

# **Proposed District Plan Change 29**

**Proposed zoning change to the western end of Petone –  
Petone Mixed Use**

## **Summary of Submissions**

**Publicly Notified:**

**13 November 2012**

**Further Submissions Close:**

**27 November 2012 at 5.00pm**



# PUBLIC NOTICE

## Public Notification of the Summary of Submissions on Proposed District Plan Change 29 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 29 – Proposed zoning change to the western end of Petone – Petone Mixed Use.**

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/districtplanchange29>

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 27 November 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**

**13 November 2012**



Appendix 1 at the back of the document provides an alphabetical list of submitters, their address for service, their allocated submission numbers and where submission can be found in the summary.

## SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

DPC29/001 - Mark Braithwaite .....	6
DPC29/002 - Michael Conroy.....	6
DPC29/003 - Lorna Lovegrove .....	7
DPC29/004 - J Wood .....	7
DPC29/005 - Angus Gibb.....	8
DPC29/006 - Gary Reid and DCP/007 Anne Reid.....	9
DPC29/008 - Norman Wilkins .....	9
Group Submission 1 .....	10
DPC29/010 – Marion Freigard .....	13
Group Submission 2 .....	14
DPC29/014 - Amanda Richards.....	16
DPC29/016 – Susan Callan on behalf of Scintilla .....	17
DPC29/019 - Raeburn Laird & Arthur Keith Laird .....	18
Group Submission 3 .....	19
Group Submission 4 .....	20
DPC29/030 - Roy Hewson .....	22
DPC29/031 - Joan Magdalene Hewson.....	26
Group Submission 5 .....	27
DPC29/033 - Neil Potter, Director PCPatch Ltd .....	35
DPC29/034 - Bevan and Naomi Knight .....	36
DPC29/035 - Angela M Corrigan .....	36
DPC29/039 – John Weeds on behalf of Executive Laundry (Wellington) Ltd.....	38
DPC29/043 - William Wieben .....	40
DPC29/044 – Mary Ely .....	41
DPC29/045 – Colin Smith .....	42
DPC29/046 – Rose Greally .....	42
DPC29/050 – Nik Zangouropoulos on behalf of the Petone Historical Society.....	43
DPC29/051 - Jacqui Gilchrist.....	45
DPC29/052 - Burton Consultants on behalf of Z Energy Limited. ....	46

DPC29/054 – Brett John Nicholls on behalf of The Chocolate Story Ltd .....	47
DPC29/055 – Laura Skilton .....	48
DPC29/058 – Carolyn Roper .....	51
DPC29/059 - Melissa Bailey .....	52
DPC29/070 - Roger Bacshaw .....	52
DPC29/073 – Andred and Rebecca Saker .....	54
DPC29/074 - Lois Robertson .....	55
DPC29/076 – Ruth Mansell .....	57
DPC29/077 – Kirsten Gendall.....	58
DPC29/078 – James Mansell.....	58
DPC29/080 – Andrew Showler on behalf of Redwood Group Ltd. ....	59
DPC29/081 – Wendy Saunders.....	60
DPC29/084 – Jane Helen Blandford.....	62
DPC29/085 - Murray Blandford .....	63
DPC29/086 – Allan Hyslop .....	63
DPC29/087 – Norma Edlin .....	64
DPC29/088 - Graeme Claridge .....	65
DPC29/089 – Nick Androutsos on behalf of the Greek Orthodox Community of Hutt Valley Incorporated .....	65
DPC29/090 – Jennifer Gray.....	66
DPC29/091 – Patrick Moriarity .....	68
DPC29/092 - Paula Louise Paton.....	69
DPC29/093 – Nick Ursin .....	69
DPC29/094 - Graham Wigley on behalf of Wigley & Roberts Ltd, Registered Professional Surveyors.....	70
DPC29/095 – Debra and Joseph Knowles .....	71
DPC29/98 – Alfred Memelink .....	72
DPC29/99 – Merran Bakker .....	75
DPC29/100 – Ann Randal.....	77
DPC29/101 – Margaret Thompson .....	78
DPC29/104 – Donald Alexander Watherston .....	81
DPC29/105 – Arthur Ward Andrews.....	81
DPC29/106 – Susie Fitzgerald .....	82
DPC29/108 – Terry Webb on behalf of GNS Science.....	83
DPC29/0109 – Alison Newbald .....	86
DPC29/0111 – Marie Robb on Behalf of SizeUp Ltd and SizeUp Properties Ltd .....	90

DPC29/112 –Barker and Associates on behalf of McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited.....	91
DPC29/113 – Mark Kirk-Burnnand on behalf of Autostop Group Ltd.....	93
DPC29/114 – Finn Brian Quentin Collins .....	94
DPC29/0116 – Joyce Kellett .....	96
DPC29/118 – Hazel Neser .....	96
DPC29/119 – Morris Te Whiti Love.....	98
DPC29/120 – John Daniels on behalf of Historic Places Wellington Inc.....	99
DPC29/121 – James Beban on behalf of Cuttriss Consultants Ltd .....	100
DPC29/122 – Matt Roberts.....	109
DPC29/123 – Julia Forsyth .....	111
DPC29/127 – Leila Macbeth .....	115
DPC29/128 – Rosie Torbot.....	116
DPC29/130 – Glenn Stewart .....	116
DPC29/132 – Peter and Nicola Prichard .....	117
DPC29/135 – Ruth Fletcher .....	121
DPC29/140 – Kevin Collins.....	126
DPC29/142 – Brian Boyer and Penny Dallimore.....	126
DPC29/146 –Frances Mountier.....	128
DPC29/149 – Stephen Shadwell .....	129
DPC29/150 – Andy Christofferson .....	131
DPC29/151 – Caroline Ammundsen on behalf of Greater Wellington Regional Council.....	133
DPC29/152 – Gerald Davidson on behalf of Petone Community Board .....	141
DPC29/0153 – Carl Bakker on behalf of PUEA Inc. (Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated) .....	146
DPC29/0154 – Brendan Hogan .....	149
DPC29/155 – Ann Neill on behalf of New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga...	152
DPC29/156 – Hone Ridley.....	155
DPC29/157 – Katherine Jane Clarke .....	156
DPC29/158 – Pamela Scowen .....	160
DPC29/159 – Chris Drayton .....	161
DPC29/160 – Ralph Wynne-Griffiths .....	163
DPC29/163 – Kristin Aitken on behalf of NZ Transport Agency .....	164
DPC29/164 – Nick Leko on behalf of FIT Architects .....	170
DPC29/165 – David Kiddey, Chief Executive of Hutt Valley Chamber of Commerce.....	171
DPC29/166 – Graeme Ebbett on behalf of the Ebbett Family Trust .....	172
DPC29/167 – Emily Griffin .....	172

DPC29/168 – Leonie Dobbs .....	173
DPC29/169 – Tui Lewis .....	175
DPC29/170 – Peter and Ronda Coyle on behalf of Hinau Holdings .....	177
DPC29/171 – Barbara Scott .....	178
DPC29/172 - R. J. Werry on behalf of Light House Cinema Limited .....	179
DPC29/174 – Richard Te One.....	180
DPC29/176 – Mike Fisher.....	181
DPC29/178 – Robert Hutton .....	182
DPC29/180 – John Howat .....	184
Group Submission 6 .....	185
DPC29/184 – Judith Vickerman .....	188
Group Submission 7 .....	189
DPC29/190 – Alan White .....	191
Group Submission 8 .....	198
DPC29/198 – Alex Edmonds .....	198
DPC29/199 – Pam Hanna on behalf of the Petone Planning Action Group .....	200
DPC29/207 – Andy Conroy .....	217
DPC29/208 – John W Dobson .....	218
DPC29/218 – Jackson Street Programme Incorporated.....	219
DPC29/221 – John Donnelly .....	221
DPC29/224 – Deborah O’Connor .....	225
DPC29/246 - Neil Curgenvon on behalf of the New Zealand Federation of Historical Societies Inc.....	227
DPC29/247 - Teremoana Sparks .....	228
DPC29/249 - James Crampton .....	228
DPC29/250 & DCP/251–Sophie Jackson and Richard Jackson .....	230
Appendix 1 Alphabetical Listing of Submitters.....	231





## SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 29

It is noted that Decision/Relief sought includes items specifically identified as decision/relief sought in the submissions, as well as implied decisions/relief sought in cases where it is clear in submissions that this is what the author of the submission intended.

<b>DPC29/001 Mark Braithwaite</b>				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
1.1	General	Support		Approve the change in full  The plan change to be extended to the other side of Petone Station (that is, land owned by Transit NZ where Car Giant is, and the old bowling building was).
1.2	General – Maximum Height	Support	Supports proposed height provisions. That is a maximum height of 30m, and 15m heights with a 45 degree set back.	

<b>DPC29/002 Michael Conroy</b>				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
2.1	General	Not stated	The submitter would like to see more shops in the plan change area, which would move customers from the supermarket. New shops would be safer for the public.	Not stated.

DPC29/003 Lorna Lovegrove				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
3.1	General	Oppose		Need to be informed what plans are in detail. Maximum building in that area and how it would affect the street.
3.2	General – Site Coverage and Foreshore	Oppose		Setback along The Esplanade of at least 6m
3.3	General – Maximum Building Height and Amenities of Existing Residents	Oppose	The submitter refers to sunlight access for residential properties and the possibility of shading from buildings.	

DPC29/004 J Wood				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
4.1	General - Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter says that the reason why Petone is popular is because it is different from other localities, with its own character and charm. Reference is also made to the absence of parking metres.</p> <p>The submitter feels that Petone should keep its differences and retain its low-rise buildings, shops, motels, apartments and small industrial units. The submitter says that bigger is seldom better.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern that the proposal would repeat the outcome of the Queensgate Mall on shops in High Street, in the Petone area.</p>	Not stated.

4.2	General – Maximum Building Height		The submitter says that high rise buildings keep out the sun, make wind tunnels, especially near the sea and are boring to look at.	
-----	---	--	---	--

<b>DPC29/005 Angus Gibb</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
5.1	General	Oppose	The submitter would not like any part of Lower Hutt to be turned into a 'concrete jungle'.  The submitter is opposed to developers having too much freedom to do what they like.	Not stated.
5.2	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	The submitter does not like high-rise buildings, especially when they are sited too close to other buildings. The submitter refers to extra wind and shading effects.	
5.3	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The submitter refers to earthquake risks on the fault line and that high-rise buildings may pose a risk to the aquifer.	
5.4	General – Transportation and Urban Planning	Oppose	The submitter considers that any development like this would need very careful planning to be user-friendly to pedestrians, cyclists, sight-seers and workers with enough green areas etc. etc. and trees.	

**DPC29/006 Gary Reid and DCP/007 Anne Reid**

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
6.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters do not agree with any of the changes proposed. Concern is raised that it would change the dynamics of Petone and that it will end up like the dead end of Lower Hutt. The submitters do not want their shop to end up in a dead area.</p> <p>More safe buildings are needed in Jackson Street to keep it the place to be.</p> <p>The submitters identify themselves as the owner/operators of Creative Cuts on Jackson Street.</p>	Not stated.

**DPC29/008 Norman Wilkins**

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
8.1	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The existing minimum floorarea for retail in the plan change should be retained, so that the boutique shops and cafes present on Jackson Street will not move to the Western End.</p> <p>Otherwise there is a risk that the cost of earthquake strengthening older buildings in Jackson Street would encourage existing tenants to move to the plan change area and discourage landowner investment in earthquake strengthening.</p> <p>Increasing the maximum size for retail development could lead to a shopping mall being established with associated demand for car parking. The submitter questions the need for larger</p>	<p>Modify the plan change.</p> <p>Retain present minimum 500m<sup>2</sup> floor area of retail activities.</p> <p>Retain present maximum size for retail developments of 3000m<sup>2</sup>.</p>

			retail units given the proximity of Queensgate, the presence of two supermarkets and other mid-sized outlets like Briscoes.	
8.2	General – Preferred Uses in Mixed Use zone	Oppose	The submitter says that the Western end of Petone should have a focus on residential accommodation. Petone has a shortage of modern buildings that suit the lifestyles of younger working people. The submitter points out that the western end of Petone is very accessible.	
8.3	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the proposed 30m maximum height and 100% site coverage rules. Development of this kind would make the area completely unsuitable for families with children, who need access to open spaces.	
8.4	General – Design Guidelines	Oppose	High standards of insulation and energy efficiency would enable occupants to cope with increasing power costs.	Specification for housing should ensure that it is built to the highest standards of insulation and energy efficiency.

### Group Submission 1

*Submitters:- 9 - Lesley Kennedy, 11 - Patricia Hawthorne, 20 - Kelsey Clendon, 21 - Anne West, 72 - Mr Charlie Dickson, 83 - Meredith Hunt, 110 - Brent Sellwood, 115 - Edward Cox, 117 - Danielle Falconer, 136 - Sue Boland, 137 - Kathy Bloor on behalf of Settlers Motor Lodge, 144 - Gemma Easton, 147 - Deane Avison, 148 - Brian Cole and Nikki Chiappini, 179 - Mrs Dianne Renee Jackson, 182 - Paul Andersen, 186 - Norman Leslie Hickmott and Annette Ivy Hickmott on behalf of Foreshore Motor Lodge Ltd., 200 - D. Flutery, 201 - Lanscella Sue, 211 - Anonymous, 213 - Lorraine Cresswell, 219 - Frances Duncan, and 220 - Anonymous.*

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
9.1	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	The plan change does not provide for protection of the traditional shopping street of Petone.	Reject the plan change and reinstate rules that limit the smallest shops in the plan change area to 500m <sup>2</sup> .

			The plan change allows for large retailing, without adequate consideration of traffic and parking implications	Reject the plan change and reinstate rules that establish maximum size of retail developments at 3000m <sup>2</sup> .
9.2	General – Design Guide and Site Coverage	Oppose	The plan change allows for residential development without adequate design quality including no open space requirement per unit or daylight or sunlight access to units.	Reject the plan change and bring in controls and design guidance that ensure that future residents have access to adequate living conditions in all types of residential development.  Submitters 20, 21, 72, 137, 147, 179, 200, 201, 211, 213, 219, and 220 also seek a minimum size of 70m <sup>2</sup> per unit.
9.3	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The plan change allows for tall buildings and residential and education activities to be established in a high hazard area of the Wellington Fault.	Submitters 9, 11, 83, 115, 117, and 144 seek: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reject the plan change and limit building height within the Wellington Fault area to 10m.</li> <li>• Make residential and educational facilities discretionary activities.</li> </ul> Submitters 20, 21, 72, 110, 136, 137, 147, 148, 179, 182, 186, 200, 201, 211, 213, 219, and 220 seek: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit building height within the Wellington faultline area to 8m; and</li> <li>• Make residential and education facilities unlikely in the high hazard area.</li> </ul>
9.4	General – Maximum Building Height	Oppose		Submitters 110, 136, 148 and 186 seek a limit on building height across the proposed area to 10m.  Submitters 20, 21, 72, 137, 147, 179, 182, 200, 201, 211, 213, 219, 220 also seek a limit on building height across the proposed area to 12m.  Submitters 83, 115, 117, and 144 seek a limit on building height across the proposed area to 15m.
9.5	General - General and Character	Oppose	Submitter 11 adds that Petone is the jewel in the crown of Lower Hutt.  Submitters 11, 83 and 136 emphasise that it is Petone’s differences from other retail areas, which has made it a	

			success. This distinctive character needs to be protected.	
9.6	General - Open Space, Natural Hazards and Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>Submitter 83 identifies a serious lack of green space and parks in Petone.</p> <p>Submitter 83 adds that they expect the Council to learn from the Christchurch experience.</p> <p>Submitter 83 does not support retailing on The Esplanade due to parking difficulties, the potential to undermine Jackson Street and impact on the quality of life of existing residents.</p>	<p>Submitter 83 also seeks the rejection of the plan change in its current form and make amendment as requested.</p> <p>Submitter 83 requests the Council to consider providing environments that foster communities and encourage people to stay and make worthwhile contributions to the area.</p> <p>Submitter 83 seeks the development of rules that will help minimise loss of life and property in the zone. New rules should limit development in proximity to the Wellington fault, and rules which address the liquefaction and tsunami risks.</p> <p>Submitter 83 also seeks the consideration of the installation of water fountains, which can double as water dissemination points during an emergency.</p> <p>Submitter 83 seeks the consideration of the type of retail permitted in this area. Any shops that replicate those on Jackson Street will be in direct competition and may threaten the sustainability of Jackson Street.</p>
9.7	General – Character, Retail Floorspace and Maximum Height and Design Guidelines	Oppose	<p>Submitter 136 refers to Petone as serving as the entrance point to the whole Hutt Valley.</p> <p>Retail and height provisions have the potential to destroy the heritage feel and unique character of Petone and reduce it to a bland, boring and enclosed shopping area. As well as reducing the value of the area to visitors and residents.</p> <p>Submitter 136 considers that provisions for residential development in the absence of quality controls, would allow for inner-city in-fill housing and a significant degradation of the character and attractiveness of the area. Provisions will not be conducive to healthy living conditions for body and soul.</p>	



