

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 email or postal 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

1. This is a submission from:

Full name OR Company/organisation	RUSSELL IAN HUDSON LINDA MARY HUDSON
Contact person <i>if different</i>	
Email address <i>the Council, hearing panel, and courts will use this to contact you, and will publish this information so other submitters can contact you if necessary</i>	
Postal address <i>Required if you did not provide an email address, otherwise optional</i>	36 PARK ROAD BELMONT
Phone <i>optional</i>	

3. This is a submission on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025.

4. I ☐ could ☒ could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
(Please tick one)

5. If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission:

- I ☐ am ☐ am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of that submission that—
- (a) adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition:

(you must tick one if you answered "could" to the question in paragraph 3 above)

Note: If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

6. The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are: 36

Give details:

OPPOSE PROPOSED ZONING OF 36 PARCELS
AND ASSOCIATED AREA AS OUTLINED
IN ATTACHED SUBMISSION

(We recommend using additional pages if your submission is lengthy)

7. My submission is:

Include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended; and reasons for your views:

THAT OUR PROPERTY AND THE AREA REFERRED TO IN THE
SUBMISSION SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE LARGE LOT
RESIDENTIAL AREA

(We recommend using additional pages if your submission is lengthy)

8. I seek the following decision from Hutt City Council:

Give precise details:

REZONING AS DESCRIBED IN # 7 ABOVE AND
ASSOCIATED AMENDMENTS TO THE PLANNING MAP

(We recommend using additional pages if your submission is lengthy)

9. I ☐ wish ☒ do not wish to be heard in support of my submission.
(please tick one)

10. If others make a similar submission,

I ☐ will ☒ will not consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
(please tick one)

Signature of submitter:

(or person authorised to sign on
behalf of submitter)

(a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means)

K. Anderson / Jackson

Date

14.4.1924

Where to send your submission

- **By email (preferred):** district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz
- **By post:** Hutt City Council, Private Bag 31912, Lower Hutt 5040
- **In person:** At the Hutt City Council Customer Service Centre, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt

SUBMISSION ON PUBLICLY NOTIFIED DISTRICT PLAN

This submission opposes

- the proposed Medium Density Residential (MDR) zoning of 36 Park Rd and of
- the lower, eastern part of Park Road to the north of Bertrams Reserve up to and including #46 Park Road. (refer Attachment 1).

The properties individually are:

4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 12A, 14, 14A, 18, 20, 24, 26, 30, 32, 36, 38, 40, and 46 and are shown in 'Attachment 1'. The properties are referred below as the "Attachment 1" properties).

We consider our property, and the above properties should be Included within the Large Lot Residential Zone (LLR): there being significant constraints to Intensified development (as enabled by the Proposed MDR) due to:

- limitations to site access
- topography
- extent of vegetation cover
- lack of convenient and safe accessibility for pedestrians, vehicular traffic, active transport and emergency vehicles
- a low level of access to commercial services and community facilities
- the constrained/dangerous traffic environment of the lower Park Rd area.

The Large Lot Residential Zone provides an appropriate framework for the sustainable management of our much-valued residential environment while at the same time enabling a level of infill (assisting housing supply overall).

Reasons for submission

1. Many of the properties within the **Attachment 1** area have residential titles dating to the 1920's and were originally part of Hutt County. They were subdivided and developed in the context of what was then predominantly a rural setting, to *minimum standards of accessibility*. This created certain legacy factors which are significant to the appropriateness and achievability of medium density housing in this area, and to the attendant baselines set out in Objective MRRZ-04 of the Proposed Plan.¹
2. The residential environment of the lower Park Road area is substantially similar (and arguably more constrained) to that of the adjacent Natusch Rd, Palm Grove, Belmont Terrace localities. It is also comparable to areas of the Eastern Bays that are Included to the Proposed LLR zone. Previous District Plans have consistently recognised these commonalities and zoned them in the same way: **Attachments 2 and 3** are an aerial view of the lower Park Rd area and show its contour and other similarities to Natusch Rd and Corrondeella Grove in the west, Palm Grove and Belmont Tce to the east. **Attachment 4** shows the Proposed DR in the context of the Proposed LLR to the west and east.

