

Proposed District Plan Change 37

HUGH SINCLAIR PARK, WAINUIOMATA
REZONING OF PART OF THE SITE AS GENERAL RESIDENTIAL
ACTIVITY AREA WITH PROVISION FOR A RETIREMENT VILLAGE

Summary of Submissions

Publicly Notified:

21 July 2015

Further Submissions Close:

4 August 2015 at 5.00pm

PUBLIC NOTICE

Public Notification of the Summary of Decisions Requested for Proposed District Plan Change 37 to the City of Lower Hutt District Plan

Clause 8 of the First Schedule – Part 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Hutt City Council has prepared the summary of decisions requested (summary of submissions) received on

Proposed District Plan Change 37 Hugh Sinclair Park, Wainuiomata - Rezoning of Part of the Site as General Residential Activity Area with Provision for a Retirement Village

Proposed Plan Change 37 seeks to rezone part of Hugh Sinclair Park in Wainuiomata from General Recreation Activity Area to General Residential Activity Area – Medium Density to provide for the establishment of a retirement village.

The proposed plan change was notified on 19 May 2015 and submissions closed on 19 June 2015. Overall six submissions were received.

The summary of submissions and decisions sought as well as copies of the original submissions are available and can be inspected

- at all Hutt City Council Libraries;
- at the Customer Services Counter, Council Administration Building, 531 High Street, Lower Hutt; and
- on Council's website: <http://www.huttcity.govt.nz/district-plan-change-37>

Copies can also be requested by contacting Hutt City Council:

- Phone: (04) 570 6666 or
- Email: district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz

The following persons can make a further submission in support of, or in opposition to, the submissions already made:

- Persons who are representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; and
- Persons who have an interest in the proposed plan change that is greater than the interest of the general public.

A further submission must be limited to a matter in support of or in opposition to the relevant submission. It must be written in accordance with RMA Form 6 and must state whether or not you wish to be heard on your submission. Copies of Form 6 are available from the above locations and on Council's website.

Please state clearly the submission reference number to which your further submission relates.

Further Submissions close on Tuesday 4 August 2015 at 5.00pm

Further submission may be lodged in any of the following ways:

- Post: Environmental Policy Division, Hutt City Council, Private Bag 31912, Lower Hutt 5040;
- In Person: Council Administration Building, 531 High Street, Lower Hutt
- Email: submissions@huttcity.govt.nz
- Online: <http://www.huttcity.govt.nz/district-plan-change-37>

Please note: In addition to serving a copy of the further submission on Hutt City Council, a copy of the further submission must also be served on the person(s) whose submission(s) you are supporting or opposing within five working days of sending your further submission to Hutt City Council.

Tony Stallinger
Chief Executive

21 July 2015

Summary of Submissions

DPC35/1	Dave Williamson – United Video	6
DPC35/2	Bernard Kenny	6
DPC35/3	Angela Pahl.....	6
DPC35/4	Kenneth Ernest Malley	7
DPC35/5	Caroline Ammundsen – Greater Wellington Regional Council.....	10
DPC35/6	Margaret Benge	13
ADDRESSES FOR SERVICE – PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 37.....		14

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 37

DPC35/1 Dave Williamson – United Video					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
1.1	Not stated	Support	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated

DPC35/2 Bernard Kenny					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
2.1	Not stated	Support	<p>If the plan is for a retirement village similar to the one at Woodland Mews, this would be good as it would enable older people to downsize.</p> <p>Most older people would rather have a Rest Home established with medical and hospital care if required.</p> <p>If the Council proposal would include medical and hospital care the submitter would give this proposal his 100% support and hope it would be sooner rather than later.</p>	Not stated	Not stated

DPC35/3 Angela Pahl					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
3.1	Rezoning	Support	Not stated.	Rezone for Retirement Village	No

