

Proposed Plan Change 47

---

# Natural Hazards

Table showing recommended responses to High Slope Hazard Overlay Mapping

The table below shows how submissions on slope hazard identification have been addressed through the updated mapping.

<b>Table Key</b>	
Submission points not addressed through the changes to the High Slope Hazard Overlay maps	
Some of the submission points addressed through the changes to the High Slope Hazard Overlay maps	
The submission point has been addressed through the changes to the High Slope Hazard Overlay maps	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 1: Sonia and Steve Morgan</b>						
S1.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose / Seek amendment	Reconsider the zoning of the high slope risk areas and exclude 172 Plateau Road, (not only part of our home, as is currently proposed).	Classification of part of the home and property as high slope (medium risk) is inaccurate and whole house and flat section should be excluded.	Slope on building platform has been removed and reduced across the site. Slope still identified beside the driveway. The submitter states <i>'That is a much more accurate reflection of our section. Slope on parts of the driveway but our house is on solid flat land.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 2: Ronald Hunter</b>						
S2.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose / Seek amendment	Please remove high slope hazard as natural hazard.	Property is not affected by high slope hazard.	Slope on the building platform has been removed and reduced across the site. The submitter states <i>'The new data ... has not resolved issues in relation to my property and I would not like a site-specific investigation. The terminology 'Natural Hazards - High Slope Hazard' invites the interest of Property Insurers who may determine not to provide insurance on the property or if they should at a very extortionist premium with many sub-clauses.'</i>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 3: Amit Kakroo</b>						
S3.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose / Seek amendment	Consider recent subdivision in Crest Road and re-evaluate the high slope hazard.	Slope hazard assessment does not take into account the existing dwellings on Crest Road built since 2020. Similar properties have been classified differently.	Slope identification covered the entire property. The amended mapping has removed slope from the building platform and flatter areas of the site and adjoining sites. The submitter states <i>'This change has resolved the issues that I had raised in my submission. I am happy with the amendments.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 5: V and J Manley</b>						
S5.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose / Seek amendment	That you reconsider classifying our section as a high slope hazard and check it out in person properly first.	Don't agree with slope hazard overlay on the property and seek site visit be undertaken.	Slope has been entirely removed from the site. The submitter did not respond to the amended mapping which offered a site visit.	
<b>Submitter 6: Gaylene Ward</b>						
S6.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose / Seek amendment	Can this be reassessed please as I don't believe the house area is high slope.	House and garage are on the flat.	Slope has been removed from the house, garage and areas of flatter land on the site. Submitter feedback states that <i>'the amended map does address my concerns.'</i>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/ Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 7: Charisa Lockley</b>						
S7.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	I request the Geotechnical Engineers visit our property for a closer look and correctly categorise the contours and high slope areas of our property.	A lot of the proposed high slope area on the property is flat land.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and areas of flatter land on the site. The submitter states <i>'that looks much more accurate.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 8: Stephen Taylor</b>						
S8.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose / Seek amendment	Removal of my property from the overlay.	Property has been identified as at risk but has had no historical slips recorded. Classification could affect insurance costs and saleability. While climate change is acknowledged there is no evidence for the inclusion.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and flatter areas on the site. Slope still identified at the rear of the property. The submitter did not respond to the amended mapping which offered a site visit.	
<b>Submitter 9: David John Angus</b>						
S9.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	I would like to request that an amendment be made to the high slope hazard overlay, removing my property from this zone.  I understand that a site inspection can be carried out by a Geotechnical Engineer, I	Inclusion of part of the section in High Slope Hazard zone seems overly cautious. Included portion isn't any steeper than remainder of the site.	Slope has been entirely removed from the site. The submitter states <i>'the suggested changes have resolved the issue I was concerned about.'</i>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
			would welcome such an inspection.			
<b>Submitter 10: Paul Atkins</b>						
S10.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay Mapping of Slopes	Oppose / Seek amendment	I wish the plan and maps to be redrawn using accurate measurement and onsite geotechnical resource, not an aerial survey.	Current slope map covers half of the existing dwelling and does not take into account flat areas surrounding the house.	Slope has been removed from the existing dwelling and flatter areas surrounding the house. The submitter still did not agree with the findings and was offered a site visit but did not respond.	
<b>Submitter 11: Steven Fargher</b>						
S11.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Support / Seek amendment	I would like the high slope areas to be reviewed in order to accurately and consistently apply them across the UHCC area. An example is that no high slope has been applied to the significant slope behind 18 - 28 Sunbrae Drive. The slope and ground material are the same as or worse than what has been identified as a high slope area between Deller Grove and Pinehaven Road and Sunbrae Drive.	High slope areas should be applied consistently or not at all.	Slope has been reviewed and submitters site has slope removed from building platform and flatter areas. Mapping shows a greater level of consistency across the district. The submitter did not respond to the amended mapping.	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 12: Alec Hobson</b>						
S12.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose / Seek amendment	<p>I oppose the way the current PC47 -Natural Hazard Map reflects the “High Slope Hazard” for 29 Aragon Grove, Kingsley Heights, Upper Hutt. I request that the “red” area and line indicating the “High Slope Hazard”, be rectified, and moved, to be behind the property at 29 Aragon Grove, where the slope does in fact start (map attached in submission).</p> <p>If this can be rectified, I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission. If the council does not make the correction I would want to be heard, as the current indication is clearly incorrect.</p>	<p>PC47 incorrectly identifies steep slope on the site. Section is flat and house is built on even and level area. Slope is located behind the property. Same is true for neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>Slope has been removed from the building platform and flatter areas on the site. Slope is identified at the rear of the property and adjacent properties.</p> <p>The submitter states that <i>‘the changes are a much truer reflection, as it now reflects that the dwelling is not on a slope but on even ground. However, the slope ... should be around 1.5m further away from the house. Scheduling a visit may be hard. I am happy to go ahead as it currently stands if it cannot move by around another meter. At least the dwelling structure is now indicated correctly.</i></p>	
<b>Submitter 13: Jo Greenman</b>						
S13.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	<p>Please move the boundary to the west of the property like the rest of the neighbouring properties e.g., 62 and 60 Mt Marua Drive.</p>	<p>House and shed are located on flat land and slope hazard boundary line should be moved.</p>	<p>The building platform, shed and flatter land has been removed from identified slope and is more consistent with adjacent properties. Slope is still identified on the property. The submitter</p>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/ Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
					states <i>'You will be pleased to know that I am pleased with your new map. This is much more realistic and appropriate.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 14: Camilla Jane Watson</b>						
S14.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Support / Seek amendment	We seek the boundary of the High Slope Hazard be moved. There is a large flattish grassed area that has been inadvertently included in the Hazard area (map included in submission). This will be because the radiata pine was included as 'bush'. The Hazard boundary should be moved.	While generally supporting the specific provisions, the boundary on the property should be amended.  High slope hazard area has been incorrectly determined due to a large tree obscuring the satellite view.  The grassed area is the same level as that next to it and should not be included in the red Hazard Area.	Slope has been removed from flatter areas on the site including the grassed area referred to in the submission. The submitter states <i>'the new mapping as notified on 13 Dec is acceptable to us.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 15: David Chrystall</b>						
S15.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose / Seek amendment	Remove flat areas from your map that you have incorrectly labelled.	Map incorrectly identifies flat paddocks as a 'high slope hazard'.	Slope has been removed from flatter areas in the paddocks. The submitter states <i>'The new map has resolved the issues I had with the previous version.'</i>	



Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 16: Eric Cairns</b>						
S16.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay Use of 26 degrees as threshold	Oppose / Seek amendment	I would appreciate a site visit to discuss the location of the high slope hazard overlay, to exclude the footprint of the existing house.	<p>Erosion susceptibility is dependent on rock and soil types, ground water saturation/water table, fracture plane, slope, vegetation cover and other factors.</p> <p>The NES-PF erosion susceptibility classification treats Mangaroa Valley foothills as low risk of significant landslide.</p> <p>Slope threshold of 26 degrees for greywacke soils seems quite conservative and simplistic when there are other factors to be considered.</p> <p>High slope hazard boundary is drawn through the house and should be reviewed.</p>	High slope has been reduced on the site including being removed from the building platform. Areas of high slope remain on the property. The submitter states <i>'The changes to the high slope hazardous mapping are satisfactory to us. We now just react to Greater Wellington's Plan Change 1 to NRP.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 17: Steve Rich</b>						
S17.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Amend the area of 271c Wallaceville Road to reflect the high slope areas of the property more accurately, by removing the current red zoned areas cutting across the house, and	Identified high slope hazard areas do not accurately reflect actual slope areas on the property.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and flat areas of the site including areas addressed in the submission. Slope remains on the property. The submitter states <i>'Thank you</i>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
			behind and above the house; in the top north corner of the property; and in two areas on the eastern side of the property.		<i>for the response, which resolves the issues I raised.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 18: Lance Burgess</b>						
S18.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose	<p>The council should not be imposing an arbitrary map on the residents of Upper Hutt without further specialist in person validation.</p> <p>It is of little value in its current form and will not achieve the aims it was intended for and will also cause the residents additional unnecessary costs.</p>	<p>The proposed slope hazard maps have been arbitrarily computer generated or generated from aerial photographs and not been adequately verified by specialist professionals in person.</p> <p>The defined areas of slope hazard do not meet the intended definition which undermines the validity of what the council is trying to achieve.</p> <p>The current overlay is inaccurate and does not reflect the actual topography. It could therefore result in unwanted outcomes.</p>	<p>Identified slope on the property has been significantly reduced. An area of slope at the rear of the property remains on the site. The submitter states '<i>I confirm that the proposal attached addresses the issues raised and correctly identifies the high slope risk areas on our property.'</i></p>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 19: David Beachen</b>						
S19.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	To reassess the property to remove the flat portion from the 'high slope hazard' area.	High slope hazard includes flat land on the property.	The site has been reassessed and identified slope hazard has been significant reduced. Slope remains on the property. The submitter states that ' <i>We are happy with the amended map.</i> '	
<b>Submitter 20: Simon Wall</b>						
S20.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Amend the shading so that it excludes the flat bits of the section. Very happy if you want to visit the site to understand my issue.	Natural hazard shading covers flat part of the section including the house. Overall agreement with provisions.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and flatter areas across the site. Slope remains on the property. The submitter did not respond to the amended mapping offering a site visit.	
<b>Submitter 23: Brenda Stonestreet</b>						
S23.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Not stated	I would like my property reassessed in particular the large area that I do not consider to be slope at the front and side of the house.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and the front and side of the house. Slope still remains on the property. The submitter stated, ' <i>Thanks for the update – much appreciated.</i> '	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 24: Aldis Malskaitis</b>						
S24.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	I request that the Council reconsider and remove the high slope hazard in relation to my property. I would welcome someone to visit my property to confirm that the topography of my site is not such that it would fit the criteria of a high slope hazard.	Area of the property that has been identified as high slope hazard area is completely flat and located at least 20m from nearest bank.  Topography of my property would not fit the criteria of high slope hazard.	Slope has been completely removed from the property. The submitter states <i>'Thank you for following up on my submission. The result being that the slope hazard has now been removed from my property. This resolves the issues I raised in my submission and the questions I had that surrounded my property.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 25: Mark Murrell</b>						
S25.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	To remove the shading/allocation of high slope from all areas of 216 Mangaroa Valley Road, Upper Hutt <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• House and car park</li> <li>• Shed and car park</li> <li>• Levelled area at the top of the track (currently overgrown)</li> <li>• Any other areas not at 26° or more</li> </ul>	Areas that are not at 26 degrees or more should be removed from the plan as they are not considered as high slope.	Slope has been removed from the building platform, shed, car parking areas and significantly reduced on the site. A large amount of slope remains on the property. A site visit was undertaken to view the 'levelled area at the top of the track' but could not be viewed as overgrown. Mapping identifies this area as high slope.  The submitter states <i>'The quality of the mapping unfortunately prevents me from identifying the detail of the proposed zoning.'</i>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/ Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
					<i>From what I can make out it appears that the proposed zoning remains inaccurate. This includes the areas show other than my lot. '</i>	
<b>Submitter 27: Karsten Kroeger</b>						
S27.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Amendment of the slope hazard assessment, requiring a new approach. The present methodology is inappropriate.	Current slope hazard assessment is insufficiently supported by data and lacks robust methodology.	Mapping methodology has been updated and slope has been removed from the building platform and entire site. The submitter states <i>'I am satisfied with the result as shown in the attachment. I am pleased to read that efforts have been made to improve the assessment of risk associated with slope as well as offering site specific assessments.'</i>	
S27.2	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Removal of high slope hazard at 17 Avian Crescent property as it is unsupported by data.	Assignment of high slope hazard to portion of the site appears to be arbitrary and unsupported by data and is not consistent with the actual conditions.  Report that informs assessment does not address vital questions regarding methodology and related maps are confusing and lack explanation.  If published the report may have significant impact on insurance and property values.		