¹ i.e. an existing and future built environment 'that is healthy, safe and accessible, includes opportunities for affordable housing including through the provision of a variety of housing and size, has good access to commercial activities and community services through active and public transport nodes, providing well connected and low emission communities' (Proposed Objective MRZ -04)

3. Notwithstanding the mandates of the NPS-UD applicable to the District Plan Review process there are significant constraints to redevelopment and infill within the **Attachment 1 area**. These support Large Lot Residential zoning and can legitimately be taken into account in the Review process.
4. Development constraints include:
 - difficult accessibility due to the properties being located well above the relative level (RL) of the Park Road carriageway
 - instability of steep banks and access within road reserve areas
 - a dangerous pedestrian environment
 - inadequate lines of sight for turning movements to and from Park Rd
 - substandard access and lack of adequate turning spaces for heavy and emergency vehicles, and
 - detrimental impact to the safety and functionality of the lower Park Road including as related to increased on-street parking as associated with MDR environments.
5. The **Attachment 1** properties have limitations to accessibility as follows:

- **northernmost properties**

#s 46, 40, 38, 36, 32, 30, 26, 24, 20, and 18 Park Rd

These properties are accessed across an upper-level area of road reserve near the Gainsborough Gr corner. This access runs in a north south direction. For the most part it is subject to significant slumping and requires both extensive retaining wall construction at the Park Road carriageway level and foundation engineering within the road reserve accessway above. Width constraints to access along this strip are described in **Attachment 5** (Preliminary Transport Review – Harriet Fraser Traffic Engineering and Transportation Planning).

Beyond the access strip there is a ROW which runs in an east west direction. This is the only vehicular access to **#18, 20, 24, 26, 30, 32 Park Rd**. There is also an additional easement within this ROW which is in favour of **#36 Park Rd** and runs parallel to its southern boundary.

The ROW surfacing is in very poor condition and requires significant subsurface and surface upgrade works. As is frequently the case for ROW's this poses problems to individual property owners in terms of spending priorities and affordability. The entry configuration to the ROW and its width pose significant difficulties for access and maneuverability by heavy vehicles, including fire and emergency services.

Construction activities and an increased density of residential development would exacerbate the substandard condition of the ROW and are also likely to lead to its more extensive use for resident (compared to incidental visitor parking) there being no requirement for on-site parking provision within MDR zones.

So far as we are aware ROW'S can only be managed by mutual agreement, and parking restrictions can only be enforced by civil proceedings.

Access for pedestrians is either entry opposite Gainsborough Gr, which has a very poor line of site to fast moving downhill traffic, or via steps near the southern ROW (described below). These steps are not maintained by Hutt City and traverse a high bank that is also subject to slumping.

The above circumstances pose a significant limitation to site access and a lack of convenient and safe accessibility for pedestrians, vehicular traffic, active transport and emergency vehicles alike.

Infill development within MDR usually involves unit title subdivision and property management by body corporate - with the possibility that the corporate could impose mandated upkeep/upgrade on the parent title to the ROW and by default, all other easement holders.

While development levies are generally applicable to medium density development their purpose is usually that of public infrastructure upgrade. The ROW's are on private property. Even if this was not the situation developer levies imposed via Council are typically assigned to competing big picture investment e.g. the Riverlink project, upgrade to the Seaview water treatment plant etc.

So far as we are aware there is no legal requirement that levies are to be allocated geographically to the immediate area of effect.

- **lower /southern ROW access to # 12, 12A, 14 and 14A Park Rd**

These properties are accessed from a ROW across #14 Park Rd in an uphill direction to an RL approximately 5m above street level. This ROW is also adjacent to a steep bank with slope stability problems.

Easements to this ROW reduce the redevelopment potential of the #14 title and there are similar accessibility and maintenance difficulties to those of the northern ROW. This ROW detail is not shown on the cadastral base to the Planning Maps; refer **Attachment 4**.

Entry and exit to Park Road are directly adjacent to the bus stop on the eastern side of the road and are opposite the uphill stop on the western side. There are constrained lines of sight in both directions, and an inadequate turning configuration onto Park Rd: meaning that vehicles entering and exiting the ROW need to turn awkwardly into uphill or downhill traffic.

- **Access to # 4, 6 (a vacant site), 8 and 10 Park Rd**

These properties have an extremely steep interface to the Park Rd carriageway. There is no drive-on access other than to a limited extent directly adjacent to the Park Road footpath (which exists only on the eastern side of the road, hard against steep banks). Exiting and entering this drive-on space is both dangerous and difficult. Access to dwellings is either via steps, or by cable car.