DPC35/4 Kenneth Ernest Malley

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
4.1	<p>Submitter wishes to retain part of the land for future improvements to the playground. In particular to retain all of the trees and shrubbery that protects the play area from cold prevailing southerly wind. A paling fence will not shelter the ground.</p>	<p>Oppose in part</p>	<p>Submitter opposes the extent of the area for the village and requires more land retained for the playground.</p> <p>Submitter doubts if the future of the playground for the children has been considered by those supporting the project.</p> <p>Area is prime piece of land, sheltered by trees, has toilets and play facilities, is conveniently close to the shops and can be easily expanded as population expands. None of the parks nearby are sheltered, have toilets or are used for general recreation or playing. They are usually only used for sport matches and team trainings.</p> <p>Hugh Sinclair Park is the only park suitable for children. It is the main thoroughfare for children walking to and from schools or to shops and it is a good socialising area.</p> <p>Corner near Medical Centre has swings etc for small children and is sheltered from cold southerly. Loss of the trees would be a disaster making the area unsuitable for small children.</p> <p>Trees make remaining area seem more friendly and natural. Fence along proposed border will make it feel like small play area in somebody's backyard and spoil the rural feeling, decreasing its attractiveness to children. It cannot be replaced by other more distant parks such as Frederick Wise Park or Bryan Heath Park which are unsuitable for all but organised team sports.</p> <p>Submitter often goes through Bryan Heath Park but hardly ever sees anyone playing there.</p> <p>Submitter considers that they want far too much of the park and will block any further development of facilities for someone else's profit. While it may be a small financial benefit to the community and convenient for a retirement village and possibly some employment of locals, that is not the purpose the park was given, it is for pleasure and recreation of the community.</p> <p>It was suggested that it would be good for work and local businesses but higher paid staff will probably come from the Hutt and only few, low paid jobs will be filled from Wainuiomata. Provisions will come from Wellington or the Hutt with little gain for local</p>	<p>To reduce the area rezoned at the playground end, to retain more for the playground as it is the best for a playground as no other park is protected well enough.</p>	<p>Yes (if others are speaking)</p>

shops.

Submitter provides a map showing the part that should be kept (Area A) and a suggested exchange area (Area B). The suggested changes would require a bridge over a fairly small stream and easily achievable allowance for floods. It crosses over to seldom used corner of Frederick Wise Park. This could be left to later time and extended to the west if the village needs to grow much larger.

Absolute minimum would be to grow a shelter belt for existing playground on Area C as trees in the playground would reduce the play area and area was donated for playground/recreational area for children, so they are entitled to keep as much as they need for future expansion.



By keeping this area of the park it could be planted, seating provided and be a valuable sunny, resting and social area for people from the retirement village, away from housing which will probably only have small gardens.

Appendix 4 – Concept Plan shows road access onto the Strand. This has not been

		<p>mentioned in any other information beforehand. It would destroy the playground corner near the Health Centre, as it would seem to cut across it and would need trees to be removed. Submitter most strongly objects to this. Legally if the plan is to be changed to that extent it must have a new round of public submission.</p> <p>Financial Consideration:</p> <p>Hutt City Policy Committee Report No. PC2013/3/186 (2) page 7 estimates the land value to be \$600.000 (\$15/m²) and page 12 gives another estimate of \$800.000 (\$20/m²). The land should not be sold at that price as it is much more valuable.</p> <p>In July 2013 the submitter inquired about land prices in Wainuiomata and found land values for flat grassy properties further away from the shops to be \$92/m² (Ashburn Road, 1,402m² for \$130,000) and \$132/m² (Wellington Road, 598m² for \$79,000). A September 2007 valuation for the Wellington Road site was \$103,000 which equals \$172/m² – nearly 12 times the price than the better, centrally located children’s heritage playground.</p> <p>Playground sale could achieve \$3,680,000 (at \$92/m²) or \$5,280,000 (at \$132/m²). Council should get the best it can for Wainuiomata, not subsidise someone else’s business venture.</p> <p>This “divide and conquer” by piecemeal overrides the public’s wishes and the submitter suggests that the sale of land at ridiculously cheap rates can only be prevented by stopping the whole project.</p> <p>The soft nature of the land is similar to land conditions that surrounding houses have been built on. So called swampiness only affects the surface at times of rain as no drainage provisions have been made. Claims of proposed purchaser about ground should be taken with scepticism.</p> <p>As a back section the retirement village will have very low rates, this should increase the price because of the permanent running cost advantage to the Village.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/5 Caroline Ammundsen – Greater Wellington Regional Council