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/ Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
				<p>Identification of slope hazard areas seems inconsistent across similar properties.</p> <p>General assumption that all slopes are soil rather than rock slopes leaves the obligation to prove otherwise to property owners.</p> <p>In conclusion, the assignment of high slope hazard across 17 Avian Crescent appears to be entirely arbitrary and unsupported by the data and should therefore be removed.</p>		
<b>Submitter 28: Donna Tofts</b>						
S28.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	That the plan is amended correctly.	House and garage are mapped as being on high slope which is incorrect as they have been built on flat land.	Slope has been removed from house and garage and significantly reduced across the site. Slope remains on the site. The submitter did not respond to the amended mapping.	
<b>Submitter 29: Stephen Shand</b>						
S29.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Further checks/drones for my slopes as the map seems over generous for my address. Note if anything will affect the	Further checks/drones for my slopes as the map seems over generous for my address. Note if anything will affect the	Slope has been removed from the building platform and reduced across the site. A small area of slope remains at the front	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
			installation of an in-ground 15metre swimming pool?	installation of an in-ground 15metre swimming pool?	of the property. The submitter did not respond to the amended mapping.	
<b>Submitter 30: Wayne Edgerley</b>						
S30.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	To be excluded from the High Slope Hazard Area.	Area of the property that is identified as High Slope Hazard is flat and sloping ground is on opposite side of Tiniroa Grove. Visit to discuss would be welcome.	Slope has been completely removed from the site. The submitter states <i>'the updated mapping has now resolved the issues raised in our submission in relation to our property.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 31: Rosemary Anne Paddison</b>						
S31.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	A new corrected map.	Slope area on the maps incorrectly covers half the house which is on flat land. Reassess the steep areas on my property so they show correctly.	Slope has been completely removed from the building platform and site. The submitter states <i>'Yes, the new map resolves my issue.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 33: Allan Kelly</b>						
S33.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	That the PC47 survey for 100 Karapoti Road be corrected.	The survey for the site contains significant errors and needs to be corrected.  We don't want unnecessary planning issues due to an incorrect survey.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and shed. Land identified as slope has been reduced across the site. Slope remains on the property the submitter states <i>'Thanks very much, I am happy with the</i>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
				Identified high slope hazard areas on the site are flat while a drop off to the river is not marked as such. This might cause issues for future building sites.	<i>revised zoning, and it resolves my issues.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 34: Karen Pugh</b>						
S34.1	Wellington Fault Overlay High Slope Hazard Overlay NH-P1 to NH-P7 NH-R1 to NH-R8	Seek amendment	Remove the natural hazard classifications i.e., uncertain constrained and high slope hazard from the land identified as 7 Turksma Lane, Kaitoke therefore removing any related natural hazard policy and rules and building restrictions on this land.	The classification of the property as 'uncertain constrained' is not correct. Based on a new report the fault area has been mapped in error and should be removed.  The High Slope Hazard overlay along rivers/streams on site is not warranted as it covers shallow banks and should be removed.	Slope identification on the site has been reduced along the stream channel. A small area of slope remains. The submitter states ' <i>We can confirm this updated mapping has resolved the issues raised in our submission in regard to high slope hazard near our property.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 36: Daniel Buhler</b>						
S36.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	To have the high hazard map on my property reviewed by Council in collaboration with the property owner.	The high slope hazard map is not accurate and includes flat land. Report seems to be	Slope identification has been reviewed and removed from the building platform and reduced across the site. Slope remains on	



Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
S36.2	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Review all high hazard maps to ensure they are accurate.	generic without considering actual land layout.	the property. The submitter did not respond to the amended mapping.	
<b>Submitter 37: Doug Gillanders</b>						
S37.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	That the area be corrected to a realistic outline actually relating to what is there regarding the small stream area.  The designation of high slope hazard removed from my property.	Most of the area marked as slope hazard is flat land. Survey has been computer modelled with no reference to actual situation.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and significantly reduced across the site. Small areas of slope remain. The submitter states <i>'this makes a lot more sense on where the high slope hazard areas are. No further action required from my side on this.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 38: Melanie Smith</b>						
S38.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	I would like the mapping to be adjusted so it's not identifying areas of flat land including roads and current building platforms.	High slope mapping is identifying areas of flat land including roads and building platforms.	Mapping has been adjusted with slope removed from building platforms and roads and slope identified on land has been significantly reduced.	
<b>Submitter 39: Quinn McCarthy</b>						
S39.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	I request that the "High Slope Hazard" zoning on number 70 Blue Mountains Road be reduced to run along the boundary line. The boundary line sits approximately 10	The high slope hazard encroaches further than what is reasonable for any slope instability on the site.	Slope has been removed from the site and is now only located between the boundary and the road. The submitter states <i>'Thanks for sending this through, it seems far more reasonable</i>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
			meters back from the bank edge, the risk of any building is greatly reduced and already covered under the building code.		<i>than the initial proposal, much appreciated. I am pleased to let you know that this has resolved my concerns'.</i>	
<b>Submitter 40: Dr Boyd Blake and Mrs Verna Blake</b>						
S40.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	<p>We wish to have amendments made to alter and realign the current “High Slope” hazard map zone boundaries, so they accurately depict the true area of “High Slope” hazard for 23 Sylvan Way, 27 Sylvan Way and 29 Sylvan Way, Silverstream.</p> <p>This can be accomplished by the simple realignment of a small area of the “High Slope” hazard map boundary by excluding from the map the level terrace area which runs to the rear of 23 Sylvan Way and continues south south-east across the back of the neighbouring properties being 27 and 29 Sylvan Way.</p> <p>An on-site inspection would confirm the above inaccuracies</p>	<p>Do not oppose Plan Change 47 as it is important to identify areas of Natural Hazards so community can plan and move forward with confidence.</p> <p>High Slope map boundaries are inaccurate and will have devastating impact on values and insurance premiums and will create unnecessary stress and worry.</p>	<p>Slope identification has been reduced on the property including the removal of the level terrace at the rear of the site and adjacent properties. The submitter states <i>'I think this update fairly represents the high slope area on this property.'</i></p>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/ Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
			<p>and the need for the realignment of the hazard map zone boundaries.</p> <p>This terrace mentioned above would not be known to exist by many and was formed many decades ago by the old Kiln Street Brick and Pipe Works for extracting clay for their manufacturing of bricks and pipes.</p>			
<b>Submitter 41: Yannick M Quesnel and Sherilyn A Quesnel</b>						
S41.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	<p>We wish to have amendments made to alter and realign the current “High Slope” hazard map zone boundaries, so they accurately depict the true area of “High Slope” hazard for 23 Sylvan Way, 27 Sylvan Way and 29 Sylvan Way, Silverstream.</p> <p>This can be accomplished by the simple realignment of a small area of the “High Slope” hazard map boundary by excluding from the map the level terrace area which runs to the rear of 23 Sylvan Way and continues</p>	<p>Do not oppose Plan Change 47 as it is important to identify areas of Natural Hazards so community can plan and move forward with confidence.</p> <p>High Slope map boundaries are inaccurate and will have devastating impact on values and insurance premiums and will create unnecessary stress and worry.</p>	<p>Slope identification has been reduced on the property including the removal of the level terrace at the rear of the site and adjacent properties. The submitter states <i>‘This is a good representation of the slope areas.’</i></p>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/ Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
			<p>south south-east across the back of the neighbouring properties being 27 and 29 Sylvan Way.</p> <p>An on-site inspection would confirm the above inaccuracies and the need for the realignment of the hazard map zone boundaries.</p> <p>This terrace mentioned above would not be known to exist by many and was formed many decades ago by the old Kiln Street Brick and Pipe Works for extracting clay for their manufacturing of bricks and pipes.</p>			
<b>Submitter 42: Dr Amarjeet Kanwal &amp; Mrs Ripudaman Kanwal</b>						
S42.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	We wish to have amendments made to alter and realign the current “High Slope” hazard map zone boundaries, so they accurately depict the true area of “High Slope” hazard for 23 Sylvan Way, 27 Sylvan Way and 29 Sylvan Way, Silverstream.	<p>Do not oppose Plan Change 47 as it is important to identify areas of Natural Hazards so community can plan and move forward with confidence.</p> <p>High Slope map boundaries are inaccurate and will have devastating impact on values and insurance premiums and</p>	Slope identification has been reduced on the property including the removal of the level terrace at the rear of the site and adjacent properties. The submitter did not respond to the amended mapping.	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/ Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
			<p>This can be accomplished by the simple realignment of a small area of the “High Slope” hazard map boundary by excluding from the map the level terrace area which runs to the rear of 23 Sylvan Way and continues south south-east across the back of the neighbouring properties being 27 and 29 Sylvan Way.</p> <p>An on-site inspection would confirm the above inaccuracies and the need for the realignment of the hazard map zone boundaries.</p> <p>This terrace mentioned above would not be known to exist by many and was formed many decades ago by the old Kiln Street Brick and Pipe Works for extracting clay for their manufacturing of bricks and pipes.</p> <p>(High Slope hazard map with proposed map boundary changes attached in submission)</p>	<p>will create unnecessary stress and worry.</p>		

