

RMA Form 5

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 **I** Steve Hobman the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025.
2. My email address for service is steveandhil@gmail.com.
3. I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
4. I **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 **do not wish** to be heard in support of my submission.
7. If others make a similar submission, I **will** present a joint case with them at the hearing.

Introduction

8. My wife and I own our residential property at 6 Catherine Grove Tirohanga

The proposed district plan shows that we are in the Slope Assessment Area.

One of the reasons we bought this home was that it was sited on a hill ridgetop. Hill ridgetops are very stable. The house site has had some minor excavation to form the driveway to the west of the site and minor filling and low retaining wall on the east side of the site. The remainder of the site is slopping but has been stable since 1950/60.

Steve Hobman – Precis background

- Latter 1970s –

Employer	Brickell Moss Rankine and Hil Consulting Engineers
Work summary	Geotechnical assessments roading design
- 1970s to 1990s -

Employer	Hutt City Council
Work summary	– Roothing Engineer - Road construction and maintenance projects including retaining walls and bridges including geotechnical assessments
- 1990s to early 2010s

Employer	Hutt, City Council also MWH and GHD consulting engineers
----------	--
- Work Summary – Roothing Engineer –

Road construction, road maintenance asset management and cycling projects – mainly for NZTA and Hutt City Council. At Hutt City Council I was tasked with remediation of slips in legal road and liaising with adjacent landowners.

Decisions Requested

1	Slope Assessment Area	6 Catherine Grove Tirohanga – House and front yard, driveway and part No 7 Catherine Grove	Oppose	<p>As stated above while at HCC, I was tasked with assessment of slips. I had never encountered a slip on a hill side terrace or ridgetop. The main tell tail reason for the hill side slips was stormwater discharges from homes above a slip.</p> <p>One of the reasons we bought this home was that it was sited on a hill ridgetop. Hill ridgetops are very stable. The house site has had some minor excavation to form the driveway to the west of the site and minor filling and low retaining wall on the east side of the site. The area is basically flat area of land and is not at risk of instability. During building on the northeast corner of our property I excavated by hand the foundations. Hard insitu ground material was generally located about 300 mm below ground level.</p> <p>I note that our neighbours to the east of us at 1,2 and 3 Catherine Grove are not in the Assessment area. They are on the same ridgeline as is our place, I can see no reason for our place to be in the Assessment area. The boundary of the assessment area seems a bit arbitrary.</p> <p>I have attached 2 photos showing the flat profile of our ridgetop home location.</p>	That this area be removed from the Assessment area.
---	-----------------------	---	--------	---	---

2	Slope Assessment Area	6 Catherine Grove Tirohanga – Sloping area to north of house	Oppose	This area is sloping but is highly stable. This section was developed in the 1950/60s and has been very stable in that time. The other properties adjacent to the west were developed at the same time with no cut and fill earth works. This was basically farmland and has now generally reverted to bush. The only areas of instability locally were when Pomare Road was developed. The cut batters have slipped due to over steep cut batters.	That this area be removed from the Assessment area.
---	-----------------------	--	--------	---	---