In common with the ROW properties the lack of convenient and safe accessibility poses constraints to new construction, increased levels of residential occupancy and day-to-day convenience, as well as being cumulatively affected by the very poor overall level of safety and convenience within this part of Park Rd, the substandard footpath and significant uphill and downhill traffic.

Infrastructure

6. All the above properties are dependent on infrastructure dating from the early development of the area and include a network of gas, electricity and telecoms within steep banks/immediate road reserve.

7. Water supply is via galvanized steel pipes, installed by Hutt County more than 50 years ago and have now started to corrode and leak. So far as we are aware there is no planned increased capacity upgrade to these services, many of which are at-risk due to slope instability, heavy rain events etc.
8. Based on recent experience of road resealing works to the lower Park Rd area approx. 3 years ago (vicinity of the Natusch Rd bridge to /Gainsborough Gr) any infrastructure upgrade has potential for major disruption and inconvenience to residents, more so because there are no alternative routes in or out of Park Road.

Different development pattern within the Attachment 1 area compared to that of other areas proposed for MDR

9. Properties in the lower, eastern part of Park Road are very different to those of the upper Park Rd/Redvers Drive catchment which were created by extensive cut and fill earthworks and associated contour modification during the 1970's/80's.
10. As a result these properties have markedly different accessibility characteristics than the Attachment 1 locale, and a roading configuration which was purpose-designed to conventional standards for suburban development. Development within the uphill catchment extends over many hectares. It includes the properties directly opposite the Attachment 1 area.
11. There will be significant cumulative effects to uphill and downhill traffic as a result of medium density development which will also bring increased on-road parking. In turn these factors will impact on the functionality of the lower Park Rd area and exacerbate the safety and accessibility concerns described above.

An MDR future environment

12. MDR enables a development typology (referred to as 3x3's) that is best suited to locations in which new dwellings can be accessed *immediately onto the street*. Typically units are constructed on a concrete pad following extensive site clearance, with attendant loss of mature trees, other existing vegetation and natural habitat.
13. It is apparent from **Attachment 2 (aerial)**, and **Attachment 3 (topographic details)** that the lower Park Road properties # 4, 6, 8, 10, 12A, 14, 14A, 18, 20, 24, 26, 30, 32, 36, 38, 40, and 46) have substantial vegetation cover, including that within gully areas adjoining Palm Grove and Bertrams Reserve.
14. These properties also link ecologically to the stream/drainage reserve to the north of the Natusch Road bridge. Individually and collectively the above properties comprise significant riparian and associated habitat.
15. Tree species within the above properties include mature kowhai, rewarewa, titoki, puriri, totara, nikau, and manuka (among others) which provide habitat for significant numbers of tui, bellbird, kereru, wax eyes, piwakawaka (fantail), riroriro (grey warbler), the endangered NZ falcon (karearea), ruru (morepork), and the itinerant shining cuckoo (piplwharauoa). Introduced species include thrush, blackbird, and rosella. Tree frogs are also present. Butterfly species include Monarch, Red Admiral, Yellow Admiral, Blue Butterfly and Boulder Cooper.
16. In our view the environmental sustainability of these habitats would be significantly impacted by increased residential occupancy, increased lighting and glare (within what is now almost a dark sky environment), increased noise levels, increased site coverage, traffic movements and number of domestic pets.

Constrained traffic environment.

17. A preliminary assessment of the existing and proposed MDR future environment is outlined in **Attachment 5**. This includes discussion of constraints within the eastern (downhill) and western (uphill) lower Park Road area.
18. Due to existing accessibility difficulties and anticipated future adverse effects associated with cumulative growth in traffic volumes, dangerous entry and exit movements, the lower Park Road area should be identified as a highly constrained road environment (with consequent amendment to the Highly Constrained Roads Overlay of the Proposed District Plan Review.
19. We consider these matters to be substantial justification of our property and the wider Attachment 1 properties for inclusion within the Large Lot Residential zone/ exclusion from MDR.