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/ Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 44: Malcom Ayers</b>						
S44.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Request an in person physical site visit.	Significant part of property has been identified as slope areas where it is flat.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and flatter parts of the site. Slope is still identified on the property. The submitter did not respond to the amended mapping which offered a site visit.	
<b>Submitter 45: Bruce Ridley</b>						
S45.7	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Please feel free to arrange to come and see my property.	The property is poorly represented by the current proposed slope hazard overlay – the flatter part is in the overlay while the steeper part is outside.	Slope was located at the front of the property and has been removed. Site visit completed.	
<b>Submitter 47: David De Martin</b>						
S47.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose	If this effects the property value on either of my houses I will sue!  Get rid of this rubbish.  Also note that I am a retired property developer, so I know what I am talking about.	This includes steep sided banks on rural roads and a reserve which can never be built on, has never slipped, and is covered in dense bush. However, costs to affected people can be huge as they need to notify Council of any activity.	Slope was located at the rear of the site and has been removed so no slope is located on the property. However, the submitter is still not content stating <i>'I'm 74 years old and I can walk over my entire property, hardly steep and hazardous. If the council continues, I will sue</i>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
					<i>for damages as this will impact my property value.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 48: Dean and Debbie Molony</b>						
S48.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Not stated.	Proposed plan mapping does not reflect our property.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and reduced across the site. Slope remains at the rear of the property. The submitters state <i>'As long as it's as per your previous email dated 13th December 2023 showing the new outline's, I'm pleased with that, so my issues have been resolved.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 49: Nathan James Gardiner</b>						
S49.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	To relook at the red line through my property.	Mapped area does not reflect reality.	Slope has been relooked at and removed from the building platform and flatter parts of the site. Slope remains on the property. The submitter states <i>'A lot more happier. But still I feel my submission stands as what is indent in yellow to me as no difference in slope to the left of my property to the right were you are say steep slope.'</i>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 50: Paul Harris</b>						
S50.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay PC 47 in relation to Moonshine Western Hills	Seek amendment	<p>That PC47 be removed from the west of the Moonshine Valley. My (north-western) neighbours have not been included and the mapping is inaccurate on my property. The Council contractor offered to correct this but as yet has not dealt with this despite communicating three times with him.</p> <p>The mapping after discussion has been completed with drones, low beam Lidar and local knowledge. The Lidar is inaccurate with pasture covered in scrub; the grade is overstated. There are better technologies more widely used for agriculture and slope mapping for the new winter grazing regulations.</p> <p>I have had an outside agency map the block, the PC47 mapping done by your outside contractor has overstated land over 26 degrees by 17ha.</p>	<p>Mapping the 26 degrees is not accurate. Identified area is regarded by GWRC as low erosion zone. Subjective approach to add this area, based on local knowledge, is unacceptable.</p> <p>Earthworks rules should be aligned or same as GWRC. Proposed limits are very low.</p> <p>Clear wording for the maintenance of existing roads, tracks culverts and drains should be explicit.</p> <p>Neighbouring steeper land is not included in red zone.</p> <p>Existing flat sites should be excluded.</p> <p>All recent developments in the area have avoided prominent ridgelines. No evidence of slipping erosion or movement in any farm tracks or houses over the last 20 years, very solid rock.</p>	<p>Slope identification has been reduced across the property and adjacent sites. Significant slope still indicated across the area. The submitter states <i>'Thanks for the update ... appreciate the comeback ... will there be a hearing ... similar to the pc50 hearings on this one?'</i></p>	



Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/ Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
			(Maps attached in submission)			
<b>Submitter 51: M de Jong</b>						
S51.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Full impact analysis from the insurance industry for all hazard areas covering potential insurance premium increases and possible lack of insurance cover for some properties.	Despite concerns regarding the impact of the plan change on property values, no efforts were made to consult the insurance industry. The expected economic cost associated with increased insurance premiums or the inability to obtain insurance has not been covered in the cost benefit analysis. There appears to be no plan to mitigate the economic risk or financial impact.  While consultation was undertaken with property owners affected by the Wellington Fault Overlay and the Mangaroa Peat Overlay, no such consultation was undertaken with property owners affected by the proposed High Slope Hazard Overlay.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and from the flatter parts of the site. Slope remains on the rear of the property. Submitter states <i>'Thank you for the update which was most welcome. I can confirm that the updated mapping has resolved the issue in relation to my property.'</i>	
S51.2			Consult affected property owners in the High Slope Hazard Overlay as was done for the other hazard areas.			
S51.3			Perform site visits to validate the desk study assessed slope hazard mapping.			
S51.4			Determine the rate increase required to cover lost rates.			
S51.5			Rework and republish the plan, including cost benefit etc. incorporating public feedback and insurance industry input.			
S51.6			Organises a vote for property owners in Upper Hutt as to			

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
			whether to adopt the revised plan.	<p>Desk study assessments were not validated through site visits and anomalies were not investigated, resulting in inaccuracies.</p> <p>Main concerns raised in earlier consultation on Wellington Fault Line and Mangaroa Peat Overlay (impact of provisions on future development and insurance and opposition to mapping or provisions) have not been addressed. Objective of plan change is to satisfy RMA requirements and ignores economic value destroyed, increased insurance premiums and rates forgone.</p> <p>Cost benefit analysis identifies minor savings over 20 years and ignores the cost from potential insurance impact and consequential drop in property value. Also not included is the loss of rates due to reduced rateable values and related rate increases.</p>		
S51.7		Offer to purchase the properties which, as a result of the plan change, can no longer obtain insurance.				
S51.8		Offer to reimburse property owners for the reduced property value as a result of this plan change.				

