

To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council

Via email to [district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz](mailto:district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz).

1. This is a submission from Lisa Caddis on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025.
2. My email address for service is QC\_LC@hotmail.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. I am Lisa Caddis, owner with my husband Quentin Caddis of 297 Muritai Road, Eastbourne.
8. We received two letters from Hutt City Council (HCC)
  - a. Outstanding Natural Feature, Outstanding Natural Landscape or Coastal Natural Character Area
  - b. Slope Assessment Overlay
9. I am making a submission regarding the following.
  - a. Large Lot Residential Zone LLRZ-S5, 2. Garages and carports
  - b. Natural Hazard Section - Flood Hazard Overlay
  - c. Natural Hazard Section - Slope Assessment Overlay
10. We purchased 297 Muritai Road in October 1997 and have lived at the property for 28 years.
11. The original part of the home was built in 1929 or ninety-six years ago and has not been subject to flood nor landslide.
12. I oppose HCC overlay's, specifically Flood Hazard and Slope Hazard because they are not the lived experience, they are arbitrary and not specific enough, and are not based on evidence related to this property that Hutt City Council (HCC) want to categorise into.
13. Broad brush overlays not evidence based in the proposed district plan could ultimately make our home uninsurable.

**BLANK**

## Decisions Requested

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
LLRZ R3	Large Lot Residential Zone	<b>LLRZ-S5</b> 2. Garages or carports with access parallel to the street must be setback 5m from the <a href="#">road</a> boundary.	<b>Oppose</b>	<p>This imposes rules on landowners in an area where if the landowner had to rebuild, they would be unable to meet the district plan and would be forced to apply for an exception.</p> <p>It does not make sense to have a house set back 3m and a garage set back 5m.</p> <p>Having been through the resource consent process recently, to replace a single garage with a double garage and wanting to breach the current 1.5m setback. It took four months and more than \$3,000 in cost to get a decision that is in keeping with what already exists as the character of the neighbourhood currently.</p> <p>We are nearing retirement, and we are wondering how we can afford to live, pay rates, pay insurances. If there were a disaster, which we sincerely hope there is not, we would want to rebuild and would face silly rules that make no sense and cause additional unnecessary delays and cost.</p>	<b>Delete the provision. Or word that accessory buildings can be built up to the front boundary.</b>

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
NH section	Flood Hazard Overlays. Additions to existing buildings and structures in the Flood Hazard Overlays	NH-P8	Oppose	<p>Not the lived experience.</p> <p>Our home was originally built in 1929, ninety-six years ago, it has never been flooded.</p> <p>We have lived at the property for 28 years. The most recent major flooding in the Hutt Valley occurred in 2016. We were unaffected. There was some pooling of water on our front lawn that subsided in a matter of hours, due to being on a sandy base.</p> <p>The one time we had flooding in our garage was due to not regular clearing of street gutters adjacent our property.</p> <p>No evidence has been provided showing flooding at this property. Therefore, the overlay is too arborary, and not specific enough.</p> <p>Imposing this on the landowner is not evidence based and puts the landowner at risk of not being able to obtain insurance.</p> <p>We would like to see HCC take a more proactive role in maintaining the culvert between 283-273 Muritai Road and the stream at Muritai Park that enters another HCC culvert that has poor design at the beach outlet that did in fact cause flooding for others to the north of our property in 2016.</p>	Delete the provision.

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
NH section	Natural Hazards Slope Assessment Overlay	NH_P9	Oppose	<p>HCC has not provided any evidence that our property is prone to landslide.</p> <p>We were advised by a geologist who undertook a study for our neighbour's property, that this area is rock (Greywacke) and is at low risk for landslide.</p> <p>We have built a deck adjacent our studio, circa 1929, that is located 70m from the front boundary up a slope. Piles had to be dug into rock. The slope is extremely stable and is not at risk of landslide.</p> <p>No evidence has been provided showing landslides at this property. Therefore, the overlay is too arborary, and not specific enough.</p> <p>Imposing this on the landowner is not evidence based and puts the landowner at risk of not being able to obtain insurance.</p>	<p><b>Delete the provision.</b></p> <p><b>Or HCC to undertake individual property geologist studies to prove fact at their cost.</b></p>