

Proposed Private District Plan Change 35

REZONING OF LAND AT MILITARY ROAD / HATHAWAY
AVENUE / BOULCOTT STREET TO GENERAL RESIDENTIAL
ACTIVITY AREA WITH PROVISION FOR A RETIREMENT
VILLAGE

Summary of Submissions

Publicly Notified:

4 August 2015

Further Submissions Close:

18 August 2015 at 5.00pm



PUBLIC NOTICE

Public Notification of the Summary of Decisions Requested on Proposed Private District Plan Change 35 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 Private District Plan Change 35 Rezoning of Land at Military Road / Hathaway Avenue / Boulcott Street to General Residential Activity Area with Provision for a Retirement Village

Proposed Private Plan Change 35 seeks to rezone an area of land in Boulcott from General Recreation Activity Area to General Residential Activity Area with site specific provisions for the establishment of a retirement village.

The proposed private plan change was notified on 14 April 2015 and submissions closed on 29 May 2015. Overall 250 submissions and one late submission 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: huttcity.govt.nz/district-plan-change-35

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 18 August 2015 at 5pm

Further submissions 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: huttcity.govt.nz/district-plan-change-35

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

4 August 2015

Summary of Submissions

DPC35/1	Kevin Melville – NME Group.....	11
DPC35/2	Frederick Albert Stohr	11
DPC35/3	Nicola Bland.....	11
DPC35/4	Gary John McKay.....	11
DPC35/5	Richard Sadleir.....	11
DPC35/6	Bruce and Gwen Patchett	12
DPC35/7	Frederick Ferris.....	12
DPC35/8	Morris and Sue Black	15
DPC35/9	Noreen Goodyear.....	15
DPC35/10	John RG Cullinane	15
DPC35/11	Judy Bradley	16
DPC35/12	Judy Macindoe.....	16
DPC35/13	Larisa Koning	16
DPC35/14	Matthew Paterson	16
DPC35/15	Sarah Worthington	17
DPC35/16	Dennis Page	18
DPC35/17	Gary Paddison	21
DPC35/18	John Ward Vallely	22
DPC35/19	Peter Donovan	23
DPC35/20	Joel William McLean	23
DPC35/21	Gary Hughes.....	23
DPC35/22	Marcus Edward McLean.....	24
DPC35/23	Lindsay Watt	24
DPC35/24	Gregor Dunn	24
DPC35/25	Raymond Tomlinson	24
DPC35/26	Joseph Tomlinson	27
DPC35/27	Peter JH and Wendy E Jenkin.....	29
DPC35/28	William Ronald and Jennifer Margaret Caradus	30
DPC35/29	Gareth Worthington, on behalf of Hutt City Kindergartens Association Incorporated.	32
DPC35/30	Paul Adams.....	33
DPC35/31	Megan Kenning	33
DPC35/32	Matthew Sturmer.....	34
DPC35/33	Patrick Ralston Fitzgerald	34
DPC35/34	Letitia Thomson.....	34
DPC35/35	Mike Anderson	34
DPC35/36	Richard Nottage	35
DPC35/37	Raymond Smith.....	35
DPC35/38	Rod Gillespie.....	35
DPC35/39	Gary Spratt.....	35
DPC35/40	John Anderson.....	35
DPC35/41	Lawrence Horne.....	36
DPC35/42	Alan Young	36

DPC35/43	Michael Bovey.....	36
DPC35/44	Adam Caccioppoli	36
DPC35/45	Nigel Lyne	36
DPC35/46	Liz Kettle	37
DPC35/47	Patricia Howatson	37
DPC35/48	John Ford.....	37
DPC35/49	John Kettle	37
DPC35/50	Annabel Freer	37
DPC35/51	John Miller.....	37
DPC35/52	Susan Maclean	38
DPC35/53	Vivianne Innes.....	38
DPC35/54	Jeanette Partridge.....	38
DPC35/55	Eroni Ekevati.....	38
DPC35/56	Lisa Boese	38
DPC35/57	Robert Mills	38
DPC35/58	Dallas Anderson.....	39
DPC35/59	Noel Kortright	39
DPC35/60	Wendy Quinn	39
DPC35/61	Mark Carew.....	39
DPC35/62	Dennis Aiken.....	40
DPC35/63	Keith Humphreys.....	40
DPC35/64	Brenda Guile	40
DPC35/65	Martin Press.....	40
DPC35/66	Sue Faulke.....	40
DPC35/67	John Howarth.....	40
DPC35/68	Christeen McKenzie	41
DPC35/69	Laura McGown.....	41
DPC35/70	Hope Walker	41
DPC35/71	Barry Revington Keate	41
DPC35/72	Vicki Harding.....	41
DPC35/73	Sharon Walker	41
DPC35/74	Kevin John Tait	42
DPC35/75	Gillian Milldove	42
DPC35/76	Larry Williams	42
DPC35/77	Len Kong.....	42
DPC35/78	Janice McSloy	42
DPC35/79	Charlie Jones	42
DPC35/80	Jean Buchanan	43
DPC35/81	Bernadette Trueman	43
DPC35/82	David Muthich	43
DPC35/83	Robbie Selwyn	43
DPC35/84	Callum Woodney.....	43
DPC35/85	Krystal Priest.....	43

DPC35/86	Terry Fraei	44
DPC35/87	Joe O'Grady.....	44
DPC35/88	Deborah Cowman	44
DPC35/89	Andrew Cowman.....	45
DPC35/90	Jenny Keehan	45
DPC35/91	Courtney Maclean	45
DPC35/92	Colin Brown.....	46
DPC35/93	John Young.....	46
DPC35/94	Terry Senior	46
DPC35/95	Maurice Sutherland	46
DPC35/96	Jesse Muru Paenga	46
DPC35/97	Joy Smith	46
DPC35/98	Roger Buchanan	47
DPC35/99	Kay Flowers	47
DPC35/100	Michaela Duthie	47
DPC35/101	David Hill.....	47
DPC35/102	Lynette McLaughlin	47
DPC35/103	Janice Tomlinson	48
DPC35/104	Gabrielle Dennis.....	48
DPC35/105	Ivy Innes.....	48
DPC35/106	Teora Teao Jennings	48
DPC35/107	Neil Simpson.....	48
DPC35/108	Tamara Milldove.....	48
DPC35/109	Michael Clark	49
DPC35/110	Susan Griffiths.....	49
DPC35/111	James Offord	49
DPC35/112	Denis Cox	49
DPC35/113	Rachel Anne Jobson and Andrew Peter Oakley.....	49
DPC35/114	Debra Curran	50
DPC35/115	Andrew Curran.....	50
DPC35/116	George and Glenys Longstaff.....	51
DPC35/117	Ken Haywood.....	51
DPC35/118	Graham Harding.....	52
DPC35/119	Dr Damayanti Hyacinth Seneviratne.....	52
DPC35/120	Dr Eric Lakshaman Seneviratne.....	53
DPC35/121	Diana Mary Brunn	53
DPC35/122	Barbara Larsen	53
DPC35/123	Thomas Brunn.....	53
DPC35/124	Fredrick Sydney Bennett.....	54
DPC35/125	Dr James Herdman	54
DPC35/126	Lance McClure	56
DPC35/127	Richard Fassbender.....	60
DPC35/128	Alison McKone	60

DPC35/129	Merran Bakker.....	63
DPC35/130	Mike Birchler	64
DPC35/131	Patrick Philip Hussey.....	67
DPC35/132	Alison Louise Hussey	69
DPC35/133	Nicolas Cooper - Opus on behalf of Ministry of Education.....	72
DPC35/134	Graeme Gibbons.....	77
DPC35/135	Sue Colson	78
DPC35/136	Brian Toomey.....	79
DPC35/137	Ian Gerrard Mc Lauchlan.....	80
DPC35/138	Anne Harris	83
DPC35/139	Lynette McLauchlan	84
DPC35/140	Joshua McLauchlan	84
DPC35/141	Gabrielle McLauchlan.....	85
DPC35/142	Sam McLauchlan	85
DPC35/143	Prudence Williams	86
DPC35/144	Susan Elizabeth McGuinness.....	86
DPC35/145	Peter Lawrence McGuinness	87
DPC35/146	John Wallbank.....	88
DPC35/147	Donna Gardiner.....	89
DPC35/148	Judith Miller	89
DPC35/149	Joseph Milcairns	89
DPC35/150	Boulcott Preservation Society Incorporated.....	89
DPC35/151	Beverley Rose.....	97
DPC35/152	Karen McCarthy	98
DPC35/153	Catherine Gilbert	99
DPC35/154	Avril Boswell.....	100
DPC35/155	Alan McCarthy.....	101
DPC35/156	Phil and Hayley Saxton	102
DPC35/157	Barry Jenness	104
DPC35/158	Andrew and Nicky Bank	107
DPC35/159	Andrew Colson.....	110
DPC35/160	Peter Young	111
DPC35/161	Martin Chin.....	113
DPC35/162	Theresa Sarten	114
DPC35/163	Moana Sinclair – Ngati Rangatahi	115
DPC35/164	Jo Clendon.....	116
DPC35/165	Brian Hall	117
DPC35/166	John McTavish.....	117
DPC35/167	Caroline Ammundsen - Greater Wellington Regional Council.....	118
DPC35/168	Venkataramana Reddy Arra	125
DPC35/169	David Robinson, on behalf of James Menara and himself.	126
DPC35/170	Sandra Wallace.....	128
DPC35/171	Kerry Wallace.....	128

DPC35/172	Pip and Tom Donnelly	129
DPC35/173	Martyn and Rachel Bain	129
DPC35/174	Stephen O'Neill	132
DPC35/175	David Wong – NME Group	134
DPC35/176	Jordan Sydow – Laser Plumbing	134
DPC35/177	Peter Peri	134
DPC35/178	Margaret Sharp - Summerset	135
DPC35/179	Ian Blackwood	135
DPC35/180	Nathan Lyne – Rapid Earth/Lyneworks Ltd	135
DPC35/181	Peter Hosie	135
DPC35/182	Wayne Abraham	135
DPC35/183	Lorcon O'Connor - Summerset	135
DPC35/184	Darryl Ray	136
DPC35/185	Debbie Wolak	136
DPC35/186	Charles John Lott	136
DPC35/187	Sue Corkill	136
DPC35/188	Nick Evans	139
DPC35/189	Kurt Noldan – Noldan Contracting Ltd	139
DPC35/190	Chad Comerford – Laser Plumbing Petone	139
DPC35/191	Michael Scott	139
DPC35/192	Doug Wallis	139
DPC35/193	Shea Howard – Laurie Wotton Builder	139
DPC35/194	Tony Mark Hope	140
DPC35/195	Paul Fenton	140
DPC35/196	Noel McCardle	140
DPC35/197	Leilanie Sagun	141
DPC35/198	Navarone Tamapeau – Stones Electrical	141
DPC35/199	Andrew Spitkerman	141
DPC35/200	Geoffrey W Topp	141
DPC35/201	Ieuan Wright – Aotea Safety Nets	141
DPC35/202	Joseph Scheres	142
DPC35/203	Clark Scarlett	142
DPC35/204	Laurie Watkins – Summerset at the Course	142
DPC35/205	Dot Whyte	142
DPC35/206	Christopher John Burger – All Roof Solutions	142
DPC35/207	Luke de Vries - JISL	142
DPC35/208	Reid McCashin - NME	143
DPC35/209	Scott Connor	143
DPC35/210	Troy Pollock	143
DPC35/211	Jerome Betham	143
DPC35/212	Alastair Knight – Rapid Earthworks Ltd	143
DPC35/213	Dom Bartels – Laurie Wotton Builders Ltd	143
DPC35/214	Benjamin Lay-Robertson	144

DPC35/215	Wayne Paki.....	144
DPC35/216	Karl Symons – Aotea Safety Nets	144
DPC35/217	Aaron Huddleston	144
DPC35/218	Brodie Liam Kensley Howard – Shea Howard Builders	144
DPC35/219	Michael Tester – B.J. Bell Bricklaying.....	144
DPC35/220	Quint Persico	145
DPC35/221	Marianne Mork	145
DPC35/222	Cedric Aiulu.....	145
DPC35/223	Fraser Stevenson.....	145
DPC35/224	Ken Taylor.....	145
DPC35/225	Brooke Riley.....	145
DPC35/226	Allan Wells	146
DPC35/227	James Neil Scott	146
DPC35/228	Thomas Lawson – Laurie Wotton Builders	146
DPC35/229	Kaylin Signal – All Roof Solutions.....	146
DPC35/230	Mark Mitchell – Valhalla Builders Ltd.....	146
DPC35/231	Ian McIntosh – All Roof	146
DPC35/232	Tim Barmes – Axis Builders	147
DPC35/233	Laurie Wotton.....	147
DPC35/234	Isaac Ham – Laurie Wotton Builder	147
DPC35/235	Jeremy Randall and Catherine Ross	147
DPC35/236	Patrick R.D and Annette J Lyford	148
DPC35/237	Dennis Ingram.....	149
DPC35/238	Robyn Ramsay.....	149
DPC35/239	David Gamble	150
DPC35/240	Michelle Walker.....	150
DPC35/241	Carolyn Coombes	151
DPC35/242	Jan Sayring	152
DPC35/243	Stephen Newton.....	153
DPC35/244	Annette Undrill.....	154
DPC35/245	David Cody - Boulcott School Board of Trustees.....	156
DPC35/246	John Freer – Boulcott’s Farm Heritage Golf Club	157
DPC35/247	Spencer and Tracey Joe	158
DPC35/248	Luke Dawson – Chair Solutions Group.....	159
DPC35/249	Pat McTavish	160
DPC35/250	Brian Timmins	161
DPC35/251	(Late Submission) Ernest Oliver Aston.....	162
ADDRESSES FOR SERVICE – PROPOSED PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 35.....		165

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - PROPOSED PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 35

DPC35/1 Kevin Melville – NME Group					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
1.1	Not stated	Support	Positive effects to the local community.	Acceptance of DPC 35.	Yes

DPC35/2 Frederick Albert Stohr					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
2.1	Not stated	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/3 Nicola Bland					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
3.1	Not stated	Support	To allow the land to be rezoned for a retirement village.	Allow Summerset to go ahead.	No

DPC35/4 Gary John McKay					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
4.1	Support for the proposed development.	Support	Totally supports the development of a retirement village as proposed.	Approve the application from Summerset.	No

DPC35/5 Richard Sadleir					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
5.1	The entire proposal.	Support	In favour of the change and zoning.	That the land be rezoned to general residential activity area for a retirement village.	No

DPC35/6 Bruce and Gwen Patchett					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
6.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness for zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the proposed activities. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Oppose the plan change and seek its rejection but support development of the site as described in GR21, provided any development is of size and scale compatible with the character and amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation. 	<p>Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset.</p> <p>Approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	No

DPC35/7 Frederick Ferris					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
7.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the proposed activities. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety based on the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by plan change. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives 	<p>Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and</p>	No

	<p>environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments.</p>	<p>the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss.</p> <p>d. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>e. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods.</p> <p>f. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school.</p> <p>g. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system.</p> <p>h. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes.</p> <p>i. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period.</p> <p>j. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare.</p> <p>k. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site.</p> <p>l. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail.</p> <p>m. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community.</p> <p>n. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation.</p> <p>o. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site</p>	<p>character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

			<p>can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly.</p> <p>p. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance.</p> <p>q. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken.</p> <p>r. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City.</p> <p>s. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by Plan Change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the Council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/8 Morris and Sue Black					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
8.1	Height of tower block and Hathaway complex.	Oppose	Not stated	Maximum height two stories.	No

DPC35/9 Noreen Goodyear					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
9.1	Proposed construction of a retirement village.	Support	There is a need for this facility and this is an appropriate location for it. Retirement village will benefit not only residents but also other businesses and service providers in Hutt City.	That proposed District Plan Change 35 be approved.	No

DPC35/10 John RG Cullinane					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
10.1	Not stated	Not stated	<p>Has neither vested interest nor intentions of engagement with either Boulcott Preservation Society Inc. or Summerset Villages (Lower Hutt) Limited.</p> <p>a. Military Road, Hathaway Avenue and Boulcott Streets represent a mix of residential properties but nothing much exceptional. Trees make the area lovely.</p> <p>b. Progress and change bring initial disruption and an altered outlook for a few.</p> <p>c. Summerset Villages do not produce ugly places.</p> <p>d. The greater portion of the neighbourhood is not affected.</p> <p>e. If the Village gets established there would only be a light to moderate increase in traffic.</p>	Not stated	Not stated

DPC35/11 Judy Bradley					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
11.1	Proposed building of Retirement Village.	Support	Lower Hutt City will benefit financially.	That the proposed District Plan be approved.	No

DPC35/12 Judy Macindoe					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
12.1	The inappropriateness of the zoning change and the unsuitability of the set of the activities planned i.e. the bulk, size, height and scale which do not sit with the existing residential spaces, also school.	Oppose/support in part	Supports the development of the site as described in GR21 provided that all developments are of a scale and size compatible with a Special Residential area.	To reconsider the scale of this proposal so it fits into area.	No

DPC35/13 Larisa Koning					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
13.1	Change current District Plan to allow construction of retirement village.	Support	Strong support. Retired Hutt area residents have a right to have a village in Hutt area.	To approve consent for development of retirement village.	No

DPC35/14 Matthew Paterson					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
14.1	All provisions with emphasis on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the 	Oppose	Opposes plan change and seeks rejection by Council. Of particular concern are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take 	Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset. Approve a more appropriate zoning for	No

	<p>proposed activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments. 		<p>place over a 5-6 year period.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. 	<p>residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/15 Sarah Worthington

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
15.1	<p>All provisions, in particular the density, height and scale of the proposed built environment with respect to the surrounding existing residential and open space environments.</p>	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change in its entirety and seeks rejection by Council.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Density, height and scale of proposed Summerset retirement village is incompatible with character of Boulcott neighbourhood. Neighbouring properties will be negatively affected by shading (incl. Boulcott School field), wind flow changes, loss of views towards the hills and Tararua ranges. Increased vehicle numbers will overwhelm surrounding streets (which are already at capacity) and put greater pressure on available parking outside Boulcott School. Children attending Boulcott Kindergarten and School will be subject to constant construction noise and vibration with negative impacts on their learning and welfare. Concerned that Plan Change will negatively impact property prices in the neighbourhood. 	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety.</p>	Yes

DPC35/16 Dennis Page					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
16.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the proposed activities; Proposed earthworks and ground level modifications; Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety based on the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Expectation, based on information presented by the applicant (p 14), that a resource consent would be lodged simultaneously with the plan change in order that the full materiality of the proposal could be assessed. Without the concomitant resource consent application local residents' concerns with respect to particulars of the plan change proposal cannot be fully referenced and benchmarked; neither could it be expected that the Hutt City Council and its officers would be in a position to fully and appropriately assess the merits (or otherwise) of the change. Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. Community of the adjacent residential area could reasonably have expected that open space zoning to continue. Adjacent Special Residential Activity Area recognises that (4B1.1.1): <i>Within the City, there are some residential areas which possess special amenity values, characterised by residential dwellings, low densities, mature vegetation, and a high standard of development. It is important that these characteristics and amenity values be protected from the adverse effects of unsympathetic development and activities.</i> Precedent analogous to these provisions and expectations has been previously set by Hutt City Council with respect to 9 Wellington Road, Wainuiomata (July 2009) and Walter Mildenhall Park in Naenae (December 2012) where developments 	<p>To reject the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>Submitter seeks retention of the open space zoning but, as an alternative, a change to the zoning as either a General or Special Residential Activity Area without amendment to provide for higher than medium density retirement villages.</p> <p>If the alternative option were considered, the submitter would also request the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> provision for reserve spaces; a requirement that any medium density area is situated in the middle of the site with transition to lower densities at the boundaries to allow better integration with the existing, surrounding environments; and that the ground height is not altered 	Yes

		<p>on those sites were rejected due to the loss of amenity value to the surrounding areas and as a result of community concern.</p> <p>f. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>g. Misuse of 'urban edge effect' concept to justify height and bulk of the site, abuse of building length provisions as stipulated in the District Plan.</p> <p>h. Attempts to distort density calculations by misuse of definition of site area, as opposed to net site area, to be able to include communal open spaces, right of way and other shared spaces in calculation of site coverage which is inconsistent with District Plan's provisions for density calculations.</p> <p>i. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods.</p> <p>j. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school.</p> <p>k. Entrance road will have negative impact on property at 1 Boulcott Street and rear properties 3 to 7 Boulcott Street. Living and bedroom facilities of these properties face out to current open space and provision for road with up to 560 vehicle movements per day will have significant effect on amenity and natural quiet values. Property at 1 Boulcott Street will have three of four sides encapsulated by roading with fourth boundary being bounded by driveway for residences at 3 Boulcott Street.</p> <p>l. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system.</p> <p>m. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed stormwater improvements/pumps specified for the site fail.</p> <p>n. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the</p>	<p>from its current levels.</p>	
--	--	---	---------------------------------	--