9.8	General	Oppose	Submitter 137 states that as a motelier, they get feedback from guests of how special Petone is compared with other towns. It's the owner-operator scenario that works so well here.	
-----	---------	--------	--	--

<b>DPC29/010 – Marion Freigard</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
10.1	General – General and Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The submitter highlights past situations where the Council has failed to protect character, heritage and amenity in the City.</p> <p>The submitter questions the sense in having more concrete, more resource consents, on-selling and charges before the Royal Commission report on Christchurch is available.</p>	Modify the plan change.
10.2	General - Character		The submitter comments that this heritage suburb is unique and that its growth should be in harmony with this, whilst keeping future generations in mind.	
10.2	General – Design Guides			<p>New buildings need design guidelines and strategic future proofing.</p> <p>Need high quality building design for all generations.</p>
10.3	General - Transportation		The submitter questions the effect that new buildings will have on traffic and parking problems.	Need a good safe cycle lane with pedestrian friendly areas for all generations.
10.4	General – Amenity of Existing Residents		<p>The submitter refers to some new apartments being subjected to a lot of noise.</p> <p>The submitter comments that many new families have moved into the area and states that in order for their needs to be met as they grow up, facilities should be planned ahead now and incorporated into well thought out designs.</p>	

## Group Submission 2

*Submitters:- 12 - Syd Moore, 13 – Marianne Jenner, 15 – D. I. Watson, 17 – Sonya Drinkwater, 18 – Janine L Steel, 22 – Simon Davis, 41 – Sally Selwood, 68 - Zhou Guang Li, 71 – Mrs Ruth Dickson, 79 – Graeme L Lyon, 175 – Mark and Anne Godley, 192 – Anonymous, 214 – Cody Jason Russell, 222 – Faith Janet Lawson, 223 – Sharyn Butters, 226 – Phillip John Collett, 230 – Debbie Frostick, 232 – Huinga Centril, 233 – Jackie Solomon, 234 – Denise Carr, 236 – Jane Parson, 237 – Mary Louise Anderson, 239 – Ruby Mullany, 241 – Kim Whitaker-Barnett and 242 – Aiga Fagaese Fiu.*

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
12.1	General	Oppose		Reject plan change in its current form and make amendments as requested below.
12.2	General – Design Guidelines	Oppose	The submitters are not opposed to mixed use in general but it must be of high quality design to ensure good environmental outcomes are achieved	Clear design guideline for all new buildings across all of the proposed zone that includes the provision of outdoor areas for each residential apartment and access to sunlight ensured. These guidelines must ensure that future buildings are designed in a manner which is respectful to the character of Petone and ensures that there is a high quality entrance route to the Hutt Valley.  Submitter 79 adds that the above guidelines should also be good and explicit.
12.3	General – Character	Oppose	As currently worded, the plan change would result in inappropriate effects on the heritage character, look and feel of Petone.  Submitter 79 adds that the plan change would also harm the coastal and suburban character of the area.	
12.4	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	Buildings 30m high with 100% site coverage across nearly all the area proposed is far too permissive and would detract from the character and amenity values of the area.	Reduce the permitted site coverage to allow for the provision of green spaces (landscaping).  Submitters 214, 222, 223, 226, 230, 232, 233, 234, 236, 237, 239, 241, and 242 request a reduction in the permitted height to 10m.

				Submitters 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 41, 68, 71, 79, 175 and 192 seek a reduction in the permitted height to 15m maximum.
12.5	General – Retail floor area	Oppose	<p>Proposed retail rules will undermine Jackson Street as they are too permissive.</p> <p>The submitters believe that there should be retail permitted on The Esplanade due to parking difficulties and the potential to undermine Jackson Street.</p>	<p>Keep the minimum and maximum floor area of retail activities 500m<sup>2</sup> and 3000m<sup>2</sup> with Jackson Street as the focus for any retail development.</p> <p>No retail permitted on The Esplanade.</p>
12.6	General – Natural hazards	Oppose	<p>The submitters are concerned that the high natural hazard risks in the plan change area have not been recognised or considered adequately.</p> <p>The submitters expect the Council to learn from the Christchurch experience</p>	<p>Develop rules that will help minimise loss of life and property in the zone. This includes new rules which limit development in proximity of the Wellington Fault, and rules which address the liquefaction and tsunami risks.</p> <p>Submitter 79 adds that rising sea level needs also need to be addressed for this low-lying land.</p>
12.7	General – General Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage, Foreshore and Design Guides	Oppose	<p>Submitter 79 refers to Christchurch rebuild plans.</p> <p>Submitter 79 considers that the coastal beach character of the Esplanade must be protected. Its name implies a beach front walkway, so shading of the street should be minimised.</p> <p>Submitter 79 expresses support for the detail, extensive submission of Petone Planning Action Group.</p>	Submitter 79 seeks a 10m setback for all buildings on The Esplanade, as well as good design guides, low building heights and protection of view shafts to the harbour and of the hills from the harbour.
12.10	General – Retail Floorspace, Character, Site Coverage and Transportation		<p>Submitter 175 raises concern about potential impacts on the traditional Jackson Street retail area, which is considered to be one of the ‘treasures’ of Petone. The submitter would not like to see this area suffer from large retail development, the way that High Street in Lower Hutt has been affected by Queensgate.</p> <p>The submitter adds that a walk around the area shows the value of planting at the front of sites and how this significantly enhances its environment.</p>	Increased provision for parking included in the plan.

			Traffic and parking issues is a major concern to Petone residents and this plan does not adequately address them	
--	--	--	--	--

<b>DPC29/014 Amanda Richards</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
14.1	General - Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter believes the plan change would destroy the character of Petone, which the Jackson Street Programme and others have worked very hard to successfully create. This would have a devastating effect on the local economy.</p> <p>The submitter describes this character of that of a seaside village being small, relatively quiet with charming little boutique shops and cafes. People are attracted to the area, because of this character. A character that has turned Petone into a much sought after place to live.</p> <p>A loss of character is believed by the submitter to lead to the relocation of existing residents, drop in house values, influx of lower income residents, Jackson Street becoming an eyesore with empty premises and Petone gaining a reputation for being an 'undesirable' area.</p>	<p>Cancel or dramatically revise the proposed change.</p> <p>Retain the charm and character that makes Petone so unique and such a great place to live.</p>
14.2	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that large retail developments would have the following effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draw customers away from small boutique shops;</li> <li>• Lead to the closure of the above type of shops;</li> <li>• Lead to a ghost-town effect, as has happened in Lower Hutt;</li> <li>• Attract large chain stores;</li> <li>• Remove profits from the local community; and.</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attract different and less desirable clientele to the area.</li> </ul>	
14.3	General – Maximum Height	Oppose	The submitter states that high rise buildings will ruin the landscape and views for local residents, as well as reducing house values.	
14.4	General – Design Guidelines	Oppose	The submitter refers to the allowance for residential developments with no outdoor areas. This type of development will increase population and put increased pressures on existing infrastructure.	
14.5	General – Transportation and Infrastructure	Oppose	The submitter state that traffic congestion along Jackson Street provides evidence, that current infrastructure is already struggling to keep up with the population. The submitter is of the view that the plan change will increase population in an area, which is not designed to cope with such increases.	

<b>DPC29/016 – Susan Callan on behalf of Scintilla</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
16.1	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned that the new zoning and provision for larger (10,000m<sup>2</sup>) retail areas, would allow the creation of a large shopping precinct at that end of Jackson Street, Petone.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that the proposed changes could create an ‘umbrella effect’ concerning resource consents, in terms of restricting future public input. The submitter says that area could be ‘onsold’ with a certain ‘resource consent’ which is then put to a different use.</p>	Strongly opposes the new zoning. The submitter would gladly help with ideas on what Petone needs to extend the charm and style (shopper experience) it currently has.
16.2	General – Character	Oppose	The submitter states that Wellington and the Hutt need a retail area that is easily accessible and gives an alternative to ‘indoor’ shopping and all the main brands that have a presence in every	

			town in the country. Petone has a great mix which draws customers from a wide area. These people will be forced to go to the Wairarapa for a similar shopping experience if this zoning change takes place.	
16.3	General – Maximum height	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the height proposals for buildings.	
16.4	General		The submitter identifies themselves as a small family-run business.	

<b>DPC29/019 Raeburn Laird &amp; Arthur Keith Laird</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
19.1	General – Maximum building height and Site Coverage	Oppose	30m high buildings would create wind funnels in more streets and cut out a lot of sunlight.  The submitter objects to 100% site coverage, as some garden spaces and trees are needed to beautify areas.	Revert proposed District Plan changes to existing parameters.  Street frontage heights to remain as now.
19.2	General – Design guidelines	Oppose	The submitter states there are not enough details of what the “design guidelines” will be.	
19.3	General – Preferred uses	Oppose	The submitter is of the view that commercial development and light industrial activity should not be permitted everywhere.	Commercial development and light industrial activity should not be located near apartments or dwellings.
19.4	General – Natural Hazards/building codes	Oppose		Building codes to take into consideration the Wellington Fault line, tsunamis and liquefaction.

### Group Submission 3

*Submitters:- 23 – Annie Treeby, 25 – Estelle Rayner, 29 – Paul Nicholson, 47 – Jenny Palmer of Heroine Fashions, 49 – Julie Kay Vry, 62 – Shayne Millar, 63 – Catrina Surridge, 82 – Kelly Entwistle, 216 – Margit Pankust, 217 – Diana Donison and 244 – J. A. McPhee.*

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
23.1	General – Local Character	Oppose	The submitters are of the view that the proposed plan change would result in inappropriate effects on the heritage character, look and feel of Petone and also detract from the Hutt Central Commercial Activity Area.	Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments.
23.2	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	Buildings up to 30m height (up to 10 stories) high with 100% site coverage is far too permissive and would detract from the character and amenity values of the area.  The proposed change is inconsistent with Hutt City Council's becoming a signatory of the Urban Design Protocol. The public expectation is that signatories of this protocol would work to raise the standard and quality of urban design of new development.	
23.3	General – Retail floor area	Oppose	The proposed retail rules for any size retail up to ten stories and 10,000m <sup>2</sup> will undermine not only Jackson Street but the Hutt CBD as well. The rules are too permissive.  Retailing away from Jackson Street will undermine Jackson Street and the Hutt CBD.  The submitters question the consistency of plans to revitalise Hutt CBD (including Plan Change 14) with the proposed plan change. As the plan change " <i>could spell the death of the central Hutt, as well as of the critical Jackson Street historic area</i> ".	Retail limits to be kept as at present at 500m <sup>2</sup> minimum and 3,000m <sup>2</sup> maximum.  Retailing only allowed along Jackson Street.
23.4	General – Character, Maximum Building Height and Site	Oppose	Submitter 49 is of the view that tower buildings would be out of character with heritage village character of Petone.  The submitter also refers to the possibility of tower buildings	Submitter 49 also requests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the retention of the heritage village character of Petone. Keep new development in character with Petone village;</li> <li>no more tower buildings should be permitted in the heritage</li> </ul>

Coverage, Natural Hazards and Transportation		being sited on sand in an earthquake zone.	village of Petone; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• keeping of new development to 2 stories height maximum; and</li> <li>• assurance that all new development includes sufficient parking.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

#### Group Submission 4

*Submitters:- 24 - Bruce Treeby, 26 - Kevin Alfred Rayner, 27 - S. R. Torstonson, 28 - Sandra Young, 53 - Martha Craig on behalf of Wanda Harland Design Store, 56 - Stephen John Adams, 57 - Graeme Pitcher on behalf of Bargain Books, 60 - San Ha Van, 61 - D.C. Mason, 64 - Qin Zhao, 65 - Janeughi Jovan, 66 - Michelle Mary Bailey, 67 - Helen Wilson on behalf of Turquoise, 103 - Richard Entwistle, 145 - Paul McGillicuddy, 173 - Melody Mclaughlin, 177 - Judith M. W. Manchester, 181 - Mrs Phyllis Anderson, 202 - Anonymous, 203 - Warren Beard, 204 - Tash Barneveld, 205 - Anonymous, 206 - Christine Nightingale, 209 - Peter Campbell, 210 - Sokha Chhim, 212 - M.J. Brittain, 215 - Lorraine Renshaw, 227 - Choutha Su, 228 - Alana Silke, 229 - Debbie Misipeka, 231 - Barbara Parkins, 235 - T. Huynh, 238 - Eljay Maunder, 240 - Anonymous, 243 - Insook and 245 - Jill Funnell.*

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
24.1	General - Preferred Uses	Oppose	<p>The submitters state they are not opposed to mixed use, but it must be of high quality design and mainly involve residential and commercial development, rather than retail (or small retail) development.</p> <p>The submitters state they want to keep trading or shopping in Jackson Street in the fantastic heritage precinct.</p>	Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments.
24.2	General – Character	Oppose	As currently worded, the proposed plan change would result in inappropriate effects on the heritage character, look and feel of Petone, particularly on its village feel.	
24.3	General – Retail Floor Area	Oppose	The proposed plan change would split Petone in two and Petone would end up like High Street in Lower Hutt.	Allowable retail spaces to be kept at their present level of between 500m <sup>2</sup> minimum and 3,000m <sup>2</sup> maximum.



			<p>The rules are too permissive and would undermine Jackson Street.</p> <p>The submitters want the heritage area to be the area of small, boutique shops and an experience like none other in the Wellington region or New Zealand. They do not want this area killed off as the High Street area is said to have been.</p>	Retail development to be restricted to Jackson Street.
24.4	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	Buildings up to 30m height (10 stories high) with 100% site coverage are far too permissive and would detract from the character and amenity values of the area. Especially with any retail spaces allowed up to 10,000m <sup>2</sup> and 10 stories high.	
24.5	General – Design Guides	Oppose		Clear design guidelines for all new buildings across the proposed zone that ensure that future buildings are designed in a manner which is respectful to the character of Petone and ensures that there is high quality residential and commercial development.
24.6	General	Oppose	Submitters 145, 173, 177, 181, and 228 see the heritage part of Jackson Street as a community. Retailers are supportive of one another. Each business has its own attraction, but brings customers who then go to other businesses.	
24.6	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose		Submitter 53 adds that they want the heritage portion of Jackson Street preserved and not lost, as has occurred in many shopping precincts in Lower Hutt and the rest of New Zealand.
24.7	General	Oppose	Submitter 67 identifies the situation for small retailers as <u>DIRE</u> (author’s own emphasis).	Submitter 67 requests don’t make the situation worse for small retailers.
24.8	General – General, Character and Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>Submitter 145 considers Petone to be the “<i>jewel in the crown</i>” and raises concern that the plan change will destroy it. Development needs to protect and enhance the special character of the area and the reasons people come to Petone, not decimate them.</p> <p>The submitter says they “<i>moved to Petone because of its vibrant, eclectic and historical Jackson Street shopping precinct</i>”.</p>	

			<p>The plan change does not provide for protection of the traditional shopping street of Petone, as the size of the allowable shops is too big and basically uncontrolled. People go to Lower Hutt if they want a shopping mall experience (its only 2.5kms away).</p> <p>The submitter states <i>“they have a problem when differing rules are used in the same city”</i> and questions whether the same lenient rules apply to the Lower Hutt CBD or any other parts of the city.</p>	
24.09	General - Character	Oppose	<p>Submitter 177 says that many people in Wellington are attracted to the highly individualised and specialised little shops and eating places spread out along Jackson Street.</p> <p>High rise or mall type developments offering the same types of shops and eateries are available in many other parts of the region and hold no interest for people currently attracted to Petone.</p>	

<b>DPC29/030 Roy Hewson</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
30.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that he has no objection to plans to revitalise the western part of Petone, but is disturbed that the plan change leaves out the strong recommendations reached through agreement between developers, business people and the community in meetings held about the Petone Vision document. These recommendations concerned the position and size of retail developments, the prevention of malls and building height.</p>	<p>Modify the plan change as requested. It is suggested that the Council withdraw the plan change and start again. A more modern approach to plan drafting should be adopted, which retains the current character of the area.</p>

			<p>The submitter questions the reasons why the Council has rejected Council officer recommendations regarding design and green space.</p> <p>The submitter states that there are a very large number people both within and outside Petone, which are opposed to the plan change as drafted.</p>	
30.2	General - Character	Oppose	<p>The Jackson Street Heritage shopping area is widely regarded as a destination place for eating and shopping, as it offers something different. Visitors come from all parts of the region and include cruise ship passengers.</p> <p>Petone is a <i>“jewel in the region”</i> that has not been spoilt by modernisation. The character of the area should not be spoilt.</p> <p>Any major plan change needs to retain the character of the area, particularly for this important heritage town, in addition to providing comfortable places to live and work.</p>	
30.2	General – Design Guides	Oppose	<p>The plan is considered to lack a great deal in design.</p> <p>A lack of open spaces and neighbourhood parks will not encourage residential development.</p> <p>Most developers embrace certainty in design guides, which show them what is expected and helps them design better buildings.</p>	Development of strong well designed guides to show what is expected in the area.
30.3	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The submitter has concerns for the safety of tall buildings in an area prone to earthquakes and liquefaction, with at least one major fault running through it that also sits on a swamp and above an aquifer.</p> <p>The aquifer which provides the water supply for Hutt City is</p>	Design guides should ensure that the safety of local workers and residents is paramount.

