the Council is going to impose rules on local landowners, it should have the common decency to give them some advance notice and an opportunity to give their views on the changes. These ambush tactics have shaken my trust in the Council and its elected members.

## **Submission and requested decisions.**

My submission and requested decisions from the Council are set out below.

My primary requested decision is for the Independent Hearings Panel to recommend that the SASM provisions in the Proposed Plan not proceed. The process the Council has followed has been so inadequate that the Panel can have no confidence in the identification of sites compared to the existing Plan, or that the costs of extra restrictions on land use and development have been properly accounted for. In particular:

The definition of category 2 and 3 SASMs is arbitrary and is based only on what mana whenua have told the Council, with the only cross-check being a “desktop review”

The “values” of the SASMs have not been identified. This robs the Proposed Plan of any content, as many of the sites no longer physically exist, leaving the question of what is left to protect

The Council has failed to carry out even a basic assessment of costs to landowners and the community from restricting land use and development. It has not even bothered to count the number of properties affected compared to the old policy, or identify how the Proposed Plan will restrict housing supply and economic growth in the Hutt. It is clear that the Council wrongly believes that the RMA requires it to act as it has, and that any cost to landowners and the community is a sacrifice it is willing to make to protect cultural and spiritual values it isn't able to identify

Overall, the purpose of the Proposed Plan appears to be to provide Maori with decision-making rights in private land, not to genuinely protect sites of significance.

The SASM provisions in the Proposed Plan should not proceed.

However, if the Panel recommends to the Council that the SASM provisions proceed, I request the changes to the Proposed Plan set out in the table below.

**My submission and the requested decisions requested by the Council are set out below.**