			<p>site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. p. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period. q. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare. r. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community. s. Stated demand for retirement villages currently is out of step with reality. Several retirement village provider companies aggressively and continuously market their complexes in local print media which suggests the demand for these facilities is saturated or is low to non-existent, otherwise advertisements attempting to entice people to buy would not be required. Future stated demand, allegedly based on extrapolated census data, makes unproven assumptions that certain demographic groups will want these facilities when alternative options could be available to them. t. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation. u. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly. v. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance. Other adjoining open spaces are private and not open to the public (golf course). w. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the 		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken.</p> <p>x. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City.</p> <p>y. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by Plan Change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the Council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/17 Gary Paddison

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
17.1	All provisions	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>Plan Change is incompatible to character and built environment (SRAA).</p> <p>Land should be rezoned to Special Residential Activity Area.</p> <p>Supports development of the site as described in GR21, any development should be of a size and scale compatible with the character and amenity of the neighbourhood.</p>	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	Yes

DPC35/18 John Ward Valley					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
18.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the proposed activities. • Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council. Supports development described in GR21, provided it is of size and scale compatible with character and amenity of neighbourhood.</p> <p>Opposition is based on following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less 	<p>Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	Yes

			<p>environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly.</p> <p>k. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/19 Peter Donovan

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
19.1	Proposal as a whole.	Support	Proposal would open the way for a badly needed facility and free up houses for families.	Accept the plan change.	No

DPC35/20 Joel William McLean

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
20.1	Not stated	Support	<p>That HCC make changes to the District Plan so that the project can go ahead.</p> <p>Benefits to local economy including tradesman, are huge. Any construction in the Hutt Valley should be encouraged.</p>	Approve the Summerset Village.	No

DPC35/21 Gary Hughes

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
21.1	Not stated	Support	Proposes to live in the village.	Not stated	No

DPC35/22 Marcus Edward McLean					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
22.1	Not stated	Support	Not stated	For the project to proceed without any further hindrance for the benefit of the Hutt Valley economy.	No

DPC35/23 Lindsay Watt					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
23.1	A change to allow for the construction of a retirement village to occur.	Support	Supports the five provisions in the plan change and being a Hutt resident for 33 years, seeks to reside at Boulcott development.	To accept the request for a change in the current District Plan.	No

DPC35/24 Gregor Dunn					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
24.1	Rezoning of land.	Support	Not stated	Rezone the land to General Residential.	No

DPC35/25 Raymond Tomlinson					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
25.1	All provisions with emphasis on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the proposed activities. 	Oppose	Opposes the plan change in its entirety based on the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. 	Reject the plan change in its entirety. Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset. To approve a more	Yes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. d. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood. e. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods. f. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school. g. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system. h. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. i. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period. j. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site. k. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail. l. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community. m. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation. n. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less 	<p>appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

			<p>environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly.</p> <p>o. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance.</p> <p>p. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken.</p> <p>q. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City.</p> <p>r. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/26 Joseph Tomlinson					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
26.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the proposed activities. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety based on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the 	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	Yes

			<p>site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> k. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail. l. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community. m. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation. n. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly. o. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance. p. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken. q. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City. 		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			r. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/27 Peter JH and Wendy E Jenkin

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
27.1	All provisions of the plan change. Particular aspects are:	Oppose	Opposes the plan change in its entirety but would have no objection to a low height and density retirement complex that complied with the provisions of the General Residential Activity Area requirements.	Reject the plan change in its entirety	Yes
27.2	The proposal is essentially a major commercial development presented as a residential development and therefore requiring major changes to the General Residential Activity Area provisions to accommodate it.				
27.3	The three and four storey buildings proposed for the site are completely incompatible with the character of the neighbourhood and would have a significant detrimental effect on its amenities.				
27.4	The density of the proposed complex of buildings is incompatible with the character of the neighbourhood and would have a detrimental effect on its amenities.				

DPC35/28 William Ronald and Jennifer Margaret Caradus					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
28.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the proposed activities. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Oppose the plan change in its entirety. Opposition is based on the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site. 	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety as proposed by Summerset.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. <p>Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	No

		<p>k. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail.</p> <p>l. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community.</p> <p>m. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance.</p> <p>n. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken.</p> <p>o. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City.</p> <p>p. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/29 Gareth Worthington, on behalf of Hutt City Kindergartens Association Incorporated.					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
29.1	All provisions covered by the plan change with particular emphasis on sections relating to benefits / advantages, costs / disadvantages, positive / negative effects (and similar wording and categories).	Oppose	<p>Hutt City Kindergartens Association Incorporated ("Association") opposes the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>Boulcott Kindergarten ("Kindergarten"), one of the 19 kindergartens run by the Association, is located beside Boulcott School on land owned by the Ministry of Education. Kindergarten (staff and 80 children) are directly exposed to the site.</p> <p>Proposed plan change will have strong negative effects on the Kindergarten.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Construction effects on staff and children are likely to be substantial (dust, noise, duration). b. Traffic effects on Kindergarten (staff, children and their families) have not been considered and are likely to have impact on access and safety. c. Large part of aesthetic appeal of Kindergarten's outlook to surrounding hills will be lost, and development permitted by plan change is out of keeping with current built environment. d. Above effects are likely to lead to reduction in roll numbers, underutilisation and potentially reduction in staff. e. Association has not been consulted and does not consider potential negative effects have been adequately considered (avoided, remedied, mitigated). f. Plan change could allow buildings of even greater scale than set out in the master plan. g. It is not clear that positive effects will be realised and there are inconsistencies between the application and an advertisement placed in the Hutt News, which place doubt on the information contained in the application. 	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	Yes

DPC35/30 Paul Adams					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
30.1	Change to height and bulk of buildings.	Support in part / Oppose in part	Support for general development but not 3-4 storey buildings in this area.	Limit height to 2 storeys.	No
30.2	Change to rules regarding parking/transportation.		Supply sufficient resident and trade supply parking.	Provide sufficient parking on site for all residents and trade supply vehicles.	

DPC35/31 Megan Kenning					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
31.1	Not stated	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>Not opposed to development of site described in GR21, provided that size and scale are compatible with character and amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Is a parent at Boulcott School and deeply concerned.</p> <p>Shading projection assumes that children are confined to playground area which is incorrect.</p> <p>Children regularly play on field at back of the school. High rise buildings close to the school boundary will have negative effect on field (being regularly shaded and less available for use).</p> <p>Area along boundary to golf course is well used by children. Shading would mean they are less useable due to wet/dangerous ground and lack of sun.</p> <p>This is contrary to studies showing the benefits of children playing outside.</p> <p>Concerned about effects on learning during construction phase. Prolonged and loud noise has negative effect on learning.</p> <p>Traffic is already under pressure, particularly during school and Kindy</p>	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	No

			pick up and drop off times. Proximity to hospital puts pressure on parking and traffic flow. Understands the need for further housing for seniors but considers it grossly unfair that this comes at the expense of the smallest and most vulnerable citizens.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/32 Matthew Sturmer

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
32.1	The adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period.	Oppose	Oppose the plan change in its entirety.	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	No

DPC35/33 Patrick Ralston Fitzgerald

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
33.1	Rezoning to residential.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/34 Letitia Thomson

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
34.1	General plan change.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/35 Mike Anderson

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
35.1	General plan change.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/36 Richard Nottage					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
36.1	Rezoning	Support	Rezoning to enhance local environment and attraction to Boulcott's Farm Golf Club.	Not stated	No

DPC35/37 Raymond Smith					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
37.1	General plan change.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/38 Rod Gillespie					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
38.1	General development of area.	Support	Not stated	Approve the submission.	No

DPC35/39 Gary Spratt					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
39.1	General plan change.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/40 John Anderson					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
40.1	Change to general residential activity area with provision for a retirement village.	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. There continues to be a need for retirement facilities in or near the Lower Hutt central area. b. Land subject to the application is ideally suited to this purpose, being in a residential area close to shopping, medical and recreational facilities. c. Promoter of the proposed retirement village (Summerset) is an 	Consent to change of zoning to allow for a retirement village.	No

			experienced operator in this field and construction of the facilities will bring employment to the Hutt Valley.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/41 Lawrence Horne

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
41.1	General plan change.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/42 Alan Young

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
42.1	General plan change.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/43 Michael Bovey

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
43.1	Plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/44 Adam Caccioppoli

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
44.1	Plan change to residential.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/45 Nigel Lyne

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
45.1	Plan change	Support	Economic benefit to the community.	Not stated	No

DPC35/46 Liz Kettle					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
46.1	Rezoning of land to residential.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/47 Patricia Howatson					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
47.1	Plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/48 John Ford					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
48.1	Rezoning to residential.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/49 John Kettle					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
49.1	Plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/50 Annabel Freer					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
50.1	Rezoning of land for residential.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/51 John Miller					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
51.1	General plan change.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/52 Susan Maclean					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
52.1	Plan change	Support	Growth of the Hutt Valley.	Not stated	No

DPC35/53 Vivianne Innes					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
53.1	General plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/54 Jeanette Partridge					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
54.1	General plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/55 Eroni Ekevati					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
55.1	General/rezoning	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/56 Lisa Boese					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
56.1	General land change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/57 Robert Mills					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
57.1	General plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/58 Dallas Anderson					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
58.1	Change to general residential activity area with provision for a retirement village.	Support	<p>a. There continues to be a need for retirement facilities in or near the Lower Hutt central area.</p> <p>b. Land subject to the application is ideally suited to this purpose, being in a residential area close to shopping, medical and recreational facilities.</p> <p>c. Promoter of the proposed retirement village (Summerset) is an experienced operator in this field and construction of the facilities will bring employment to the Hutt Valley.</p>	Consent to change of zoning to allow for a retirement village	No

DPC35/59 Noel Kortright					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
59.1	Rezoning to residential	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/60 Wendy Quinn					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
60.1	General plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/61 Mark Carew					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
61.1	General plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/62 Dennis Aiken					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
62.1	General rezoning	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/63 Keith Humphreys					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
63.1	General plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/64 Brenda Guile					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
64.1	General land change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/65 Martin Press					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
65.1	General plan change	Support	Submitter supports the proposed district plan change.	Approve the plan change.	No

DPC35/66 Sue Faulke					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
66.1	General plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/67 John Howarth					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
67.1	General Development to occur	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/68 Christeen McKenzie					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
68.1	General plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/69 Laura McGown					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
69.1	Plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/70 Hope Walker					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
70.1	Rezoning to residential.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/71 Barry Revington Keate					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
71.1	Rezone land to residential.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/72 Vicki Harding					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
72.1	Plan change	Support	General benefit.	Not stated	No

DPC35/73 Sharon Walker					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
73.1	Rezoning of land to residential.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/74 Kevin John Tait					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
74.1	Rezone to residential	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/75 Gillian Milldove					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
75.1	General change	Support	Supports the land change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/76 Larry Williams					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
76.1	Rezoning to residential.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/77 Len Kong					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
77.1	Change of zone to residential.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/78 Janice McSloy					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
78.1	General development	Support	Supports the development.	Not stated	No

DPC35/79 Charlie Jones					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
79.1	General Plan	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/80 Jean Buchanan					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
80.1	Plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/81 Bernadette Trueman					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
81.1	General plan change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/82 David Muthich					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
82.1	Change to residential	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/83 Robbie Selwyn					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
83.1	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/84 Callum Woodney					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
84.1	General plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/85 Krystal Priest					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
85.1	General plan change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/86 Terry Fraei					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
86.1	Rezone to residential	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/87 Joe O'Grady					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
87.1	General plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/88 Deborah Cowman					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
88.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the proposed activities. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space movements. 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a long period of time. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation. 	Reject the plan change in its entirety, as proposed by Summerset. They need to consider the locality they wish to be part of.	No

DPC35/89 Andrew Cowman					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
89.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the proposed activities. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school. Adverse effects increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. 	Reject the plan change in its entirety. The build does not fit with the area.	No

DPC35/90 Jenny Keehan					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
90.1	Plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/91 Courtney Maclean					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
91.1	Benefits of rezoning the land.	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/92 Colin Brown					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
92.1	Plan change to occur	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/93 John Young					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
93.1	General plan change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/94 Terry Senior					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
94.1	General plan change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/95 Maurice Sutherland					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
95.1	Rezoning residential	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/96 Jesse Muru Paenga					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
96.1	Rezoning of land	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/97 Joy Smith					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
97.1	General plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/98 Roger Buchanan					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
98.1	General changes proposed	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/99 Kay Flowers					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
99.1	Plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/100 Michaela Duthie					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
100.1	General plan change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/101 David Hill					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
101.1	Proposed plan change	Support	Land was surplus to requirements of golf club. It needs to be utilised and provide economic benefit for Lower Hutt.	Not stated	No

DPC35/102 Lynette McLaughlin					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
102.1	General benefit of development.	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/103 Janice Tomlinson					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
103.1	Plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/104 Gabrielle Dennis					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
104.1	General plan change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/105 Ivy Innes					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
105.1	General plan change	Support	Supports the general plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/106 Teora Teao Jennings					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
106.1	Rezoning of land to residential	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/107 Neil Simpson					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
107.1	Rezone land to residential	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/108 Tamara Milldove					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
108.1	General land change	Support	Supports the land change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/109 Michael Clark					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
109.1	General re-zoning	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/110 Susan Griffiths					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
110.1	General plan change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/111 James Offord					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
111.1	Plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/112 Denis Cox					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
112.1	Plan change	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/113 Rachel Anne Jobson and Andrew Peter Oakley					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
113.1	Scale and height of proposed development, and detrimental effect that construction and completed development will have on surrounding area including nearby residents and	Oppose	Oppose the plan change in its entirety for the following reasons: a. Height and scale of development are excessive and at odds with surrounding residential area. b. Proposed development doesn't take into consideration the negative impact on neighbours and the neighbourhood in general. Negative impact includes loss of amenity value, effects of shading	Reject the plan change.	Yes

school.			<p>and wind, and effect of prolonged and disruptive construction on neighbourhood in general and school children in particular.</p> <p>c. Lack of adequate assessment of effects of development on Hutt River system</p> <p>d. Lack of adequate assessment of effects of development on neighbourhood in terms of traffic and storm water.</p> <p>e. Central Ward already has fewer publically accessible reserves/open spaces than other Wards; development will further deprive Central Ward of land for this use.</p> <p>f. Whether and to extent there is a need for housing for the elderly in the Hutt Valley should be subject to comprehensive and independent Council initiated review, and housing developments for the elderly should address the needs identified and policies that come out of the Council review.</p>		
---------	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/114 Debra Curran

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
114.1	Bulk, height and scale of the proposed plan change is out of character with the Boulcott area.	Oppose	The loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood would result.	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	Yes

DPC35/115 Andrew Curran

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
115.1	Bulk, height and scale of the proposed plan change is out of character of the surrounding Boulcott area.	Oppose	Opposes the plan change in its entirety.	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	Yes

DPC35/116 George and Glenys Longstaff

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
116.1	Loss of property value.	Oppose	Oppose the plan change in its entirety unless Summerset keeps the height to two storeys and do not raise the land more than the surrounding properties.	Oppose the plan change as above and ask Lower Hutt City Council to get a commitment from Summerset to agree to these two conditions before passing a change.	Yes
116.2	Raising of the land above surrounding properties.				
116.3	Flooding				
116.4	Unsightly 4 storey buildings.				
116.5	Traffic volume				
116.6	Exit for the elderly in a major earthquake.				
116.7	Profit making business.				

DPC35/117 Ken Haywood

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
117.1	Provision for a retirement village.	Support	<p>a. Supports the application by Summerset Villages for a change in zoning to as to enable a retirement village to be constructed.</p> <p>b. Considerable research is available to show that increasing numbers of persons will be reaching retirement age over the next few years. Consequently there will be a continuing and increasing need to provide adequate accommodation for the older generation.</p> <p>c. For too long Hutt City had insufficient facilities to accommodate retirees, resulting in waiting times of up to five years before suitable accommodation has become available. While three new projects have just been completed or are in the course of construction there is a need to expand the number of retirement villages to meet future demand. A barrier to further development is the scarcity of suitable land.</p> <p>d. Building a retirement village would be utilising the land to the best</p>	Rezone the land to enable a retirement village to be constructed.	Yes

			<p>advantage in providing housing for a greater number of persons by comparison with normal residential subdivision. It must also be attractive to ratepayers because of revenue which will be received for Council's services.</p> <p>e. Another retirement village in Lower Hutt would be a positive step in providing quality accommodation and care for aging population. Unless organisations who are members of the Retirement Villages Association continue to build villages, the burden will fall on Central Government, Local Authorities and Voluntary or Charitable Organisations to do so.</p> <p>f. Proposed plan change would provide the opportunity for a quality village to be established and this opportunity should not be missed.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/118 Graham Harding

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
118.1	Rezoning of land at Military Road/ Hathaway Avenue etc. as General Residential Activity for a Retirement Village.	Support	Supports the proposed private district plan change.	To proceed with acceptance of the proposal.	No

DPC35/119 Dr Damayanti Hyacinth Seneviratne

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
119.1	To rezone this site in Boulcott from General Recreation Activity Area to General Residential Activity Area with a specific provision for a retirement village.	Support	Wishes to support the proposal as is aware of the need for a retirement village in the Hutt area.	Approve the rezoning.	No

DPC35/120 Dr Eric Lakshaman Seneviratne					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
120.1	To rezone this site in Boulcott from General Recreation Activity Area to General Residential Activity Area with a specific provision for a retirement village.	Support	Wishes to support the proposal as is aware of the need for a retirement village in the Hutt area.	Approve the rezoning.	No

DPC35/121 Diana Mary Brunn					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
121.1	Not stated	Support	Aging population need more facilities of this time. Local families having option of this type of facilities.	Rezone as requested in change 35.	No

DPC35/122 Barbara Larsen					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
122.1	Rezoning of land to General residential with provision for retirement village.	Support	In support of rezoning to allow a retirement village.	To allow for retirement village.	No

DPC35/123 Thomas Brunn					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
123.1	Economic benefits to City.	Support	Giving local families another retirement village option.	To rezone land as stated in change 35.	No

DPC35/124 Fredrick Sydney Bennett					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
124.1	Rezoning of land at Military Rd / Hathaway Ave / Boulcott St as General Residential Area with provision for a Retirement Village.	Support	Supports the provision for a District Plan change as a Retirement Village is ideal for this area.	To let the retirement village plan and buildings go ahead.	Yes

DPC35/125 Dr James Herdman					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
125.1	Whole plan change	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>Writing in capacity as a resident of the Hutt Valley, as a health professional and advocate for the elderly, and as a parent at Boulcott School. Opposes the proposed plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. Wrong design</p> <p>Creating such a facility lacks the diversity of an age mix and international best practice is moving away from such models as they can easily become old peoples ghettos, segregated from the rest of the community with an institutional feel.</p> <p>As a senior doctor visiting many retirement villages, rest homes and residential care facilities in the Hutt Valley, wishes to advocate for quality facilities for older people. The only reason for putting 260 older people in multi-storey blocks on a relatively small piece of land would be to maximise corporate profits, not to create a sensitive integrated facility.</p> <p>Multi storey blocks are not part of the fabric of the Hutt Valley, most dwellings being ground level or one storey at most. Older people on upper floors tend to get isolated because of significant psychological and physical barrier to accessing the outdoors. Considers the Summerset retirement village complex in Trentham, Upper Hutt to be a good model to follow.</p>	Decline the proposal.	Yes

			<p>Responsible organisations like Hammond Care in Australia consult closely with relevant health professionals and environmentally sensitive architects to create facilities of quality, mostly low rise buildings.</p> <p>b. Wrong location</p> <p>Only public facilities close to the development site are Hutt Hospital and golf course; no shopping centre, only a few small local shops. No open park either as golf course is not available as a public park. No direct access to the river and its walkways. People risk being cooped up in the facility with few local amenities available on foot.</p> <p>c. Traffic Issues</p> <p>Roading around proposed site is not safe or adequate for the size of the development nor the thousands of truck journeys needed during construction. This would represent a blight and a hazard to neighbouring community and Boulcott School, around which traffic is already at capacity.</p> <p>d. Boulcott School</p> <p>There would be a severe impact on school, compromising education of hundreds of primary school children which is of concern to the submitter as a parent and his family. Issues of concern include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • effects of construction noise over a period of years, for some their entire primary school career could be dominated by this; • adverse effects from bulk, scale and height of the building; • shading over the lovely playing field; • visual impact with loss of a green view down the valley to the Rimutakas, dominated instead by the rear end of a four storey block; • adverse effects on traffic as described above, with peak times already congested and the addition of another 260 people on the same road being unsafe and impracticable; • retention of teachers is likely to become more challenging and role of the school could fall as school becomes less desirable, 		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>which could in turn affect the entire Boulcott community and the choice of families to live there.</p> <p>e. Seismic risk</p> <p>Major seismic event such as a large earthquake is an absolute certainty over time, all the more reason not to put a large multi-storey retirement complex on seismic vulnerable, liquefaction prone, flood prone land. Lessons about where to build should be learned from Christchurch.</p> <p>Major problems arise trying to evacuate such buildings after a natural disaster. Frail elderly would be especially vulnerable. In Christchurch many older residents had to be relocated and the mortality rate within a year of the event was particularly high. In constructing residential developments here, it is important not to make them too dense or on land that is inherently risky.</p> <p>f. In conclusion</p> <p>There is scope for responsible developers to create quality facilities for older people that are sensitive to the needs of the local community, environmentally and socially integrated. So far the proposal does not meet this threshold and is clearly concerned primarily with corporate profit. It is of an inappropriate design, in the wrong location and with severe negative environmental impact. If Summerset cannot be good community citizens The submitter suggests they sell the piece of land to someone who can be. The submitter urges the regulatory authorities to decline the proposal.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/126 Lance McClure					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
126.1	All provisions with emphasis on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary 	Oppose	Opposes the plan change in its entirety, also the following: <p>a. Has personally lost a prospective purchaser for his current property as they were concerned about size, scale, bulk, shading wind effects and a general loss of value to the property as a result of the proposal. Initial five storey proposal has been lowered by</p>	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	Yes