			<p>located about 23m below the surface.</p> <p>No engineering works could make people living in 30m high apartments feel safe. Considerable safety measures would need to be used for buildings even 12m high. Buildings in this area would be expensive with high costs for engineering and insurance costs. This could deter prospective buyers.</p> <p>The Council needs to take into account lessons from the Christchurch earthquakes. There is no doubt that there will be a major earthquake in this area sooner or later.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the safety responsibilities of the Council and considers that the safety of office and commercial workers, as well as people living in high rise apartments should be paramount. He adds that narrow streets hinder the ability to make the area safe.</p>	
30.4	General – Retail Floor Space	Oppose	<p>The plan change is a “wishful scheme” which overly relies on the market. The plan risks damaging the popular and busy retail area in Petone.</p> <p>Types of retailing allowed would seriously affect businesses on Jackson Street and may harm shopping in Lower Hutt as well.</p>	
30.5	General – Preferred Uses	Oppose	<p>The plan change identifies the area as unsuitable for light industry. However, small industrial sites have been an important part of Petone’s success and the area abounds with them.</p>	
30.6	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>A height restriction is needed to prevent overshadowing of Jackson Street and the beach.</p> <p>Buyers will not be attracted to a poorly designed area. They will want parking, open space and small parks for recreation. A well designed area would be sought after.</p>	<p>The height restriction between Sydney and Victoria Streets to remain at its current restriction of 12m.</p> <p>The Design Guide to require the provision of open spaces around buildings and small parks.</p>

30.7	General – Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Oppose		Building in the area should be restricted, until an archaeological report has been prepared by Historic Places Trust.
30.8	Amendment 2	Oppose	Inclusion of small retail sites and shopping malls in the plan change area would detract from this successful shopping strip in a Heritage area.	Definition of Integrated Retail Developments be amended to exclude small retail sites and shopping malls.
30.9	Amendment 3	Oppose	There is no other industrial area suitable for this type of activity in Petone. Small industry is an important part of the local economy. There is no need for change.	Leave the area between Sydney and Victoria Streets as small industrial sites with a maximum height of 12m.
30.10	Amendment 4	Oppose	Existing retail restrictions have worked extremely well over the past 20 years.  The introduction of supermarkets in the area, led to the closure of mall vegetable and meat shops along Jackson Street.  Allowing more retail development in the plan area would have a “devastating” effect on retailing along Jackson Street.  No evidence is provided that there is a demand for complementary retail activities, as referred to in the proposed explanations and reasons. A mall would not be complementary to a strip shopping area, and this is “ <i>clearly proven by the destruction of retail shopping on lower High Street in the Hutt mainly caused by Queensgate</i> ”.	Amend 5B 1.1.2 Policy (b) to refer to stand alone businesses between 500m <sup>2</sup> and 3000m <sup>2</sup> , that are complimentary to the existing shopping strip.
30.11	Amendment 5	Oppose	The policies for the main gateway and entrance routes to the city, will not achieve the stated objective of making this area attractive.  The plan change area needs to be attractive, rather than just the edges.	
30.12	Amendment 7 to 43	Oppose	It appears unnecessary to create additional shopping areas, especially with two major supermarkets within the area.	

30.13	Amendment 11, Urban Design and Transportation	Oppose	<p>100% site coverage would not provide adequate car parking or green spaces. At present, the streets are heavily parked. Large numbers of rail commuters park in local streets.</p> <p>Modern planning practices identify a need for green spaces.</p> <p>A better approach is the Christchurch example, which includes neighbourhood parks in areas with a number of multi-storey buildings. These parks are built for recreation and safety reasons, and contain emergency infrastructure.</p>	

DPC29/031 Joan Magdalene Hewson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
31.1	General	Oppose	The submitter has no objection to the revitalising of the plan change area, but does not consider that the plan change is the best way to do this. They strongly object to the plan change in its current form.	Plan change be withdrawn.
31.2	General - Character	Oppose	Although the Petone area is in need of a "face lift", changes should retain its local feel and character.	
31.3	General – Retail Floorarea	Oppose	Retailing should continue as it has been for the past 20 years. There is no need or desire for extra retail up to 500m <sup>2</sup> . The current system works well with the Heritage area of Jackson Street being complimented by single stores up to 3,000m <sup>2</sup> . A mall of 10,000m <sup>2</sup> would devastate the local retail area.	Retention of the existing retail restrictions in the plan change area of between 500m <sup>2</sup> and 3000m <sup>2</sup> .
31.4	General – Design Guides and	Oppose	A mixed-use area requires careful planning. 30m high buildings regardless of use, should be complemented with green space	A comprehensive design guide be prepared.

	Maximum Height and Site Coverage		and rest areas.	
31.5	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The submitter has strong doubts as to whether 30m high buildings would be safe in an area, subject to so many natural hazards.	
31.6	General – Preferred Uses	Oppose	The area between Sydney Street and Victoria Street has a lot of small industrial sites which are good for the local economy. Banning light industrial use will harm our local area.	The removal of the area bounded by Sydney and Victoria Streets from the proposed mixed-use area, so that it can remain available for small-scale industry.

### Group Submission 5

*Submitters:- 32 - Joan Isaac, 36 - Steve Heathcote, 37 - Phil Nixey, 38 - Fry Drysdale on behalf of Build-a-Birthday, 40 - Kevin Moar, 42 - Janet Theo Milne, 48 - Linda Brewer, 69 - Robert John Commane, 96 - G. Pallo, 102 - Rachelle Dempsey, 107 - Nick Millar and Jan Simmons, 124 - Sarah Rogers, 125 - Theresa Greally, 126 - Kathryn Vinten, 129 - Mrs Rachael Slade, 131 - Katherine Anderson, 133 - Kiri and Tony Waldegrave, 134 - Emma Jane Brodie, 138 - Roger Whitmarsh, 139 - Dianne Boss, 141 - Leon Ralph Cooke, 143 - Rowan Pollock, 161 - Colin Partington, 225 - Sarah Kennedy and 248 - Rochelle Neil*

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
32.1	General	Oppose		Reject plan change in its current form and make amendments.  Overall, I want to see a plan change that will enhance Petone's unique and special character – not ruin it.
32.2	General – Design Guidelines, Preferred Uses and Foreshore	Oppose	Mixed-use or economic growth must be of high quality design to ensure good environmental outcomes are achieved.  The lack of quality or amenity design guides or inclusion of setbacks on the Esplanade, or the encouragement of urban parks and landscaping, will result in poor-quality development,	Clear design guidelines for all new buildings across all of the proposed zone that includes the provision of outdoor areas for each residential apartment and access to sunlight ensured. These guidelines must ensure that future buildings are designed in a manner which is respectful or sympathetic to the character of Petone.

			<p>especially undermining Petone foreshore's amenity value.</p> <p>There is also a lack of recognition of the Esplanade as a gateway entrance.</p>	<p>Submitters 48, 69, 124 and 248 request that the above guidelines be 'green'.</p> <p>Submitter 161 requests that the above type of guidelines be mandatory.</p> <p>Submitters 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 69, 96, 102, 107, 124, 125, 126, 131, 133, 138, 139, 141, 143, 161 and 248 request the inclusion of high quality design guidelines and urban planning for the area to increase its amenity value. Especially interacting with the Harbour and the Esplanade.</p>
32.3	General – Character	Oppose	The submitters consider that the plan change would result in inappropriate or significant adverse effects on the heritage character, look and feel of Petone.	
32.4	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>Buildings 30 metres high with 100% site coverage across nearly all the area proposed is far too permissive and could result in walls or canyons of high buildings and excessive shading, which undermine the attractiveness of the area.</p> <p>Submitters 96, 125, 129, 131, 138, 139, 141, and 161 add that development as described above could also create potential wind tunnels.</p> <p>Submitters 32, 36, 37, 40, 42, 69, 96, 102, 107, 125, 129, 131, 133, 138, 139, 141, 143, 161 and 248 consider that the plan change is inconsistent with Hutt City Council's becoming a signatory of the Urban Design Protocol. The public expectation is that signatories of this protocol would work to raise the standard and quality of urban design of new development.</p> <p>Reducing the permitted height would also help to protect views of the hills from the floor of the valley in Petone.</p>	<p>I want to see the current scale of Petone used as the basis for any future development. It works in Petone and it is really important for the future of all the younger people who are currently growing up in Petone and their children in the future. (requested by most but not all submitters).</p> <p>The provision of green spaces and a lot of landscaping.</p> <p>Submitters 36, 37, 40, 42, 48, 69, 96, 102, 107, 124, 125, 126, 131, 138, 141, 143, 161, 225 and 248 seek a reduction in the permitted height for the whole area to 12 to 15m.</p> <p>Submitters 32 and 134 seek a reduction in the permitted height to 15m maximum.</p>



32.5	General – Retail floor area	Oppose	<p>The submitters consider that the proposed retail rules will undermine Jackson Street and the Hutt CBD as well, as they are too permissive. The submitters do not want Jackson Street to become the run-down area that it was two decades ago.</p> <p>The submitters consider that existing retail provisions have worked well over the last twenty years and it should stay as they are.</p> <p>Submitters 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 69, 102, 107, 124, 126, 129, 131, 133, 134, 138, 139, 141, 143, 161, and 225 do not believe that retail should be permitted on The Esplanade, due to traffic congestion, parking difficulties and the potential to undermine Jackson Street.</p>	<p>The existing retail rules should stay as they are at present with 500m<sup>2</sup> the minimum and 3,000m<sup>2</sup> the maximum outside the heritage precinct. Any further retail development should only be allowed in the part of the proposed area along the western end of Jackson Street that it has been allowed in in the past (and not expanded to apply throughout the proposed new zone and certainly not up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup>. This has worked well over the last twenty years and should stay as it is.</p> <p>I especially do not believe that there should be retail permitted on The Esplanade, due to traffic congestion, parking difficulties and the potential to undermine Jackson Street.</p>
32.6	General – Natural hazards	Oppose	<p>The submitters are concerned that the high natural hazard risks in the plan change area have not been recognised or given strong recognition.</p> <p>Submitter 134 adds that they also expect the Council to learn from overseas experience.</p>	<p>I expect HCC to learn from the Christchurch experience, develop and apply rules that will help minimise loss of life and property in the zone. This includes new rules which limit development in proximity of the Wellington Fault, and rules which address the liquefaction and tsunami risks.</p> <p>(Requested by most but not all submitters).</p>
32.7	General	Oppose	<p>Submitters 36, 37, 40, 42, 69, 96, 102, 107, 124, 125, 129, 131, 138, 139, 141, 143, 161, 225, and 248 add that they are not opposed to seeing Petone grow and have more jobs and additional people. However they seek additional controls on this growth.</p>	
32.8	General – General and Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>Submitters 36, 37, 48, 69, 96, 102, 107, 124, 125, 131, 138, 141, 143, 161 and 248 consider that the plan change would detract from the Hutt Central Commercial Activity Area.</p>	
32.9	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>Submitters 36, 42, 69, 102, 124, 125, 129, 131, 133, 138, 139, 141, 143, 161 and 248 consider that the proposed retail rules allowing up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> anywhere in the plan change, will undermine commercial areas in the Hutt CBD, Naenae, Stokes Valley, Taita, Moera and Wainuiomata, in addition to Jackson Street.</p>	

32.10	General – Maximum Height, Activity Status and Assessment Criteria	Oppose	Submitters 36, 37, 40, 42, 48, 69, 96, 102, 107, 124, 125, 126, 131, 133, 138, 139, 141, 143, 161, 225 and 248 raise concern about the lack of protection of important views of the hills from the floor of the valley in Petone and from the hills out across Petone to the wharf and Foreshore etc.	There is no protection of the current important views of the hills from the floor of the valley in Petone and also the important views from the hills out across Petone to the wharf and the Foreshore etc. Such protections need to be included and can be achieved by restricting permitted building height and evaluating over height buildings on the basis of their effects on views and other urban design elements.  Submitter 133 also requests the maintenance of view shafts to significant hills and waterways.
32.11	General – Character and Retail Floorspace	Oppose	Submitters 38, 42, 107, and 161 refer to the impact that Queensgate Mall has had on the surrounding shops in the Hutt CBD and raises concern that this could be repeated in Petone.	
32.12	General – Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Oppose	Submitters 69, 133, 143 and 248 refer to a lack of respect for the cultural history of this area.	More protection of the urupa from future development on its boundaries.
32.13	General - Infrastructure	Oppose	Submitters 125, 129, 131, 138, 139, 141, and 161 consider the plan change would have significant adverse effect on supporting infrastructure.	
32.14	General - Character	Oppose	Submitters 32, 42, 48, 96, 102, 107, 125, 126, 129, 131, 138, 139, 141, and 161 consider that it is the character of Jackson Street, which attracts people to the area. Therefore it is very important for this character to remain.	
32.15	General - Character		Submitter 102 identifies themselves as a local resident of Petone for 10 years. They consider that the character of the area must be protected at all cost and that this protection is not achievable under the proposed plan change. They point out that damage to this beautiful area would be irreversible.  Submitter 107 states that the low-rise, open sunny feeling of Petone should be preserved. Allowing unrestrained new retail development risks destroying the character of the area.  Submitter 107 refers to the ‘concrete fortress look’ of Queensgate, as an example of poor quality design which should	Submitter 102 requests that the plan change be reconsidered.

