

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 **Malcolm Ross** on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025.
2. My email address for service is Ross.Family@Xtra.co.nz.
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

Dear Hutt City Council Members and those reviewing the Proposed District Plan –Specifically in relation to rezoning the property of 92 Park Road, Belmont, Lower Hutt (and its’ surrounding affected properties of similar size, orientation, topography and the like) to not rezone this (and the like) property(ies) from Hill Residential Activity Area or the Landscape Protection Activity Area to that of the Medium Density Residential Zone.

I should be noted between receiving advice of the proposed changes and the approximate 6 weeks we personally received to produce this response to the proposal is not a lot of time. We believe 3 months should have been given (at least) when having to respond to a proposal that has great consequences for those of us in our later years of our only significant asset.

There are many factors within this zone change that will adversely affect the residents of our area, especially those who do not wish to be subjected to the ramifications of similar changes that have already ‘graced’ those living in the Hutt Valley floor. We have seen the results of rapid infill housing resulting in (but not necessarily limited to:

1. Micro climates changed where once trees and grass absorbed heat to black painted homes which absorb heat and radiate it again creating hot spaces – which affects our climate and weather patterns.
2. Infrastructure that cannot keep up with demand on the network where water pressure (for example) has reduced to a dribble in comparison to years before.
3. Roads that have become congested with stationary traffic making human life secondary to emergency services rapid response times.

4. Wear on roads / Infrastructure where increased traffic (especially when considering the forces involved with large vehicles (particularly if this plan change is implemented) where the wear on surfaces will result in greater cost to the residents in paying for the damage that will be caused (it is undeniable and to say otherwise completely contradicts the simple laws of physics)
5. Where children once congregated outside homes having predominantly been a tradition in this area will alter to the detriment of the neighbourhood character.

We raise the question “Would the rezoning give the council a mandate to increase rates within this area over time where the change in use will (for example) allow for three properties to be placed on this site and failure to do so result in a rate increase to reflect what would be possible in the Proposed District Plan?” As a direct example, circa 2007 we are aware of a couple in another councils catchment area who had purchased a large lifestyle block for their retirement to grow avocados. The local council rezoned their land to residential meaning they had to subdivide within ‘x’ years otherwise face paying increased rates the land would have otherwise generated from more than one section.

Ultimately we believe the change will lead to increased parking congestion / competition and decreased neighbourhood character. This will negatively impact residents, emergency services and property values. We are also concerned about potential rate hikes (of which are already crippling many) and pressure on infrastructure including storm water systems that discharge into an already overwhelmed network. The increased demand on the infrastructure of our city will only result in higher maintenance costs to the city and ratepayers.

We request you reconsider these changes and engage with the affected residents directly. I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this further.

Decisions Requested

1	MRZ-C2	Part 2	Oppose the activity	The Character of the environment would change and would increase load on the existing infrastructure without significant investment.	Non-residential activities should be removed from the proposal.
---	--------	--------	---------------------	--	---

2	MRZ-03 / MRZ-04	Height of Buildings	Oppose	I oppose the proposal given the topography of hillside area would result in loss of privacy and mean intrusion to those neighbouring the property.	Delete provision allowing for greater than two floors. Or not to increase to higher than existing property if demolished.
3	MRZ-03 / MRZ-04	Loss of natural light	Oppose	The increase height and density has a high chance of adversely affecting those neighbouring properties should intensity increase.	Delete provision
4	MRZ-04 Item 7	Infrastructure	Oppose	Increased loading in the infrastructure will adversely affect those living below the development	Keep the policy noting how this activity would affect surrounding residents.
5	MRZ-P2 Medium Density Residential Zone	Non-Residential Activities	Support	All the listed items would be difficult to implement in this environment	
6	MRZ-P12 -	Urban Design Outcomes et al.	Support	Noting the end of the first paragraph "the development shall meet the outcomes to the greatest degree practical."	Add to the end of this line "that do not adversely affect neighbouring property unless the affected residents, upon review of the proposal, their expressed permission to proceed."