	<p>nature of many of the proposed activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments. • Errors and omissions from the Summerset proposal. 		<p>Summerset to now four storeys.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> b. Summerset bought the land knowing it was in a Special Residential Activity Area. Proposal ignores SRAA and fight through the courts, shows what type of neighbour Summerset wishes to be and how it does not care for the local rules, as per the recent 10-14 Hathaway Avenue development that failed on every aspect of the submission. c. Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. d. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. e. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. f. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood. g. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods. h. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school. Residents have already suffered windblown dirt and objectionable fumes from the redevelopment of the proposed site, whereby the Golf Course allowed fumes and dust to waft into the surrounding street and this was in direct conflict with the agreed rules. The mounds of dirt were to be watered down to stop dust swirling around and this was not carried out. i. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system. j. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, 		
--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes.</p> <p>k. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period.</p> <p>l. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare.</p> <p>m. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site. This would be completely illegal in the Tauranga City District plan, so why should we allow this infill to occur.</p> <p>n. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail.</p> <p>o. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community.</p> <p>p. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation. The safety of its elderly residents in an emergency when four storeys up.</p> <p>q. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly.</p> <p>r. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance.</p> <p>s. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken.</p> <p>t. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City.</p> <p>u. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.</p> <p>v. Removal of several large Pohutukawa trees on the two sites to facilitate full use of the land and lose established trees for financial gain of Summerset Group</p> <p>w. This Property Development Company needs to be sent a clear signal by the Environment Court authority, that the local council rejected their proposal to build 6 properties on three sections that were less than the required by SRAA (2100m²) 700m² required, namely 1709m² for 6 separate residences would equal 427.25m² per property, just over 50% of the required land mass.</p> <p>x. The generic drawings shown to the Commissioners for the 10-14 Hathaway Avenue Summerset proposal were so similar in appearance, they drew attention to themselves for the lack of unique character.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/127 Richard Fassbender					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
127.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the proposed activities. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> “Green field” nature of the site is special and makes the area one of quality. Redevelopment of “brown sites” as carried out by other operators does add economic value to the City as a whole. Proposed plan change does not pass this test. Impact on Boulcott School and traffic impacts have been glossed over on all adjoining streets and junctions. Change seeks to take current amenity benefits that locals and school enjoy and makes them a selling feature of the new site, thereby depriving the current owners/beneficiaries of adjoining sites of these values. No monetary compensation redress this loss, particularly to pupils of Boulcott School. Submitter could possibly support development of the site described in GR21, provided any development is of a size and scale compatible with the character and amenity of the overall neighbourhood. Strict adherence to scale, height etc. would be necessary for this to be supported by the submitter. 	<p>Reject the plan as proposed and approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes, which includes provisions for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood and school area. Low density housing [low height in particular] for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	Yes

DPC35/128 Alison McKone					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
128.1	Not stated	Oppose	<p>Residents have been aware of this pending project since 2010. Stopbank was relocated towards the river in order to provide the Golf Course with saleable land. Understanding is that the sale was required to fund the development of Golf Club facilities. Concerned residents were told that a high rise development was not likely. Concerned that parties have resorted to advertising in the Hutt News, not giving an accurate view of the issues and influencing people who are not affected by the project. Concerns are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Effects on the school of the construction phase 	<p>Overall does not support the application for a District Plan Change to facilitate a commercial venture of this scale. The District Plan is developed for a reason and as much of the open space amenity value of the central area as possible,</p>	Not stated

			<p>There will be noise, dirt and dust alongside the school for quite some time with heavy trucks driving past the school on a regular basis.</p> <p>Vibration from earthworks and truck movements will be a distraction to students and teachers, particularly with 21,000m³ of fill to be brought to the site.</p> <p>Ground level of the site is to be brought up which will add to the height of the buildings and exacerbate drainage issues experienced on the school field. The field was often closed because it was wet and not draining, being near the river the water table can get high, so drainage can be an issue.</p> <p>b. Reverse sensitivity</p> <p>Elderly residents are likely to be disturbed by the noise from children, particularly school bells and whistles from games or sports activities. This will be made worse when there are big events e.g. sports day or cross country. A school needs to be able to operate freely without fear of noise complaints.</p> <p>c. Traffic</p> <p>Traffic report estimates an additional 700+ vehicle movements per day. Streets in Boulcott area are very narrow and congested at times, not just Boulcott St and Military Road but Arika St, Ropata Cres and Mills St as well.</p> <p>Getting onto High Street from Boulcott St or Military Road is difficult at times; hundreds of extra vehicles are going to make things worse, not to mention access on to already busy Connolly Street.</p> <p>There will be problems with large trucks carting the fill to be added to the site on narrow often congested residential streets. Trucks will be forced to use either High Street or Connolly Street. If using Connolly Street they will be negotiating a series of narrow streets creating hazards for residents.</p> <p>Trucks and trades vehicles will be a further hazard for kindergarten and primary school children in the area.</p>	<p>particularly adjacent to the river corridor, needs to be retained for future generations. If the District Plan Change does get through, then height restrictions be imposed to ensure that buildings do not exceed the height of surrounding properties.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Added to this is the hazardous mix of elderly drivers and unpredictable/excited children.</p> <p>d. Infrastructure</p> <p>Boulcott area is one of the older areas (1900's – 1930's) of the Hutt Valley. With existing infill housing load on infrastructure is already high. Adding this amount of additional housing and a care centre will add further to the load on sewerage and stormwater systems.</p> <p>Currently rainwater on the site is absorbed into the ground to the aquifer. Majority of the site will either be roofed or sealed, creating significant additional run off for stormwater systems to cope with.</p> <p>e. Environmental</p> <p>One big concern about Hutt City is the loss of open spaces particularly in the Central Area. Parks and open space are lost at an alarming rate. Soon land in several parks (Copeland St, Avalon Park, Mitchell St) will be sold to enable the sites to be developed by commercial interests, which has huge impact on amenity value. Any development should be required to fit in with existing neighbourhood.</p> <p>Intensification of housing needs to be balanced by the provision of open spaces, playgrounds and parks within walking distance. The central area will lose significant open space with proposed river channel widening work. Combined losses will have huge effect on future generations.</p> <p>Does not believe that a 4 storey building on raised land fits in with either the Special Character Area or the open space environment of the golf course and adjoining river corridor. District Plan should not be able to be changed to suit commercial interest. Community interest and requirements need to come before dollars.</p> <p>The site is part of the secondary river corridor. Given the possibility of major flooding and the proximity of the hospital there needs to be an alternative escape route for any overflow in the event of a horrendous flood. Filling this area will mean water diverts elsewhere.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>f. Employment</p> <p>While much has been made of the employment opportunities this project provides, the wages rates for care workers are often quite low. It is likely that staff will not be living nearby, generating more traffic and possible parking problems. While there is some staff parking provided it is likely to be prioritised meaning further competition for on street parking space.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/129 Merran Bakker

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
129.1	Proposed Plan Change 35 in its entirety.	Oppose	<p>a. In its current form the plan change fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and education areas which adjoin the proposed retirement village.</p> <p>b. As currently worded the plan change would result in inappropriate effects on (including but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding area.</p> <p>c. Should high rise development be allowed near residential areas?</p> <p>Fundamental issue is whether it is necessary to allow for high rise developments adjoining residential areas. Issue has arisen twice (PC 25 WelTec Precinct in Petone and Ryman development on former Petone College site) but not been addressed across Lower Hutt. Current proposal will dominate a residential area, causing shading, reduction of hill views and removing some open space from the neighbourhood. Developer's economic goals (building higher) need to be balanced against protection of existing environment from loss of amenity. Residential height and bulk rules should not be changed for development such as the Summerset Retirement Village.</p> <p>d. Changing the District Plan</p> <p>If Council believes that the residential provisions in the District Plan are insufficient, these should be changed after widespread</p>	That Hutt City Council reject the Plan Change.	Yes

			<p>community consultation but not piecemeal in response to individual developers' plans.</p> <p>Council should uphold the value of open space which is one of the city's current assets. More retirement housing in Lower Hutt should not come at the expense of local communities whose properties will be affected by size and bulk of buildings. The submitter urges Council to reject the plan change and seek the best possible urban design solutions to accommodate new development city wide.</p> <p>e. Boulcott and the Summerset development</p> <p>Area where plan change is proposed is already somewhat congested by traffic to and from hospital. Suburb also contains Special Residential Activity Area (low-density, low-rise, character home), to add high and bulky Summerset development seems an anomaly and deprives residents of some of the features that make the suburb attractive. Effects of construction noise and traffic, shading, loss of views and domination by large buildings on Boulcott School are of particular concern.</p> <p>Plan Change 25 experience shows that residents do not give up their amenity (sunlight, open space and views) lightly. WelTec has found a suitable site for its construction school away from these issues and it is to be hoped that Summerset may also find a way to provide housing for the elderly without reducing the amenity of the residents of Boulcott.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/130 Mike Birchler					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
130.1	All provisions with emphasis on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the 	Oppose	Opposes Proposed Plan Change 35 and seeks its rejection by Council. <p>a. Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Summerset is proposing maximum possible land use. Surrounding</p>	Reject the plan as proposed and approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes, which includes provisions for reserve space and is	No

	<p>proposed activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments. 		<p>neighbourhoods and school include green space. People have chosen to live in the area for a reason. Other areas provide for more intense building/commercial opportunities and Summerset's proposal is suited to those areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. Existing roading doesn't cope at certain times of the day. Congestion will be an issue. It is currently difficult to exit Boulcott Street onto High Street. Adding vehicle traffic related to 263 residents, full and part time staff and visitors will increase this exponentially. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the 	<p>directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood and school area. Low density housing [low height in particular] for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>site.</p> <p>k. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail.</p> <p>l. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community.</p> <p>m. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly.</p> <p>n. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance.</p> <p>o. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken.</p> <p>p. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City.</p> <p>q. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/131 Patrick Philip Hussey

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
131.1	Specific provisions that the applicant wants included with the plan change to enable them to build what they want.	Oppose	<p>a. The current proposal is deliberately confusing for the community and the applicant is attempting to include numerous conditions that should more appropriately be considered as part of a resource consent process. As detail is included in the application concerns are addressed in the overall development as described.</p> <p>b. The proposed development is adjacent to Boulcott Special Residential Activity Area and would have significant detrimental impact on amenity values in the area if permitted at the scale, height and bulk proposed.</p> <p>c. No consideration has been given to transition between existing SRAA zone and application land. Proposal is for two-storey bulky, joined up buildings along most of the existing boundaries which will destroy outlook from existing properties and potentially create shading, wind and drainage issues.</p> <p>d. The land subject to the application lies in a potential flood risk area, has significant drainage issues and the applicant proposes to raise the existing ground level by way of large-scale infill transported from out of the area. This work will have detrimental impact on environment and will affect the local school significantly.</p> <p>e. The land subject to application is of historical significance and does not think sufficient consultation has taken place with Iwi and other interested parties.</p> <p>f. Would prefer land to be developed as recreational area, rather than rezoned residential.</p> <p>g. Does not support construction of medium – high density tower</p>	<p>Decline the application.</p> <p>Alternatively if allowed to proceed, ensure the applicant is not able to attach specific design aspects to the plan change that should more appropriately be subject to a resource consent application.</p>	Yes
13.2	The scale height and bulk of the buildings proposed.				
13.3	The impact on the surrounding SRAA neighbourhood.				
13.4	The construction impacts.				
13.5	The traffic impacts.				
13.6	The cultural impact report.				
13.7	The aged care model proposed.				

			<p>blocks, intensification is not appropriate adjacent to SRAA.</p> <p>h. Concerned that traffic impact has not been accurately considered with special concerns regarding traffic conflict outside Boulcott School and at the intersection of Boulcott St and High St.</p> <p>i. Does not believe that proposed high-rise, high density aged care model is in the best interest of aging population. Model will be found to be unsuccessful as people will choose to remain attached to and supported within their own communities. Questions financial model that requires residents to sacrifice significant capital sums as part of 'ownership model' and sees strong possibility for significant vacancies in years to come. Summerset and similar operators are already competing for the same customer base with competitive advertising. Summerset model is focused on maximising return for its investors with needs of residents and impact on communities given only lip service.</p> <p>j. Concerned that scale of development will cause major ongoing disruption throughout extended construction process with particular impact on school and immediate neighbours. Huge earthworks will create dust and noise even if trucks are permitted access across golf club land.</p> <p>k. Concerned that development will have significant detrimental impact on property values in the Boulcott area.</p> <p>l. Believes the applicant has paid expensive price for the land because of potential outlook over and access to the golf club meaning that the land needs to be developed very intensively to create enough residential units to generate financial return needed by their investors. Therefore they are not designing facility that takes real concern over impact on environment or provides decent living experience for their residents. They could develop something more suitable on less expensive land elsewhere. Land subject to application could be better developed for residential or recreational purposes if Summerset's financial imperative was not main motivating factor. Submitter objects strongly to existing environment being ruined by poorly designed and inappropriately scaled commercial development.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			m. Would potentially support development of a low-rise, well designed retirement village on the land but would want the potential flooding risk to be properly mitigated before even that kind of development was considered.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/132 Alison Louise Hussey					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
132.1	Application should be heard in two parts, one process to consider the change of land use to general residential and one to consider the inclusion of permission for development of a retirement village as proposed by the applicant and described as high rise, high density and high bulk.	Oppose	<p>Strongly opposes application</p> <p>a. Change of permitted land use to general residential allowing for development is viable but additional provisions for retirement village makes application unacceptable given proposed development shown in application. Summerset should not be permitted to confuse District Plan process with RMA process for particular developments. Application should be treated as two separate requests and a retirement village of the size, density and height shown in the application should be declined at this time and considered through a more explicit process.</p> <p>b. Risk that submitters' concerns will be ruled out as being not relevant to a plan change hearing, however application provides considerable detail about the development thereby large amount of what should be covered through a resource consent application would be approved if Plan Change is allowed.</p> <p>c. Plan Change does not provide kind of growth opportunity that will future proof the Hutt valley (LTP 2015-20125: "<i>A healthy and attractive built environment- our built environment enhances our quality of life. Our city is vibrant, attractive, healthy and well-designed. We promote development that is sustainable, and that values and protects our built heritage and the natural environment.</i>" "<i>Council will embrace low impact urban design approaches</i>"). Development proposed by Summerset is not in line with LTP statements, proposed retirement village is poorly designed for low cost build using every last centimetre of land. Development is not sympathetic to neighbouring area, particularly Special Residential Area. Proposed development will impact</p>	<p>Decline the application. The Plan Change to general residential may be acceptable only if a separate process is employed to decide which conditions are allowed for permitted activity. The current application, if approved, effectively provides permission for the proposal from Summerset to proceed. It is clear the scale, density and height of the retirement village proposed by Summerset will have serious adverse effects on the surrounding community and that it does not align with the long term vision expressed by the Council itself, for the future of a healthy Hutt City.</p> <p>In summary - Don't let corporates make the</p>	Yes

			<p>negatively on amenity values of neighbouring properties and on outlook of whole community including Boulcott School.</p> <p>d. Building of development will cause unreasonable disruption to residential area and school over several years and developers have shown no consideration for community. Does not accept Summerset's suggestion that there will be a process for neighbour complains about unreasonable noise or disruption. Corporate has damaged potential relationship with community through lack of consultation. Summerset has always told community that financial model would not allow more sympathetic, low-rise development.</p> <p>e. LTP: Council is <i>"Committed to transforming Hutt City into one of New Zealand's leading economic growth centres based on science, engineering and technology."</i> Hutt Valley needs to be future proofed through sound economic growth and with opportunities for the population. However proliferation of retirement villages without strategic approach and long term view is not good planning and use of land. No evidence that retirement villages as planned by Summerset will provide for needs of aging population in next 20 years. Hutt Valley could be faced with vacant buildings on desirable residential land. Summerset model for aged care is not sustainable, as aging population recognizes financial losses through fees structure and sale and purchase conditions. No Council should be convinced that high rise living is the best way for people to 'age in place'. Concept of housing well-heeled older people in a gated community is not making the most of the resource older people offer to communities. Healthy cities are made up of communities with diversity across the life span.</p> <p>f. Boulcott is not identified in the LTP as a likely zone for intensification and therefore application is not in line with long term vision for the Hutt Valley. (LTP on Intensification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"Provide for targeted infill intensification in Waterloo and Epuni beyond 2018;</i> • <i>Carry out further investigatory work on other areas that may be suitable for targeted infill intensification, e.g. the railway corridor and the periphery of the CBD;</i> 	<p>rules; high-rise neighbours are not cool.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Provide for low-rise apartment developments in key locations in the city, namely:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Eastbourne against the hills, and other sites that will not have negative effects on views and shading of existing dwellings</i> ○ <i>Jackson Street from Cuba Street West excluding the area covered by Plan Change 29, The Esplanade and Marine Parade areas in Petone</i> ○ <i>Around the Waterloo shops and train stations with the exception of Ava station</i> ○ <i>The periphery of the CBO (high-rise is already provided for in the CBD)</i> ○ <i>Suburban shopping centres.”</i> g. <i>Application will not contribute to cultural, social or environmental wellbeing of the Hutt and the community of Boulcott. (LTP page32: “The Local Urban Environment activity promotes social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing in particular through our strategies for growth and development, our Heritage Policy, our CBD Making Places project and our Vision documents. It contributes to all community outcomes. Looking at the potential for negative effects associated with this activity, urban design activities could result in temporary disruptions during any construction phase. Ineffective sustainability initiatives could lead to increased resource usage, waste and detrimental impact on the environment.”) Boulcott neighbourhood has social capital aplenty; community is united in opposition to Summerset proposal.</i> h. <i>Summerset application states: “As noted in section 5.3 above, some existing nearby residents may consider a retirement village is incompatible with the character of the adjoining and adjacent existing residential areas. However, retirement villages are residential in nature and are almost invariably sited within residential areas.” Challenges Summerset and Council to find a retirement village of the height and density proposed located closely to an area of quality, character homes on large sections. Sympathetically designed retirement villages in neighbourhoods are invariably single or at most two level buildings well spread over flat sites.</i> 		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>i. Summerset application: “Building development will have to comply with the standard General Residential Activity Area conditions for buildings. Accordingly, existing adjoining properties will be protected to the extent that is considered acceptable by the District Plan where residential sites adjoin one another. However, in proposed Areas 1 and 2 (shown by the Plan in Appendix 1) additional building height, bulk and location is proposed. The potential adverse effects (i.e. shading, view, etc) are assessed to be acceptable and well outweighed by the positive effects. This will be tested through the DPC process.” Proposed height, bulk and location of proposed building have no benefits to surrounding area and effects are adverse. Development is not wanted in this area.</p> <p>j. Very concerned about impacts of construction and additional residents’ vehicle movements on narrow streets, in particular Boulcott Street (school) which is extremely congested during drop off and pick up times. There is risk to children and vehicles. Military Road and Hathaway Avenue are narrow and intersections of Military Road and Boulcott Street with High Street are dangerous with traffic volumes in High Street resulting in long delays for vehicles joining High Street.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/133 Nicolas Cooper - Opus on behalf of Ministry of Education					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
133.1	PC 35, Part 3, Section 4 (Section 32 Evaluation); Pages 23-24, Sec 4.2 Options 3 and 4 ‘Benefits/Advantages’, Costs/Disadvantages	Oppose	Not opposed to development enabled by changes of land use zoning that area consistent with Part 2 of the RMA and have adequately demonstrated that actual or potential effects on the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	That Hutt City Council declines the Proposed District Plan Change in its entirety.	Yes Ministry of Education does wish to present a joint case with Boulcott School
133.2	PC 35, Part 3, Section 4 (Section 32 Evaluation); Page 25, Sec 4.2, last bullet point <i>“There will be adverse effects</i>		Boulcott School opened on its present site in October 1928 and has a roll of 350 students within 15 classrooms. It is classified as a decile 7 school with 19.5 full time teaching equivalent positions. Boulcott School has an important strategic role in the network of schools within the Hutt Valley. In terms of the elements identified opposed to Plan Change 35 in its		