			<p>not be replicated, but is allowable under relaxed planning controls.</p> <p>Submitter 124 states that the love living in Petone and the vibe of it.</p> <p>Submitter 139 raises strong concerns that the plan change would destroy Petone’s character and lower urban amenity values. Petone is well known as the Ponsonby of Wellington, although Petone is better than this area in many ways. Petone’s character and attraction come from its low-rise urban design.</p>	
32.16	General – Design Guidelines and Urban Planning	Oppose	<p>Submitter 42 believes there needs to be a cohesiveness of design, with what has already proved successful.</p> <p>Submitter 96 considers that all development should have to comply with a minimum appropriate design quality.</p> <p>Submitter 96 recommends that the Council look at the proposed plan for the rebuilding of the Christchurch CBD for appropriate features to include in the long term concept plan for Petone. The plan for this city has plenty to commend with its use of low-rise development and green spaces.</p> <p>Submitter 161 considers the plan change would have a devastating effect on Petone. It would lead to a loss of property values, business, jobs and interest in earthquake strengthening. It is considered to be the sort of proposal that the RMA was designed to deter. They believe the plan change is the precursor to low quality, low material, squalid, jam packed accommodation.</p> <p>Submitter 161 is of the view that development of the western end of Petone must be of high quality design and ensure</p>	<p>Submitters 69, 133 and 143 seek: A plan change that will offer excellent guidelines and positive direction for Petone and protection of Wellington Harbour. It needs to offer quality design guidelines for this whole zone, which will also govern the look and feel at the entrance to Petone and affect the whole community for many years to come.</p> <p>Submitter 48 requests that the above type of guidelines also reflects and enhances the established culture and identity of what is Petone today.</p> <p>Submitter 107 requests that the above type of guidelines ensure that all future buildings are designed in a manner which is in harmony with, and appropriate to, the character of Petone.</p> <p>Submitters 96 and 161 state that design guidelines and urban planning should especially increase the unique heritage feel of the area.</p> <p>Submitter 96 requests an overall concept plan for the next 25 years minimum, showing how this will enhance the area, making it a magnet for people to live, to conduct business and enjoy the recreational facilities.</p>

			sustainable community and environmental and community values and futures are achieved	<p>Submitter 133 adds that the plan change needs to draw more heavily on the principles of the NZ Urban Design Strategy and Te Aranga Maori Cultural Landscape Design Strategy.</p> <p>Submitter 161 requests that the Council separate out the diverse changes in this proposal so they can be considered separately. For example, the height of a building should not be considered at the same time as allowing small retail. These are totally separate issues. It's disrespectful, confusing and has an underhand appearance. We simply should be setting higher standards than that.</p>
32.17	General	Oppose	<p>Submitter 38 states that their business recently moved to Jackson Street and had to wait 6 months to secure a property. They comment <i>"DO NOT (author's own emphasis) mess with the one area that is moving ahead in the recession"</i>.</p> <p>Submitter 107 raises concern that new development In Petone West would be at the expense of the existing Petone retail area. New development should not be contrary to the wishes of existing residents. The Petone Vision Statement should be used as a guideline for all future development.</p> <p>Submitter 129 states that he and his young family want to be able to enjoy Petone as a place to walk, shop and use the facilities such as library and parks, without extra congestion and danger to pedestrians. Petone is a wonderful place to live and it has come a long way from the 'dive' it was twenty odd years ago.</p>	
32.18	General - Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>Submitter 38 adds that the permitted height and site coverage provisions would be detrimental to customer's shopping experiences along Jackson Street.</p> <p>Submitter 42 raises concern that the permitted height and site coverage could led to the western entrance to Petone</p>	

			<p>becoming a “canyon’, which detracts from the heritage appearance of Jackson Street.</p> <p>Submitter 96 identifies that a reduction in site coverage is essential to not only convey a feeling of space, but to assist in the run-off of storm water, which could potentially overload the present infrastructure</p>	
32.19	Transportation	Oppose	<p>Submitter 96 points out that the gateway entrance to the Esplanade from the overbridge is already a potential bottleneck. No recognition has been given to the known future growth in commercial and heavy freight traffic through this area, irrespective of the impact from the proposed Grenada to Petone link.</p> <p><i>“This coupled with high-density high-rise development along Jackson Street and the Esplanade will create enclosed canyons filled with queues of smoke belching semi-trailers, totally negating the charm and desire of people who want to shop and live in Petone”.</i></p>	
32.20	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>Submitters 96 and 161 raise concern about the promotion of development near a known fault line.</p>	<p>Submitter 96 requests that the plan identify the risks posed by natural hazards and a warning that any developments within those areas must submit mitigation measures to deal with those risks.</p>
32.21	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>Submitter 107 and 139 raise concern regarding the expansion of retail development in the plan change area. Pointing out there is only so much demand for retail space and that creating new retail areas will inevitably reduce demand somewhere else. Submitter 139 expects job growth in the plan change area to be at the expense of existing jobs.</p> <p>Submitters 124, 126 and 133 raise concern that the proposed retail rules would undermine the vibe of Petone and its boutique nature and village feel/character. Submitter 124 states that they love the lack of big ‘mega stores’ in Petone.</p>	

			Submitters 124 and 126 point that persons seeking large format or mega stores, can find it in nearby areas including Lower Hutt, a short drive away.	
32.22	General - Consultation	Oppose	Submitter 133 considers there needs to be more meaningful engagement with the community about what is desired and what will be beneficial to the whole community and not just a few developers.	Better quality and more meaningful consultation and engagement with the wider Petone community. Wishes to see some public open days on a similar scale to the recent Avalon Park consultation. HCC should not rely on rigid inefficient consultation methods.
32.23	General – Impact on Existing Residents, Building Height and Character	Oppose	<p>Submitter 134 states that the height and site coverage provisions will have an impact on houses located on Nelson Street, as it will cast a shadow over the street, impacting on the view of the hills and severely restricting the sun. This will detract not only from the values of the houses, but the heritage and aesthetic feel of the area.</p> <p>Submitter 141 identifies themselves as a resident of Fitzherbert Street, Petone for over 10 years. Concern is raised that the plan change will seriously compromise his residential amenities. The proposed change allows for properties on Victoria Street <i>“literally over my back fence, to build a 30m structure, right on my western boundary. This is going to largely eliminate afternoon sun and change the whole property from a family home in an attractive residential neighbourhood, into a house that has a large commercial/industrial structure looming over it”</i>.</p> <p>Submitter 141 refers to the cost imposed on long term residents who have to live under the shadow of new developments. The plan change is considered to reduce the attractiveness of his property as a residential home and consequentially lower its value for rental or re-sale.</p>	

DPC29/033 Neil Potter, Director PCPatch Ltd

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
33.1	General	Oppose	The submitter does not believe that the development in the area would attract new businesses. <i>"It would just emulate what has happened in the Hutt, the creation of a lot of dead areas"</i> .	Reject plan change in its current form and make amendments as requested.
33.2	General – Design Guidelines and Preferred Uses	Oppose	The submitter is not opposed to mixed use in general but it must be of high quality design and mainly about residential and commercial development and not retail development.	Clear design guideline for all new buildings across all of the proposed zone that ensures that future buildings are designed in a manner which is respectful to the character of Petone and ensures that there is high quality residential and commercial development.
33.3	General – Character	Oppose	The submitter considers the plan change would completely change the whole character of Jackson Street (and Petone). Allowing lots of small shops in the proposed area would strip shops out of buildings in the heritage precinct.  The submitters want the current heritage area to continue to be the area of small, boutique shops.	Rules to ensure that the current heritage area remains the area of small, boutique shops.
33.4	General – Retail Floorspace, Permitted Activities and Discretionary Activities	Oppose	The submitter considers that allowing retail spaces of up to 10,000m <sup>2</sup> as a non-notified activity, plus the likelihood of developments over 10,000m <sup>2</sup> getting non-notified consent, makes a mockery of having a District Plan at all.  Existing business owners would be attracted to new buildings because of possibly lower insurance premiums and rentals, especially at the start when mall type developments traditionally offer inducements.  The proposed retail rules completely remove the 'protection' of Jackson Street by stealth.  The notification of retail development above 3,000m <sup>2</sup> would allow the community to have some say.	Much tighter rules around retail provisions. The maximum size should be no more than 3,000m <sup>2</sup> .  Public notification of retail development above 3,000m <sup>2</sup> .

**DPC29/034 Bevan and Naomi Knight**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
34.1	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	Permitted buildings heights are too great for the area.  Provision needs to be made for green spaces.	Reduce maximum heights to 18m, with a maximum height of 12m along street frontages.  Retain green spaces.
34.2	General - Character	Oppose	The submitter raises concern that the look of Petone will be spoiled	Alter the plan.

**DPC29/035 Angela M Corrigan**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
35.1	General	Partially Oppose	The submitter states that they do not oppose the changes entirely.	Plan change to be amended.
35.2	General - Character	Oppose	The submitter states that Petone is and always has been a small seaside town with low rise buildings, shops on the ground floor with accommodation above. The Jackson Street Programme has worked hard to retain these characteristics, so that new buildings blend with existing historic premises.  Retention of this character has been part of the Petone success. With Petone becoming an increasingly desirable location to live and attracting shoppers and visitors from far and near. Not all shoppers want the uniformity of other shopping areas, such as malls.	



			The proposed changes could destroy the appeal of Petone. Concern is raised that the Petone could become a low income area with undesirable small apartments, which do not appeal to wealthier buyers. This scenario would also reduce rates revenue for the Council.	
35.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	Increased provisions for retail and commercial development, will allow retail developments to be built in side streets and harm the existing retail area of Jackson Street. The changes would replicate the loss of retail trade which has occurred on High Street, Lower Hutt.	No retail development outside of Jackson Street.
35.4	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>The side streets in the west end of Petone are far too narrow for buildings of 30m height and will become “<i>sunless wind tunnels</i>” in adverse weather.</p> <p>A height limit of 12m would be in keeping with Petone’s small town character and “<i>will please residents</i>”.</p> <p>The absence of green spaces greatly reduces the amount of runoff which can be absorbed naturally. Green areas and gardens are a top priority for most people.</p>	<p>A height limit of 12m to be retained. If heights need to be increased, the maximum should be 15m.</p> <p>Ample provision of car parking and plenty of outdoor living areas and green spaces.</p>
35.5	General - Parking	Oppose	<p>The submitter questions how will parking be provided for residents and visitors in high-density residential developments and retail outlets.</p> <p><i>“As a resident of 27 years in Sydney Street, I have increasingly, experienced problems with cars parked across my driveway which has resulted in missing important appointments”.</i></p>	Ample provision of car parking.

35.6	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The area proposed for buildings up to 30m high is subject to natural hazards, including location on a major fault-line, and risk of liquefaction and maybe tsunami. The area seems a highly dangerous place to build high rise, high-density housing.</p> <p>The risk of liquefaction in Petone is higher than Christchurch, given the shallower depth of the aquifer, and could become even shallower if sea levels rise. A lack of space for natural runoff absorption also increases this risk.</p> <p>The Christchurch experience shows that people are unwilling to live or work in buildings above two stories.</p> <p>The Petone area provides few large areas where emergency civil defence areas could be established, and virtually none in Petone West. Capacity of escape routes by road is already limited, and would be further compromised by higher residential densities.</p>	
35.5	General - Infrastructure	Oppose	The recent floods in Beijing, China are a reminder of what can happen when drainage has not been upgraded to allow for additional housing.	Improving drainage in the event of heavy rainfall and other relevant infrastructure to be improved.

<b>DPC29/039 – John Weeds on behalf of Executive Laundry (Wellington) Ltd.</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
39.1	General	Oppose	The submitter questions the ability of the plan change to attract employment and more people, especially when considering possible relocations from Petone and Lower Hutt.	Reject plan change and appreciate what we have.
39.2	General – Design Guides	Oppose	The submitter states that they are not opposed to economic growth, but it should not be open slather. Development has to be of high quality design to ensure good environmental and community outcomes are achieved.	

39.3	General - Character	Oppose	Petone is one of the very few retail precincts that have worked in the last five years. It attracts people with its heritage and its difference from other shopping areas.	
39.3	General – Preferred Uses and Transportation		<p>The submitter identifies his company as an expanding Commercial Laundry operating in the plan change area. The location of the business was specifically chosen because of its current zone status. The business relies on quick access to the motorway.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern that the plan change would require the future relocation of the business, if residential development is allowed and traffic volumes on the Esplanade increase.</p>	
39.4	General – Maximum Height		Retaining the small scale of existing development is important for future residents and generations.	The small scale of Petone used as the basis for future development.
39.5	General – Retail floor area	Oppose	<p>Small to medium size businesses put money back into the community. Whilst large retail business are generally internationally owned and send money overseas.</p> <p>The current retail rules have worked well for the past 20 years and should stay as they are.</p> <p>Retail should not be permitted on The Esplanade due to parking difficulties and the potential to undermine Jackson Street.</p>	<p>Keep the minimum and maximum floor area of retail activities of 500m<sup>2</sup> and 3000m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Any additional retail development allowed only on the western part of Jackson Street, where it has been allowed in the past.</p>

**DPC29/043 William Wieben**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
43.1	General - Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern that the plan change would compromise the integrity of the Petone Village Character.</p> <p>Visitors to the area come from far and near due to the special village atmosphere.</p>	An integrated policy which gives Petone a better future.
43.2	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned that the proposals would allow for the establishment of a mall, which would ‘rip the heart’ out of Petone.</p> <p>The cost of construction and rentals on shops within malls limits occupiers to large national companies, leading to uniformity. It shuts out local businesses and existing businesses along Jackson Street would either have to compete with a mall or become part of it.</p>	No small, medium or large mall developments.
43.3	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>There should be provision for roadway and pedestrian access, in addition to green space.</p> <p>A front setback of 8m could be used by pedestrians and for off-road temporary parking, such as delivery vehicles.</p>	<p>Buildings south of Jackson Street should have an 8m front setback.</p> <p>Limit building heights to 15m south of Jackson Street.</p>
43.4	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The existing aquifer needs to be recognised, as both a threat in the event of earthquake and as an important asset to Petone.	

DPC29/044 – Mary Ely

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
44.1	General – Character, Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>The submitter objects to both the maximum permitted height and site coverage. The heritage character of Petone would be harmed by “outsized” buildings.</p> <p>Including green spaces and parks in the plan change area, would make it more attractive.</p>	<p>Maximum building height in the Petone West area be no higher than 12m.</p> <p>That the maximum building height along The Esplanade. Jackson Street, Hutt Road and small side streets, buildings height should be 9m with a recession plane of 45 degrees sloping upwards from the front boundary to increase to 12m.</p> <p>That no structure is built that covers 100% of the site.</p> <p>No structure to be built, which does not include green space on at least 10% of the property.</p>
44.2	General - Character	Oppose	<p>Petone has achieved a unique and desirable character/ambience through the vision and hard work of many people. Part of its attraction is its different atmosphere to modern malls.</p>	
44.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises strong concerns that the permitted retail floorspace would allow for the construction of a mall, which would “rip the heart out of Petone’.</p> <p>Building a mall in Petone West would undermine and threaten many of the smaller retailers in Jackson Street. They are working hard just to keep their businesses profitable.</p>	<p>That no structure be permitted that covers more than 3,000m<sup>2</sup> or less than 500m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>That no mall should be built in the Petone West area.</p>
44.4	General – Preferred Uses	Oppose		<p>That residential properties be sited close to already existing properties.</p>

DPC29/045 – Colin Smith				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
45.1	General	Oppose	The submitter states that providing the buildings are not an earthquake risk, don't destroy what you have created there.	
45.2	General - Preferred Uses	Oppose	Petone should be made into a hub where people can do their business. The submitter refers to the accessibility of the area.	The western end of Jackson Street should be industrial/commercial not retail.
45.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	The submitter refers to the possibility of a Westfield type development in Petone, and refers to the impacts that this type of development has had on the High Street area.	
45.4	General - Character	Oppose	Jackson Street is becoming the “Eating Capital of Wellington” with its older character buildings which are suited to this type of business.	

DPC29/046 – Rose Greally				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
46.1	General – Character and Maximum Building Height	Oppose	<p>The submitter finds the plan change worrying. <i>“Petone is a unique working town, complete with charm, rich in history, rich with culture and very fortunate to have few buildings over 3 levels”</i>. The submitter refers to the buzz of Jackson Street.</p> <p>The submitter identifies themselves as born and bred in Petone, and a local with love for the area.</p> <p>The submitter suggests the Council loans shop owners money to strengthen and restore their buildings, as in Napier. As well as making a feature of <i>“our quaint little town”</i>.</p>	<p>Don't turn it (Petone) into an industrial soulless slum in shadows like your plan shows.</p> <p>Protect our heritage and feel of our very special place.</p>

46.2	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	The submitter opposes the creation of a mall in Petone. The plan change is considered to make it possible for a <i>“conglomerate to move in and virtually suck the life from Petone”</i> .	
46.3	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The submitter refers to the more stable ground in Lower Hutt.	

<b>DPC29/050 – Nik Zangouropoulos on behalf of the Petone Historical Society</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
50.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter identifies himself as a local resident which grew up in Petone and as the president of the Petone Historical Society. The submitter moved back to Petone, partially because of the vibrancy of the area.</p> <p>The Petone Historical Society (PHS) was founded in 1980 and has a current membership of approximately 75 persons. PHS has represented the heritage arm of the Jackson Street Programme since 2003. The submission refers to the objectives of the group and its previous activities.</p> <p>Although PHS is in favour of development in Petone, the version of development permitted by the plan change is considered to be a serious direct threat to the real development of Petone. They are concerned that the permissive nature of the plan change will create conditions that could extinguish the hard fought development gains of the last two decades and seriously threaten the heritage character of central Petone.</p>	Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments.

