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 <a href="mailto:contact@huttcity.govt.nz">contact@huttcity.govt.nz</a>, 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 Loren Brown on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025.
- 2. My email address for service is lorenmbrown@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.

## **Decisions Requested**

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
1	Large Lot Residential Zone	LLRZ-R3	Oppose	Our property at 5 Russo Terrace has been zoned LLRZ in the PDP. I understand the purpose of this zone is to manage land that is less suitable for higher density development and I support that subdivision of such steep terrain need not be encouraged. I also understand how a lower density built form is appropriate for the District's steep undeveloped ridges and bush covered hill. However, while Russo Terrace is steep, it is already developed and the housing on this short road is already built right up close to the road and the houses are relatively close to one another – much more akin to a standard residential zoning. The street does not feel like LLRZ – it feels far more densely urban.	Amend LLRZ-R3 to not apply where there is an existing home where such standards cannot already be met and instead the standards of the MDZ should apply.

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
				The topography of the properties on this street has	
				lead to this situation, the only place suitable to build	
				is where the houses currently are and have been for	
				nearly 100 years. These properties do not at lend	
				themselves to further subdivision. However, if my	
				other submission to change the zoning of these	
				properties to better reflect the existing development	
				and density is not granted, I which to oppose the	
				standards of this zone contained in LLZ-R3. These	
				rules may well be perfectly fine for undeveloped	
				sites but would result in those houses on Russo	
				Terrace where some modernisation or extension is	
				required, to almost certainly require a resource	
				consent. A costly and unnecessary process, with no	
				worthwhile outcome. This would particularly be the	
				case for the setback from the road, and probably	
				height in relation to boundary. The existing buildings	
				are, in places, almost right on the road and given the	
				steep topography any building is likely to encroach	
				on the height in relation to the boundary. An	
				exemption for existing homes, where the standards	
				of the zone can already not be met, should be	
				provided. The exemption should be made for the	
				standards of the MDZ should apply, which far better	
				reflects the built form of the existing street.	

2	Planning	LLRZ	Oppose	I oppose this zoning as it applies to 5 Russo Terrace,	Amend the planning maps to rezone 5 Russo
	Maps			and indeed other properties as shown on the map.	Terrace, and other properties as shown on the
	- 1			The proposed zoning does not reflect the existing	attached map 1, as Medium Density Residential,
				character of this already developed street, nor does	which more accurately reflects the existing built
				the character of the street reflect the character of	character of the street.
				the Large Lot Zone as described in LLRZ-O3. This	ondidates of the street.
				objective describes the Zone as having generous	
				spaces surrounding buildings and streets. Russo	G 958
				Terrace is short, narrow street with 4 properties	700
				located on the western side of the street. Three of	37 W
				the houses, being 5, 7 and 9 are built right up to the	3 R
				street front given the steep topography of the site,	
				which slopes steeply downwards from the road.	80 76
				While the sections are quite large, this is not evident	8 2 10x
				from the street, where they appear as any house	60 80A 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8
				would on Medium Density Zoned street. The effect	3
				the LLRZ Zone has on those houses should, for	7 9 80
				example, they wish to extend or may alterations, is	30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 3
				likely to require a resource consent because of the	50 Today sy 50 / ya / /
				necessity to be set further back from the road or	
				other boundaries, than they would have had to have	
				been, had they been zoned MDZ. The larger setbacks	
				are not fair in the instance of these existing homes	
				which are already built right against the road, and	
				close to one another. With the exception of perhaps	
				subdivision, the standards of this zone serve no	
				purpose about protecting the character of the area	
				or the street scene, nor other characteristics	
				described in LLRZ-O3. All it achieves is placing an	
				unnecessary and expensive resource consent route	
				for minor household alterations. While I believe it	
				would be physically impossible to subdivide any of	
				the properties on this street, the controls over	

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
				subdivision should be managed by matters such as	
				site suitability, stability, access and hazards. Any one	
				of these factors would need to be fully addressed for	
				a more consequential subdivision application, these	
				should be managed not through the proposed zone,	
				but instead through the provisions contained in the	
				number of overlays that apply to this same street	
				(which I do not oppose).	