Requested Amendments to the Proposed Review

20. Include the area shown in Attachment 1 to the large Lot Residential Zone (LLR) with any consequential amendments to Plan descriptors and Rules
21. Amend the Planning Maps accordingly
22. Amend the Transport section of the Proposed Plan (and respective Maps including /Highly Constrained Roads Overlay to delineate “constrained traffic environment” on the lower eastern side of Park Road, commencing at #46 Park Rd south to the Park Rd/Grounsell Cres intersection.

6 April 2025

Hutt City



Attachment 2. - Aerial of Properties requested as Large Lot Residential (LLR)

Hutt City



Attachment 3. - Area to be included to Large Lot Residential Zone (LLR) with contour overlay showing similarities to the proposed LLR area to the west (Natusch Rd and Corondella Grove) and to the east (Palm Grove and Belmont Tce).

Harriet Fraser Traffic Engineering & Transportation Planning

PO Box 40170
Upper Hutt
5140
M 027 668 5872
E harrietfrasertraffic@xtra.co.nz

2 April 2025

Marilyn Brown
18 Park Road
Belmont
Lower Hutt

Via email: marilynbrown@nmassociates.co.nz

Dear Marilyn

HCC District Plan Review – Park Road Medium Density Residential Zoning Preliminary Transport Review

Further to your request, I have summarised below transport matters arising from an initial site visit and examination of the local transport context along the lower section of Park Road, that is from between Grounsell Crescent and Gainsborough Grove.

Existing traffic environment on lower section of Park Road

- Estimated traffic flow of around 3,500vpd with Park Road serving the large residential catchments off Redvers Drive and the upper section of Park Road.
- Carriageway width of around 8m with single narrow street level footpath on western side.
- Vehicles turning to and from Park Road and the upper and lower rights of way on the eastern side, have restricted sight lines and constrained widths for turning and passing on the right of way entry/exit.
- No cycle facilities.
- Bus route with route providing access to Melling and Waterloo Stations as well as Queensgate.
- Lower section of Park Road from Redvers Drive to Grounsell Crescent is an Urban Connector in the road hierarchy with the function of accommodating public transport, active modes and vehicle traffic.
- Some existing demand for kerbside parking. Where this occurs along the eastern side of Park Road, vehicles park close to the bank due to narrow carriageway width. This makes access into and out of vehicles difficult as there is no footpath or berm.
- Properties on the eastern side of Park Road either need to walk within the carriageway to access the downhill bus stop or cross the road twice to use the footpath on the western side.
- Rubbish bins from the eastern properties are placed within the carriageway on collection days as no berm or footpath.
- The footpaths on the lower section of Park Road are narrow and poorly maintained.

Transport consequences of the local topography

- The steep bank along the eastern side of the road constrains the road width to an 8m carriageway width with a single street level footpath on the western side.
- The bank on the eastern side constrains the ability to access the properties above and where access is provided, achieving safe sight lines to road users on Park Road is difficult.
- There is a narrow access strip within the road reserve (generally opposite Atherstone Lane up to Gainsborough Grove) that provides access to some of the existing properties. The width is

constrained on one side by the bank and on the other side by existing property boundaries and residential infrastructure (stone and concrete block fencing).


- This access strip has a formed width of less than 3m with very limited passing opportunities, inadequate width for trucks (grocery deliveries, waste collection, fire appliances, furniture trucks) and necessitates shared use by vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists.

With Medium Density Development

- With increased residential development, as a result of the proposed MDR zoning, within the wider Park Road catchment, the traffic carrying function (cars, trucks, cyclists, pedestrians and buses) of the lower section of Park Road will necessarily increase with cumulative adverse traffic effects for the lower section of Park Road. Two-way traffic flow will need to be maintained with additional controls on kerbside parking. Accesses will need to be designed to avoid disruption to through traffic flows on Park Road. Safe pedestrian access to the downhill bus stop on this section of Park Road would become a key consideration.
- With increased residential development within the local area along the eastern side of lower Park Road, there would be increased kerbside parking demands, increased pedestrian demands along the eastern side of the carriageway where there is no footpath and increased reliance on bin collection from within the carriageway. Challenges with truck access whether for construction, waste collection or emergency services. The existing access arrangements do not meet the District Plan access standards and it is unclear how upgrades could achieved safely accommodate existing and future access needs.

Please do not hesitate to be in touch should you require clarification of any of the above.

Yours faithfully



Harriet Fraser