	<i>generated by development and use that will be enabled by the DPC as assessed in section 5 of this DPC document, including quantification to the extent practicable. The adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or adequately mitigated by the DPC provisions.”</i>		current form. Seeks the plan change is declined in its entirety for the following reasons:		Board of Trustees.
133.3	PC 35, Part 3, Section 4 (Section 32 Evaluation); Page 26, Sec 4.5, second paragraph “That development and use of housing for the elderly is enabled on the site shown in Appendix General Residential 21 provided that the design is consistent with the Retirement Village Design Guide and that the adverse effects of transportation and construction are avoided, remedied or appropriately mitigated.”		a. The information presented in the assessment of effects on the environment in relation to off-site traffic, construction and building height / mass/ shading is not sufficient to determine that the Ministry's interests are not adversely affected by the Proposed District Plan Change (Section 5 of Part 3 and Part 3 Appendices). b. The Proposed District Plan Change will not provide for the Ministry to safeguard its interests in the Boulcott School by removing its ability to participate in a resource consent process and is therefore inconsistent with Part 2 of the RMA 1991 (Section 4.6 Part 3). c. There is no positive or negative impact statement in relation to consideration of the District Plan Change on Boulcott School (Section 4 of Part 3). d. There is no assessment of the likely social and health impacts upon Boulcott School in terms of a staged development on the site. e. There is no information in the Transportation Assessment that assesses the actual or potential traffic effects that could occur on Boulcott Street adjacent Boulcott School as a result of the Proposed District Plan Change. f. There is no information provided in the Shading Effects Assessment to indicate a not more than minor adverse effect upon the amenity of the Boulcott School outdoor area that could occur from building development during a school day over the Winter season. g. The Proposed District Plan Change is not clear in terms of the relationship of the maximum height zones (14m and 16.5m under the General Residential Appendix 21), the finished height of 3 or 4 storey buildings proposed under the Master Plan, and the height to boundary relationship of the finished buildings along the boundary of the Proposed District Plan Change site shared with		
133.4	PC 35, Part 3, Section 4 (Section 32 Evaluation); Pages 26-27, Sec 4.6 Table listing Benefits/ Advantages, Costs/ Disadvantages, and Efficiency and Effectiveness for proposed rule changes (4A 2.3(l), 4A 2.3(m), 4A 2.3.1 (n), 4A 2.5 and 4A2.3.2)				

<p>133.5</p>	<p>PC 35, Part 3, Section 4 (Section 32 Evaluation); Page 27, Sec 4.6, first paragraph</p> <p><i>“In relation to the proposed non-notification clause 4A 2.3(1), this specific provision is consistent with and gives effect to the District Plans notification procedure set out in Rule 17.2.2 of the Plan. Non-notification is justified because it provides an appropriate balance between enabling the Council to manage the restricted matters while avoiding risk, cost and delay to applicants/investors associated with notification processes.”</i></p>		<p>Boulcott School.</p> <p>h. The Proposed District Plan Change provides a false permitted baseline argument in relation comparing the effects of a retirement village with a 60 Lot residential dwelling development. The current zoning does not support that, and there is no information in the Proposed Plan Change documents to verify that a 60 Lot resident dwelling subdivision would fit as a controlled activity or be otherwise granted consent on the same site of the Plan Change.</p>		
<p>133.6</p>	<p>PC 35, Part 3, Section 4 (Section 32 Evaluation); Page 27, Sec 4.6, last paragraph</p> <p><i>“The adverse effects associated with the provision are assessed in Section 5 of this document and are considered to not outweigh the benefits. This assessment will be tested through the DPC process.”</i></p>				
<p>133.7</p>	<p>PC 35, Part 3, Section 4 (Section 32 Evaluation); Page 28, Sec 4.8, paragraph 5</p> <p><i>“Local residents adjoining or very near the site will lose the significant benefits they have enjoyed from residing next to</i></p>				

	<p><i>privately owned open space/golf course land. This loss cannot justify the retention of the General Recreation Activity Area zoning and failing to make efficient and effective use of this scarce land resource for retirement village accommodation and care that will significantly benefit the wider residential community of Hutt City."</i></p>				
133.8	<p>PC 35, Part 3, Section 4 (Section 32 Evaluation); Page 30, Sec 5.3 and subsequent comments on page 61, item 14</p>				
133.9	<p>PC 35, Part 3, Section 4 (Section 32 Evaluation); Pages 30-31, Sec 5.4 and Appendix 7</p>				
133.10	<p>PC 35, Part 3, Section 4 (Section 32 Evaluation); Page 31, Sec 5.5 and Appendix 8</p>				
133.11	<p>PC 35, Part 3, Section 4 (Section 32 Evaluation); Page 35, Sec 6.2</p> <p><i>"The proposal is considered to be consistent with and will promote Section 5 of the Resource Management Act 1991."</i></p>				
133.12	<p>PC 35, Part 3, Section 4 (Section 32 Evaluation);</p>				

	<p>Page 41, Sec 6.4</p> <p><i>“the proposal adequately provides for the management of adverse effects so that the amenity of the surrounding immediate residential locality will be maintained to an appropriate standard;</i></p> <p><i>any potential adverse effects resulting from future residential development and use of the site will be appropriately managed through the District Plan objectives, policies and rules of the General Residential Activity Area and with the proposed site specific refinements.”</i></p>				
133.13	<p>PC 35, Part 3, Appendix 1; Page 68, Sec 2.3</p> <p>Reference to insertion of activities (l) and (m) into rule 4A 2.3 “Restricted Discretionary Activities” and that activity (l) qualifies for the preclusion of public notification and/ or limited notification</p>				
133.14	<p>PC 35, Part 3, Appendix 1; Page 68, Sec 2.4</p> <p>Reference to insertion of (m) and (n) as matters for the restriction of Council’s discretion under rule 4A 2.3.1</p>				
133.15	<p>PC 35, Part 3, Appendix 1; Page 69, Sec 2.5</p>				

	Insertion of "other Matter" (ii) referring to the permitted height of buildings and structures under Appendix General Residential 21				
133.16	PC 35, Part 3, Appendix 1; Page 69, Sec 2.6 Reference to the insertion of (b) as a non-complying activity under rule 4A2.5				
133.17	PC 35, Part 3, Appendix 1; Page 72 Plan showing District Plan Change location and portraying the Height Zone 1 (14.0m) and Height Zone 2 (16.5m)				

DPC35/134 Graeme Gibbons					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
134.1	Specific areas of concern relate to bulk/scale and in particular height of proposal in relationship to surrounding residential areas. Concerned about "datum height" to be used for height measurement of project, "datum height" may best be reference to Boulcott School playing field. Original proposal was for single and two storey units.	Oppose	Opposes the plan change in its entirety and seeks its rejection in its current form. Supports development of the site provided development is of size and scale (height in particular) compatible with character and amenity of neighbourhood.	Reject the plan change in its entirety as proposed by Summerset. To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes reserve spaces and reflects an appropriate design guide that reflects the size scale and character of the adjacent neighbourhoods.	Yes

DPC35/135 Sue Colson					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
135.1	<p>All provisions caused by the plan change.</p> <p>The incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments.</p>	Oppose	<p>Reasons for opposing the Land Change in its entirety:</p> <p>a. Loss of view from property</p> <p>Proposed development would cause present views of green grass and trees to the Western Hills to be replaced with dense row of 2 storied town houses and beyond that 3 x 4 storied tower blocks. Would potentially lose sight of hills all together if land was raised before construction. Dense infill housing would be an eyesore. Scale of proposed buildings would cause site to be over built with respect to neighbouring properties.</p> <p>b. Shading</p> <p>Anticipates some loss of sunlight from dense build and high rise apartments which is of considerable concern as submitters have renovated their house and constructed a deck to maximise enjoyment of the sun.</p> <p>c. Potential for localised flooding</p> <p>In recent heavy rains (14 May 2015) considerable water pooling on proposed land. If site was to be raised by 21,000m³ of fill adjoining properties are in danger of run-off. Stormwater drains overflow with heavy rain at present therefore opposes the scale of development. If Council choose to agree to proposed development would seek “water tight” guarantee the run-off from the land would not cause localised flooding on their property.</p> <p>d. Adverse effects of large scale construction just metres from submitters’ property for 5-6 year period</p> <p>Construction effects will cause loss of enjoyment of life, sound and sight irritation and dust issues and submitter is concerned that construction in close proximity will cause damage to the structure of the house. Development could cause significant loss of value in the next 5 – 6 years. Property valuer estimated</p>	Reject plan change in its entirety.	Yes

			<p>\$50,000 reduction in value.</p> <p>e. Danger from golf balls</p> <p>Submitter is a playing member of Boulcott's Farm Heritage Golf course and regularly sees golf balls flying 'out of bounds' into development site which would make a 4 storied high rise block vulnerable to damaging missiles.</p> <p>f. Housing elderly in high rise apartments</p> <p>Housing elderly in high rise apartments is undesirable Main concerns of elderly are isolation in the event of an earthquake when lifts cannot be used and lack of easy access to outside environment for exercise, gardening and a washing line.</p> <p>If housing for the elderly is an important consideration for the city Council should reject the plan change and seek to design a more tasteful, spacious and elegant single storey development better suited to surrounding neighbourhood or find a more suitable site for the scale of the proposal.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/136 Brian Toomey

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
136.1	<p>All provisions covered by the plan change.</p> <p>Climate change must be taken into account. Risk is the safety of elderly extremely vulnerable people hazard of Hutt River. Section 31 of RMA and Energy and Climate Change amendment to the Act require climate change to be taken into account.</p> <p>Inappropriateness of zoning change request. Special zone</p>	Oppose	<p>Opposes Plan Change 35 and seeks its rejection by Council.</p> <p>Should the plan change be approved, any development should be in accordance with GR21 provided it is of a size and scale compatible with character and amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>a. Traffic safety matters.</p> <p>b. Flood hazard.</p> <p>c. Loss of amenity value for neighbourhood.</p>	<p>That Council reject the plan change.</p> <p>Should the change be approved any development should be in accordance with GR21.</p>	Yes

<p>area of Hathaway Avenue has its own special character.</p> <p>The incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding residential and open space environments.</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

DPC35/137 Ian Gerrard Mc Lauchlan

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
137.1	<p>All rules to spot zone the land, especially as what is proposed will destroy existing general and special residential characteristics and amenity values of Boulcott established over the last 100-plus years. Proposal is totally inappropriate as a discretionary activity and is only pursued to maximise profit by housing older people in institutionalised living which is unnecessary given the lack of population growth in Hutt City in the next 20 years and that older residents are housed perfectly fine. Plan change is incompatible as to build height and scale. Development should have to be compatible with existing environment and with all environment that runs along the Hutt River corridor. If</p>	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council. Supports the development of the site described in GR21, provided that development is of size and scale compatible with character and amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Opposition is based on following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Plan change is akin to property development for the wealthy based on a golf resort. If it was a retirement village, why is there not one single storey structure? Why are there 36 three bedroom two storey Coronation Street type townhouses if it is a retirement village for older people who generally want ground level living? The apartment buildings proposed are the same with 80% of the apartments 2 bedrooms or more and none located on the ground floor. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change are such that one of the few character areas left in Hutt City will be butchered. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods 	<p>Reject the plan as proposed by Summerset. Approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes, which includes provisions for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Why completely butcher a perfectly good residential area for the sake of corporate entity focused on maximising profit? If the Hutt City District Plan has any integrity then Council must reject Plan Change 35, as to do otherwise will destroy one of the last areas left</p>	Yes

	<p>something looks like a dog it is a dog and no amount of dressing-up or supposedly expert evidence will change it from a dog.</p>		<p>currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss.</p> <p>d. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore (and prevent consideration of) impact on amenity values of Boulcott.</p> <p>e. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding properties including Boulcott School.</p> <p>f. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on Boulcott neighbourhoods and school.</p> <p>g. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system.</p> <p>h. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes with already heavy parking in all streets. Where are all the visitors going to park, or guests staying, especially in their Coronation Street townhouses that have very limited areas for parking?</p> <p>i. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period, even given that construction traffic may be diverted through the golf course.</p> <p>j. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare at Boulcott School and the Kindergarten.</p> <p>k. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site. Applicant has admitted that land is a bathtub, why allow high density high-rise development placing lives at risk in a flood-prone area and on an earthquake Faultline?</p>	<p>in Hutt City that has special residential characteristics and amenity values.</p>	
--	---	--	---	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="813 148 1626 240">l. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail. <li data-bbox="813 268 1626 427">m. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community. Properties bordering the development will have significant loss in value as result of development that is out of scale with its surroundings. <li data-bbox="813 454 1626 547">n. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation. In addition flood-prone site and location of site close to major earthquake faultline. <li data-bbox="813 571 1626 699">o. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for older residents. <li data-bbox="813 722 1626 850">p. Shortfall of publically accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance. <li data-bbox="813 874 1626 1209">q. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken. Application is the tail wagging the dog. <li data-bbox="813 1233 1626 1425">r. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger section sizes 		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City. Council have made it clear that there will be no intensification on general recreation land. Given the existing zoning is general recreation, the proposed intensification is totally contrary to statements from Council that there will be no urban intensification on general recreation land.</p> <p>s. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/138 Anne Harris

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
138.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the proposed activities. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the proposal in its entirety as</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is a major commercial property development presented as a residential development, therefore requiring major changes to General Residential Activity Area provisions to accommodate it. Proposed three and four storey buildings along with Coronation Street type 3 bedroom townhouses are completely incompatible with residential character of neighbourhood and would have significant detrimental effect on residential characteristics and amenity values. Density of proposal is incompatible with residential character of Boulcott and would be detrimental to its existing residential characteristics and amenity values. 	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the character of the Boulcott neighbourhood.</p>	Yes

DPC35/139 Lynette McLauchlan					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
139.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the proposal in its entirety as</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is a major commercial property development presented as a residential development, therefore requiring major changes to General Residential Activity Area provisions to accommodate it. Proposed three and four storey buildings along with Coronation Street type 3 bedroom townhouses are completely incompatible with residential character of neighbourhood and would have significant detrimental effect on residential characteristics and amenity values. Density of proposal is incompatible with residential character of Boulcott and would be detrimental to its existing residential characteristics and amenity values. 	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the character of the Boulcott neighbourhood.</p>	Yes

DPC35/140 Joshua McLauchlan					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
140.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety for reasons outlined in the submissions of I G McLauchlan (DPC35/137) and L L McLauchlan (DPC35/139).</p>	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the character of the Boulcott neighbourhood.</p>	Yes

	residential and open space environments.				
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/141 Gabrielle McLauchlan

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
141.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	Opposes the plan change in its entirety for reasons outlined in the submissions of I G McLauchlan (DPC35/137) and L L McLauchlan (DPC35/139).	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the character of the Boulcott neighbourhood.</p>	Yes

DPC35/142 Sam McLauchlan

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
142.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and 	Oppose	Opposes the plan change in its entirety for reasons outlined in the submissions of I G McLauchlan (DPC35/137) and L L McLauchlan (DPC35/139).	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide</p>	Yes

	scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments.			that reflects the character of the Boulcott neighbourhood.	
--	---	--	--	--	--

DPC35/143 Prudence Williams

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
143.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	Opposes the plan change in its entirety for reasons outlined in the submissions of I G McLauchlan (DPC35/137) and L L McLauchlan (DPC35/139).	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the character of the Boulcott neighbourhood.</p>	Yes

DPC35/144 Susan Elizabeth McGuinness

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
144.1	Opposes the plan change in its entirety.	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse effect of increased traffic flow in the area, in particular if there was consideration of vehicular access to the development from Military Road. Effect of shading on adjoining houses and school caused by the 	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	No

			<p>development.</p> <p>c. Negative effects of significant site construction activity particularly earthworks, piling and drainage works.</p> <p>d. Adequacy of proposed drainage systems from retirement village and effect on adjoining area.</p> <p>e. Proposed zoning change should be more closely aligned to Special Residential Area designation of Boulcott area not the proposed General Residential Area.</p> <p>f. Loss of amenity to Boulcott area. Retirement village creates a physical and visual barrier to adjoining golf course which did not previously exist.</p> <p>g. Bulk, height and scale of proposed retirement village is completely out of character to its adjoining neighbours.</p> <p>h. Inappropriateness of the site for such a large commercial operation.</p> <p>i. Result of trying to utilise a narrow tract of land bordering the golf course has produced a mismatch of buildings. Buildings appear “jammed” in to provide as much accommodation as possible without any real effort to effect good urban design.</p> <p>j. Stated construction economic benefits are exaggerated. There is no guarantee that local contractors will be engaged, Summerset is a national company and has established suppliers.</p> <p>k. Concern in relation to siting such large commercial buildings so close to the toe of the stopbank.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/145 Peter Lawrence McGuinness					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
145.1	Opposes the plan change in its entirety.	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety because:</p> <p>a. Adverse effect of increased traffic flow in the area, in particular if there was consideration of vehicular access to the development</p>	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	Yes

			<p>from Military Road.</p> <p>b. Effect of shading on adjoining houses and school caused by the development.</p> <p>c. Negative effects of significant site construction activity particularly earthworks, piling and drainage works.</p> <p>d. Adequacy of proposed drainage systems from retirement village and effect on adjoining area.</p> <p>e. Proposed zoning change should be more closely aligned to Special Residential Area designation of Boulcott area not the proposed General Residential Area.</p> <p>f. Loss of amenity to Boulcott area. Retirement village creates a physical and visual barrier to adjoining golf course which did not previously exist.</p> <p>g. Bulk, height and scale of proposed retirement village is completely out of character to its adjoining neighbours.</p> <p>h. Inappropriateness of the site for such a large commercial operation.</p> <p>i. Result of trying to utilise a narrow tract of land bordering the golf course has produced a mismatch of buildings. Buildings appear “jammed” in to provide as much accommodation as possible without any real effort to effect good urban design.</p> <p>j. Stated construction economic benefits are exaggerated. There is no guarantee that local contractors will be engaged, Summerset is a national company and has established suppliers.</p> <p>k. Concern in relation to siting such large commercial buildings so close to the toe of the stopbank.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/146 John Wallbank					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
146.1	To change the area of land to allow the zoning to be used as	Support	This sort of thing can only benefit the area and provide a pathway for the future.	To allow for the rezoning of the area in question.	No

	a retirement village.				
--	-----------------------	--	--	--	--

DPC35/147 Donna Gardiner					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
147.1	Rezoning the land from Recreation to Residential.	Support	Submitter supports the rezoning of the land to build the retirement village as it will benefit retired people in the area and bring more members of the Golf Club, which has built a short course especially suitable for older players.	To grant the private plan change to rezone the land from General Recreation Activity to General Residential Activity for the development of the retirement village.	No

DPC35/148 Judith Miller					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
148.1	Rezoning must go ahead.	Support	Lower Hutt has an aging population and needs another retirement village. The land/position is ideal for a village being close to the hospital and city centre.	That the proposed changes be accepted by Council.	No

DPC35/149 Joseph Milcairns					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
149.1	Plan Change in general	Support	Not stated	Not stated	No

DPC35/150 Boulcott Preservation Society Incorporated					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
150.1	Plan Change in general, Section 32.	Oppose	Opposes PC35 in its entirety. Not opposed to development of the land where development is	In addition to specific relief outlined below or alternatively, BPS seeks	Yes