			<p>Over this time, Petone has transformed from an industrial, working class suburb with a functional feel, to an attractive boutique local that people want to visit. A constant theme has been the rich history and heritage of the town. The direct result of initiatives has been a highly attractive array of eateries and other retail outlets that is often compared to Ponsonby in Auckland or suburbs in Melbourne.</p> <p>The PHS disagrees with the presentation of supporting material in the plan change. The reference to \$294 million over a 20 year period, ignores the costs of the plan change. They state it is <i>“intellectually dishonest to ignore these costs on the doubtful claim that they are difficult to estimate.”</i></p> <p>The Society states that there is overwhelming opposition to the aspects of the plan change that threaten the viability of Jackson Street.</p>	
50.2	General – Character/Heritage	Oppose	<p>Submitter states that the success of the town has laid the foundations for protection and preserving a regionally and nationally significant heritage area. The mix of buildings from Victorian, Edwardian and inter-war periods provides a rich blend of architectural styles that is quite rare in New Zealand. A fact recognised by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust’s registration of the area as a Heritage Precinct.</p>	
50.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>Allowing for any size retail up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> in any part of the plan change area could create the conditions <i>“for a fatal blow to be inflicted on the viability of the Jackson Street’s shopping precinct. The freedom to create a Johnsonville mall like enterprise side by side with the existing small scale, boutique stores that are spread over the length of Jackson Street, would have only one result: consigning Jackson Street to a death spiral”</i>.</p> <p>The permitted floorspace of 10,000m<sup>2</sup> represents well over half</p>	<p>The current small scale, boutique and comfortably spread out retail regime of Petone retained as the basis for any future development of the town.</p> <p>The existing retail rules should remain at the present levels of 500m<sup>2</sup> minimum and 3,000m<sup>2</sup> maximum outside the heritage precinct.</p> <p>Any further retail development should only be allowed in the part of the proposed area along the western end of Jackson Street, that it has been allowed in the past.</p>



			<p>the combined existing retail floorspace of the Jackson Street heritage precinct. The plan change would allow multiple retail facilities of this size.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the impact of Queensgate Mall has had on the Lower Hutt town centre, as what can happen when a large multi-use retail facility is erected next to an existing town centre. This phenomenon has been repeated in other parts of the wider region.</p> <p>The existing retail regime has worked fantastically well for Petone.</p>	
50.4	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	The submitter considers that buildings up to 30 metres high (ten stories) with 100% site coverage would decrease the attractiveness of the area.	The maximum height restrictions should be less than or equal to half the proposed maximum of 30 metres (i.e. up to 15m).
50.5	General – Design Guides, Foreshore and Open Spaces	Oppose	The lack of quality design guidance and the absence of recreational/landscape options will diminish the amenity value of the foreshore.	Clear and proper design guidelines for all new buildings in the proposed zone including provision for adequate recreational and other ancillary areas, within a general framework that is compatible with the fresh, emerging character of Petone.

*Submitters supporting Submission: – Submitter 75 - Zandra Brickhill, Submitter 97 - Basil Chan and 162 - Jonathan Lewis*

<b>DPC29/051 Jacqui Gilchrist</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
51.1	General	Oppose	<p>Petone is unique/quirky from other areas.</p> <p><i>“Paint it tart it up then leave it”.</i></p>	<p><i>“Tarting Up”</i> of existing businesses in the Petone area.</p> <p>Inject funds into existing buildings and surrounds.</p> <p>Leave Petone in its original form.</p>
51.2	General –	Oppose	The area does not need high-rise buildings.	Keep all buildings at existing height.

	Maximum Building Height			No high-rise buildings permitted.
51.2	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	A mall in the area, would replicate issues experienced in Lower Hutt.	No malls permitted.

<b>DPC29/052 Burton Consultants on behalf of Z Energy Limited.</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
52.1	Amendment 10	Oppose	<p>Proposed provisions in the plan do not clearly permit works that would be associated with the re-tanking of an existing service station. The effects of tank removal and/or replacement activities at their ordinary scale can be adequately controlled to ensure that they are less than minor. The District Plan should not impose unnecessary restrictions.</p> <p>As part of its normal ongoing service station operation at Z Petone (60 Hutt Road), the company is required to maintain, remove or replace its Underground Petroleum Storage Systems (UPSS) from time to time. This involves earthworks of a temporary nature.</p> <p>Potential health risks from the activity are already controlled pursuant to the 'Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011 (NES)'. There is no need for additional controls to be imposed through the District Plan.</p> <p>Restrictions on re-tanking in the District Plan would impose significant costs and unnecessary delays for a standardised procedure, which is already appropriately regulated through</p>	<p>Provide for the retanking of an existing service station on sites fronting Jackson Street, Hutt Road or the Esplanade as a permitted activity, subject only to meeting the hazardous substances standards in the Plan.</p> <p>The following wording is suggested:</p> <p><i>"5B 2.2.1 Permitted Activities</i></p> <p><i>(o) On sites with frontage to Jackson Street, Hutt Road or the Esplanade.</i></p> <p><u><i>iii) The replacement of existing fuel storage tanks and ancillary equipment works at existing service stations, subject only to meeting the hazardous substances rule in the Plan".</i></u></p> <p>Adopt any other such relief, including additions, deletions or consequential amendments necessary as a result of the matters raised in these submissions, as necessary to give effect to this submission.</p>

			the NES.	
--	--	--	----------	--

<b>DPC29/054 – Brett John Nicholls on behalf of The Chocolate Story Ltd</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
54.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter identifies himself as the director of a store which opened in April this year. The store's customers come from across the Wellington region.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern that the plan change could result in Jackson Street losing its reputation as a great destination.</p>	Reject the plan change in its current form and amend.
54.2	General – Character and Transportation	Oppose	The proposed plan is too broad and risky for this area. It may negatively affect the heritage character, look and feel of the Jackson Street Heritage Area and the regions traffic flow.	
54.2	General – Retail Floor Area and Transportation	Oppose	<p>Allowing retail up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> anywhere in the proposed area could harm the heritage area and will undermine Jackson Street and the greater Hutt region.</p> <p>Jackson Street is known for its boutique type stores, not large retail complexes.</p> <p>The current traffic flow is just sufficient for most businesses to operate, additional large retail complexes would make it no longer feasible to operate on Jackson Street and push some owner/occupiers out of business.</p> <p>Retailing along The Esplanade would create traffic congestion and parking issues, as well as negatively impact on businesses</p>	<p>Allowable retail spaces to be kept at their present level of between 500m<sup>2</sup> and 3,000m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Retail development to be restricted to Jackson Street.</p>

			on Jackson Street.	
54.3	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	Provisions for buildings 30m high could result in an unattractive area, reduced sunlight and blocked views.	Reduction in permitted height across the whole area to 12m to 15m maximum.  The permitted site coverage area should be reduced to allow for the provision of green spaces and landscaping.
54.4	General – Design Guides	Oppose	The lack of quality design guides is likely to result in poor-quality development lowering the value of the area.  Guidelines need to be clearly stated in all zones. Petone has already lost some of its character. Design guidelines need to increase the value of the area and compliment the unique history of the area.	Use of guidelines to ensure that future buildings are designed to reinforce the character of Jackson Street and Petone.

<b>DPC29/055 – Laura Skilton</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
55.1	General	Partial Support	The submitter supports high density and mixed-use development. They refer to the proximity of the plan change area to Petone Railway Station.  The submitter identifies themselves as a transport planner and resident of Petone. Attached to the original submission are several photographs of parking on local roads.	
55.2	General – Maximum Height and Maximum Site Coverage		The submitter has concerns about 100% site coverage and a 30m building height. They refer to the possibility of 30m tall buildings adjacent to ground level parking areas and single large buildings covering large areas of a site.	

			<p>A few tall buildings scattered amongst low rise development (as is the case at present) is considered to have a worse appearance than a more uniform building height. Visual impacts are made worse by parking at ground level. The Wellington Post Centre is considered to provide an example of the negative impact of large buildings on surrounding areas.</p> <p>Plans showing permitted height limits under the current district plan and proposed plan change are attached to the original submission.</p>	
55.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	The submitter strongly opposes Integrated Retail Developments up to maximum of 10,000m <sup>2</sup> .	The maximum area for any form of retail, whether integral or single development should be much lower, such as 3,000m <sup>2</sup> , the floorspace limit allowed under current provisions.
55.4	Amendment 4	Partial Support	<p>The submitter agrees with the policies for the proposed amendment, but does not consider that the plan provisions (particularly the maximum permitted retail floorspace) would allow the achievement of policy 5B1.1.2 (b).</p> <p>A visual mock-up of the approximate footprint of a retail development with a floorarea of 10,000m<sup>2</sup> (at ground level), plus associated car parking area, overlaid onto an aerial plan is attached to the original submission.</p>	
55.5	Amendment 10	Oppose	<p>The wording of 5B 2.2.1 (a) suggests a single retail outlet of any size (such as K’Mart) could be established in the plan change area, providing it is not an integrated retail area. A floorspace of 10,000m<sup>2</sup> is too large already.</p> <p>The submitter objects to the proposed change to rule 5B 2.2.1 (e), which places restrictions on the location of service stations as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Service Stations need to be on road frontages with high traffic volumes. Service stations located on quieter roads would bring</p>	<p>Alter the wording of Rule 5B 2.2.1 (A) to read: Retail activities, excluding <u>retail activities</u> and integrated retail development exceeding <del>10,000m<sup>2</sup> in total combined floor area</del> <u>3,000m<sup>2</sup></u>.</p> <p>Alter the wording of Rule 5B 2.2.1 (e) to read: Service stations excluding on sites with road frontage to <del>the Esplanade, Hutt Road or Jackson Street.</del></p> <p>Remove Rule 5B 2.2.1 (g) regarding Brothels and commercial sex services.</p>

			<p>traffic into local roads, or else close down from lack of custom. No objection is raised to the banning of service stations on Jackson Street.</p> <p>The submitter goes on to say that service stations on The Esplanade or Hutt Road should at least be a Restricted Discretionary Activity, with the requirement of a traffic impact assessment. Service stations on these roads need to be managed to ensure that traffic movements do not impact on the capacity of the road.</p> <p>The submitter objects to rule 5B 2.2.1 (g) as they do not consider the use of brothels and commercial sex services appropriate in a high-density mixed-use location where residential development is permitted.</p> <p>The submitter refers to rules 5B 2.2.1 (o) and (p) as confusing and potentially contradictory. They note there is no definition of demolition or partial demolition in the District Plan.</p>	Clarify rules 5B 2.2.1 (o) and (p).
55.6	Amendment 12	Oppose	The submitter objects to rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (d) (i) regarding the front treatment of buildings adjacent Jackson Street. This rule implies that retail buildings will occur here, when other commercial activities are also permitted. Commercial buildings do not require display windows. The submitter points out that two commercial businesses on Jackson Street have covered their display windows to block views of the inside of the building.	Alter the wording of Rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (d) (i) to read: <del>All buildings should be built to the front boundary of the site and have display windows along the frontage. The ground floor façade surface shall have a minimum of 60% transparent glass display windows.</del>
55.7	Amendment 22 and 24	Oppose	The submitter refers to potential confusion between rules 5B 2.2.2.1 (c) and Rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (b) as to the activity status of buildings above 12m in height.	Either clarify rules 5B 2.2.2 (b) and (c) or remove the clause that says applications do not need to be publicly notified.
55.8	Amendment 31	Oppose	A maximum retail development of 10,000m <sup>2</sup> is too large.	Alter the wording of Rule 5B 2.2.3 (d) to read: All retail activities <del>within an</del> and integrated retail developments with a gross floor area exceeding <del>10,000m<sup>2</sup></del> 3,000m <sup>2</sup> .

55.9	Amendment 57	Oppose	<p>The submitter objects to the reduced car parking provision of 1 space per 2 residential units and suggests this should be 1 space per residential unit. On street parking is at a premium already with many businesses in the area not providing enough parking, with parking overflowing onto roads. The proposed car parking requirement will make this worse.</p> <p>Retail developments greater than 500m<sup>2</sup> should have the standard minimum retail parking requirements as set out in the current District Plan. The reduced level of car parking is satisfactory within Lower Hutt CBD, but is not appropriate for the plan change area, where there is a much wider range of activities and greater demand for on-street parking. The submitter refers to rail commuters parking on the local roads.</p> <p>Many streets in Petone are narrow and do not have space for on-street parking. Parking requirements must therefore ensure that there is no overspill car parking onto roads.</p>	<p>Alter the wording of Rule 14A 2.1 (2) (ii) to read</p> <p>...minimum parking requirement for residential activities is 1 space <del>for every two residential units</del> <u>per residential unit.</u></p> <p>...minimum parking requirement for retail activities and licensed premises shall be based on the following graduated scale:</p> <p>Less than 500m<sup>2</sup>GFA – Nil  <u>Greater than 500m<sup>2</sup> – as per the minimum parking standards for retail set out in Appendix Transport 3.</u></p> <p><del>More than 500m<sup>2</sup> GFA but less than 1500m<sup>2</sup> GFA – 1 space per 100m<sup>2</sup></del>  <del>More than 1500m<sup>2</sup> but less than 3000m<sup>2</sup> GFA – 2 spaces per 100m<sup>2</sup></del>  <del>More than 5000m<sup>2</sup> GFA – 5 spaces per 100m<sup>2</sup> GFA</del></p>
------	--------------	--------	--	--

<b>DPC29/058 – Carolyn Roper</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
58.1	General – Character, Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage and Permitted Activities	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern that the lack of requirements in the plan change would lead to the ‘disastrous’ transformation of the western end of Petone.</p> <p>The submitter refers to building height, 100% site coverage and the non-requirement of resource consent.</p>	<p>Guarantee that the heritage factor of Petone is retained.</p> <p>The submitter would like HCC to provide the public with a model (which many people find easier to understand than written descriptions) and give the public adequate time to view, object etc.</p> <p>A further guarantee that Jackson Street will not suffer the same fate as High Street in Lower Hutt. Jackson Street is a thriving, wonderful and unique main street – long may it remain so.</p>

58.2	General – Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Oppose		Given that there is a burial ground in Te Puni Street. I assume that this will be untouched and not surrounded with tall buildings.
------	---	--------	--	---

DPC29/059 Melissa Bailey				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
59.1	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage and Impact on Existing Residential Properties	Oppose	A height of 30m and 100% site coverage would detrimentally affect neighbouring residential properties, including my home.	Requirement for green spaces and a restriction on building heights in streets adjacent to residential areas.

DPC29/070 Roger Bacshaw				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
70.1	General	Oppose	The submitter states that are not opposed to mixed-use development, but changes to the District Plan must be of high and respected quality. People must be central to all planning.  The submitter identifies himself as a local worker and resident of over 30 years, with involvement in a range of community activities.	That the plan change in its current form is rejected and that a more sympathetic plan is introduced.
70.2	General –	Oppose	100% site coverage is not acceptable. Much of Petone is barely	A maximum height of 15m, setback from the footpath. Maybe a



	Maximum Height and Site Coverage, Infrastructure, Natural Hazard and Character		<p>one mete above sea level and very flat. There is need for less buildings and more open space, with permeable surfaces to allow rainwater penetration and to avoid further overloading the storm-water drainage systems.</p> <p>A 30m height limit is not acceptable, due to seismic risk and the current nature of Petone with its narrow streets and the existing heritage character.</p> <p>There should be no relaxation of existing building regulations or guidelines.</p>	setback of 6m, wherever a building of over a single storey abuts a footpath.
70.3	General – Natural Hazard	Oppose	<p>West Petone is a known seismic risk area. The recent seismic history of Christchurch has shown how low-lying areas can be subjected to intense destructive flooding and liquefaction. The Hutt Valley has long been considered at much greater risk from earthquake activity than Christchurch.</p> <p>Plans for future development need to take these natural hazard risks into account.</p>	
70.4	General – Design Guides, Open Space and Landscaping, Preferred Uses, Energy Efficiency and Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage.	Oppose	<p>Any further development must be of a high quality of design in respect of people and the environment and not based on the principle of maximum profit.</p> <p>Suggestions for the development of the plan change area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open areas and spaces including lawns;</li> <li>• Groups of trees;</li> <li>• Open courtyards;</li> <li>• Sheltered and open walkways and cycle-ways;</li> <li>• Areas of water and outdoor display areas;</li> <li>• Business area of small businesses, trade and small manufacturing,</li> <li>• human-scale low rise apartments that are designed to suit the locality, and</li> <li>• solar power fixtures, and rainwater recycling.</li> </ul>	

70.5	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	High density occupation in West Petone, such as malls and shopping centres, would destroy the existing heritage feel and community of Jackson Street, which has been protected and encouraged in the past.	
70.6	General – Preferred Uses	Oppose	Petone is known for its history of small businesses, trade and small manufacturing. Perhaps this is the type of business to suit this area.	

