

RECEIVED UHCC
8 MAY 2017



SUBMISSION FORM (FORM 5)

**PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT PLAN: PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 42 - MANGAROA AND
PINEHAVEN FLOOD HAZARD EXTENTS**

File Number: 351/12/046
Submission Number:
(for office use only)

To: Upper Hutt City Council

Submission on Proposed Plan Change 42 to the Upper Hutt City Council District Plan

Submissions can be:

- Delivered to: Level 1 Reception, Civic Administration Building, 838-842 Fergusson Drive, Upper Hutt
- Posted to: Proposed Plan Change 42, Upper Hutt City Council, Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt
- Faxed to: (04) 528 2652
- Emailed to: planning@uhcc.govt.nz

The closing date for submissions is 8th May 2017 at 5pm

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE INFORMATION PROVIDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION, INCLUDING YOUR CONTACT DETAILS, WILL BE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

DETAILS OF SUBMITTER

Name of submitter	Alan Jeffries.		
Postal address of submitter	1102 Maymorn Road 5018		
Agent acting for submitter (if applicable)	—		
Address for service (if different from above)	Please indicate if you wish email to be the authorised method of service: YES/NO <input checked="" type="radio"/>		
Contact phone / email	Telephone:	Email:	
	5263133	—	
I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (Please tick one)	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Only answer this question if you ticked YES: I am / am not (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.	
	YES <input type="checkbox"/>		

DETAILS OF SUBMISSION

The specific provisions of the proposed Plan Change that my submission relates to are as follows:

- ① Flood hazard maps, and
- ② Erosion hazard lines, and
- ③ Definitions (a) River Corridor
(b) Ponding area
(c) Overflow path, and therefore

(Please use additional sheets if necessary)

The proposed plan change in its entirety.

My submission is that:

See page ① attached.


(Please state in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons. Please use additional sheets if necessary)

I seek the following decision from the local authority: Withdraw the plan change in the form proposed. As proposed the plan change is unnecessary, complicated and controversial. As was the case with PC-15, it is easily possible to achieve the aim of advising of the risks associated with flooding in a far simpler, less costly, more accurate, straight forward and less controversial manner.

(Please give precise details and use additional sheets if necessary)

Please indicate whether you wish to be heard in support of your submission (Tick appropriate box)	I do wish to be heard in support of my submission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please indicate whether you wish to make a joint case at the hearing if others make a similar submission (Tick appropriate box)	I do wish to make a joint case	<input type="checkbox"/>
	I do not wish to make a joint case	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SIGNATURE AND DATE



Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making submission

Date: 8th May 2017

(Note: A signature is not required if you are making your submission by electronic means)

①

My submission is that: I oppose the plan change in its entirety for the following reasons:

① The flood hazard maps: The PCIS flood hazard maps were questionable. These flood hazard maps are far worse. Apart from being impossible to read, they are absurd. Furthermore they are unnecessary.

② The erosion hazard line: The line is farcical. It makes a mockery of a process which ought to be well considered and thorough. This is setting a precedent for Upper Hutt. You must get it right.

③ Definitions (a) The term "river corridor" is unlawful as it contradicts a court decision, the essence of which decision is that the so called "river corridor" is in fact a "river" "bed", as those two terms are appropriately defined in the RMA.

(b) The term "ponding area" is unnecessary. Water ponds everywhere during and after heavy rain. The term is an irrelevant and inappropriate distraction. The only appropriate terminology is, 100year flood extent or floodplain.

(c) The term "overflow path" is likewise an irrelevant and inappropriate distraction. Again the more apt and accurate terminology is floodplain which is the space of land which the river occupies when in flood.

RECEIVED UHCC

8 MAY 2017