	Other relief.		<p>consistent with Part 2 of the RMA and is in keeping with the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Issues <p>PC35 describes applicant's intention to follow up Plan Change request with resource consent application intending that request and resource consent application be heard and assessed simultaneously by the same Hearing Panel (page 14).</p> <p>No resource consent application has been lodged, timing of lodgement has not been advised, submitters could not calibrate their submission accordingly and assess concerns with PC35 provisions based on definition to the actual proposal arising out of the requested "spot zone".</p> <p>Status of Wellington Regional Council designation (WRC11) on the site is not clear. If designation is to be uplifted, it is unclear whether GWRC has any residual concerns about effects of the development on flood protection works or the balance of river corridor land and any public amenity provided by it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 32 <p>PC35 documentation includes section 32 analysis which is not commensurate with scale of proposal and effects of discretionary development for a retirement village. Analysis does not articulate what the "problems" are or issues that the plan change seeks to address, nor does it provide any clear objectives or criteria by which options are to be addressed.</p> <p>PC35 includes evaluation of consistency with existing plan policies and other statutory documents (not accepted by BPS), but no evaluation of effects of proposed provisions or of alternative provisions. It is an inadequate assessment by comparison to MfE 2014 Guideline for preparation of s.32 assessments.</p>	<p>retention of the open space zoning or a change to an appropriate residential activity area (zoning) which is directed by a design guide that reflects the scale (including size), density and character of the neighbourhood with provision for open space and reserves, and enablement of housing for the elderly at an appropriate scale.</p> <p>BPS seeks further, other, alternative or additional relief arising out of this submission and any evidence heard in support of it as is deemed reasonably necessary for PC35 to be in accordance with the purpose, principles and provisions of the RMA.</p>	
150.2	Incompatibility with context.	Oppose	<p>PC35 appears to be predicated on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> shortage of housing for the elderly; shortage of 'greenfield' land; and 	<p>Plan Change provisions to limit development so that effects on adjacent Open Space, the school,</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • corresponding justification to zone greenfield land for significantly out of scale development. <p>PC35 does not include assessment of suitable brownfield opportunities.</p> <p>Subject area has historically been recreation and open space with zoning to manage land use accordingly.</p> <p>Community of adjacent residential area, school and kindergarten expected open space zoning to continue. Special Residential Activity Area recognises that <i>“Within the City, there are some residential areas which possess special amenity values, characterised by residential dwellings, low densities, mature vegetation, and a high standard of development. It is important that these characteristics and amenity values be protected from the adverse effects of unsympathetic development and activities”</i> (4B 1.1.1). Similarly objective of General Residential Activity Area is <i>“To maintain and enhance the amenity values and residential character of the General Residential Activity Area of the City”</i>.</p> <p>Financial benefits for the golf club and to Summerset if it builds and operates a retirement village on the site as well as benefits to people waiting to live in such retirement village, should not be at cost of amenity expectations provided by Special Residential Area, adjoining residential zones, school, kindergarten and open space amenity of the river corridor.</p> <p>Effects of plan change should be determined to maintain and enhance existing amenities and residential character of General and Special Residential Areas in order to reflect expectations of residents who have located adjacent to open space and enjoy the qualities of General and Special Residential Area.</p> <p>Economic and efficiency benefits have been assumed without taking into account amenity effects on existing community, school and kindergarten, the potential for undermining aspects of existing zoning and other externalities. Net economic impacts of development are likely to be negligible or immaterial such that claimed efficiency benefits are over-stated.</p>	<p>the kindergarten, the Special and General Residential Area properties, and road network are neutral or positive.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

150.3	Issue statement	Oppose	<p>Proposed issues statement (Issue 4A 1.1.2) for General Residential Activity Area includes assertion that current density provisions in GRAA cannot provide for retirement villages and thereby opens all General Residential Areas up to challenge as to appropriateness of density provisions by any applicants for retirement villages or other higher density developments.</p> <p>Current issue statement for medium density sufficiently recognises that higher density developments may be appropriate where adverse effects on surrounding residential development are managed, and amenity values are maintained and enhanced.</p> <p>Changing density provisions only with respect to retirement villages is unjustified. Proposal is poorly conceived and has potential to be precedent setting for entire District Plan as 'higher than medium' density for any other form of residential/mixed use development could similarly be appropriate.</p> <p>If there is a need to make provision for higher than medium densities for development this should either be undertaken comprehensively by Council or current medium density provisions should be maintained and applications for resource consent used to evaluate effects on existing context on case by case basis.</p> <p>Explanatory Statement and Reasons (4A 1.1.2) are poorly conceived and belong in s32 analysis.</p> <p>Proposed change to Issue Statement for Medium Density Residential Development is inappropriate.</p>	<p>That the issue statement not be changed. That Hutt City Council promulgate a comprehensive plan change for addressing locations for higher than medium density if there is a genuine need for it across the city.</p>	
150.4	Policy	Oppose	<p>Proposed Policy 4A 1.1.2 (d) is inappropriate as it suggests that development of housing for the elderly should be allowed on the subject site, provided design guide is met and adverse effects of construction and transportation are addressed. Proposed guidelines are largely focussed on internal layout of the site – only 5 of 61 site guidelines refer to existing context.</p> <p>Policy is inconsistent with objective and policies (a), (b) and (c). Objective is for medium density residential opportunities around some commercial centres (subject site is not part of commercial centre), along major transport routes (subject site is not on major transport route) and where amenity values will not be adversely affected</p>	<p>That the proposed policy 4A 1.1.2 (d) be deleted, or a comprehensive plan change for addressing locations for 'higher than medium' density be promulgated by the Hutt City Council.</p>	

			<p>(adverse effects on amenity values will arise) and where there is appropriate servicing of development.</p> <p>Proposed policy is inappropriate as it is in direct conflict with the objective it is required to implement.</p>		
150.5	Site Area	Oppose	<p>Proposed change to 'site area' from 'net site area' for calculating site coverage will significantly increase allowable density and therefore effects of form and scale on existing context.</p> <p>As explanation and reasons for site coverage (4A 1.2.1 (b)) explains "<i>combined with net site area, site coverage helps to control building density</i>". By changing 'net site area' to 'site area' communal open spaces, right of way and other shared spaces will be able to be included in calculation of site coverage which is inconsistent with the District Plan approach to density.</p> <p>A 'Master Plan' is provided in Appendices 2 & 13 which is assumed to be indicative only as there is no concurrent consent application. Master Plan shows large areas of what may be common areas. Under 'net site area' definition these could not be used within calculation of site coverage, but under definition of 'site area' they can such that density can be increased at expense of open space.</p> <p>Changed definition would also apply should the site be used for standard residential development. Given the intention to 'preserve overall open character' for General Residential Activity Area the changes are not considered appropriate.</p>	Site coverage definitions should continue to apply unchanged as they do for the General Residential Activity Area.	
150.6	Building Height	Oppose	<p>Proposed Plan Change provides for 14m and 16.5m height 'zones' within the site. At the interface with adjoining Hathaway Avenue properties the proposal is for 8m height limit.</p> <p>Current rules for General Residential Activity Area provide for height at 8m with maximum overall height of 13m.</p> <p>Proposed height restrictions exceed provisions of medium density rules and specific provisions for Petone Education Precinct. Scale of development proposed adjacent to existing residential area and alongside school and kindergarten is inappropriate. Proposed building height regime will not balance effects on adjacent residential properties (e.g. Petone Tertiary Education Precinct with height limit of</p>	General Residential Activity Area heights should apply and where appropriate the height limits should be supplemented with controls that address impacts on the amenity of adjacent residential areas, the school and the kindergarten and limit the scope for overbearing	

			12m and range of set-backs and recession planes successfully addressed adjacency to residential areas on the precinct's boundaries).	structures and adverse shading effects.	
150.7	Scale	Oppose	<p>Master Plan images show that scale of development is significantly different to that of surrounding area. Shading Effects Assessment (Appendix 13) demonstrates significant shading in winter months for school and adjoining Hathaway Avenue properties given their location to the south of the subject site.</p> <p>Other adverse effects will include visual dominance of blocks for adjacent properties as demonstrated by viewpoints in the Urban Design, Landscape And Visual Effects Assessment (Appendix 9). Extent of visual dominance is inadequately described. This component of AEE contains no proper assessment of visual effects and falls short of best practice requirements of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects.</p>	That the Requestor be required to meet the cost of an independent visual effects assessment to an appropriate standard and/or the plan change request be rejected.	
150.8	Public Amenity	Oppose	<p>PC35 seeks to remove limitations on building length and recession planes on west facing boundary at river corridor where there is high level of open space public amenity. GWRC aspire to achieve public access to and along the stop bank and there is public access to Ariki Street and from Boulcott Street from where development would be visually dominant. Boulcott Primary School grounds are publicly accessible open space outside of school hours and at weekends. Immediacy of development to these open spaces increases potential for abrupt, out of scale development to dominate these areas.</p> <p>Any increase of, or exemption from, maximum building length and recession plane rules is inappropriate given the high public amenity of the adjacent open spaces, including school and kindergarten.</p>	Retain the General Residential Activity Area recession planes and maximum building length provisions unchanged.	
150.9	Urban Design, Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment (Appendix 9)	Oppose	<p>PC35 places significant weight on the resource consent process and the proposed <i>Boulcott's Farm Heritage Golf Club Retirement Village Design Guide</i> to manage effects of development.</p> <p>Design Guide objectives (01-05) do not provide for fit of master plan development into existing context (Special Residential Activity Area, school and kindergarten) with specific qualities of openness. Of 61 Guidelines only 5 relate to relationship with existing context.</p> <p>Guidelines are numerous and not supported by any graphic</p>	(a) If there is to be a guide then it should be the Medium Density Design Guide or equivalent and be vastly simplified as a basis on which planning assessments can be	

			<p>interpretations. Sheer number of guidelines and impracticality of assessing consistency and ability to monitor whether guidelines are being met are problematic. Guidelines as proposed and intended degree of reliance are inappropriate for determining resource consent applications.</p> <p>Visual effects assessment identifies number of viewpoints but inadequately makes clear assessment of the significance of any changes noting vaguely that e.g. 'the view is affected' (View 1) or 'there is reasonable change to the natural characteristics of the view' (View 2). Urban design assessment considered proposed density to not be out of character with 'urban edge' development and appears to refer to clusters of taller, denser development on either High Street or the periphery of urban areas adjoining the river corridor open space. This is not a reasonable assessment given that any taller development in this part of the city appears around the hospital.</p> <p>PC35 enables up to 16.5m (4 storey) blocks and apart from the hospital there are no comparable developments of this scale in the vicinity.</p> <p>Guide is impracticable and visual assessment is inadequate, there is no fit with existing built environment.</p>	<p>made; and</p> <p>(b) The visual effects should be properly and independently assessed and quantified with consistent language of scale from minor to significant and/or the plan change request be rejected.</p>	
150.10	Activity Status and Notification	Oppose	<p>PC35 includes provision which exempts housing for the elderly from being non-complying in the event that permitted activity and general rules are not met and introduces provision that applications for consent are exempted from public notification and need not be subject to limited notification.</p> <p>Exemption from notification process appears not to be limited to retirement villages. As for any development proposal, which fails to meet the relevant standards, the opportunity to make submissions should apply as it would anywhere else in the city. Exemption is not appropriate.</p> <p>Similarly, exempting development of a retirement village from non-complying status is inappropriate as (a) there are already proposed additional tolerances in the rules (e.g. site coverage and height) and not complying with these could be considered deserving of higher scrutiny than normal discretions as the tests of s104 RMA would</p>	<p>Remove the non-notification and non-complying status exemptions.</p>	

			<p>allow; and (b) housing for the elderly should not take precedence over the way in which effects beyond those allowed for by rules should apply to any other activity.</p> <p>Exemption from non-complying status is inappropriate given the scale of effects and change to current environment.</p> <p>Automatic non-notification is inappropriate given the potential scale of effects.</p>	
150.11	Earthworks and Retaining Walls	Oppose	<p>Master plan contemplates earthworks up to 23,700m³ to level and raise parts of the site, achieve practicable floor levels and minimise the risk of inundation. Information is unclear regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • final floor levels and their impact on relative building heights in relation to existing school, kindergarten and dwellings on the periphery; and • management of groundwater and any surface water flows within the site. <p>No information is provided regarding the extent of retaining walls that may be required to manage filling adjacent to properties on Hathaway Avenue and how recession planes have been calculated at these points. The Engineering and Reticulated Services Effects Assessment (Appendix 7) states that 'these will be minimised where practicable'. Earthworks Layout Sheets 1 and 2 suggest these walls may be between 1–5m in height (difficult to read graduated colour codes).</p> <p>Information as to the effects of retaining walls on adjacent properties, including groundwater effects, and how recession planes have been used at these points is inadequate.</p> <p>Existing General Residential Activity Area earthworks provisions are inadequate to deal with magnitude and complexity of earthworks including groundwater effects contemplated by PC35.</p>	<p>The proposed earthworks provisions should be particularised to adequately provide for the magnitude and complexity of earthworks and retaining walls including groundwater effects contemplated by PC35, and the specific educational and residential amenities to be maintained beyond the PC35 site.</p>
150.12	Traffic	Oppose	<p>Boulcott Street and its intersection with High Street have insufficient capacity to carry the proposed increase in vehicle movements at peak hours (including peak school hours) without significant delays, particularly at intersections.</p> <p>Similar capacity issues will arise for Military Road, Troon Crescent,</p>	<p>That PC35 in its present form be rejected.</p>

			<p>Fry, Ariki and Potomaru Streets. Scale and magnitude of potential development is unable to be adequately provided for by current road network.</p> <p>Potential for pedestrian safety issues to arise, particularly in the vicinity of Boulcott Primary School and kindergarten has been inadequately assessed.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/151 Beverley Rose

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
151.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council. Supports development of the site described in GR21, provided any development is of a size and scale compatible with the character and amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Opposition is based on following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> If you visit the land you will see that Summerset have bought a piece of land which is too small for their requirements. To compensate Summerset have put themselves in position of having to cram in multi-storey buildings to maximise their return. Area will be over-built with respect to size of the site. At present Boulcott neighbourhood is a lovely place to live due to beautiful homes and gardens and established trees. If development goes ahead properties will be overshadowed by ugly tower blocks which will block sunlight from bordering properties. Surely it is more important to Lower Hutt to retain special suburbs and make it a pleasant place to live. New Zealanders who have always valued "The Quarter Acre Paradise" theory will know that to build unnecessary high rise dwellings similar to those seen in heavily populated areas such as Asia or Europe in such a beautiful neighbourhood defies everything that we value. Believes wind tests have been conducted to evaluate the effect of high rise buildings which will abut neighbouring properties, which conclude that a wind tunnel will be created. At present some neighbouring properties suffer from drainage 	Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset. Only approve plans for a retirement village that will not adversely affect our neighbourhood and is more in Character with the environment. The site only lends itself to single (or at the most two storey) dwellings that would be more in keeping with the unique area attached to the Golf Club.	Yes

			<p>problems. Once 21,000m³ of fill is imported drainage problems will become even more of a problem. If developers have to truck in all the landfill this shows that the site is inappropriate. Who will be responsible for flooding that occurs to these properties?</p> <p>e. With Boulcott bordering Hutt and Boulcott Hospitals, traffic flows and parking area at a premium because staff and patients take advantage of free parking. Streets are very narrow and sometimes it is difficult to back out of residents' driveways due to congestion. Does not believe that area will cope with even heavier traffic, both during construction and on completion when Summerset residents and staff travel to and from the complex.</p> <p>f. Very concerned at impact that Summerset will have on Boulcott School. Submitter's three children attended the school. If proposed development goes ahead school will lose a great deal of sunlight to playground and classrooms and constant noise of construction (expected to take app. 5 years) will affect children's learning. It is primary school to form 1 level which means some children will be subject to unpleasant construction noise the entire time they attend Boulcott School. How could the Government let this happen.</p> <p>g. Does not think it is very safe to house a group of elderly people in a high rise complex in the event of fire/earthquake.</p> <p>h. If Summerset are hell-bent on building high rise retirement villages, they should choose somewhere more appropriate where sheer size, bulk, height and scale will not adversely affect such a beautiful and unique area of Lower Hutt.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/152 Karen McCarthy					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
152.1	Adverse effects of construction.	Oppose	Adverse effects of construction, which large scale development triggered by plan change will have on neighbourhood; Boulcott School and Kindergarten in particular as construction may take place over 5-6 year period. This will also impact lifestyle and house value	Reject the plan change in its entirety	Yes

			as submitter borders construction site and 5 years of trucks and construction is an unrealistic and unreasonable undertaking in a residential area.		
152.2	Increased traffic on already congested streets.		Changing the top of Boulcott Street to a 90 degree corner will create extremely dangerous egress to school children getting to School from Ariki Street pathway and to the submitter trying to reverse out of their driveway which is on the extreme left of their section (designed to never have the road extended).		
152.3	Building of multi-storey buildings.		Building of multi-storey buildings is completely unacceptable and completely out of character for the Hutt Valley in general and Boulcott in particular.		

DPC35/153 Catherine Gilberd

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
153.1	All provisions covered by Proposed Plan Change 35.	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council. Supports development of the site described in GR21, provided any development is of a size and scale compatible with the character and amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Opposition is based on following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposal is not in keeping with the surrounding suburban Boulcott neighbourhood, and in particular the school. Negative effects that 5 year construction period will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school in particular. Submitter's child attends Boulcott School and physical location with open spaces, an attractive field for outdoor play and sports, a quiet residential neighbourhood and a safe environment were amongst reasons for choosing Boulcott School. Does not want her child's learning environment significantly disrupted by large scale construction site just over the fence. Adverse effects on children, staff and families of the school of large scale multi-storey development would include noise levels associated with project of this size (including major earthworks), 	Submitter rejects the plan change as it is completely out of character with local neighbourhood and in particular Boulcott School. Instead the Hutt City Council could approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes, which includes provision for a reserve space and which is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood.	No

			<p>interfering with normal classroom routines, physical disruption for children and staff with outdoor learning, sports and play. Disruptions to school families during drop off and pick up times in narrow congested Boulcott Street, with increased traffic which could become a safety issue. Parking and manoeuvring vehicles is already problematic around the school.</p> <p>d. Boulcott School has 50% of children enrolled out of zone and plan change will have detrimental impact on the school roll. If large scale development goes ahead families will choose to withdraw their children from Boulcott School (and Kindergarten) and new families choose to enrol their children elsewhere. Development of this size will have detrimental effect on school and adjacent kindergarten.</p> <p>e. Summerset is a business focused on making profit. Real needs of older people and specifically needs of aging population of Lower Hutt do not appear to be high priority. Having easy access to an outdoor environment and engaging respectfully with your neighbours are major contributors to quality of life in later years.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/154 Avril Boswell					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
154.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council.</p> <p>a. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. Roads in this area are already narrow and congested.</p> <p>b. Elderly drivers tend to have lower reaction times and with number of children in this area this is a great concern for both the Elderly who will feel terrible if something happens to a child but also to the children who use the area.</p> <p>c. Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the</p>	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Housing for the elderly</p>	Yes

	residential and open space environments.		<p>surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Height of development right beside school and kindergarten is just too large. Elderly and students could benefit from each other and children learn empathy by being involved but in a smaller scale than what is being proposed.</p> <p>d. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site with respect to proposed changes.</p> <p>e. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail. Given the issues with recent flooding in the area this should be a big concern to not place elderly people in a low lying area close to the river where emergency evacuation is difficult due to narrow streets.</p>	could be developed within this zoning.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/155 Alan McCarthy

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
155.1	Adverse effects of construction.	Oppose	Adverse effects of construction, which large scale development triggered by plan change will have on neighbourhood; Boulcott School and Kindergarten in particular as construction may take place over 5-6 year period. This will also impact lifestyle and house value as submitter borders construction site and 5 years of trucks and construction is an unrealistic and unreasonable undertaking in a residential area.	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	Yes
155.2	Increased traffic on already congested streets.		Changing the top of Boulcott Street to a 90 degree corner will create extremely dangerous egress to school children getting to School from Ariki Street pathway and to the submitter trying to reverse out of their driveway which is on the extreme left of their section (designed to never have the road extended).		
155.3	Building of multi-storey buildings.		Building of multi-storey buildings is completely unacceptable and completely out of character for the Hutt Valley in general and Boulcott in particular.		