<b>DPC29/073 – Andred and Rebecca Saker</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
73.1	General – General, Character, Open Spaces,	Oppose	<p>The submission supports the comments of the Petone Community Board, whom the submitters believe has got the right balance between uncontrolled development and maintaining the status quo.</p> <p>The submitters state they are not opposed to new development, but <i>“uncontrolled development may lead to the construction of largely unappealing and purely functional buildings that in the long run would seriously undermine the attraction of a place like Petone.”</i></p> <p>The design of new buildings would be driven by cost as they are built for business purposes and would therefore exclude many features that would enhance people’s experience of the area.</p>	Amend the District Plan to unreservedly reflect all of the views of the Petone Community Board.

			<p>Green spaces are required to make any place of living or employment more enjoyable. However they will not be provided by the private sector. The submitters suggest that the Council should set aside some land in the plan change to allow for them.</p> <p>The submitters believe that <i>“as Wellington reaches its natural boundaries areas like Petone will become more and more sought after and Council will therefore not have to entice developers by allowing uncontrolled development”</i>.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

DPC29/074 Lois Robertson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
74.1	General	Oppose	The submitter identifies themselves as a local resident, who considers Petone to be one of the loveliest places in Wellington. The submitter is opposed to the plan change.	
74.2	General - Character	Oppose	<p>Petone has developed a very special character, which attracts shoppers and residents from all around Wellington. It features a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• multi-cultural population;</li> <li>• strong interest in sports;</li> <li>• residents of mixed ages;</li> <li>• historic characteristics; and</li> <li>• small, boutique shops.</li> </ul> <p>The area has attracted young families and professional people who are interested in restoring Villa houses and obviously like Petone for its historical character.</p>	

			Previous residents have worked hard to establish this character and it is important that this is preserved.	
74.3	General - Foreshore	Oppose	<p>The beach area must be protected. Tall buildings along the beach front are not wanted.</p> <p>On the weekend, many people enjoy walking along the foreshore. The beach area included in the plan change area is developing into a special area for boating and canoes with many young people involved. The people do not want this area overshadowed by tall buildings.</p>	Areas along The Esplanade to stay as General Business.
74.4	General – Permitted Activities	Oppose	The proposed rezoning from General Business to a Petone Commercial Area will change the character of the area. An open commercial area where any size of building can be built is not wanted.	
74.5	General – Retail Floorspace		The people do not want an area of large commercial shops and businesses. Petone has a reputation for small boutique shops and this is what people outside the area come to see.	
74.6	General – Maximum Height	Oppose	The area must be protected from developers who wish to build tall buildings.	
74.7	General – Open Space	Oppose	<p>It is important that all residential areas in Petone have some outdoor area. Green and garden areas must be planned in any group housing complex.</p> <p>The women who proposed Central Park in New York met with much opposition a century ago. But look how valuable this park is today and how many people use it.</p>	
74.8	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The risk of earthquakes must be remembered in any planning.	

**DPC29/076 – Ruth Mansell**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
76.1	General – General, Character, and Design Guidelines	Oppose	<p>The plan change prevents the achievement of a mixed use area that is environmentally friendly, safe and pleasant for people to live and work in, and which compliments the heritage character of Petone as a whole.</p> <p>The plan change does not encourage or require high quality design. It does not ensure that good environmental outcomes are achieved. It does not ensure that the village scale, look and feel of Petone is protected and enhanced.</p>	<p>Reject plan change in its current form and make amendments as requested.</p> <p>Rules and design guides for all residential buildings which address resident’s need for sun, light and outdoor space. Each apartment unit should have a minimum of 70m<sup>2</sup> allowed for single occupancy.</p>
76.2	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>Buildings 30 metres high with 100% site coverage across nearly all the area proposed is far too permissive. It would change the look and character of Petone. Buildings would block out sunshine, light and views of the hills and harbour.</p>	<p>Significant reduction in permitted site coverage to allow for green spaces, shared community spaces and landscaping on street frontages of buildings.</p> <p>Reduction in the permitted height across the whole area to 15m maximum.</p>
76.3	General – Retail floor area	Oppose	<p>The retail rules are detrimental to the flourishing shopping area in Jackson Street. The submitter raises the concern that <i>“new shops will compete with the small businesses in the Heritage Precinct, hollowing it out, leaving it to the sad fate of lower High St”</i>.</p> <p>Keeping the existing retail floorspace provisions will protect and retain the Jackson Street Heritage area.</p>	<p>Keep the minimum and maximum floor area of retail activities of 500m<sup>2</sup> and 3000m<sup>2</sup> respectively.</p>
76.4	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers the plan change is irresponsible in relation to its treatment of high natural hazards from earthquake, liquefaction, tsunami and flooding.</p>	<p>Rules for all structures in the vicinity of the Wellington Fault to property address earthquake, liquefaction and tsunami risks.</p>

<b>DPC29/077 – Kirsten Gendall</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
77.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	The submitter raises concern that the proposal will adversely affect the village character, look and feel of Petone. In addition to possible negative environmental impacts.	Plan change as currently worded be rejected and that amendments be made.
77.2	General – Maximum Height and Maximum Site Coverage	Oppose	Concern is raised that buildings 30m high with 100% site coverage would undermine the attractiveness of the area.	The permitted height of buildings across the whole area be reduced significantly and the permitted site coverage reduced to allow for the provision of green spaces and a lot of landscaping.
77.3	General – Open Space and Landscaping	Oppose	The submitter would like to see more emphasis and inclusion of green spaces in the area as a whole (such as a park or outdoor community space) and on individual sites	Some land/space put aside for a community area that could be developed into a park or some kind of outdoor community space.
77.4	General – Design Guidelines	Oppose	The Council should be sending out a clear message to potential developers that any buildings should meet the highest possible environmental standards.	Environmentally sustainable design guidelines/requirements for all new buildings across all of the proposed zone that have the provision of outdoor areas/space and also guidelines that ensure that buildings are designed in a manner which is respectful to the character of Petone.
77.5	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	The proposed retail rules allowing up to 10,000m <sup>2</sup> anywhere, would undermine other areas in the Hutt including existing retailers on Jackson Street. The submitter strongly opposes mall developments, which are considered plentiful, unattractive and unpleasant.	Rules that prevent the development of mall type retail developments in this area.

<b>DPC29/078 – James Mansell</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
78.1	General	Oppose	Provisions in the plan could completely alter the character of Petone.	

78.2	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	The maximum building height should be well below 30m. Landscaping and building setback should be required.	12m building height maximum. Set rules for landscaping and setback.
78.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	Rules should limit the size of retail buildings to the “ <i>present values</i> ”.	“ <i>Revert to the present values as to size of retail buildings</i> ”.
78.4	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	Special requirements should be set to limit potential damage from earthquakes etc. etc. for the whole area, and not just the ‘Wellington Fault Area’. Christchurch has shown that damage can extend up to 10km from the earthquake epicentre.	Add rules requiring special earthquake etc. plans and certificates according to best engineering requirements.

<b>DPC29/080 – Andrew Showler on behalf of Redwood Group Ltd.</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
80.1	Amendment 11	Oppose	<p>The proposed provision of a recession plane for buildings above 15m is supported for sites above 1,000m<sup>2</sup>, but not for sites below this area.</p> <p>The application of this rule for sites less than 1,000m<sup>2</sup>, would prevent landowners/developers from being able to gain the full effect of the proposed plan change and the new 30m height limit. Smaller, narrower sites would yield some very odd shaped buildings over 15m.</p>	Remove the Recession Plane requirement for buildings above 15m height on sites under 1,000m <sup>2</sup> .

DPC29/081 – Wendy Saunders				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
81.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>The submitter states that the submission should be taken as including the views expressed in the GNS Science submission, regarding natural hazards.</p> <p>The submitter identifies themselves as a member of the Making Places Reference Group, but confirms the submission is not made on behalf of this group.</p>	<p>For Hutt City Council not to support the plan change.</p> <p>The Council include the Making Places document into the Section 32 Analysis, and ensures the proposed plan change will not compromise the vision for the CBD.</p>
81.2	General – Section 32 Analysis and Impact on Hutt CBD		<p>The list of background documents reviewed in the Section 32 report does not include the publication ‘CBD Making Places: Hutt City Council’s project to transform the CBD toward the year 2030’ published in 2009.</p> <p>The proposed plan change will undermine the Making Places Project, the money that has been invested in it (over \$2 million) and the community who have been involved and supported it.</p> <p><i>“The Hutt is not big enough to have two competing areas for mixed use development, and with empty shops and buildings already common in the CBD, this proposed plan change has the potential to have a large impact on the businesses remaining. There is also not the population to support two areas of apartment-style mixed use development...The Council either needs to have a whole of Hutt strategy in place so that proposals do not undermine each other, or just back the CBD project”.</i></p>	<p>That Council put some thought into a whole of Hutt approach to development over the next 20 years, to ensure various growth proposals do not undermine each other.</p> <p>The Council support the Making Places project and withdraws its support for the proposed plan change.</p>



81.3	Natural Hazards and Section 32 Analysis	Oppose	<p>The Section 32 analysis does not refer to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, which is considered to provide relevant policies to the plan change area in respect to coastal hazards, with policy 25 making reference to considering the potential effects of tsunami.</p> <p>Petone is identified by Bell and Hannah 2012 as one of the predicted worse affected areas by climate change in New Zealand.</p>	Include the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement into the Section 32 Analysis, and ensure the proposed plan change will adhere to the policies in the document.
81.4	General – Design Guides	Oppose	<p>Although the Section 32 report refers to the Urban Design Protocol, the proposed plan change is not considered to seek to implement the protocol. Contrary to statements contained in the protocol the plan change is considered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undermine the unique identity of Petone, and Jackson Street in particular;</li> <li>• Have no clear direction or widely shared vision for the Hutt; and</li> <li>• Undermine the goals for the Lower Hutt CBD that has been set under Making Places.</li> </ul>	The Council understand the implications of the plan change with their obligations under the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol.
81.5	General - Transportation	Not stated	The submitter refers to the accessibility of the Hutt CBD.	<p>Council acknowledge that the Hutt CBD provides a similar level of transport opportunities than those at Petone West.</p> <p>That a full traffic assessment is undertaken, including a comparison to the CBD.</p>

**DPC29/084 – Jane Helen Blandford**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
84.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter is opposed to the plan change, as it is considered to undermine the heritage character of Petone. The Jackson Street shops, restaurants and cafes are unique within the whole Wellington area.</p> <p>The submitter suggests that an independent commissioner is needed to hear the submissions.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks that the Hutt City Council do not support this plan change.</p> <p>The submitter wants the Council to take this opportunity to create a wonderful, progressive entrance to Petone and the Hutt, that will take Petone forward in a positive direction that is beneficial for the whole area and withdraw their support for this proposed plan change.</p>
84.2	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	Retail rules permitting developments up to 10,000m <sup>2</sup> would seriously undermine Jackson Street and the Hutt Central Business District. It would “drag” both retailers and people from these areas.	The submitter wants to see existing retail rules for outside the Heritage precinct to stay as they are now – 500m <sup>2</sup> (minimum) and 3,000m <sup>2</sup> (maximum).
84.3	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to buildings being allowed up to 30m high, with 100% site coverage. These buildings would block views, block sun and result in shading and detract from the heritage feel and look of Petone.	
84.4	General – Design Guidelines, Foreshore and Landscaping	Oppose	The plan change has a lack of quality guidelines, including setbacks, especially on The Esplanade. This would result in poor-quality development with no urban parks or landscaping.	<p>To offer quality design guidelines for the whole Western End of Petone with urban planning being involved, as this is an important part of the Wellington harbour as an entrance way to the Hutt City.</p> <p>That quality design guidelines are required for all new building in the area.</p> <p>That each residential apartment must have an outside area and rules to ensure access to sunlight in all apartments.</p> <p>That Hutt City Council understands their obligations as a signatory to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol.</p>
84.5	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The submitter would like the Council to learn from the earthquake in Christchurch.	

### DPC29/085 Murray Blandford

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
85.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter is of the view that the permissive nature of the plan changes seriously threatens the current Jackson Street vibe. A new shopping area in the plan change area would result in the swapping of a unique and vibrant environment for something found in many other areas.</p> <p>Jackson Street has changed in the past 10-15 years from a “Dead Zone” to one of the most alive shopping areas in Wellington, with people from all over Wellington choosing to walk, shop and enjoy the many varied restaurants, cafes and shops it provides.</p>	<p>That the Council withdraw their support for the proposed district plan change 29.</p> <p>That the Council has a long-term development plan for the whole of the Hutt to ensure various growth proposals do not undermine but complement each other.</p>

### DPC29/086 – Allan Hyslop

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
86.1	General - Character	Oppose	The proposed plan change as currently worded would result in undesirable effects on the heritage, character, look and feel of Petone. The submitter states <i>“It appears that the plan change is all about greed and very little about need”</i> .	Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments.
86.2	General – Building Height and Site Coverage, Transportation and Infrastructure.	Oppose	<p>Buildings 30m high with 100% site coverage are far too permissive and would detract from the character and amenity values of the area.</p> <p><i>“The vertical growth proposed is not the way forward for</i></p>	

			<i>Petone because of insufficient parking, over burdening of infrastructure, the visual pollution i.e. blocking people's views of the hills and the sea".</i>	
86.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	The proposed retail rules will destroy the current balance of retail, residential and commercial activities that makes up the unique character of Petone.	
86.4	General – Design Guidelines	Oppose		Quality design guidelines that ensure future buildings are designed in a manner which is respectful to the character of Petone.
86.5	General – Natural Hazards and Open Space	Oppose	This is the ideal opportunity to learn from Christchurch and provide a multi-purpose green space.	A recreation green area that caters not only for the daily needs of the various groups and sectors, but can also become a facility in the event of an emergency/disaster i.e. water, power, sewerage and green space for people to gather.

<b>DPC29/087 – Norma Edlin</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
87.1	General – Design Guidelines	Oppose	The submitter states that they are opposed to the lack of quality design guidelines for both residential and commercial buildings.	Reject the Plan Change in its current form and make amendments.  Clear design guidelines for all new buildings across all of the proposed zone, that includes the provision of outdoor areas for each residential apartment and access to sunlight ensured.
87.2	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose		The permitted height across the whole area reduced to a maximum of 15m and the permitted site coverage reduced to allow for the provision of green spaces and landscaping.
87.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	No retail should be permitted on The Esplanade due to parking difficulties and the potential to undermine Jackson Street.	Retailing to be kept as at present to 500m <sup>2</sup> minimum and 3000m <sup>2</sup> maximum, with Jackson Street as the focus of any retail development.  No retail development on The Esplanade.

87.4	General – Open Space	Oppose	This would be a perfect entry into the Hutt Valley.	Reserve area to be included in the proposed plan area that connects the beach to the green belt of the hills with a walkway, cycle tracks which could include a wetlands area.
------	----------------------	--------	---	--

<b>DPC29/088 Graeme Claridge</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
88.1	General	Oppose	The submitter objects to the proposed district plan changes.	
88.2	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage and Impacts on Amenity of Existing Residents	Oppose	<p>The plan change will permit the construction of buildings up to 30m with total site coverage, anywhere within the plan change area.</p> <p>The submitter considers that such buildings should be setback from sites at present zoned as residential. Buildings as shown in the summary document, would drastically reduce the amount of light received by the submitter’s property on Campbell Terrace, as well as any privacy current enjoyed by residents of Campbell Terrace.</p>	The setback of such buildings (buildings up to 30m height) from existing residential sites.

<b>DPC29/089 – Nick Androutsos on behalf of the Greek Orthodox Community of Hutt Valley Incorporated</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
89.1	General	Oppose	The submitter points out that the local Greek community has had a long association with the Hutt Valley and with Petone in	Amend the proposed plan change in regards to height and retail space.

