

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 Mark Gunkel AND Evangeline Gunkel on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan 2025.
2. My email address for service is gunkelmark25@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 do not 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

We are the owners of a residential property in Lower Hutt, built in 1995. Our interest in the Proposed District Plan stems from the recent classification of our property as being located within a "high natural hazard area," specifically regarding flood risk and slope stability.

We support the Council's efforts to manage natural hazards but seek greater transparency and fairness in the classification and its impacts. Our requested changes aim to ensure the proposed plan reflects an accurate, property-specific understanding of risk, minimises undue economic hardship, and provides clear and fair expectations for property owners.

Decisions Requested

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
1	Natural Hazards	Flood Hazard and Slope Stability Overlays	Oppose in part	Our property's classification is based on computer modelling, not a property-specific site assessment. We request clarification on the accuracy and appropriateness of the designation.	Require Council to conduct or offer property-specific assessments where requested, and revise mapping/designation accordingly.
2	Natural Hazards	Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose in part	It is unclear what thresholds or criteria determined inclusion in the high hazard area, and what margin of error exists in the modelling.	Publish the specific assessment criteria and margins of error applied for flood risk and allow owners to challenge classifications through independent assessments.

#	Chapter	Provision	Position	Reasons	Relief sought
3	Natural Hazards	Slope Stability Overlay	Oppose in part	No property-specific risk assessment has been conducted; designation is based solely on a generalised model.	Allow property owners to commission independent geotechnical assessments to contest or refine their classification.
4	Whole Plan	Economic Impact Assessment	Oppose in part	Council has not assessed the potential financial impacts (e.g., property values, insurance, mortgage obligations) of hazard designations on affected property owners.	Conduct and publicly release an economic impact assessment on the effect of hazard classifications on property owners.
5	Natural Hazards	Resource Consent Requirements	Oppose in part	The requirement for resource consent for extensions or new dwellings within the overlay creates uncertainty and a potential financial burden.	Provide a clear and straightforward guide for owners outlining when consent is required, what assessments are needed, and likely costs. Include streamlined consent processes for low-risk cases.
6	Maps	Property Zoning and Overlays	Oppose in part	The mapping currently does not distinguish between different levels of hazard risk (e.g., low, medium, high).	Introduce a tiered hazard classification system (e.g., low, medium, high) with corresponding different consent thresholds and requirements.
7	Plan Review Timing	Whole Plan	Neutral	The timing of this review, considering the property was built in 1995, appears delayed and inconsistent with changes in risk management best practice.	In future reviews, conduct natural hazard assessments on a rolling basis or at defined shorter intervals (e.g., every 10 years) to ensure currency and accuracy.