

# **Proposed District Plan Change 26**

**30 Shaftesbury Grove: Rezoning part of the site as General Residential  
Activity Area**

## **Summary of Submissions**

**Publicly Notified:**

**22 MAY 2012**

**Further Submissions Close:**

**6 JUNE 2012 at 5.00pm**



# PUBLIC NOTICE

## Public Notification of the Summary of Submissions on Proposed District Plan Change 26 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 submissions received on

### **Proposed District Plan Change 26 – 30 Shaftesbury Grove: Rezoning part of the site to General Residential Activity Area**

The summary of the decisions sought and full copies of the submissions are available and can be inspected at

- All Hutt City Council Libraries; and
- Customer Services Counter, Council Administration Building, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt.

Alternatively, the summary of submissions is available on the Council website:

- <http://www.huttcity.govt.nz/Your-Council/Plans-and-publications/District-Plan/District-Plan-changes/District-Plan-change-26>

Copies can also be requested by contacting Hutt City Council:

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

## **Further Submissions close on 6 June 2012 at 5.00pm**

Persons who are representing a relevant aspect of the public interest or persons who have an interest in the proposed plan change that is greater than the interest of the general public can make a submission in support of, or in opposition to, the submissions already made.

### **You may do so by sending a written submission to Council:**

- Post: Environmental Policy Division, Hutt City Council, Private Bag 31912, Lower Hutt 5040;
- Deliver: Council Administration Building, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt
- Fax: (04) 570 6799;
- Email: [district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz](mailto:district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz)

**You must also send a copy of your further submission to the person on whose submission you are supporting or opposing within five working days of sending your further submission to Hutt City Council.**

The further submission 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 the Council website.

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

**Tony Stallinger  
Chief Executive**

**22 May 2012**

## SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

<b><i>Sub. No</i></b>	<b><i>Name/Organisation</i></b>	<b><i>Page No.</i></b>
DPC26/1	Wayne Robinson	3
DPC26/2	Phil Angus	3
DPC26/3	Greater Wellington Regional Council	6



## SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 26

Submission Number: DPC26/1					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
Wayne Robinson	1.1	Whole Proposed Plan Change	Oppose	Water supply: The water supply to my street and suburb would be adversely affected.	Do not proceed with the proposal and would like to see the council install speed humps (low profile) approximately 50-100 metres from the Kindergarten in both directions.
	1.2			Road safety: Road safety issues will increase with the increased amount of traffic along Holborn Drive area. As well as the Kindergarten in Holborn Drive, there are numerous young families living within the Holborn/Logie/Shafesbury streets, some of the properties are without fences and the children play on the footpath and at times on the street itself.  Having lived in the street since May 2005, I have seen many vehicles travelling at excess speeds along Holborn/Logie, it being link roads from two points on George Street. This is especially dangerous at the times the Kindergarten starts and ends with Vehicles lining both sides of the road at pick up and drop off times.	

Submission Number: DPC26/2					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
Phil Angus	2.1	Whole Proposed Plan Change	Oppose	Recreational purposes My children and many others in the neighbourhood use the larger grass spur to the north to throw around a Frisbee, to pass around a rugby ball and play with the dog. The southern spur they ride their bikes down the muddy track. These areas are just across the road so they often use them, if you force them to travel half a kilometre away, then they are more likely to stay on the couch. The submitter questions when the study on ground usage was done to obtain the stated results.	Do not proceed with the proposal; keep the status quo
	2.2			Property view Many ratepayers purchased their homes with a view of the hills across the valley, the harbour, the Kaikoura ranges on a clear day – this view is guaranteed as the	

			<p>land across the road is General Recreational, managed as reserve. The proposed plan change has a major effect on the existing properties outlook and therefore will also lessen their value. Will council compensate for this loss?</p> <p>The Drakeford Williams Report reference 11012W on landscape and visual effects is incorrect as it states the view across the gully for a number of properties, yet one of the properties mentioned is a back section with no view of the gully.</p>	
	2.3		<p>Removal of native bush</p> <p>The land is within a Significant Natural Resource, it contains Tree Ferns, Mahoe, Manuka, it is lowland forest on hill country containing the only Pukatea forest remnant in the region, the only way we can protect this resource is to keep it as General Recreation Activity Area or to upgrade to full reserve status.</p> <p>The proposal shows a sewage network encroaching well into the gullies containing our densest clusters of native bush, besides this, even the proposed sections will eliminate substantial native bush cover let alone a buffer zone along the boundaries.</p> <p>The character of the local environment will be adversely affected. It is council policy to protect and conserve areas of such significance as SNR50 therefore the proposal must be turned down.</p>	
	2.4		<p>Loss of habitat for native wildlife</p> <p>This SNR is also the habitat for a significant amount of native wildlife. It is home to the Common Green Gecko, Wetas and native birdlife such as the Whitehead, Fantail, Tui, Woodpigeon and Morepork. They need protection, not loss of habitat and wiping out of the gorse buffer zone which slows down the predation (ie: domestic cats); the damage will escalate.</p>	
	2.5		<p>Safety on access roads</p> <p>The council quotes studies showing no issues with the local road network, this totally contradicts our extensive studies that show these roads are currently struggling, the lower Holborn Drive area is narrow, winding, only has room for a footpath on one side of the road for much of it, most residents must park illegally on the footpath to allow traffic to flow. If they did not do this, there would be a huge spate of head on collisions.</p> <p>Our study shows that 80% of vehicle movements in the area travel down Holborn with only 20% on Logie. Nine of out every ten residents surveyed say that on a road trip to Lower Hutt CBD they feel most vulnerable while travelling up and</p>	