			<p>particular. The organisation became a separate entity from the wider Wellington Greek community in the early 1970's. It currently owns a property at 23 Bay Street, Petone which has been used as a Church and school since 1977.</p> <p><i>"The Greek Community has had the pleasure of seeing its local neighbourhood transform miraculously from the near ghost town that it had become in the mid-1980's to the buzzing, exciting and very progressive place that it currently is. At the heart of this Petone success story has been the well-known transformation of Jackson Street".</i></p> <p>The submitter adds that they are happy that large wholesale type operations have found a niche in the plan change area, as that provides locals with a great mix of shopping options.</p>	Remainder of the plan to be seriously reviewed as per other submissions, especially in terms of design guidelines.
89.2	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The submitter strongly opposes the plan change because it gives <i>"developers the freedom to create large retail premises that would shift the balance from a vibrant town centre to a small peripheral block of land"</i>. If Petone repeated the experience of Lower Hutt, it would be very sad for Greek New Zealand families living in the area.</p>	Existing retail provisions relating to mixed use retail space be maintained so that large mall like structures cannot be built.
89.3	General – Maximum Height	Oppose	<p>The maximum height limit of 30m is out of character with the rest of Petone.</p>	A significant reduction in the proposed maximum height limit of 30m.

<b>DPC29/090 – Jennifer Gray</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
90.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern that the proposed plan change would result in Petone losing its heritage character. <i>"Successive councils have turned the Lower Hutt CBD into one of the ugliest</i></p>	<p>Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments.</p> <p>Please listen to the people of Petone and rethink Proposed Plan Change</p>

			<p><i>cities in New Zealand with a mish-mash of buildings without any character whatsoever and the proposed plan looks to turn Petone into the same”.</i></p> <p>Many people visit Petone from outside the local area because of its uniqueness and free parking. If the plan change goes ahead, Jackson Street is in danger of returning to the “<i>decrepit state</i>” it was in 20 years ago.</p> <p>The submitter looks forward to seeing Petone grow and prosper, but not at the expense of the existing business people and residents (voters).</p>	29.
90.2	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage, Foreshore and Landscaping	Oppose	<p>The proposed 100% site coverage allowing no landscaping or green areas will detract from the heritage look of the area and turn Petone into “<i>just another bland shopping centre</i>”.</p> <p>A lack of setbacks will detract from the area. The Esplanade is enjoyed by locals and non-local alike. This is the gateway to Lower Hutt and should be a show-piece. Concern is raised regarding overshadowing from 10 storey buildings.</p>	<p>Lower the permitted height of buildings. Plan for more landscaping.</p>
90.3	General – Retail Floorspace and Transportation	Oppose	<p>Traffic on The Esplanade is already a “<i>nightmare</i>”. If more apartment blocks are built or retail allowed on The Esplanade, it will result in more traffic build up and more delays.</p> <p>The submitter also poses the question of where is the cross-city link that has been talked about for years.</p>	<p>Allow more parking for residential apartments. Keep existing retail rules in place.</p>

**DPC29/091 – Patrick Moriarity**

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
91.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter is of the view that the plan change is ill-considered, piecemeal, haphazard and lacking in vision and enterprise. Stating that its only value appears to be offering financiers and developers a “free hand”.</p> <p>The area is described as valuable real estate and one of the ‘jewels in the city crown’. Careful, thoughtful development is needed to enhance the value of the heritage area and its rateable value.</p> <p>The submitter questions the timing and demand for any of the expansion envisaged. <i>“The high rise development along the river bank lies dormant. Shop premises are for the asking in the CBD, Jackson Street is just holding its own, and the retail market is in decline, economics and internet trading both significant factors. The International financial markets are in crisis with no end in sight...This is not the time to be looking for finance or even expecting projects of this nature.”</i></p>	<p>The proposal should be dropped and further studies undertaken.</p> <p>The submitter would like a plan with flair and imagination that will capture the favour of developers, citizens and ratepayers.</p>
91.2	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The submitter questions the logic of allowing for high rise buildings in one of the highest known earthquake risk areas.</p> <p>The demand for high-rise building and living in high risk areas is expected to drop in the future, leading to a drop in property value.</p>	



**DPC29/092 Paula Louise Paton**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
92.1	General – Retail Floorspace, Open Space, Character and Preferred Uses.	Oppose	<p>The submission refers to a loss of green spaces and a possible mall towards the rail end of Petone.</p> <p>Wall to wall building would change the character of Petone. People are attracted to the area because of its village atmosphere.</p>	All development be in line with Petone character. Light industry (Sydney Street) important to remain.

**DPC29/093 – Nick Ursin**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
93.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern that the plan change could act as a precedent for development in other parts of the city.</p> <p>Concern is expressed that the proposed increase in permitted activities could lead to construction shortcomings and increase Council liabilities.</p>	If Council accepts the proposed changes, by-laws and related provisions should be clearly tagged that any changes agreed to are not to be used as a precedent or guide for any other parts of the city and cannot be relied upon in any applications as providing acceptable, permitted activities.
93.2	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose		Any buildings within the existing Earthquake fault boundaries should be of acceptable design and subject to the same stringent conditions specified for the construction of the Harvey Norman building in Rutherford Street, Lower Hutt.

**DPC29/094 Graham Wigley on behalf of Wigley & Roberts Ltd, Registered Professional Surveyors**

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
94.1	General	Support	<p>For the most part, the submitter supports the provisions of Plan Change 29 because it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rationalises the land use of the area;</li> <li>• Consolidates uses which can have adverse effects, in an area generally clear of residential dwellings; and</li> <li>• It provides as Permitted Activities many types of uses that otherwise would be difficult to obtain consent for under the Current Plan.</li> </ul>	
94.2	Amendment 14	Oppose	<p>The submitter objects to the proposed rule 5B2.2.1.1 E (iii) which requires a rear setback of 8m for properties on the east side of Sydney Street , which abut a residential area.</p> <p>The submitter points out that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Properties on the eastern side of Sydney Street are generally built to 3.0m clear of the rear boundary; and</li> <li>• These properties were built prior to the existing requirement for an 8m setback.</li> <li>• Many of the sites have a 5m front yard for packing purposes.</li> <li>• An 8m rear yard requirement, reduces the maximum building length from approximately 22m at present to 17.0m, reducing the value and use of these sites.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter adds, that the suggested reduction in the rear yard setback would led to no physical change for buildings abutting adjoining residential land, given the existing pattern of 3m setback.</p> <p>A rear setback of 8.0m is not required, because a daylight recession plane of 45 degrees, taken from a height of 2.5m,</p>	<p>The proposed rear yard requirement to be reduced to 3.0m to <i>“match the current occupation of the existing buildings”</i>.</p> <p>Remove 8m yard. Replace with 3m rear yard.</p>

		<p>would ensure that a 10.0m high building could not be located any closer, than a distance of 7.5m from the rear boundary (sketch attached to original submission). The same recession plan, would allow for a single storey building to be built 3m away from the rear property boundary.</p> <p>The suggested reduction to the size of the rear yard required for permitted activities, would allow for the existing buildings to be reinstated, should they be demolished for any reason. This provision would allow for the maximum building area to be maintained, without any additional adverse effects on the adjoining residential owners.</p> <p>An aerial plan of businesses in the area is attached to the original submission.</p>	
--	--	--	--

<b>DPC29/095 – Debra and Joseph Knowles</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
95.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	<p>The submitters are of the view that the plan change is incomplete and irresponsible without a plan for the survival of Jackson Street. Concern is raised that Jackson Street will become empty and turn into a ghetto.</p> <p>The plan is considered likely to destroy the appreciation of the heritage character of Petone and have a large impact on Jackson Street retailers.</p>	<p>Money be put into earthquake strengthening the current buildings and retaining the character of Petone as a unique area for shopping/business.</p> <p>Council follow the lead of Wanganui Council who recognize the importance and uniqueness of heritage building sites and are supporting owners by providing funding to earthquake strengthen their buildings.</p>

			The submitter refers to existing vacant premises in this area and retail tenants already struggling to pay current rents, water charges etc.	
95.2	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that the proposal to build on an earthquake fault line is extremely bad town planning. This will increase the risk to human life.</p> <p>The submitter implies that this risk could lead to higher insurance premiums and higher rents.</p>	

<b>DPC29/98 – Alfred Memelink</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
98.1	General	Oppose	The submitter supports the creation of a plan for the improvement of the Petone West area, but does not support the proposed plan change.	Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments.
98.2	General – Archaeology, Built and Cultural Heritage	Oppose	Petone West is an area of historical importance for Wellington and New Zealand and this needs to be considered in planning for the area.	The historical Te Puni Cemetery should be enhanced and protected as part of a 'greenzone' and not risk falling to the shadow of surrounding buildings.
98.3	General – Design Guide and Open Spaces	Oppose	<p>A design guide would be beneficial for any development in the area, so that it enhances the historical importance of the area and special links. Design guides are important to ensure quality and character.</p> <p>The submitter seeks opportunities to incorporate areas of green zones with view shafts to the harbour and suggests that areas on either side of the fault line could be earmarked for future green projects. The use of art could enhance such a green zone.</p>	<p>Develop a design guide to ensure that any new buildings will compliment Jackson Street.</p> <p>Include green zones.</p>

			<p>The submitter makes several suggestions about the possible content of a design code including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building design that allows multi-level buildings to become tsunami shelter zones;</li> <li>• Provision of quality outdoor areas;</li> <li>• Use of wooden cladding;</li> <li>• Hidden carparks with perhaps green zones above; and</li> <li>• Consideration of design guides prepared for other areas, such as Wellington CBD, suburban centres and the Lower Hutt CBD.</li> </ul>	
98.4	General – Retail Floorspace, Preferred Uses and Transportation.	Oppose	<p>A smaller carefully planned retail zone could compliment and lead into Jackson Street, rather than risk draining away from it. The boundaries for this area are suggested under relief sought. Limiting retail sizes to between 500m<sup>2</sup> and 3,000m<sup>2</sup> will help channel retail development into Jackson Street and not put smaller retailers at risk.</p> <p>The relatively low population of the areas surrounding Petone West, means that any additional large retail attraction will be at the detriment of other local retail facilities in the region, including Jackson Street, Moera and Eastbourne. This is said to be demonstrated by the economic assessment commissioned by the Council, as part of the plan change process.</p> <p>The plan change may result in the collapse of Jackson Street. The submitter refers to impacts on High Street in Lower Hutt from mall developments.</p> <p>Local retail/café facilities tend to strengthen their local community, whilst large commercial shopping venues tend to be vehicle oriented, often do not fit in with the character of the area and do nothing to create a sense of community.</p> <p>It is not desirable for retail activities to exist in large numbers along The Esplanade, as there is limited parking available and the Council has expressed a desire to reduce traffic flows along</p>	<p>Retail to be limited to an area on either side of the western end of Jackson Street, in a triangle shaped area between Hutt Road to the north, Petone Avenue to the east and a line drawn south wall of Pak ‘n’ Save building to the south.</p> <p>Limiting size of any new retail areas to between 500m<sup>2</sup> minimum and 3,000m<sup>2</sup> maximum.</p> <p>The area just south of Pak ‘n’ Save and The Esplanade to be designated for mixed use including residential, but excluding retail.</p>

			this road.	
98.5	General - Transportation	Oppose	The plan change will increase the strain on the already full main arterial route of The Esplanade, particularly on weekends. Melling Bridge is often clogged on weekends due to large format retail located in this area. The potential traffic effects associated with the plan change need to be explored.	
98.6	General – Foreshore and Preferred Uses	Oppose	The value of being beside the sea and harbour views should be preserved.  The submitter questions the value of retail activities in this area. As an alternative, the submitter suggests the creation of a new well designed residential precinct with green areas and view shafts down to the sea. The foreshore is considered to be one of the most beautiful parts of Wellington.	
98.7	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	The proposed plan change puts the foreshore area and The Esplanade at risk of being in winter shadow from the construction of tall buildings. The submitter suggests a height limit of three stories and set back from The Esplanade. The submitter points out that the western end of Petone Beach has become an increasingly popular stretch of beach all year round.  The submitter suggests that the type of building the plan permits is more suited to Wellington City, rather than the low-rise character of Petone.	Limit new buildings to a maximum height of 15m but limited to 9m on street frontages and to include a setback along The Esplanade.

DPC29/99 – Merran Bakker

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
99.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that they have no in-principle objection to mixed-use areas, but are concerned that the plan change does not provide adequate rules and safeguards to ensure that this area will be developed in the most attractive, sustainable and economically viable way for Petone and Hutt City.</p> <p>The plan change is considered to fail to introduce best practice rules and guidelines to improve the area. It also fails to put in place measures that ensure the four main values in the Petone Vision Statement are upheld. <i>“The possibility for tall buildings with 100% site coverage, retail which may undermine the existing Jackson Street businesses, and limited requirements for design excellence, landscaping and drainage are in opposition to the heritage values, economically and environmentally sustainable development, a place for people and vibrant village culture we agreed in our vision”.</i></p>	Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments.
99.2	General – Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Oppose	The relief sought would give additional value to this heritage site.	Include landscaping requirements in the setback area and recession plans for new buildings abutting urupa.
99.3	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage, Natural Hazards and Character	Oppose	<p>The proposed building heights are out of scale with the rest of Petone, may be a hazard risk in the earthquake area and would lead to excessive shading in small streets and the proposed residential areas. Allowing buildings adjacent the street frontage would have a considerable negative impact on the look and feel of the area. At present the few tall buildings in the area are well setback and include landscaping, so they do not dominate the streetscape.</p> <p>Provisions for The Esplanade will not achieve the goal of making an attractive entry to the city. Rather it will increase</p>	Limit building height to 10 metres, with discretion to allow a few taller buildings if surrounded by landscaped open space, following appropriate design guidelines and addressing issues of shading, wind and views of harbour and hills. Along The Esplanade, require at least a 6 metre setback.

			shading.	
99.4	General – Design Guidelines and Infrastructure	Oppose	<p>The design guidelines are limited to main entrance and gateway routes, but should apply to all new building. The submitter refers to the need for residential developments to have sunlight and open space.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the ability of open spaces and landscaping to improve the attractiveness of areas.</p>	<p>Apply design guide to all new building in the mixed use zone and include requirements for sunlight and open space for all residential developments.</p> <p>Require landscaping of car parking areas. Include landscaping and storm water management in the design guideline for the whole area.</p>
99.5	General – Drainage Infrastructure	Oppose	The plan change is an opportunity for the Council to provide leadership in storm-water management by including best practice guidelines in its design guides and encouraging their use.	Include landscaping and storm water management in the design guideline for the whole area.
99.6	General – Retail Floorspace and Transportation	Oppose	The retail rules are too permissive. Extremely large retail development will put pressure on the roads and parking infrastructure of Petone West. Allowing for smaller shops may also threaten the viability of the successful shopping precinct.	Retain existing provisions for retail as 500m <sup>2</sup> to 3,000m <sup>2</sup> and ensure that traffic and parking requirements meet actual need as development occurs.
99.7	Amendment 8	Oppose	Existing Section 5B 1.2.3 should be retained.	Retain Section 5B 1.2.3 and require landscaping of car parks.
99.8	Amendment 10 and Activity Status	Oppose	The submitter is of the view that brothels and commercial sex services should be a discretionary activity in a mixed use area, in the interests of protecting residential amenity. The Council needs more control over their location and operation, similar to that provided for childcare facilities in residential areas.	The operation of brothels and commercial sexual services in the zone become a discretionary activity.



**DPC29/100 – Ann Randal**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
100.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	<p>Any development of Petone should be of high quality design, ensuring good environmental and community results, so that the area retains its appeal and heritage. It should avoid a <i>“mess of high rise buildings and large modern shopping mall type constructions”</i>.</p> <p>The plan change will significantly change the feel, appearance and character of Petone. The submitter states they do not want or need another version of the Lower Hutt shopping centre, which the changes encourage.</p> <p>Jackson Street and The Esplanade attracts visitors and shoppers from around the Greater Wellington region.</p>	Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments.
100.2	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	The proposed retail rules will effectively destroy the heritage and style of Petone.	
100.3	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>The proposed 100% site coverage allows for no landscaping or green areas and will detract from the heritage of Petone.</p> <p>Allowing 30m high buildings will create shading and the appearance of walls and canyons.</p>	
100.4	General - Transportation	Oppose	If more apartments are allowed in Petone West, congestion along The Esplanade will increase and traffic delays become even longer.	
100.5	General - Foreshore	Oppose	The submitter refers to The Esplanade and Petone beach as great assets for Petone and Lower Hutt.	

