

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 James Sunderland & Jocelyn Qian on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025.
2. My email address for service is Sunderqian@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 consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Introduction

7. We are the owners of the property at 11 Gribble Grove, Stokes Valley, a 1,027m² section that I am actively working to develop into a safe, sustainable residential site. As a local resident and future builder in the Northern Ward, I am committed to responsible land use that respects both the environment and community resilience.
8. I am writing to appeal the proposed classification of my property as being within a "slope failure risk" area under the updated District Plan. This categorisation significantly affects my ability to proceed with planned development, despite the fact that no historical evidence of slippage on this site has been identified in council records, including the most recent LIM provided in June 2024.
9. This appeal seeks to ensure that risk classifications are based on site-specific geotechnical data rather than broad mapping assumptions. I believe this designation overstates the actual geotechnical risk at my property and may unnecessarily restrict development without corresponding environmental or safety benefit.
10. The changes I request are aimed at achieving a more accurate, evidence-based categorisation of land stability in this area. This would enable fair development opportunities while ensuring that genuine slope failure risks continue to be managed appropriately across the district.

Decisions Requested

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
1	Maps	Natural Hazards Overlay – Slope Failure Risk (11 Gribble Grove, Stokes Valley)	Oppose	The classification of 11 Gribble Grove as a slope failure risk area is not supported by site-specific geotechnical evidence or historical records of instability. The LIM report (June 2024) shows no known incidents of slippage on this property. The categorisation appears to be based on broad regional modelling rather than a direct assessment of the site.	Remove 11 Gribble Grove, Stokes Valley, and any other properties with no history of slippage from the Slope Failure Risk Overlay, or defer classification until a site-specific geotechnical assessment determines actual risk. Ensure land categorisation decisions are based on current, accurate, and site-specific data.
2	District Plan	Natural Hazards – Policies and Rules (General)	Oppose in part	While the goal of managing slope failure risk is appropriate, blanket classifications without site-specific evidence can have disproportionate effects on landowners and may undermine confidence in the planning process.	Amend relevant provisions to require Council to rely on site-specific technical reports before applying restrictive natural hazard overlays, especially where development or consent is likely to be impacted.