155.1	Impact study should be submitted.		At the very least an impact study (required under the RMA) should be submitted. Study should include (but not be limited to) environment (and the effects change these structures will have), neighbours (how this will impact them), community (how it will alter and change the unique Boulcott community including the local school).		
-------	-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--

DPC35/156 Phil and Hayley Saxton					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
156.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Oppose the plan change and seek its rejection by Council. Supports development of the site described in GR21, provided any development is of a size and scale compatible with the character and amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Opposition is based on following reasons :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore (and prevent consideration of) impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River 	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	Yes

			<p>system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> h. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. i. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period. j. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare. k. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site. l. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail. m. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community. n. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation. o. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly. p. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance. q. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in 		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken.</p> <p>r. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City.</p> <p>s. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/157 Barry Jenness

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
157.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the proposed built 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council. Supports development of the site described in GR21, provided any development is of a size and scale compatible with the character and amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Opposition is based on following reasons:</p> <p>a. Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces.</p>	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide</p>	Yes

	<p>environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. c. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. d. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore (and prevent consideration of) impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood. e. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period. f. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods. g. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. h. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system. i. Plan Change gives no indication as to which system is being used for floor notation. j. Stormwater drainage system in the plan cannot handle a 100 year flood. k. No indication as to scheduling of storm-water pipes during earthworks to handle street stormwater off Hathaway Ave and run-off from low lying areas at the rear of Hathaway Ave. l. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail. m. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development 	<p>that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site.</p> <p>n. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community.</p> <p>o. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation.</p> <p>p. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly.</p> <p>q. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance.</p> <p>r. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken.</p> <p>s. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City.</p> <p>t. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/158 Andrew and Nicky Bank

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
158.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential, school and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council. Supports development of the site described in GR21, provided any development is of a size and scale compatible with the character and amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Opposition is based on following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Boulcott School and neighbourhood currently have beautiful green outlook looking towards river and hills which provides Boulcott school a unique open and green outlook, especially evident on the school field where children play. Proposed 3-4 storey buildings close to the school boundary will ruin special character of the school creating a 'built-in' and shaded environment and negatively impacting upon school environment and activities which occur within it. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods, in particular the school. Some classrooms and the school field (only 	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset.</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	Yes

			<p>green space of the school) will be in shade for significant (if not entire) school day, making it cold, damp and potentially very boggy, having significantly adverse and limiting effect on children's outdoor activities, learning outside the classroom and playing.</p> <p>f. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school.</p> <p>g. Proposed high buildings will scar and completely block beautiful view the submitters currently have of the western hills. Submitters' children have been taught their Pepeha in specific relation to a connection with western hills. Cultural identity children are learning will be destroyed by Summerset as hills will be hidden by large imposing buildings and visual reference for tamariki will be lost.</p> <p>h. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system.</p> <p>i. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. Safety of young impulsive children is of utmost concern with resulting increase of congestion.</p> <p>j. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period. Detrimental impact external environmental noise has on children's learning is well documented and researched. Close proximity of proposed building site to classrooms and potential 5-6 year building period makes this particularly concerning.</p> <p>k. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare.</p> <p>l. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site with respect to buildings of proposed size and bulk. Resulting imminent massive volumes of dust that will spill across neighbouring properties and school, exacerbated by prevailing wind, will have negative impact on residential and school children's health, welfare and daily living activities.</p> <p>m. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail.</p> <p>n. Proposed raised height of the land causes significant concern for lower lying neighbouring properties and usability of Boulcott School field in day to day wet weather, due to imminent 'run off'.</p> <p>o. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community.</p> <p>p. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation.</p> <p>q. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly.</p> <p>r. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance.</p> <p>s. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			t. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/159 Andrew Colson

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
159.1	Not stated	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>a. Bulk, height and sheer scale of development is more in tune with industrial park than any enhancement of a "special character residential neighbourhood". Buildings are going to be equal or taller than majority of buildings in Lower Hutt CBD.</p> <p>b. Other areas within Hutt Valley are far more suitable, for example South end of High Street. Benefits would be close to town centre, views over Hutt River and surrounds, close to library etc, all within walking distance.</p> <p>c. Residents of Boulcott have invested great deal of time, effort and money to achieve desirable neighbourhood that promotes Lower Hutt in favourable light. Summerset's main focus is to make money from housing the elderly. They have not listened to the community and do not have intention of being a good neighbour nor to enhance the neighbourhood which is not acceptable.</p> <p>d. Adverse wind effects. Submitter noticed and increase in strength of wind when stands of trees were removed from golf course. Summerset's proposal of 4 storey blocks will create tunnelling effect that will produce stronger winds to surrounding area. Increased traffic will come about due to 5-6 year development and beyond, in already highly congested traffic area.</p>	That Hutt City Council reject the plan change by Summerset. The negative aspects of the Summerset proposal far outweigh any positive aspects they may argue. We need zoning for residential areas with good design that reflects the local community not high rise tenements that will be out of character in a lovely suburb.	Yes

DPC35/160 Peter Young					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
160.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council.</p> <p>Supports development of the site provided any development is of a size and scale compatible with the character and amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The Resource Management Act defines amenity values: <i>Amenity values are those natural or physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people's appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes.</i></p> <p>Part II of the RMA sets out the responsibilities of territorial authorities, regional councils, and members of the community in protecting amenity values. In addition, section 75 requires councils to provide for amenity values in their district plans.</p> <p>Opposition is based on following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. Change removes amenity values that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, transfer them as features of the applicant's site, depriving the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore (and prevent consideration of) impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods and school. 	<p>Reject the plan change as proposed by the applicant, Summerset.</p> <p>A more appropriate zoning for residential purposes would include provision for reserve space and be directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	Yes

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods, school and kindergarten. g. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. h. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period. i. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare. j. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site. k. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail. l. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community. m. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation. n. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly on a more appropriate scale, in keeping with existing neighbourhoods. o. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to 		
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken.</p> <p>p. As a resident of Hutt City for more than twenty years, value the low-to-medium density, low-rise residential environment of Boulcott area, with many large trees and greenery, which made the area ideal for raising a family. If plan change is approved, allowing a high density, high rise concrete and asphalt development to proceed, the attractive values of the area will be significantly eroded for all who live here now and in the future, and the neighbourhood as a whole will be worse off.</p> <p>q. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/161 Martin Chin					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
161.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety. Reasons being:</p> <p>a. Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces.</p> <p>b. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system.</p> <p>c. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period.</p> <p>d. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City</p>	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	No

	residential and open space environments.		Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/162 Theresa Sarten

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
162.1	<p>Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed.</p> <p>Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments.</p>	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council.</p> <p>a. Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Looking at plans provided re effects on sunlight it is worse than had estimated. Plans appear based on lower height of 8m and not the proposed (and probable) higher builds. Would not like to be at a school or home in the shade of these buildings through winter.</p> <p>b. Doubts Council would have initially approved proposal that saw 5-storey development in residential neighbourhood. This is a tactic by the proposers to have backing for original 2-3 storey buildings when they have always intended on a 5 storey, more controversial building.</p> <p>c. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change.</p> <p>d. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss.</p> <p>e. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site</p>	<p>Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	No

			<p>fail.</p> <p>f. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period.</p> <p>g. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare.</p> <p>h. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site.</p> <p>i. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/163 Moana Sinclair – Ngati Rangatahi

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
163.1	Not stated	Oppose	<p>Ngati Rangatahi has not been consulted with as required by sec 5-8 of the RMA. Further the commissioned Cultural Impact Report does not include Ngati Rangatahi who has Mana Whenua over the lands in question.</p> <p>Submission is made by Ngati Rangatahi as an iwi with MANA WHENUA status in the Boulcott lands and as it relates to Private Plan Change 35 submitted by Summerset Group Holdings Ltd (SGHL) required under the HCC District Plan and relevant provisions of the RMA.</p> <p>SGHL has made a private plan change application to Council to rezone the land known to Ngati Rangatahi as Maraenuku Paa now commonly known as the Boulcott land.</p> <p>As per section 32 a plan change requires a Cultural Impact Report (CIR) which was provided by Raukura Consultants.</p>	<p>That Ngati Rangatahi be consulted on all matters concerning the Summerset Group Holding Ltd Proposed Private District Plan Change.</p> <p>That the Ngati Rangatahi claimants receive all information relevant to the SGHL application to the Changed Plan 35 currently before the Hutt City Council District Plan processes and any</p>	Yes

			<p>Historical accounts from Waitangi Tribunal Report make it clear that Ngati Rangatahi have rights in and around the lands known to Ngati Rangatahi as Motutawa – Maraenuku and other areas of interest within the Hutt Valley region.</p> <p>Ngati Rangatahi note that the CIR by Raukura Consultants ignore Ngati Rangatahi status on the said land, specifically that they were living and cultivating land at Maraenuku between 1830's to 1846 when they were evicted by Governor Grey and his colonial troops.</p> <p>The CIR report by Raukura Consultants failed to inform SGHL that in order to satisfy their consultation requirements under the RMA ssS-8, SGHL should have consulted with Ngati Rangatahi as they are iwi who whakapapa to the said land and are currently being heard on their specific rights to the said land, before the Waitangi Tribunal.</p> <p>A Waitangi Tribunal report Te Whanganui a Tara me ona Takiwa establishes that Ngati Rangatahi has suffered wrongful Crown actions when they were wrongfully evicted.</p> <p>The abovementioned Waitangi Tribunal report establishes the clear historical and spiritual links of Ngati Rangatahi to Maraenuku Pa (Boulcott land) in the Hutt Valley.</p> <p>Ngati Rangatahi intend to participate in any planning for the said site and in this submission make clear that they are to be party to all dealings with the said land.</p> <p>This submission is to notify the Hutt City Council, Summerset Group Holdings and all other interested parties, that Ngati Rangatahi will address their claim in any hearings scheduled by the Hutt City Council in the matters that concern Somerset Group Holdings Ltd proposal which seeks to change the zoning of the land with the view to build a Retirement Village on their lands.</p>	<p>resulting Resource consent applications by SGHL.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

DPC35/164 Jo Clendon					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
164.1	Not stated	Oppose	Expresses opposition to high rise and high density development at Boulcott formers golf course land. Whilst supports the development	Not stated	Not

			of further aged care facilities, they should be more in keeping with current neighbourhood, more like Shona mcfarlane.		stated
--	--	--	--	--	--------

DPC35/165 Brian Hall

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
165.1	All provisions covered by plan change, in particular the bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments.	Oppose	<p>The following provisions need to be amended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces and this requires amendment to prevent this type of overbuild. b. Potential adverse effect of shading that proposed built environment will have on surrounding neighbourhoods needs to be prevented from happening conclusively. c. Local roading network will not be able to accommodate the traffic that will be generated by proposed changes during construction and post construction and significantly increasing volume of traffic around early educational facilities should be avoided. d. Local neighbourhood and education facilities (school and kindergarten) will be unreasonably impacted during the long construction period. e. It is inappropriate to be housing elderly people in high rise environments. It drives isolation and a barrier to getting out of the building for walks etc. 	<p>Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset</p> <p>Approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes and is directed by more appropriate and specific design guidelines that reflects the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Appropriate housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	Yes

DPC35/166 John McTavish

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
166.1	Not stated	Oppose	<p>Has been informed that Summerset Retirement Village hierarchy has once again had another change of heart.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The levelling for construction up to 21,000m³ fill. 	Not stated	Not stated

			<p>b. Issues with drainage with one 675mm pipe under the new stop bank would not cope with the recent deluge leaving the submitters property under 500mls of muddy water in their back yard.</p> <p>c. With construction to take place over five to six years the disruption to the nearby school and residents not to mention the huge amounts of dust swirling around while basically breaking the health departments strict rules.</p> <p>d. The Boulcott area has always had a huge amount of traffic so what will a further count of 560 vehicles do for it total gridlock.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/167 Caroline Ammundsen - Greater Wellington Regional Council					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
167.1	Plan Change as a whole	Oppose in part	<p>Primary reasons for opposing in part proposed Plan Change 35 are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of specific detail about final design and layout of proposed buildings, earthworks and associated works along the northern boundary of the site. • Lack of information regarding effects on flood protection stopbank including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential instability and altered flow paths through and/or under the stopbank caused by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - excavations for pump station, - placement of 900mm diameter stormwater pipe, - excavation of unsuitable fill, retaining walls and building foundations. ○ Vibrations during excavation, filling, compaction and piling. ○ Shading on grass growth on the stopbank. ○ Overland flow paths along the toe of the stop bank. • Lack of provision of public access links around the proposed site. 	<p>GWRC opposes the private plan change for a rezoning of land at Military Rd/Hathaway Avenue/Boulcott Street as General Residential Activity Area with provision for a retirement village in its current form and asks that the following matters be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that the applicant provide evidence of methods to ensure piling and other works causing vibration adjacent to the Boulcott Hutt Stopbank do not adversely affect the stopbank, taking 	Yes
167.2	Flood Protection		<p>GWRC's Flood Protection department have concerns around particular aspects of proposed Plan Change and lack of information on a number of aspects. It is understood that this is a plan change and a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity would</p>		

		<p>still be required, however the proposed non-notification clause would restrict GWRC's ability to address these aspects in a resource consent process. Therefore GWRC's concerns are raised now.</p> <p><i>Proposed changes to flood hazard</i></p> <p>Recently completed Boulcott Hutt Flood protection works is located immediately to north of plan change site and includes access-way and stopbank, currently owned by the Boulcott Farm Heritage Golf club but to be transferred to GRWC on completion. Access-way has drainage easement over it (in favour of HCC, accommodating existing Hathaway Avenue drainage).</p> <p>Site now has 1 in 440 year flood protection, therefore 1-in-100year flood notation on HCC' District Plan can be removed.</p> <p><i>Hutt River Gravel for Fill</i></p> <p>GWRC has resource consent to extract gravel from Hutt River for flood mitigation purposes only. No discussions between GWRC and the applicant have been held regarding the use of river gravel to fill the site. Whether material can be used depends on availability. Existing resource consent held by GWRC does not permit material to be extracted for any other purpose than flood mitigation.</p> <p>No discussions have been held with GWRC regarding potential access for trucks transporting fill across GWRC land, the stopbank and access-way.</p> <p><i>Residual Risk</i></p> <p>GWRC notes that residual flood risk has been recognised and assessed as part of application, however residual risk from stormwater flooding has not been identified and addressed.</p> <p><i>Effects on the stopbank</i></p> <p>GWRC is concerned about effects on adjoining stopbank and access-way from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overland flow paths directed along the access-way including during events greater than Q100 or if pump station fails; and • Vibration from earthworks (excavation, backfill), piling etc; and • Shading of stopbank; and 	<p>into account Hutt River flood water levels (for flooding reaching the crest of the existing stopbank). This shall include details for assessing investigating and monitoring pre- and post-development ground conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that the applicant provide evidence via a geotechnical report that the excavations required for the pump station, building foundations and retaining walls and stormwater pipe will not create instability of the stopbank or create flow paths under the stopbank during and after construction. - that no structures, including fences be built within the area shown to be transferred to the GWRC for flood protection works (access- way and stop bank). - that no planting be proposed or carried out within the area shown to be 	
--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential geotechnical instability and flow paths caused by excavations greater than 1m deep within 10m of stopbank. <p><i>Public Access</i></p> <p>GWRC supports creation of off-road pedestrian links between existing public access points in Boulcott Street and Military Road along Hutt River. Policy 53 of the RPS promotes enhancing public access to and along rivers.</p> <p>GWRC supports in principle the proposed retirement village gaining access to adjoining public land. Currently northern access-way is landlocked and can only be accessed crossing applicant's site. GWRC would support linking of stopbank access-way to public access points.</p> <p><i>Specific comments on the application</i></p> <p>GWRC has following specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application proposes removal of height and recession plane controls along northern boundary (Rule 4A 2.3.2 and 4A 2.5). Application provides insufficient information to assess effects of these changes on adjoining flood protection works. • No details regarding final design and location of retaining walls, buildings, fences setbacks and adjacent building heights along northern boundary. • Application shows proposed 900mm diameter stormwater pipe to pump station inside boundary of the site. Buildings are proposed to be set back 1m from boundary (condition 4A 2.1.1 (b), page 37 of application) and constructed on fill up to 1-1.5m at the boundary. No assessment of effects on stopbank and access-way. Difficult to interpret Appendix 7 as no cross-sections or details are given. • No information whether sheet piling will be required to support cuts described as "the maximum cut and fills are less than 5 metre in depth and typically less than 3m" (page 206 of application). <p><i>Details of height and design of proposed retaining walls along northern boundary of the site</i></p>	<p>transferred GWRC for flood protection works (access-way and stopbank) and removal of the blanket changes to height and recession planes along the northern boundary of the site (Rule 4A 2.3.2) and (4A 2.5).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that there is a minimum 1m setback of all buildings along the northern boundary of the site. - the addition of "effects on the flood protection system (access-way and stopbank)" to the proposed provision (m) Housing for the Elderly on the site shown in Appendix General Residential 21 that complies with permitted activity conditions in Rule 4A 2.3.2 - the deletion of 'Others Matters' proposed (i) the recession planes condition and maximum length for all buildings and structures condition shall not apply to the length of boundary 	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Infrastructure and Design Report (Aurecon, page 206) states “some retaining walls are likely to be required along the northern boundary adjacent to the corner of the proposed buildings due to the proximity to the property boundary”, but provides only limited information on what this might entail.</p> <p>GWRC requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan showing how proposed combination of retaining walls, buildings and stormwater pipes will fit on the site given the 1m setback of buildings from the boundary provided. • Information on how potential upslope catchment runoff during earthworks operation (page 206) will be managed. • Details on proposed earthworks adjacent to accessway/stopbank for stormwater pumping station. Preparation of a detailed earthworks management plan "in due course" makes it difficult to undertake an assessment of effects. <p><i>Stormwater</i></p> <p>GWRC notes and requests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should meet appropriate standard for stormwater, which includes the Regional Standard for Water Services. (District Plan - Section 11.2.2.1b). • Floor levels of units should comply with Regional Standard for Water Services. Design for setting of earthworks levels (page 206) has floor levels of units to comply with NZ Building Code for Surface Water. In Assessment of Environmental Effects, it is noted "that stormwater can and will be effectively managed in accordance with relevant regulations and standards" (page 31). Infrastructure and Design Report by Aurecon quotes Regional Standard for Water Services November 2012 as one of those standards (page 210). However, page 203 of report states that a lesser standard is acceptable where "local standards cannot be met due to the constraints of the site". <p><i>Overland Drainage Paths</i></p> <p>Design for setting of earthworks levels (page 206) has overland drainage paths that follow existing Hutt City drainage easement</p>	<p>specified in Appendix General Residential 21.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the addition of "Public Access along and adjacent to the Hutt River stopbanks" to 4A 3 Anticipated Environmental Results. Public access links to be provided to enable the existing public access-way from Connolly Street and Ariki Street to join up to Military Rd and Hathaway Avenue. - that any detailed design plans include good pedestrian access throughout the development to give connectivity to High Street. 	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>adjacent to the stopbank. No information is provided to assess effects of overland flow on stopbank and access-way.</p> <p><i>Effects on the stopbank – Stopbank security – Vibration</i></p> <p>Only information given regarding foundations proposed for buildings is piles for multi-story buildings and piles or shallow foundations for low-rise buildings, no information regarding how piles are proposed to be constructed. Unable to assess how building foundations fit with stopbank and around proposed 900mm diameter stormwater pipe and any required retaining walls.</p> <p>Plan Change (page 31) states that it “assesses the effects of likely excavation/earthworks on the structural integrity of the realigned stopbank and finds that the structural integrity of the realigned stopbank can be assured through appropriate management of onsite earthworks/excavation”. No information to enable any assessment of proposed works on stopbank, therefore no assurance can be given regarding stopbank security.</p> <p>No detail regarding effects of proposed 6m hole for pumping station on stopbank and access-way, especially regarding piping failure of stopbank and effects of piling works. Excavation Management Plan (page 222) begins from premise that no adverse effects are expected with no supporting analysis.</p> <p>No detail to assess effects of piling and excavation for 900mm diameter stormwater pipe and associated works and excavation and piling for buildings on stopbank. Excavation Management Plan (page 222) assumes that risk of adverse effects will be avoided by structural engineering design and management of excavations without providing any detail.</p> <p>GWRC is concerned about potential vibration effects on stopbank from piling, excavation, backfill and compaction. Vibration effects were raised as concern for residents during designation and resource consent phase of Hutt Boulcott stopbank and GRWC adhered to stringent conditions during construction of stopbank.</p> <p>Plan change states (page 35) that “it is not anticipated (from site inspection, knowledge of ground conditions and the experience managing the Boulcott stopbank realignment works) that vibration</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>problems will arise that would unreasonably affect residential amenity".</p> <p>Potential vibration effects of stormwater pipe through stopbank should be assessed.</p> <p>GWRC suggests that geotechnical stability and flow path issues should be analysed and addressed for any excavations greater than 1m deep within 10m of the stopbank due to risk and consequence of piping failure to the stopbank.</p> <p><i>Public Access and Amenity Controls</i></p> <p>Access is not possible along top of stopbank this is part of functioning golf course and public access on golf course is a safety issue. Public access will need to be formed along access strip at the foot of the stopbank. Report (page 60) states that pedestrians will be walking along the top of the stopbank.</p> <p>Plan change states (page 37) that village buildings will lie to the south of the stopbank and this will assist with sunlight access and negligible impact (positive and adverse) on year round grass growth necessary for continued structural resilience of stopbank. No specific assessment has been provided in shading assessment regarding stopbank and effects on grass growth.</p>		
167.3	Biodiversity	<p>Existing biodiversity values of the site are limited and should not be overstated but deserve recognition and consideration.</p> <p>Proposed rezoning represents form of residential intensification and GWRC supports in principle because provision of well-designed high-density housing will reduce potential incursion of development into surrounding valued indigenous habitats and ecosystems. Provision for higher density housing aligns with Policies 54 and 55 of the RPS.</p> <p>Policy 54 requires to give regard to principle of 'custodianship' Accordingly quality urban design in the Wellington region will seek to (a) protect ecological systems, (d) utilise 'green' technology in design and construction of buildings and infrastructure and (k) provide a positive contribution to environmental health of urban streams, the harbours, beaches and their catchments.</p>		

		<p><i>Suggestions for mitigating ecological effects</i></p> <p>Assessment of potential ecological effects was limited by absence of an Ecological Impact Assessment. Assessment was carried out by GWRC with knowledge of biodiversity of the site limited to brief descriptions in Urban Design, Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment (mostly grassland with scattered clusters of trees). While indigenous biodiversity values may be limited, the general ecological values of these landscapes are well recognised.</p> <p>Indigenous vegetation on site contributes to what little remains of once contiguous tracts of lowland forest and is important to wildlife corridors linking established parks and reserves of northern and eastern hills.</p> <p>According to New Zealand Threatened Environment Classification site is located in “acutely threatened” environment because of past losses of indigenous vegetation and paucity of legal protection for what remains. This classification elevates importance of any indigenous vegetation on site both at present and in the future.</p> <p>RPS Policy 47 provides considerations for managing of effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with biodiversity values, including (a) maintaining connections or corridors between habitats, (d) avoiding cumulative adverse effects of incremental loss of habitats, (f) protecting the life supporting capacity of ecosystems, (g) remedying or mitigating adverse effects to ecosystems and (h) requiring a precautionary approach when considering effects. GRWC suggests that these considerations are integrated into the design of any development on site.</p> <p>Development will increase proportion of land covered by hard surfaces and thus reduce habitat for local wildlife. GWRC’s preference would be for any development to focus on vertical growth. Loss of established trees and vegetation is another concern when considering residential intensification. Concerns include potential losses to amenity values, indigenous habitat values, and other ecosystem services. Effects can be mitigated through incorporation of sensitive urban design features such as planted setbacks between adjacent properties.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Although no permanent waterways traverse the site any development will impact on surrounding watercourses. RPS policies 40, 41, 42, and 43 provide range of considerations for assessing suitability of applications for plan changes. Policies require applicants to consider potential effects on aquatic ecosystems health and functionality from earthworks and vegetation disturbance to stormwater contamination.</p> <p>Hutt City Council could consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limiting the extent of impervious surfaces allowed in new developments; and • requiring rooftop rainwater collection for gardens; and • requiring roadside swales, filter strips and rain gardens for stormwater runoff. <p>Design elements could be used as opportunities for retaining or enhancing the value of habitat. Given the site is currently dominated by grassland there is potential to increase the amount of woody vegetation while accommodating new housing and associated facilities and infrastructure.</p>		
167.4	Traffic		<p>GWRC would like any detailed design plans to include good pedestrian access throughout the development to give connectivity to High Street. RPS policy 57 seeks good integration between land use and transportation. Useful pedestrian links will give future residents effective links to public transport options. High Street is key public transport corridor with frequent core bus services giving access to key centres of Lower Hutt CBD, Upper Hutt CBD Petone and Stokes Valley.</p>		

DPC35/168 Venkataramana Reddy Arra

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
168.1	All provisions as outlined in PC 35.	Oppose	<p>Oppose the plan change in its entirety due to below points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Main impact on school. Height and density in bulk with multi-storey buildings. Heavy earthworks cause damage and pollution in residential 	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	No

			area.		
--	--	--	-------	--	--

DPC35/169 David Robinson, on behalf of James Menara and himself.