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
				<p>Cost benefit has been updated in relation to High Slope hazard to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic value destroyed (\$655,800,000)</li> <li>• Increased insurance premiums (\$2,597,600)</li> <li>• Rates forgone (\$2,892,000 per year)</li> </ul>		
<b>Submitter 53: Kevin Trotter</b>						
S53.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Find someone more competent to assess the matter and if needed try at a later date.	Contractor's report should be dismissed as erroneous and ask for refund of service paid for by ratepayers.	Slope has been reduced across the site with no slope identified on the building platform. Significant slope remains on the property. Attempt has been made to contact the submitter with no success.	
<b>Submitter 54: D Johnson</b>						
S54.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Remove the slope hazard from 11 Ronald Scott Grove, Riverstone Terraces, Upper Hutt.	Section of property that has been assessed as hazard slope is not correct and needs to be reassessed. Property has not been adequately investigated to inform plan change. Hazard	Slope has been reviewed and the small area of identified slope has been removed. The submitter states <i>'The recommended map changes in relation to our property on the map provided</i>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
				has been incorrectly identified and should be reviewed.	<i>have resolved the issues raised in my submission.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 55: Katelyn King</b>						
S55.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Alterations to the mapping of our property at 148 Kakariki Way.	Two areas identified as slope hazard on the property need to be amended as they cover flat areas.	The two areas of identified slope have been amended and reduced to remove flatter areas. The submitter states <i>'this resolves the issue raised in our submission.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 56: Elena Goff</b>						
S56.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Only slope is a hazard not the whole property and slope should be in red colour on the plan not the property.	If the slope is a hazard, it should be in red but not the whole property. Would like to see all the property in usual colours.  House may lose market value. When property was bought 12 years ago Council advised this area was not dangerous. Who will compensate for losses?	Slope has been removed from the building platform and flatter areas of the site. Slope remains near the rear boundary of the site. The submitter did not respond to the amended mapping.	
<b>Submitter 57: Christine Lehmann</b>						
S57.1	Mangaroa Peat Overlay	Seek amendment	Remove high slope hazard band of my property.  <i>(Note: submission corrected from initial request which</i>	Map incorrectly identifies a small portion of slope on my property to be potentially affected by slope risk. Identified slope is across a flat road, nearest hills are further	The small portion of slope identified across the flat road has been removed. No slope remains on the site. The submitter states <i>'The updated map resolves the issues I raised. The revised map</i>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
			<i>requested removal of peat risk band from property)</i>	away, which are not on my property and of no risk to anybody.	<i>no longer shows any high slopes around our property - which is correct. Thank you for taking our concerns on board. '</i>	
<b>Submitter 58: Jeff Price</b>						
S58.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	<p>To have the following areas removed as 'High Slope Hazards' - not in red as per plan of local area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower driveway on south side</li> <li>• Lower driveway on north side into bush</li> <li>• Southwest side of house (too close)</li> <li>• Back yard – bush fence internal area</li> <li>• 'Landing' at northwest corner of property</li> <li>• Below house about halfway to property border</li> </ul>	<p>Slope failure is due to at least 3 factors – slope angle, water catchment area and vegetation type and cover. Based on these factors some high slope hazards on the property should not be included.</p> <p>A detailed description and map of the identified areas is provided.</p>	<p>Slope has been removed from the building platform, driveway, and flatter areas of the property. The areas identified in the submission seem to be addressed but the submitter did not respond to the amended mapping.</p>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/ Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 59: John and Lynne Hill</b>						
S59.7	High Slope Hazard Overlay Mangaroa Peat Overlay	Seek amendment	Please feel free to arrange to come and see my property.	The property is poorly represented by the current proposed slope hazard overlay/peatland overlay – the flatter part is in the overlay while the steeper part is outside.	The maps have been amended by not the full extent sought within the submission.	
<b>Submitter 60: Weston Hill</b>						
S60.7	High Slope Hazard Overlay Mangaroa Peat Overlay	Seek amendment	Please feel free to arrange to come and see my property.	The property is poorly represented by the current proposed slope hazard overlay/peatland overlay – the flatter part is in the overlay while the steeper part is outside.	The maps have been amended by not the full extent sought within the submission.	
<b>Submitter 61: Mark Robbins</b>						
S61.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Amendment of the high slope hazard to accurately reflect the actual situation - this may necessitate a visit by UHCC officers.	The shading on the map does not reflect the actual slope hazard.  The map shades parts of the property as high slope hazard that aren't, in particular the north-western corner of the property.	Slope has been amended to remove flatter parts of the site including the north-western corner of the property. Small areas of slope are identified on the western boundary of the site. The submitter states ' <i>We are happy with the amended map. Please advise us if there is any change before the hearings</i>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
					<i>process as we may need to request to be heard. Otherwise, if it doesn't change, we would like confirmation after the hearings process.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 65: Gavin Burgess</b>						
S65.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	The hazard line is lower to the bush line and should be removed from the lounge area of my house.	The hazard area over the lounge area of my house and round about is not correct. This was cut and lowered from original ground.	Slope has been amended and removed from the building platform including the lounge area. Flatter areas of the site have also had slope removed. Slope remains on the property. The submitter states ' <i>I was happy with the updated remapping of slope extent; it has resolved my issues.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 66: Judith and Sandy Kauika-Stevens</b>						
S66.7	Slope Hazard Overlay / Mangaroa Peat Overlay	Seek amendment	Please feel free to arrange to come and see my property.	The property is poorly represented by the current proposed slope hazard overlay/peatland overlay – the flatter part is in the overlay while the steeper part is outside.	No high slope has been identified on this property. It is found within the Peat Hazard Overlay.	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 67: Philip Clegg</b>						
S67.5	Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Please feel free to arrange to come and see my property and we can see the disparity between the overlay and the actual land on my property and those of my neighbours.	The property is poorly represented by the current proposed slope hazard overlay – the flatter part is in the overlay while the steeper part is outside.	Slope has been amended to be removed off the building platform and flatter areas of the site. A site visit was undertaken. The submitter states <i>'Thanks for the revised map. This does seem to now exclude most of the areas I highlighted of concern. Lets consider my issues resolved.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 68: Jeff and Noeline Berkett</b>						
S68.1	Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Before this Plan is discussed, there should be some study of soil and ground composition throughout the affected areas.	Disagree with the extent of the proposed hazard areas. There is no evidence that soil and ground composition have been taken into account.  Recent heavy rain events and previous earthquakes have not resulted in slips or subsidence in the area.  About 80ha of our property was cleared and are now cultivated as grass with no slippages.	Slope has been reduced across the two named sites in the submission. Slope is still identified on both properties. The submitter states <i>'Our reply is that very little has changed. As we said in our submission, a lot of what is designated 'high slope' has been cultivated, fertilised and had other work done on it with a wheeled tractor, so we cannot accept it is a risk to anything.'</i>	



Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 70: Roger O'Brien</b>						
S70.8	Mangaroa Peat Overlay	Seek amendment	Please feel free to arrange to come and see my property.	The property is poorly represented by the current proposed peatland overlay.	No high slope has been identified on this property. It is found within the Peat Hazard Overlay.	
<b>Submitter 72: Mike Philpott</b>						
S72.1	Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Please correct the current hazard slip zone map surrounding 4 Morepork Close, Brown Owl.	Current slip zone marking cuts directly through dwelling located on flat land and marks 90% of the dwelling as red zone. While there is a bank adjacent to the site, the section is terraced and flat.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and flatter areas of the site including the terrace. No slope is now identified on the property. The submitter states <i>'Please be advised the updated mapping has resolved my issues I identified in the initial hazard mapping provided by the council.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 74: Paul Lunn</b>						
S74.1	Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	I would like our property at 5 Valley View Way to be excluded from the proposed high slope risk area.	Dwelling and land would be partially affected by high slope hazard area which appears incorrect. Would like more evidence to suggest that the property should be included.  No slippage in 10 years, house has been professionally engineered and has several piles down to rock.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and the flatter areas of the site. Slope still identified at the front and rear of the property so is not excluded from high slope. The submitter did not respond to the amended mapping.	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 75: Adam Pawlak</b>						
S75.1	Slope Hazard Overlay  Earthworks provisions	Seek amendment	Council is to accurately map properties or inspect proposed build sites so areas that are less than the proposed 26deg slope hazard are excluded from the draft mapping rather than the blanket mapping that is happening now or go off existing geotech reports so there is no reduplication occurring requiring new owners to prove that the proposed earthworks are not on a slope hazard.	<p>No support for proposed rules which require resource consent for all earthworks for building platforms in the High Slope Hazard Overlay.</p> <p>Overlay is highly inaccurate capturing areas of properties that are less than 26 degrees.</p> <p>Approved subdivision required geotech report due to proposed hazard overlays which found that mapping was not accurate.</p> <p>Cost analysis understates the number of effected properties and the activities that require resource consent.</p> <p>Existing provisions only allow for minimal earthworks.</p> <p>Plan change will result in unnecessary section 72 notifications on certificates of title.</p>	High slope hazard map has been updated using more up to date LiDAR data. This has allowed for identified slope to be more accurate at a site-specific level. Slope identification is now more reflective of over 26 degrees. Building platforms have also been analysed and removed.	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 81: Karen Leishman and Christopher Griffin</b>						
S81.1	Mapping	Seek amendment	A reassessment of the slope identification.	Disagree with the slope identification on the property.	Slope identification has been significantly reduced on the site being removed from the building platform and flatter areas. Slope remains on the property. The submitters did not respond to the amended mapping.	
<b>Submitter 84: Wendy Botha</b>						
S84.1	Mangaroa Valley High Slope Hazard Zone	Oppose	To remove the high slope hazard restriction on our property at Mangaroa Valley Road. Please stop adding unnecessary cost to the rate payers and owners. UHCC and GWRC should not be able to add additional rules to boost their bank accounts.	Engineers report is generic. Plan change will only generate another unnecessary cost and restrictions to landowners.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and identification significantly reduced on the flatter areas across the site. Slope remains on the property. The submitter did not respond to the amended mapping.	
<b>Submitter 86: Evie Gray</b>						
S86.1	Slope Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Not stated	Map has not been developed with sufficient level of detail and is incorrect – steep areas are excluded, and flat areas are included.  I do not support this plan change as currently written.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and flatter parts of the site. Slope remains on the property. The submitter states <i>'That's a much more accurate reflection of my property, and I really appreciate</i>	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
				Proposal makes currently empty section even harder to build on. Rates should be adjusted downwards due to decreased property value.	<i>you folks taking my feedback on board.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 91: Grant and Melanie Avery</b>						
S91.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	<p>Amendment of the PC47 “High Slope Hazard Overlay” concerning and in the area of our property at 3 Valley View Way, Timberlea Upper Hutt, per our recommended overlay-amendment as Figure 3.</p> <p>This amendment is sought for the reasons stated, and which we have expanded on in our Figs. 1, 1b, 1c, 2.</p> <p>(Annotated figures included in full submission).</p>	<p>Large areas of the property identified as High Slope Hazard do not have a slope of 26 degrees or greater and/or do comprise an engineered bank, constructed when the subdivision was first built. These areas should be corrected.</p> <p>A number of other locations with comparable engineered banks are not rated as High Slope Hazard.</p> <p>Consistency is important for effective hazard management and fair and consistent treatment of ratepayers.</p>	Slope has been removed from the building platform and flatter parts of the site. Slope is still identified at the front and rear of the property and is more in line with the mapping suggested in the original submission. The submitter has raised concerns around the classification of data on the original mapping.	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/ Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
<b>Submitter 93: Emma Zee</b>						
S93.1	High Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	I would like an amendment considered to the extent of the hazard area to more accurately reflect the slope which would exclude my dwelling from the hazard area.	House is shown half within, half outside of the high slope hazard area and should be amended to reflect the slope and exclude the dwelling more correctly.	Slope has been removed from the building platform and flatter areas of the site. Slope identification remains at the rear of the property. The submitter states <i>'Thank you very much for looking into this. I really appreciate the time you've taken to adjust the high slope mapping.'</i>	
<b>Submitter 99: Silver Stream Railway Incorporated</b>						
S99.1	Slope Hazard Overlay	Seek amendment	Please refer to the attached mark-ups of the slope hazard planning maps where SSR is seeking them to be amended by UHCC to reflect the actual land contours.  (Maps included in full submission)	Significant areas of railway land for SSR which are broadly flat have been included in the slope hazard maps as 26 degree or greater slopes.  Areas of stream bank are also included but should be removed because they are covered by setback requirements.  The inclusion of these areas of SSR railway land within the proposed high slope hazard area overlay could adversely affect the assessment and	Slope identification has been reduced across the site. Slope remains on the site. Stream banks still identified although identified area has reduced. The submitter did not respond to the amended mapping.	

Sub. Point	Provision	Support/Oppose/ Seek amendment	Decision Sought	Reasons	Changes made through the amended mapping	Submission addressed
				ongoing future replacement of existing and future structures.		