			<p>down the lower reaches of Holborn Drive which concludes the fact that we should be doing something to remedy the problem area, not make it worse.</p>	
	2.6		<p>Water shortages and poor pressure</p> <p>On many occasions the area has without warning, had no water supply since council contractors have turned it off and forgot to turn it back on. The council say that the current water supply for the upper levels of the Holborn water zone do not meet Hutt City Council's standards and any further demand will make it worse. To overcome this issue, a booster pump station must be installed. The council states in their proposal that this booster pump station will only occur if their zoning change occurs. This is blackmail. We are rate payers. The council recognises that there is a water supply issue and therefore it is their responsibility to remedy it regardless.</p>	
	2.7		<p>Inaccurate information provided in council studies</p> <p>The Drakeford Williams report is flawed and the interpretation of the Traffic Design Group report is flawed as it states there are insignificant effects to infrastructure, recreational purposes, property views and property valuation. To say that General Residential Activity Area is the most appropriate for the area is totally untrue as the land at the end of Shaftesbury Grove is zoned Hill Residential.</p> <p>The average property size of dwellings on Shaftesbury Grove is 710m<sup>2</sup> (figures in original submission). These sizes relate more closely to the 800m<sup>2</sup> Hill Residential zone requirements than the 400m<sup>2</sup> General Residential zone requirements.</p> <p>Surprised that the report says General Residential zoning blends into the area better when you consider than there is Hill Residential 50m up the road. Since the councils own meaning of Hill Residential is an exact fit for this plot of land and by their own admission this type of zoning would have much less effect on neighbourhood properties, the environment, road network and water supply then the only conclusion that can be drawn is that this proposal is all about greed, more houses mean more income, you say you consider all mitigating factors but the severe inaccuracies in your report make it obvious that income overrides all other factors so much so that the hours spent fighting for a fair outcome and the huge amount of stress that this has caused to myself, my family and my neighbourhood will be totally ignored by the people driving this thoughtless proposal.</p>	

**Submission Number: DPC26/3**

Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
Greater Wellington Regional Council	3.1	Whole Proposed Plan Change	Oppose	<p>The following are considered appropriate considerations which relate to impacts on indigenous biodiversity:</p> <p>Maintaining ecological connections and/or corridors between habitats</p> <p>In the Ecological Assessment for proposed plan change 26 the connectivity values of the sites were identified as having significant ecological value. The sites link with a significant tract of indigenous vegetation along the whole length of the eastern edge of the Lower Hutt Valley. The Ecological Assessment also identified that residential development would result in a reduction of ecological connectivity values between the Significant Natural Resource Area (SNR Area) 50, lying south of the site and the northern tip of the SNR Area 50, resulting from the intrusion of proposed development into the SNR Area 50.</p>	<p>Avoid adverse effects on significant indigenous biodiversity on the sites and provide adequate buffers to protect it.</p> <p>Reconsider the choice of these sites for residential zoning and the potential cumulative effects on the remnant indigenous biodiversity in the wider Hutt Valley.</p>
	3.2			<p>Providing adequate buffers around areas of indigenous ecosystems</p> <p>The site for proposed plan change 26 is adjacent to and partly overlapping with the SNR Area 50 being Stokes Valley Bush, identified in the Hutt City District Plan. Stokes Valley Bush is in turn adjacent to a larger SNR Area being Eastern Hutt Hills (SNR Area 12). As such, the proposed site acts as a buffer to significant tracts of indigenous vegetation, recognised as having significance in the Hutt City District Plan. The intrusion of residential housing into SNR Area 50 will reduce the buffers between the new residential area and the SNR area and potentially lead to the invasion of weed species from gardens and more domestic cats entering the SNR Areas.</p>	
	3.3			<p>Avoiding the cumulative effects of incremental loss of indigenous ecosystems and habitats</p> <p>The present process of numbers of separate plan changes to rezone parcels of council-held land which were previously classified as reserve land, fails to look at the bigger picture of total biodiversity loss. When cumulative adverse effects on significant natural resources are not taken into account, mitigation proposals fail</p>	

			<p>to address the overall loss of significant natural resources. Consequently this approach allows for a loss of significant natural resources, where the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.</p> <p>Greater Wellington does not have information on the reasoning and/or criteria for choosing these particular sites for rezoning during the Land Review process. Greater Wellington questions the rezoning these sites which are part of or adjoin SNR Areas, and whether there is other more appropriate land that could be developed for residential purposes that doesn't compromise significant biodiversity values.</p>	
	3.4		<p>Protecting the life supporting capacity of indigenous ecosystems and habitats</p> <p>The loss of forest and aquatic habitat on the sites as mentioned in the reports for Plan Changes 26 will impact on the wider indigenous biodiversity of SNR Area 50 and other wider biodiversity values in the surrounding area. Edge effects along the boundaries of SNR Area 50 and the part of the sites to be rezoned as part of plan change 26 will also develop. This will further degrade the significant indigenous vegetation in SNR Area 50.</p>	
	3.5		<p>Remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the indigenous biodiversity values where avoiding adverse effects in not practicably achievable</p> <p>As above, Greater Wellington is concerned that these parcels of reserve land have been chosen for rezoning while it is clearly stated in Council reports that both sites have significant biodiversity values, provide ecological connectivity and important habitat for birds and geckos. Hutt City Council has the option of avoiding adverse effects by withdrawing proposed plan change 26.</p>	

**ADDRESS FOR SERVICE – PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 26**

<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>Name/Organisation</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Address</b>
DPC26/1	Wayne Robinson	██████████	████████████████████
DPC26/2	Phil Angus	████████████████	████████████████████
DPC26/3	Greater Wellington Regional Council c/- Caroline Ammundsen	PO Box 11646	Wellington 6142