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
5.1	Plan Change 37	Support	<p>Proposal has been assessed for its consistency with the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region 2013 (RPS).</p> <p>Public Transport Area proposed to be rezoned has excellent public transport access (bus routes) which is consistent with Policy 57 of the RPS (well integrated land uses and transport).</p> <p>Pedestrian links to enable safe and easy access to bus routes should be included in detailed design for Retirement Village.</p> <p>It is important that additional traffic to the site does not cause congestion on bus corridors which creates travelling time issues for buses.</p> <p>Parks GWRC does not generally support the loss of public open space and recreation reserve but area is well serviced with public open space. Development could deliver significant community benefits through development contributions which could include potential enhancement of recreation facilities in remaining reserves.</p> <p>Flood Protection Site is affected by flooding (Parkway Drain).</p> <p>Key issues for development of the site relate to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building floor levels above 100 year return period flood level for habitable buildings (villas) and for health care facility. 2. Achieving safe access to all buildings. 3. Safety in an over-design flood i.e. larger than 1:100 year flood. 4. Flood modelling including allowance for climate change. <p><i>Building floor levels above 100 year return period flood level for habitable buildings and Achieving safe access to all buildings</i></p> <p>Parkway Drain is maintained by HCC which is also responsible for identifying flood hazard and flood hazard maps for watercourse (Appendix 6).</p>	<p>Should the Hutt City Council approve proposed Plan Change 37, GRWC requests that: Consideration is given to the recommendations made in the submission.</p>	Yes