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
169.1	Not stated	Oppose	<p>Part owner of 731 High Street, situated on the corner of High Street and Military Road.</p> <p>Objection to Plan Change is fundamental firstly in that no commercial organisation should be permitted simply to re-write the District Plan in a self-serving way to maximise its profits, and in a way which jeopardises the integrity of the District Plan.</p> <p>Has no disagreement with an holistic approach to the issue of housing for elderly being included in the District Plan nor objects to rest-home complexes per se. What Summerset is asking is for is to spot zone a piece of land to permit a development which is utterly inconsistent with the adjacent zones.</p> <p>Specific objections to Plan Change 35 are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Council designated certain areas within the city as special zones where land size per dwelling and certain other matters affecting amenity were of such importance as to require protection in the District Plan. Part of Boulcott area which includes Military Road, Hathaway Avenue and environs is one such. Plan change seeks to permit structures as tall as 16.5 metres, over twice that which is considered appropriate in residential areas, including the adjacent special residential zone. Bulk and scale of permitted buildings proposed for the zone are extreme and out of keeping with the special zone, the general residential and the recreational areas abutting the proposed zone. Cannot see how such a proposal can avoid a loss of existing amenity values with the dominance which this zone permits and proposes. Acceptance of plan change will be inconsistent with very values 	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	Yes

			<p>the Council sought previously to protect with extreme vigour.</p> <p>f. Creation of amenity value within the intended zone cannot address the deleterious effect on amenity values of adjacent zones which such monolithic structures as proposed to be permitted will cause.</p> <p>g. Ceiling of the level of the commercial building from where the submitter conducts business sits 16 metres above street level. This is the 4th storey of the building including ground level. Building is in the centre of the CBD.</p> <p>h. How could it be considered appropriate to permit large monolithic structures of 16.5 metres in height in the middle of an area bounded by openness of a golf course on one side and residences constraint to less than half that height on the other sides, mostly on large planted plots of land?</p> <p>i. This is about economics but not about economic benefits for a community.</p> <p>j. There will be no economic benefit for those immediately adjacent residential zones. Reverse is the case and specific properties will suffer economic detriment if plan change is approved.</p> <p>k. Greatest economic benefit is not to wider community in creation of jobs (at the bottom end of society) and purchases of services but that which proposers will derive from an ability massively to overdevelop land which should at least have a general residential zone tag bound by normal bulk and location requirements.</p> <p>l. Rest homes not run by not-for –profit organisations are not built out of social altruism. They are businesses (euphemistically described as housing for the elderly) where a commercial organisation bets on how long people who take up occupation rights will last, and how often and quickly those rights can be turned over, while income is earned by the organisation and people’s capital is held on loan to grow the business. Any small economic benefits to the wider community are entirely secondary to this raison d’etre.</p> <p>m. Special residential zone is already one where traffic and parking</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>in narrow streets is an issue and existence of local school and kindergarten create traffic spikes and congestion in Boulcott Street.</p> <p>n. With the site over-development contemplated by Plan Change 35 must assuredly come substantial increased traffic to compound pre-existing detrimental features.</p> <p>o. If Council is to consider the issue of changing demographics in its community and what is appropriate in residential zones for housing for the elderly, it should do this in a measured and comprehensive way, rather than agreeing to spot zoning of land out of context and without proper consideration of the wider issues.</p> <p>p. To permit Plan Change 35 would be for the Council to de-base the integrity of a proper planning process and its District Plan.</p> <p>q. If the proposed plan change is accepted without this wider process the precedent effect would be almost impossible for the Council to resist in future.</p> <p>r. Proposed plan change should be rejected.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/170 Sandra Wallace

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
170.1	All provisions covered by the plan change plus height, size and bulk which is not in character with surrounding area.	Oppose	Opposes the plan change in its entirety and the shading, wind tunnel, privacy damage, loss of value of our house, elderly living in high rise buildings.	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	Yes

DPC35/171 Kerry Wallace

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
171.1	All provisions of the plan	Oppose	Opposes the plan change in its entirety especially with the height,	Reject the plan change in	Yes

	change and especially with the height, bulk and size, the shading, wind tunnel, privacy, damages, length of time causing disruption.		bulk and size, the shading, wind tunnel, privacy, damages, length of time causing disruption.	its entirety.	
--	--	--	---	---------------	--

DPC35/172 Pip and Tom Donnelly

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
172.1	The bulk, height and size of the proposed village when compared to the current local surroundings of the Special Character area.	Oppose	Oppose the plan change in its entirety with particular reference to: The size and scale of the buildings are not appropriate neighbours for the current residents. Does not mind a retirement village and would like a retirement village as neighbours but current 4 storey proposal is not ok and does not into the Boulcott environment. Strongly objects to the effect 5 years of construction (having just had 3 years of constant earthworks with the regional council building the stop bank and the ongoing golf course creation) will have on their lives and the lives of children and staff at Boulcott school.	Reject the plan change in its entirety unless they can make the above amendments.	Yes

DPC35/173 Martyn and Rachel Bain

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
173.1	All provisions with emphasis on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to 	Oppose	Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council. Supports development of the site described in GR21, provided any development is of a size and scale compatible with the character and amenity of the neighbourhood. Opposition is based on following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan 	Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of	Yes

	<p>surrounding existing residential and open space environments.</p>		<p>Change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. d. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore (and prevent consideration of) impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood. e. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods. f. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods. g. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school – which is already at capacity with overflow of hospital traffic - and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. In particular the Military Road and Boulcott Street intersections with High Street. h. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period. i. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children’s learning and welfare. j. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site. k. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community. l. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation. m. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site 	<p>the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly.</p> <p>n. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance.</p> <p>o. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken.</p> <p>p. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City.</p> <p>q. Summerset's own 'open day' session indicated that attendees were only 6% interest in an apartment only residence.</p> <p>r. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/174 Stephen O'Neill					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
174.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriateness of zoning change request. • Discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. • Activities requested in the plan change are inappropriate, in particular bulk, height and scale of proposed built. 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council.</p> <p>Supports development of the site described in GR21, provided any development is of a size and scale compatible with the character and amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Opposition is based on following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore (and prevent consideration of) impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions 	<p>Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset</p> <p>Approve an appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	Yes

			<p>for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City. j. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development. k. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. l. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period. m. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare. n. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site. 		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>o. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail.</p> <p>p. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community.</p> <p>q. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation.</p> <p>r. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly.</p> <p>s. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/175 David Wong – NME Group

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
175.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/176 Jordan Sydow – Laser Plumbing

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
176.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/177 Peter Peri

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
177.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/178 Margaret Sharp - Somerset

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
178.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change	Not stated	No

DPC35/179 Ian Blackwood

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
179.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/180 Nathan Lyne – Rapid Earth/Lyneworks Ltd

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
180.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/181 Peter Hosie

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
181.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/182 Wayne Abraham

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
182.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/183 Lorcon O'Connor - Somerset

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
183.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/184 Darryl Ray					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
184.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change	Not stated	No

DPC35/185 Debbie Wolak					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
185.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/186 Charles John Lott					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
186.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/187 Sue Corkill					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
187.1	All provisions with emphasis on the incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments.	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council based on the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. b. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. c. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that 	<p>Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset</p> <p>To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood.</p>	No

			<p>they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss.</p> <p>d. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore (and prevent consideration of) impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>e. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods.</p> <p>f. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school.</p> <p>g. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system.</p> <p>h. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes.</p> <p>i. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period.</p> <p>j. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare.</p> <p>k. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site.</p> <p>l. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail.</p> <p>m. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community.</p> <p>n. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation.</p>	<p>Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

		<p>o. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly.</p> <p>p. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance.</p> <p>q. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken.</p> <p>r. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City.</p> <p>s. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/188 Nick Evans					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
188.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/189 Kurt Noldan – Noldan Contracting Ltd					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
189.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/190 Chad Comerford – Laser Plumbing Petone					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
190.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/191 Michael Scott					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
191.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/192 Doug Wallis					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
192.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/193 Shea Howard – Laurie Wotton Builder					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
193.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/194 Tony Mark Hope					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
194.1	General Plan Change.	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/195 Paul Fenton					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
195.1	Plan Change in its entirety.	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>a. The large number of additional traffic movements created by the development (560 vehicle movements per day) will detrimentally affect safety of pedestrians and create significant additional delays to motorists wishing to access High Street. Military Road and Boulcott Street are access roads and are not suitable for extra traffic flows. Military Road is just over 8m wide and effectively a single lane road due to parking. Boulcott Street/High Street intersection does not adequately deal with existing traffic volumes, especially during school pick up and drop off times. Extra traffic in Boulcott will be a safety hazard to school children.</p>	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	Yes

DPC35/196 Noel McCardle					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
196.1	All provisions covered by the plan change.	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council. Opposition is based on the following reasons:</p> <p>a. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood.</p> <p>b. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system.</p> <p>c. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the</p>	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	Yes

			Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/197 Leilanie Sagun

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
197.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/198 Navarone Tamapeau – Stones Electrical

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
198.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/199 Andrew Spitkerman

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
199.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/200 Geoffrey W Topp

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
200.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/201 Ieuan Wright – Aotea Safety Nets

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
201.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/202 Joseph Scheres					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
202.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/203 Clark Scarlett					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
203.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/204 Laurie Watkins – Summerset at the Course					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
204.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/205 Dot Whyte					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
205.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/206 Christopher John Burger – All Roof Solutions					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
206.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/207 Luke de Vries - JISL					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
207.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/208 Reid McCashin - NME

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
208.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/209 Scott Connor

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
209.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/210 Troy Pollock

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
210.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/211 Jerome Betham

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
211.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/212 Alastair Knight – Rapid Earthworks Ltd

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
212.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/213 Dom Bartels – Laurie Wotton Builders Ltd

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
213.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/214 Benjamin Lay-Robertson					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
214.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/215 Wayne Paki					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
215.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/216 Karl Symons – Aotea Safety Nets					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
216.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/217 Aaron Huddleston					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
217.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/218 Brodie Liam Kensley Howard – Shea Howard Builders					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
218.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/219 Michael Tester – B.J. Bell Bricklaying					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
219.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/220 Quint Persico					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
220.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/221 Marianne Mork					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
221.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/222 Cedric Aiulu					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
222.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/223 Fraser Stevenson					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
223.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/224 Ken Taylor					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
224.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No
DPC35/225 Brooke Riley					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
225.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/226 Allan Wells					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
226.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/227 James Neil Scott					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
227.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/228 Thomas Lawson – Laurie Wotton Builders					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
228.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/229 Kaylin Signal – All Roof Solutions					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
229.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change	Not stated	No

DPC35/230 Mark Mitchell – Valhalla Builders Ltd					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
230.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/231 Ian McIntosh – All Roof					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
231.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/232 Tim Barmes – Axis Builders					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
232.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/233 Laurie Wotton					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
193.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/234 Isaac Ham – Laurie Wotton Builder					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
194.1	General Plan Change	Support	Supports the plan change.	Not stated	No

DPC35/235 Jeremy Randall and Catherine Ross					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
195.1	All provisions covered by the plan change.	Oppose	<p>Oppose Plan Change 35 and request it is declined in its entirety.</p> <p>Are residents of Hathaway Avenue and parents of one current and two ex-pupils of Boulcott School. Not opposed to development of the site described in PC35 as GR 21, where development is in keeping with size, scale and character of the neighbourhood and adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>Have been dismayed at cavalier approach taken by the applicant to impact on surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>Applicant has overstated benefits and under-stated or ignored the costs (externalities). Benefits will largely accrue to Summerset investors whereas externalities will be borne by community during</p>	<p>Request that the Hutt City Council declines PC35 in its entirety.</p> <p>In the alternative request that an appropriate residential activity area which reflects the scale, density and character of the neighbourhood. with provision for the maintenance and enhancement of the amenity values currently</p>	Yes

			<p>construction and ongoing operation of retirement village.</p> <p>Applicant argues that size and scale will enable 'aging in place' in line with government policy. Question how moving from one or two storey home to multi-storey apartment building can be described as 'aging in place'. Motivation is rather to maximise profit for investors. Range of concerns include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Size, scale and density of development. Teaching and learning implications for Boulcott School and Kindergarten. Effects on amenity values including visual impact currently enjoyed by adjoining properties. Shading effects for neighbouring properties including school. Construction effects – dust, noise and vibration. Traffic effects – in particular concerned for safety of children in already congested Boulcott Street. Loss of privacy for neighbouring properties. Potential ground water effects caused by extensive earthworks proposed. 	<p>enjoyed by the adjoining Special Residential Activity Area , school and kindergarten.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/236 Patrick R.D and Annette J Lyford					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
236.1	The inappropriateness of the zoning change and incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially the bulk, height and scale.	Oppose	<p>Oppose Plan Change 35 for the specific provisions as outlined below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Very concerned about bulk, height and scale and assess the height to be approximately half that of the main block of the Hutt Hospital. Concerned about shading and loss of view caused by 5 high buildings. Considerable congestion now from vehicular traffic along Boulcott Street will become much worse with proposed main entrance 	Submitters oppose proposed Plan Change 35 and wish the Council to reject it in its current form.	Yes

			<p>along the same street, especially at school start and finish time.</p> <p>d. Parking around Military, Troon, Hathaway, Fry and Boulcott Streets and other adjoining streets will become chaotic and dangerous.</p> <p>e. Potential for localised flooding around suburb and along Hathaway Ave is a concern in view of proposal to raise level of land where village is to be built.</p> <p>f. Proposal in its current form will adversely affect the character of the Boulcott suburb.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/237 Dennis Ingram

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
237.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	Opposes the plan change but supports development as in GR21, provided it is of size and scale compatible with character and amenity of neighbourhood.	Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset. To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.	No

DPC35/238 Robyn Ramsay

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
238.1	All provisions with emphasis on:	Oppose	Opposes the plan change but supports development as in GR21,	Reject the plan change	Yes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments. 		provided it is of size and scale compatible with character and amenity of neighbourhood.	as proposed by Summerset. To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.	
--	---	--	--	--	--

DPC35/239 David Gamble

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
239.1	The change proposal as listed in the documentation: Part 1 Introduction, Para 2.	Support	Supports the proposal as it provides for productive use of otherwise surplus land.	Accept the plan change request and notify it as a private plan change.	No

DPC35/240 Michelle Walker

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
240.1	<p>Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed.</p> <p>Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing</p>	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods 	Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset. To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the	Yes

	residential and open space environments.		<p>currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss.</p> <p>d. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes.</p> <p>e. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period.</p> <p>f. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare.</p> <p>g. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site.</p> <p>h. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail.</p> <p>i. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community.</p> <p>j. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation.</p>	size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.	
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/241 Carolyn Coombes

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
241.1	<p>Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed.</p> <p>Incompatibility of the fit of the</p>	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council.</p> <p>a. Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces.</p>	To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is	No

	activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments.		<p>b. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change.</p> <p>c. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss.</p>	directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.	
--	---	--	---	--	--

DPC35/242 Jan Saying

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
242.1	<p>Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed.</p> <p>Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments.</p>	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council.</p> <p>a. Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces.</p> <p>b. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change.</p> <p>c. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss.</p> <p>d. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes.</p> <p>e. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period.</p> <p>f. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare.</p>	Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset. To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.	No

			<p>g. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site.</p> <p>h. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail.</p> <p>i. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community.</p> <p>j. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/243 Stephen Newton

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
243.1	<p>Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed.</p> <p>Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments.</p>	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council.</p> <p>a. Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces.</p> <p>b. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change.</p> <p>c. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss.</p> <p>d. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes.</p> <p>e. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take</p>	<p>Reject the plan change as proposed by Summerset. To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	No

			<p>place over a 5-6 year period.</p> <p>f. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare.</p> <p>g. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site.</p> <p>h. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail.</p> <p>i. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community.</p> <p>j. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/244 Annette Undrill					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
244.1	<p>All provisions in particular those relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the embedding of the words "with provision for a retirement village" into the District Plan; the proposal to build a commercial retirement complex which contravenes the Hutt City Council limits in respect of height, density and site coverage; drainage; 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change in its entirety for the following reasons:</p> <p>Land under consideration abuts Special Residential Area at Military Road/Hathaway Avenue. Special Residential designation is in place to protect area's special character, i.e. low density housing, larger sections with extensive garden, and open spaces. Extreme development as proposed by Summerset in narrow corridor of land does not allow for sufficient "tapering" of height and density as protection for special amenity. Abrupt change in character between residential area and another activity area disregards accepted principles of town planning. Town planning rules are designed to prevent situation occurring. Proposed high buildings on raised land are on sunny side of special residential area and therefore extreme in their effect. Existence of stop bank behind Hathaway Avenue already constitutes more than 35% site coverage on what would be a typical residential section abutting rear sections in Hathaway Avenue. No</p>	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	Yes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “need” for more retirement villages in Lower Hutt. 	<p>future structures are therefore allowable.</p> <p>In large areas importation of fill will use up 100% site coverage which is not acceptable in general residential area. Any building must have permitted height based on existing ground level. Site coverage and building heights in proposal greatly exceed District Plan levels.</p> <p>Drainage is important issue in any development in terms of climate change and more frequent “extreme” events. Historically drainage for rear of low-lying sections on north side of Hathaway Avenue has been managed by run-off into golf club land. Summerset has made no provision for alternative form of drainage and proposed raising of land will remove current drainage provision.</p> <p>Hutt City Council has yet to review its policy concerning provisions of General Residential Area and therefore it is inappropriate for Summerset to seek to embed the words “provision for a retirement village” in its request for a plan change. Summerset model of massive commercial development is not the only option for provision of housing for the elderly and is not suitable for the transition between a recreational activity area and a special residential activity area.</p> <p>There is a shortage of land for residential development in the Hutt and excessive use of land for retirement villages will create imbalance of groups who can support local business, schools and sporting facilities. Hutt City has history of state and low socio-economic housing and desperately needs more balanced housing portfolio. Existence of Special Residential Activity Areas is an attempt to redress some of this imbalance. Much advertised need for retirement villages has to be looked at carefully. Ministry of Health figures show there are more beds per capita in Hutt Valley than in Wellington City. Community of Boulcott is already surrounded by several facilities for the aged within 5 km radius.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

