

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 Ben Rumsey on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025.
2. My email address for service is ben.rumsey@gmail.com
3. I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
4. 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.
5. I wish to be heard in support of my submission.
6. If others make a similar submission, I will not consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Introduction

The proposed district plan , particularly the HRZ zoning, recession planes and building heights are excessive to the stated needs and goals. Allowing 6 story buildings though the majority of the valley floor is extreme and impacts so many around in so many negative ways. I personally know of people who have gone through significant stress and eventually sold property adjacent to two story developments that went outside their consents with little to no enforcement from council.

How about the council go after the low hanging fruit to solve the housing crisis. So many of todays 3 and 4 bedroom family homes are occupied by empty nesters or childless couples. We have the bedrooms needed, but most of them are gathering dust. Why is there no feebate on rates for full bedrooms vs empty homes? Make moving to a smaller house financially better, make taking on a border a better option, free up teh housing we do have without building anything. Think outside the box.

As much as submitting is the right thing to do it was my clear experience that the previous district plan was not followed, and significant deviations from the plan were allowed for as long as a single urban architect stamped them with a 'less than minor impact' stamp. The only recourse was a judicial review - an excessive cost to overcome for almost all. How is it that one person can stamp away a whole district plan with a less than minor stamp? Is it even worth trying to consult on a plan when it can be ignored so easily?

I have taken the time and effort to try to put in a submission - but will anyone at council actually try to put in any effort in controlling the 'less than minor' stamp issued by the few that destroys the plan settled on by the many?

Decisions Requested

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
1	HRZ – High Density Residential Zone	HRZ-O4	Oppose	The height of 6 stories is highly detrimental to the area in terms of shading, wind management, neighbourhood privacy, the urban environment and is not necessary to achieve the stated goals. The proposed intensity is extreme when compared to the majority of the single story HRZ and not compatible with the alluvial soil / aquifer in the valley.	Limit buildings to 3 stories
2	HRZ – High Density Residential Zone	HRZ-S4	Oppose	The proposed recession lines are oppressive, will impact neighbouring properties excessively though denial of sunlight and impose costs due to reduced thermal heating on shaded properties. Sunlight can provide up to 1000w/m2 of energy and the proposed 4m x 60° recession would be expected to cut significant areas of neighbouring properties' access to sunlight, costing them significantly more to heat their properties in our sub tropical environment.	Reduce boundary height for recession plane to 2.5m from 4.0m

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
3	NoiseHRZ – High Density Residential Zone	Whole chapter	Addition required	<p>Cycle storage requirements are mostly missing from the high density zone, particularly with <4 units or multiple units that are free hold. Cycle storage is critical for the HRZ due to inherent lack of parking options that come with high density. Many current new builds the council has allowed under the current plan either have a ‘bike’ shed that is too small to store an adult bike (dimensions as set out in TR-S3), or no bike storage at all. Lack of appropriate cycle storage impacts the whole life of the building (60+years) and therefore has a multi generational impact in denying residents cycle ownership. If there is a true desire to provide for affordable housing, requiring access to affordable transport options such as cycling is essential.</p>	Add requirements for all builds in HRZ to accommodate cycle storage options with dimensions as per TR-S3 requirements.

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
4	Maps	HRZ	Oppose	The high density zone exceeds too far away from the train corridor. The proposed HRZ density allows for dwellings that require increased support from transport, retail and commercial options due to small size, lack of in house facilities such as a washing lines. These service options such as laundromats do not readily exist outside the rail corridor. In effect the proposal is allowing for apartment living without suitable proximity to city type services and transport required for this type of living.	limit HRZ to 500m from the rail corridor.