		<p>Plan Change identifies that floor level of habitable spaces is to be raised above the 1:100 year return period flood level for Parkway Drain. Raising of floor levels appears to be generally achieved by raising ground levels across the site. GWRC supports raising of building floor levels as an appropriate minimum standard. To enable safe evacuation GWRC considers that access to villas should also be raised above 1:100 year flood level.</p> <p>GWRC considers that healthcare facilities should have higher standard of flood risk mitigation due to vulnerability of patients and difficulty in evacuating sick and/or immobile patients (consistent with Hutt River Floodplain Management Plan). Building floor level for health care facility should be set at 500 year return period flood as a minimum.</p> <p><i>Safety in an over-design flood i.e. larger than 1:100 year flood</i></p> <p>If more severe flooding occurs, flooding of at least some of the proposed villas could be expected. Plans to manage residual flood risk should be put in place and could include evacuation plans, flood proofing buildings, provision for emergency power generation and emergency water supply. Emergency response management plans should be coordinated with Hutt City Council CDEM.</p> <p><i>Flood modelling including allowance for climate change</i></p> <p>Although not stated in the plan change documentation GWRC presumes that climate change is appropriately included in flood modelling for determining building floor levels.</p> <p>Biodiversity</p> <p>Plan change requiring rezoning of 3.9ha from General Recreation Activity Area to General Residential Activity Area – Medium Density represents form of residential intensification in Wainuiomata. GWRC supports this change in principle, because provision of well-designed higher-density housing will reduce potential incursion of development into surrounding rural or open space land that is valued for its productive, ecological, aesthetic or recreational qualities (Policies 54 and 55 of the RPS).</p> <p>Policy 54 requires that when a plan change is considered, regard shall be given to achieving the region’s seven urban design principles, which include the principle of ‘custodianship’.</p> <p><i>Recognition of ecological values</i></p> <p>Assessment of potential ecological effects was limited by absence of an Ecological Impact Assessment. Submitters’ knowledge of biodiversity on site and ecological importance was limited to description in Section 32 (mostly grassland with scattered clusters of amenity trees covering approximately 20% of the site). While dominance of grassland and only</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>scattered trees indicates lower indigenous biodiversity values, the general ecological values of grassland based landscapes are well recognised (prevention of soil erosion, regulation of local microclimates, and provision of habitat for protected species) and contribute to safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, soil and ecosystems under section 2(b) of the RMA. To accurately capture the ecological values of the site GWRC suggests that a scoping assessment of the site is undertaken as per the EIANZ Ecological Impact Assessment Guidelines.</p> <p>According to the New Zealand Threatened Environment Classification the site is located in an ‘acutely threatened’ environment due to past losses of indigenous vegetation in lowland environments and low level of legal protection for what remains. Classification elevates significance of any indigenous vegetation on site.</p> <p><i>Suggestions for mitigating ecological effects</i></p> <p>Development will increase proportion of land covered by hard surfaces and reduce site’s provision of ecosystem services (including provision of habitat for local wildlife). Any development should therefore focus on multi-storey development, reducing the area of impermeable surfaces and providing space for wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Potential losses to amenity values, indigenous habitat values and other ecosystem services can be mitigated in part through incorporation of sensitive urban design features such as planted setbacks between adjacent properties.</p> <p>Policy 47 provides considerations for managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats including maintaining connections or corridors between indigenous habitats, avoiding the cumulative adverse effects of incremental loss of habitats, protecting the life supporting capacity of ecosystems remedying or mitigating adverse effects and requiring a precautionary approach when considering effects. These considerations should be integrated into the design of any development on site.</p> <p>GWRC supports the extensive plantings put forward in the concept plan and sees the potential that this may increase the amount of woody vegetation while accommodating new housing and associated facilities and infrastructure. GWRC suggests incorporating existing woody vegetation by avoiding removal of established trees.</p> <p>Unavoidable removal of trees could be partly mitigated by including locally-appropriate species in planting plan.</p> <p>Although no permanent waterways traverse the site any development will impact on surrounding watercourses, particularly Black Creek. RPS Policies 40, 41, 42 and 43</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>require applicants to consider the range of potential effects on aquatic ecosystem health and functionality, from earthworks and vegetation disturbance to stormwater contamination. Considerations include limiting the extent of impervious surfaces allowed in new developments, requiring rooftop rainwater collection for gardens and requiring roadside swales, filter strips and rain gardens for stormwater runoff (policy 40). Particular regard should be given to maintaining or enhancing the ecological functions and amenity values of riparian margins and reinstating riparian habitats (Policy 43).</p> <p>Undertaking riparian planting in adjacent Black Creek and nearby park to improve amenity and biodiversity values could be appropriate mitigation for the loss of public space. Riparian planting would mitigate likely effects of earthworks and enhance amenity value. Improving planting of nearby park would partly mitigate loss of established vegetation and public open space.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/6 Margaret Benge					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
6.1	Making the change of the land to a Medium Density for the building of a retirement village.	Support	<p>Supports the change as a retirement and hospital complex is badly needed.</p> <p>There are enough play or green areas in Wainuiomata near the centre of town.</p>	Not stated	Not stated

ADDRESSES FOR SERVICE – PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 37

Subm. No	Submitter Name/Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC35/1	Dave Williamson - United Video	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/2	Bernard Kenny	[REDACTED]		
DPC35/3	Angela Pahl	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/4	Kenneth Ernest Malley	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/5	Caroline Ammundsen - Greater Wellington Regional Council	PO Box 11646	Manners Street	WELLINGTON 6142
DPC35/6	Margaret Benge	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]