DPC35/245 David Cody - Boulcott School Board of Trustees					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
245.1	All provisions covered by Proposed Plan Change 35	Oppose	<p>Opposes PC 35 and requests that it is declined in its entirety.</p> <p>Not opposed to development of the site described in PC35 as GR21, where such development is in keeping with size, scale and character of neighbourhood and adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>Supports the Ministry of Education's submission.</p> <p>Boulcott School has been open since 1928. School shares northern boundary with Boulcott Farm Heritage Golf Club (proposed site) and shares its site with Hutt City Kindergarten.</p> <p>School has decile 7 grading and role of around 350 students. 50% of current roll come from locations 'out of zone'. In 2014 Ministry of Education invested in new classroom and there are plans for further new classroom to be built end of 2015.</p> <p>Boulcott School is proud of vibrant and diverse community and achievements of students. School is passionate about maintaining and enhancing quality learning environment for pupils.</p> <p>School has range of concerns with PC35 and potential effects of any development on the school and the children's learning and well-being:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Potential size, scale and density of development enabled by PC35 on boundary and resulting impacts on amenity value caused by over-bearing and dominant structures. Shading of school grounds (classrooms, play equipment, orchard and sports field). Loss of privacy – development enabled by PC35 has potential to directly overlook school and cause loss of privacy. Traffic effects – Boulcott Street suffers from significant congestion particularly at school and kindergarten drop off and pick up times. No information in traffic assessment that assess actual or 	<p>That Hutt City Council declines PC35 in its entirety.</p> <p>In the event that the Hutt City Council chooses to accept PC35 or some variation of PC35 the submitter requests the following relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan Change provisions that limit development so that effects on the school and the school community are neutral or positive. An independent assessment of the likely teaching, behavioural, social, health and economic impacts upon Boulcott School resulting from a development enabled by PC35. An independent traffic assessment that assesses the actual and potential traffic effects that could occur on Boulcott Street adjacent to Boulcott School as a result of a 	Yes

			<p>potential traffic effects (including safety implications) as result of PC35.</p> <p>e. Construction effects – scale, noise, dust and vibration. Possible construction timeframe/duration of 5-6 years means some children may spend entire primary school years on site adjacent to large scale development.</p> <p>f. Teaching, learning and behavioural implications – direct impact of noise, dust and vibration on teaching, learning and behaviour and indirect impacts such as loss of teachers.</p> <p>g. Detrimental impact on roll – reduced student numbers. Anecdotal evidence that parents will withdraw children from school or choose not to enrol at Boulcott School if actual or perceived effects of proposed development are not avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>h. Noise effects – more than minor effect caused by post construction noise (emanating from plant, equipment and traffic) at or beyond school boundary during school hours and after school activities.</p>	development enabled by PC35 and at the intersection with High Street.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

DPC35/246 John Freer – Boulcott's Farm Heritage Golf Club					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
246.1	Entire Application	Support	<p>Submission is made in good faith supporting the proposed plan change. Submission is made as adjoining neighbour and former owner of land in question.</p> <p>Boulcott's Farm Heritage Golf Club (BFHGC) has been formed by merging Hutt Golf Club Incorporated and Boulcott Golf Club Incorporated in 2010 and has 1119 adult/junior playing members and 180 junior development members.</p> <p>Golf Club agreed in 2012 to sell the land in question to Summerset. Upon establishment of BFHGC agreement was entered with GWRC to enable construction of Hutt-Boulcott Flood Protection Stopbank utilising golf club land. Redesign of golf course after completion of stopbank removed the use of a three hectare on land-based side of</p>	That application for a private plan change as submitted by Summerset Villages (Lower Hutt) Limited be approved in its entirety.	Yes

			<p>stopbank which became surplus to golf club's needs. Club was aware of potential commercial value of the land and that appropriate disposal would enable the club to develop a recreational facility which would be a long-term sustainable community asset for Hutt City.</p> <p>Club considered a number of potential land use options including indoor or outdoor sport and recreation facilities, hotel and conference centre, residential properties, two retirement options and education expansion.</p> <p>Golf Club board used number of criteria to determine final decision which option would achieve its objectives (resourcing redevelopment, securing on-going partnership for golf club, meeting needs of wider community).</p> <p>Discussion and negotiation between BFHGC and Summerset included visits to other Summerset villages, discussions with Hutt City Council, discussions with GRWC and membership communications and briefings.</p> <p>BFHGC Board accepted partnership with Summerset being well aware of the need for retirement village facilities in Hutt City.</p> <p>Residents of the village could become active and passive golf club members.</p> <p>Partnership between Summerset and BFHGC has provided significant funding, required to develop golf course and associated facilities.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

DPC35/247 Spencer and Tracey Joe

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
247.1	All provisions covered by the plan change.	Oppose	<p>Oppose plan change in its entirety and seek its rejection by Council based on the following reasons:</p> <p>a. Size, scale and density of proposed built environment is greater than surrounding residential homes, school and kindergarten. PC35 takes no regard of 'distinctive characteristics and special amenity values' of Special Residential Activity Area (SRAA) and</p>	<p>That Hutt City Council declines Proposed Plan Change 35 in its entirety.</p> <p>That in the event the Hutt City Council chooses to accept a variation of</p>	Yes

			<p>the “residential characteristics and amenity values” associated with General Residential Activity Area (GRAA) due to requested size, scale, density and height allowances and will have more than minor effect on these areas.</p> <p>b. Lack of buffer between proposed high rise, high density built environment and low rise, low density SRAA, GRAA and Education zone. PC35 does not provide any graduation of height, scale and density between proposed site and surrounding neighbourhood zones.</p> <p>c. Loss of amenity value for neighbourhood.</p> <p>d. Adverse effects of shading, loss of privacy, and wind flow on immediate neighbourhood, school and kindergarten.</p> <p>e. Adverse effects of increased traffic flows (during and post construction) on already congested Troon Crescent and streets in the neighbourhood, especially Boulcott Street.</p> <p>f. Adverse effects (noise, vibration, dust) that large scale and lengthy construction period will have on neighbourhood and particularly school and kindergarten and impact on children’s learning and welfare.</p> <p>g. PC35 could set precedence for medium/high density development in Hutt City which is not intended by Council and residents. High/medium density allowances requested by plan change are inconsistent with views of Residential Growth workshop attendees (3 February 2015).</p> <p>Singular and cumulative effects of PC35 are more than minor.</p> <p>Do not oppose development of the site that is sympathetic and empathetic with surrounding neighbourhood.</p>	<p>PC35 that specific size, scale and density provisions are in keeping with the immediate surrounding area and are sympathetic, empathetic and enhanced with the SRAA, GRAA and Education zones in Boulcott.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

DPC35/248 Luke Dawson – Chair Solutions Group					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
248.1	All provisions with emphasis on:	Oppose	Oppose plan change in its entirety.	Reject the plan change in its entirety. To approve a	Yes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments. 		<p>a. Adverse effect that increased traffic through Boulcott Street will have.</p> <p>Currently Boulcott Street is no go around 8.30am and 3-3.30pm due to traffic related to school. Was more congested when Boulcott Golf club had club house at end of the street and will get worse if development progresses.</p> <p>Getting out of Boulcott Street at 5.00pm is nightmare due to rush hour traffic and traffic from Hospital and surrounding business.</p> <p>b. Adverse effects of construction</p> <p>Had to put up with constant noise from recent golf course redevelopment and does not want to put up with more noise and pounding that construction of proposed development will generate. Effects will be worse on residents if construction occurred during weekends and holidays.</p> <p>Noise will effects school students' concentration levels during school hours.</p> <p>c. Strain on current services to Boulcott Street</p> <p>Drains in Boulcott Street currently flood in heavy downpours. Sewerage system backs up and stinks. Any more development will put strain on network in Boulcott Street.</p>	<p>more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p> <p>A large scale "commercial development" should not be allowed in Boulcott under the guise of "residential".</p> <p>The Summerset proposal is a "Commercial" venture not suited to Boulcott's "Special Residential" character.</p>	
--	---	--	--	--	--

DPC35/249 Pat McTavish

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
249.1	Not stated	Oppose	Recent heavy rain left submitter's back yard in 1 foot of water and the submitter had to put gum boots on to get to garage. Not against retirement villages but the eyesore that Summerset are proposing is not an asset and will be a problem with dust, flooding, noise and heavy traffic up Boulcott Street and High Street, not to mention shading and wind gusts. Asks this not to be allowed to be built. Maybe a scale down model – house prices will drop.	Not stated	Not stated

DPC35/250 Brian Timmins					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
250.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Oppose plan change in its entirety.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore (and prevent consideration of) impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been undertaken. 	Reject the plan change in its entirety.	Yes

DPC35/251 (Late Submission) Ernest Oliver Aston					
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought	Wish to be heard
251.1	<p>All provisions with emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriateness of zoning change request and associated discretionary nature of many of the activities proposed. Incompatibility of the fit of the activities requested, especially bulk, height and scale of proposed built environment with respect to surrounding existing residential and open space environments. 	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change and seeks its rejection by Council. Supports the development of the site described in GR21, provided that development is of size and scale compatible with character and amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Opposition is based on following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk, height and scale of the proposed built environment are over-built with respect to site's area and its relationship to the surrounding residential areas and open spaces. Loss of amenity value for the neighbourhood that would result from a development of the size and scale enabled by Plan Change. Change takes amenity benefits that local neighbourhoods currently enjoy, translocates them as features of the new site, and deprives the incumbent adjoining sites of these values that they currently enjoy and with no compensation for that loss. Proposed changes address amenity value for the development, but ignore (and prevent consideration of) impact on amenity value of the neighbourhood. Adverse effect of shading on surrounding neighbourhoods. Adverse effects of changed wind flow on the surrounding neighbourhoods and school. Inappropriateness of removing 'secondary river corridor' designation of the site given its underlying geological and alluvial form, and its relationship with respect to the current Hutt River system. Adverse effects of increased vehicular traffic, triggered as a consequence of nature of development facilitated by plan change, will have on surrounding neighbourhood and school and inability of local roading network to cope with proposed changes. 	<p>Reject the plan change in its entirety. To approve a more appropriate zoning for residential purposes which includes provision for reserve space and is directed by an appropriate design guide that reflects the size, scale and character of the neighbourhood. Housing for the elderly could be developed within this zoning.</p>	No

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Adverse effects of construction on the neighbourhood, Boulcott School and Kindergarten, particularly as construction may take place over a 5-6 year period. j. Adverse impacts of construction and the finished built environment on the development of children's learning and welfare. k. Need to remediate site prior to construction of any development commencing by importation of up to 21,000m³ of fill. Proposed earthworks are major and demonstrate inappropriateness of the site. l. Potential for localised flooding on neighbouring sites in event that proposed storm water improvements/pumps specified for the site fail. m. Stated economic benefits of development are flawed, particularly around dismissal of any externality costs for the community. n. Inappropriateness of housing elderly in high-rise environments and potential for social isolation. o. Other environmentally and economically efficient uses for the site can be found that would bring benefits to Hutt City with less environmental and social costs to surrounding neighbourhoods including provision of housing for the elderly. p. Shortfall of publicly accessible reserves/open space in the Central Ward, as identified by Hutt City Council sponsored reports, will be exacerbated since plan change does not seek to set aside land to address shortfall and imbalance. q. Indications from Hutt City Council are that policies and provisions for the General Residential Activity Area are to be reviewed in the period 2016/17 (e.g. to align with some of the issues identified in the Urban Growth Strategy). Review can incorporate provisions for housing for the elderly and could be accomplished with input from residents from across the city. Summerset proposal seeks to pre-empt review and if approved, may generate an outcome that may not have otherwise been created had a more city-wide consultation on provisions for housing for the elderly been 		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>undertaken.</p> <p>r. Residents of Hutt City attending workshops facilitated by Hutt City Council (such as the one held on 3 February 2015, for Waterloo, Epuni and the CBD edge Residential Growth) expressed strong sentiments against high-rise development or over intensified built environments in suburban areas and noted one of the attractive features of many parts of Hutt City was the larger plot sizes and more vegetated environments. Intensified and over-built environments were seen as a highly negative attribute and a feature that would drive people away from Hutt City.</p> <p>s. Other areas in Hutt City, such as the CBD and its run-down southern and northern fringes would better support a zoning of the type proposed by plan change 35 and zoning would be more compatible with the surrounding environment. This is recognised by the council who acquired adjoining properties in the southern CBD to facilitate such development.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

ADDRESSES FOR SERVICE – PROPOSED PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 35

Subm. No	Submitter Name/Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC35/1	Kevin Melville – NME Group	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/2	Frederick Albert Stohr	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/3	Nicola Bland	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/4	Gary John McKay	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/5	Richard Sadleir	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/6	Bruce and Gwen Patchett	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/7	Frederick Ferris	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/8	Morris & Sue Black	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/9	Noreen Goodyear	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/10	John RG Cullinane	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/11	Judy Bradley	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/12	Judy Macindoe	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/13	Larisa Koning	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/014	Matthew Paterson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/015	Sarah Worthington	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/016	Dennis Page	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/017	Gary Paddison	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/018	John Ward Vallely	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/019	Peter Donovan	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/020	Joel William McLean	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/021	Gary Hughes	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/022	Marcus Edward McLean	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subm. No	Submitter Name/Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC35/023	Lindsay Watt	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/024	Gregor Dunn	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/025	Raymond Tomlinson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/026	Joseph Tomlinson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/027	Peter JH and Wendy E Jenkin	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/028	William Ronald and Jennifer Margaret Caradus	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/029	Gareth Worthington - Hutt City Kindergartens Association Incorporated	PO Box 35061	Naenae	LOWER HUTT 5041
DPC35/030	Paul Adams	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/031	Megan Kenning	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/032	Mathew Sturmer	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/033	Patrick Ralston Fitzgerald	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/034	Letitia Thomson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/035	Mike Anderson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/036	Richard Nottage	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/037	Raymond Smith	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/038	Rod Gillespie	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/039	Gary Spratt	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/040	John Anderson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/041	Lawrence Horne	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/042	Alan Young	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/043	Michael Bovey	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/044	Adam Caccioppoli	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/045	Nigel Lyne	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/046	Liz Kettle	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subm. No	Submitter Name/Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC35/047	Patricia Howatson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/048	John Ford	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/049	John Kettle	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/050	Annabel Freer	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/051	John Miller	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/052	Susan Maclean	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/053	Vivianne Innes	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/054	Jeanette Partridge	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/055	Eroni Ekevati - Fulton Hogan	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/056	Lisa Boese	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/057	Robert Mills	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/058	Dallas Anderson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/059	Noel Kortright	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/060	Wendy Quinn	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/061	Mark Carew	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/062	Dennis Aiken	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/063	Keith Humphreys	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/064	Brenda Guile	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/065	Martin Press	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/066	Sue Faulke	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/067	John Howarth	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/068	Christeen McKenzie	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/069	Laura McGown	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/070	Hope Walker	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subm. No	Submitter Name/Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC35/071	Barry Revington Keate	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/072	Vicki Harding	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/073	Sharon Walker	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/074	Kevin John Tait	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/075	Gillian Milldove	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/076	Larry Williams	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/077	Len Kong	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/078	Janice McSloy	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/079	Charlie Jones	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/080	Jean Buchanan	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/081	Bernadette Trueman	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/082	David Muthich	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/083	Robbie Selwyn	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/084	Callum Woodney	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/085	Krystal Priest	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/086	Terry Fraei	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/087	Joe O'Grady	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/088	Deborah Cowman	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/089	Andrew Cowman	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/090	Jenny Keehan	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/091	Courtney Maclean	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/092	Colin Brown	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/093	John Young	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/094	Terry Senior	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subm. No	Submitter Name/Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC35/095	Maurice Sutherland	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/096	Jesse Muru Paenga	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/097	Joy Smith	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/098	Roger Buchanan	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/099	Kay Flowers	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/100	Michaela Duthie	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/101	David Hill	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/102	Lynette McLaughlin	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/103	Janice Tomlinson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/104	Gabrielle Dennis	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/105	Ivy Innes	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/106	Teora Teao Jennings	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/107	Neil Simpson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/108	Tamara Milldove	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/109	Michael Clark	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/110	Susan Griffiths	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/111	James Offord	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/112	Denis Cox	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/113	Rachel Anne Jobson & Andrew Peter Oakley	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/114	Debra Curran	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/115	Andrew Curran	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/116	George & Glenys Longstaff	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/117	Ken Haywood	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/118	Graham Harding	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subm. No	Submitter Name/Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC35/119	Dr Damayanti Hyacinth Seneviratne	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/120	Dr Eric Lakshaman Seneviratne	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/121	Diana Mary Brunn	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/122	Barbara Larsen	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/123	Thomas Brunn	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/124	Fredrick Sydney Bennett	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/125	Dr James Herdman	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/126	Lance McClure	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/127	Richard Fassbender	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/128	Alison McKone	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/129	Merran Bakker	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/130	Mike Birchler	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/131	Patrick Philip Hussey	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/132	Alison Louise Hussey	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/133	Nicholas Cooper - Opus International Consultants Ltd on behalf of Ministry of Education	PO Box 12 003		WELLINGTON 6144
DPC35/134	Graeme Gibbons	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/135	Sue Colson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/136	Brian Toomey	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/137	Ian Gerrard McLauchlan	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/138	Anne Harris	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/139	Lynette McLauchlan	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/140	Joshua McLauchlan	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/141	Gabrielle McLauchlan	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/142	Sam McLauchlan	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subm. No	Submitter Name/Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC35/143	Prudence Williams	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/144	Susan Elizabeth McGuinness	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/145	Peter Lawrence McGuinness	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/146	John Wallbank	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/147	Donna Gardiner	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/148	Judith Miller	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/149	Joseph Milcairns	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/150	Dennis Page - Boulcott Preservation Society Inc	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/151	Beverley Rose	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/152	Karen McCarthy	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/153	Catherine Gilberd	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/154	Avril Boswell	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/155	Alan McCarthy	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/156	Phil and Hayley Saxton	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/157	Barry Jenness	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/158	Andrew and Nicky Bank	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/159	Andrew Colson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/160	Peter Young	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/161	Martin Chin	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/162	Theresa Sarten	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/163	Moana Sinclair - Ngati Rangatahi	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/164	Jo Clendon	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/165	Brian Hall	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/166	John McTavish	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subm. No	Submitter Name/Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC35/167	Caroline Ammundsen – Greater Wellington Regional Council	PO Box 11646	Manners Street	WELLINGTON 6142
DPC35/168	Venkataramana Reddy Arra	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/169	David Robinson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/170	Sandra Wallace	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/171	Kerry Wallace	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/172	Pip and Tom Donnelly	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/173	Martyn and Rachel Bain	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/174	Stephen O'Neill	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/175	David Wong - NME Group	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/176	Jordan Sydow - Laser Plumbing	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/177	Peter Peri	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/178	Margaret Sharp	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/179	Ian Blackwood	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/180	Nathan Lyne - Rapid Earth/Lyneworks Ltd	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/181	Peter Hosie	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/182	Wayne Abraham	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/183	Lorcon O'Connor - Summerset	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/184	Darryl Ray	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/185	Debbie Wolak	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/186	Charles John Lott	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/187	Sue Corkill	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/188	Nick Evans	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/189	Kurt Noldan - Noldan Contracting Ltd	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/190	Chad Comerford - Laser Plumbing Petone	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subm. No	Submitter Name/Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC35/191	Michael Scott	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/192	Doug Wallis	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/193	Shea Howard - Laurie Wotton Builder	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/194	Tony Mark Hope	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/195	Paul Fenton	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/196	Noel McCardle	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/197	Leilanie Sagun	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/198	Navarone Tamapeau - Stones Electrical	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/199	Andrew Spitkerman	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/200	Geoffrey Topp	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/201	Ieuan Wright - Aotea Safety Nets	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/202	Joseph Scheres	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/203	Clark Scarlett	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/204	Laurie Watkins - Summerset at the Course	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/205	Dot Whyte	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/206	Christopher John Burger - All Roof Solutions	PO Box 736	Paraparaumu	KAPITI COAST
DPC35/207	Luke de Vries - JISL	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/208	Reid McCashin - NME	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/209	Scott Connor	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/210	Troy Pollock	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/211	Jerome Betham	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/212	Alastair Knight - Rapid Earthworks Limited	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/213	Dom Bartels - Laurie Wotton Builders Ltd	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/214	Benjamin Lay-Robertson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subm. No	Submitter Name/Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC35/215	Wayne Paki - Builder	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/216	Karl Symons - Aotea Safety Nets	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/217	Aaron Huddleston	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/218	Brodie Liam Kensley Howard - Shea Howard Builder	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]
DPC35/219	Michael Tester - BJ Bell Bricklaying	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]
DPC35/220	Quint Persico	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/220	Marianne Mork	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/222	Cedric Aiulu	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/223	Fraser Stevenson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/224	Ken Taylor	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/225	Brooke Riley	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/226	Allan Wells	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/227	James Neil Scott	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/228	Thomas Lawson - Laurie Wotton Builders Ltd	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/229	Kaylin Signal - All Roof Solutions	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/230	Mark Mitchell - Vahalla Builders Ltd	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/231	Ian McIntosh - All Roof	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/232	Tim Barmes - Axis Builders	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/233	Laurie Wotton	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/234	Isaac Ham - Laurie Wotton Builder	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/235	Jeremy Randall and Catherine Ross	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/236	Patrick and Annette Lyford	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/237	Dennis Ingram	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/238	Robyn Ramsay	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subm. No	Submitter Name/Organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC35/239	David Gamble	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/240	Michelle Walker	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/241	Carolyn Coombes	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/242	Jan Sayring	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/243	Stephen Newton	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/244	Annette Undrill	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/245	David Cody - Boulcott School Board of Trustees	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/246	John Freer - Boulcott's Farm Heritage Golf Club	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/247	Spencer and Tracey Joe	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/248	Luke Dawson - Chair Solutions Group	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/249	Pat McTavish	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/250	Brian Timmins	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC35/251	Ernest Oliver Aston	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]