**DPC29/101 – Margaret Thompson**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
101.1	General – General and Section 32 Analysis	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that the proposed plan change does not consider the requests of the local community and that it will have a negative impact on the 'focus' and identity of Petone.</p> <p>The submitter is of the view that the plan change should be aimed at promoting small businesses and activities, which will provide wealth to the economy and also provide a pleasant place to work and interact.</p> <p>The redevelopment guidelines from the Christchurch rebuild, should be a reference document of the Section 32 report.</p>	Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments.
101.2	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The geotechnical constraints should dictate low-rise developments and prohibit residential/emergency service activities.	
101.3	General –Site Coverage, Foreshore and Transportation	Oppose	<p>Heavy traffic along The Esplanade should be a consideration to push setbacks from the site boundaries.</p> <p>The Council needs to be able to provide evidence that the current supply of car parking within Petone will not be adversely affected by the plan change.</p>	The performance standards and design guidance should ensure on-site car parking meets or exceeds the demands of the permitted activity, and is provided for in a manner which recognises and reflects the streetscape and visual values of the area.
101.4	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	The submitter does not agree with making provisions for integrated retail development within the plan change area. This is considered contrary to the Petone Vision Statement.	
101.5	Amendment 2	Oppose	The submitter objects to Integrated Retail Developments in the plan change area.	Amendment 2 be deleted.
101.6	Amendment 3 and Preferred Uses	Oppose		The plan change area to be identified as suitable for Industrial Activity, and that references to retail as a suitable use be deleted.
101.7	Amendment 6	Oppose	Although the submitter does not object to the provision of verandahs, they believe this should be provided by the	

			<p>Council.</p> <p>If verandahs are to be provided by developers, they should not be used to create additional net lettable areas for the floors above. The Council needs to safeguard the public air space between the site boundary and the street roadway.</p>	
101.8	Amendment 8	Oppose		<p>The objectives of 5B 1.2.4 should also include, ensuring that areas adjacent to the Petone Mixed Use Area are not impacted by the car parking demands of this amendment.</p>
101.09	Amendment 10 and Activity Status	Oppose	<p>The submitter is of the view that large integrated retail developments should not be a permitted activity.</p>	<p>Revise wording of 5B 2.2.1 (a) to</p> <p><u>Retail Revised activities, excluding integrated retail developments exceeding 10,000m<sup>2</sup> in total combined floor area with a gross floor area not less than 500m<sup>2</sup> and not more than 3,000m<sup>2</sup></u></p> <p>The term 'revised' in this case is considered by Council officers to be a typing mistake and it is considered likely that the author meant to use the word 'retail'.</p>
101.10	Amendment 11	Oppose	<p>The permitted site coverage and maximum heights of buildings should be revised to promote open spaces, recognise geotechnical risks posed by large developments, encourage safe walking and allow adequate space for landscaping.</p>	<p>Revise wording for rule 5B 2.2.1.1.1 (a) and (b) to:</p> <p><del>(a)</del> (b) Site Coverage: <del>100%</del> <u>60%</u></p> <p><del>(b)</del> (c) Maximum Height and <del>Recession Plane</del> of Buildings and Structures</p> <p>i) 30.0m, providing that:</p> <p>ii) <del>15.0m on road front boundary of Jackson Street, Hutt Road and The Esplanade with a recession plane of 45° sloping inwards up to 30.0m in height.</del> No part of any building shall exceed a height equal to 10 metres plus the shortest horizontal distance between that part of the building and the boundary of Jackson Street.</p> <p>The use of (b) and (c) in this case are considered by Council officers to be a typing mistake and it is considered likely that the author meant to use (a) and (b).</p>

101.11	Amendment 13 and 21	Oppose	The submitter states that the agree with the requirement for a landscaping plan as referred to under Amendment 21, but adds that Amendment 13 deletes all reference to a landscaping plan.	Revise Amendment 13 to compliment the requirements of Amendment 21.
101.12	Amendment 15	Oppose	<i>"It is my preference that low (&lt;10m) rise residential be a permitted activity. If Hutt City Council is to enforce their 'high quality' development, then it is very unlikely that clause ii Ventilation would not be necessary. Having to permanently ventilate a building is not environmentally friendly and this type of design should be discouraged."</i>	
101.13	Amendment 31	Oppose	The submitter request references to retail activities, and particularly 'integrated retail activities' be specifically excluded from the plan change.	Request that amendment be deleted.
101.14	Amendment 38	Oppose	Provision 5B 3 (b) needs to identify what adjoining residents are being protected from. The submitter suggests privacy, outlook and access to natural light needs to be protected, but raises doubts as to the ability of the plan to protect privacy.  The submitter points out that it is unclear what the term 'centre' refers to in 5B 3 (d), making the term ambiguous and open to interpretation.	Item (d) for 5B 3 needs to be rewritten to become clearer and more specific, or the plan needs to be revised to show where 'the centre' is.
101.15	Amendment 57	Oppose	The submitter is of the view that high quality residential development would demand at least one car parking space for each unit. Unless adequate on-site parking is provided, the narrow residential streets will be clogged with long stay cars, which will extend beyond the area currently under review.	If residential developments are to be a permitted activity, than it is requested that rule 14A (iii) 2.2 (c) (ii) be reworded as follows:  ...minimum parking requirement for residential activities is 1 space for every <del>two</del> <u>single</u> residential units

**DPC29/104 – Donald Alexander Watherston**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
104.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes any changes to current provisions in regards to Petone's commercial areas.</p> <p>The submitter refers to changing Petone Commercial Activity Area 1 to Area 2.</p>	The Council opposes any vote on changes to existing district plan in relation to Plan Change 29.

**DPC29/105 – Arthur Ward Andrews**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
105.1	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The submitter does not agree with allowing a number of small retail and larger box retail, as this threatens existing retailers on Jackson Street.</p> <p>The submitter identifies that on the basis of his many years of experience in retailing, he considers that the plan change has the potential to fracture a 'fantastic' retailing area and that this has occurred in many areas around the world. The submitter does not want this experience repeated in this location.</p>	Small retailing needs to be controlled in the present main Jackson Street arena.
105.2	General – Maximum Building Height	Oppose	The submitter does not agree with buildings up to 30m high.	Buildings should be no higher than 12m.

**DPC29/106 – Susie Fitzgerald**

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
106.1	General	Oppose	The submitter indicates that the focus of Petone should be the beach, river, aquifer water, architecture, views of the hills, walkways, bike tracks, uniqueness and economic prosperity.	Residential plans are made with a wider view of Petone, which includes plans for preschool, school, 'elderly' facilities and green space.
106.2	General – Retail Floorspace, Activity Status and Notification	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that they support the general concept of retail development. However, they oppose provisions allowing retail development up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>The submitter makes reference to underground parking or parking buildings, and green spaces, trees, plants, park-like areas to sit/rest.</p>	Developers requiring a consent and a hearing to build retail complexes up to 10,000m <sup>2</sup> . This is too big a coverage area for the Western end of Petone.
106.3	General – Design Guides and Preferred Uses	Oppose	The submitter states that they support the general concept of residential development, but object to a maximum building height of 30m and site coverage provisions.	<p>Low rise, high quality residential development. This includes a maximum building height of 12-15m, or 6-8 stories maximum throughout the area.</p> <p>I would like a consistent design throughout the Jackson St, Hutt Road and The Esplanade, Petone. Ideally the design will be in keeping with the special village culture that has been fostered from the Jackson St Heritage Area.</p> <p><i>"I seek the design guidelines to include the issue of: parking to ensure there are no 'congestion' points along the Jackson Street, Hutt Road and The Esplanade, Petone (and) no 100% site coverage; commercial, retail or residential and green space".</i></p>
106.4	General – Natural Hazard and Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes provisions regarding the Wellington Fault Area.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the maximum height and site coverage provisions.</p>	<p>I would like there to be a maximum building height of 12-15m throughout the area (Jackson Street, Hutt Road and The Esplanade Petone). This is in keeping hopefully with Christchurch's (earthquake risk management) plans in the CBD to have buildings only 6-8 stories high.</p> <p><i>In Petone there is a high risk of extensive liquification (sic) process occurring when a high Richter scale earthquake occurs. It is important</i></p>

				to <u>build the buildings correctly once</u> (author's own emphasis). <i>This needs to be done not only for the residential development but also with the view to how quickly local economy (Petone commercial, retail areas) after the earthquake can be restored</i> ".
--	--	--	--	---

DPC29/108 – Terry Webb on behalf of GNS Science				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
108.1	General		The submitter identifies the authors of the submission (which include Dr Wendy Saunders) and identifies the company as <i>'New Zealand's leading provider of Earth, geoscience and isotope research and consultancy services'</i> .	Rules are developed to address the natural hazard risk for the Petone West area.  The Council review and reconsider the plan change, with regard to recent research on hazards.
108.2	General – Natural Hazards		<p>For the purposes of saving space, general commentary regarding natural hazards has been spread over both columns labelled reasons &amp; decision/relief sought.</p> <p>A risk-based approach to planning is recommended for each hazard, including earthquake, tsunami, liquefaction and climate change hazards.</p> <p>The Wellington Region is located within one of the most seismically active areas in the country. The likelihood of a Wellington Fault earthquake (approximate magnitude 7.5) occurring within the next 100 years is approximately 10%. The western portion of Petone is vulnerable to a number of different earthquake hazards (surface fault rapture, liquefaction, landslides and tsunami). Any future development of this area should take into account those hazards and include risk reduction measures that would reduce the consequences from an earthquake event.</p> <p>A repeat of the 1855 West Wairarapa Fault earthquake would result in a 1m high tsunami for the Petone West area. A subduction zone earthquake in the Cook Strait would result in flow depths of up to 2m. For these scenarios, initial tsunami waves are expected to arrive in as little as 20-30 minutes after the earthquake.</p> <p><u>Tsunami risk</u> While avoidance of high tsunami risk areas is preferable, often this is not practical. However, several risk reduction measures should be</p>	

		<p>considered to reduce the consequences from a tsunami, covering structural and evacuation requirements and land use planning options. These options are detailed in the original submission and include the use of reinforced concrete, piled foundations, elevated building foundations, and emergency vertical evacuation provision in new buildings.</p> <p>The submitter points out that the Environment Court in 2007 have identified the need to consider evacuation planning in resource consent applications for public facilities in areas susceptible to natural hazards. Likewise the Council needs to give sufficient weighting to this issue in the proposed plan change.</p> <p><u>Liquefaction risk</u></p> <p>Land features that could result in liquefaction exist in areas to the east of the Wellington Fault in Petone. The 2010-2012 earthquake sequence in Christchurch has demonstrated the vulnerability of underground infrastructure and buildings to damage from liquefaction. Whilst liquefaction hazards can often be mitigated using geotechnical design, this may not be technically or financially feasible. Consideration also needs to be given to in-ground infrastructure (including any new infrastructure required to support an increased level of development) and potential new buildings.</p> <p>The construction of high-rise buildings to the east of the Wellington fault may be problematic as deep piled foundations would be required, an activity that is currently prohibited. Further consideration may be required around what is an appropriate building height within the area subject to the proposed plan change, given the need to reduce risks from liquefaction.</p> <p>The submitter considers that further understanding of the liquefaction hazard is required to ascertain impacts on the proposed redevelopment area. This requires the systematic acquisition of subsurface information specifically targeted at the liquefaction hazard. The cost of an investigation program is small compared to the cost of developing the area, and ultimately the costs (e.g. economic, social, life safety and infrastructure resilience) to repair damage following a large earthquake.</p> <p><u>Climate Change</u></p> <p>This year Greater Wellington Regional Council released a report on sea-level rise and coastal flooding from storm events in the Wellington region. Projections for the end of the century indicate that sea levels in the Wellington region could rise by 0.8m by 2090s or 1.0m by 2115. Wellington has the highest rate of sea-level rise in New Zealand. Most of this rise is due to climate change, but it is being exacerbated by subsidence of the city over the past decade, caused by slow-slip seismic events from deep tectonic plate movements. Areas at risk include the mouth of the Hutt River and the low-lying parts of Petone.</p> <p>It is essential that the Council prepare for climate change, in particularly around the Petone West area. Further intensification of development should be carefully considered. Existing reports recommend planning for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sea-level rises above 1.5m for new greenfield developments;</li><li>• A sea level rise of at least 1.0m by 2115 for existing communities and developed areas.</li></ul>
--	--	--



108.3	Amendment 20	Oppose	<p>It is unlikely that any emergency facilities established in this area would be able to undertake their post disaster functions following an earthquake. Making these facilities a Discretionary or Non-Complying Activity would allow for consideration of the risk from the natural hazard on the ability of emergency facilities to operate post an event.</p>	<p>That emergency facilities are either an identified Discretionary Activity or Non-Complying Activity within the area subject to the proposed plan change.</p>
108.4	Section 32 Analysis and Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>Consideration of costs, should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs (economic, social and health and safety) arising from damage from an earthquake on future buildings established on the area.</li> <li>• Potential issues associated with obtaining insurance cover on hazard prone land.</li> <li>• Potential costs to Council from future proofing infrastructure in the area so that it can function post-earthquake; and</li> <li>• Cost to Council associated with repairing services in the area following a large earthquake.</li> </ul> <p>There are loopholes within the existing rules which can result in an increase in risk from a natural hazard. These include changes of use within the Wellington Fault Special Study Area and no requirement for the consideration of risks from liquefaction.</p> <p>There is no discussion in the Section 32 report of why the recommendations of GHD's report titled 'Hutt City Council Report for Petone West District Plan Change Natural Hazards Review &amp; Geotechnical Considerations dated February 2012 has not been considered further. The suggested mitigation measures would assist in reducing the consequences associated with natural hazards.</p> <p>The Section 32 analysis relies on the Building Act 2004 to</p>	<p>That additional costs are included in Option 1 (status quo) and a determination made as to whether this is still the most appropriate option to proceed with in regards to addressing the natural hazard risk to this area.</p> <p>That the rules of Chapter 14H (Natural Hazards) and 14I (Earthquakes) are amended to ensure loopholes are addressed.</p> <p>That the mitigation measures outlined in the GHD report (particularly recommendations 6 and 7) are adopted into the plan change as specific rules to reduce the consequences from an earthquake. These recommendations should be viewed as a potential minimum set of rules to be considered.</p> <p>That the Section 32 analysis be updated to reflect the Building Act 2004's limited consideration of natural hazards and that specific land use planning rules are created to address these natural hazards as opposed to relying on the Building Act 2004/Loading Standard.</p> <p>While the TAG report has no legal weighting, the Council should revisit its Section 32 analysis regarding natural hazards; and ensure that appropriate rules are proposed to reduce the risks to future development from the various natural hazards which this area of land is subjected to.</p>

			<p>address the consequences from liquefaction, tsunami and fault rapture. However the Loading Standard on which the Building Act relies, only covers loadings for snow, wind and ground shaking. As such, the Building Act 2004 currently does not cover these natural hazards.</p> <p>Since the plan change has been notified, the Minister for the Environment has released a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) report which reviewed sections 6 and 7 of the RMA. The TAG report has recommended several potential changes to the RMA to better recognise natural hazards, including the consideration of risks from natural hazards.</p> <p>The submitter does not agree with the statement in the Section 32 analysis that rules that reduce the risks from natural hazards would not be effective and efficient in addressing the objectives for the plan change area, as they will still allow for mixed use development to occur and will ensure that the adverse effects generated by the activity are avoided or mitigated.</p>	
108.05	General	Oppose	The submission is supported in the personal submission made by Wendy Saunders (Submission No 81).	

<b>DPC29/0109 – Alison Newbald</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
109.1	General – General, Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage, Retail Floorspace, Design	Oppose	The submitter believes that the plan change will result in development that is uncoordinated, of poor urban design, with poor amenity outcomes, which significantly undermines the retail locations of Petone (Jackson Street) and Lower Hutt.	<p>Have more regard to the findings and Urban Design outcomes provided for in the Boffa Miskell report including height, urban design and land use activities.</p> <p>Limit permitted retail to LFR (Large Format Retail) on or in the vicinity of</p>

	Guides, Preferred Uses and Residential Amenity	<p>The Plan is considered to be unsupported by technical reports commissioned by the Council. This includes the August 2010 Boffa Miskell report, which recommended different building heights across the plan change area and included areas for commercial and industrial activities.</p> <p>In contrast the plan change (with the exception of some street-frontages) treats the plan change area as one undifferentiated zone, with an overall height of 30m, and no clear provision for continued industrial uses.</p> <p>The key recommendations contained in the report by Development Economics 'Petone West Plan Change: Evaluation of Market Demand and Development Feasibility' regarding the location of particular types of retailing are not adopted in the plan change. The retail provisions provided in the plan change are contrary to those outlined in the report and have the potential to undermine the vibrancy and vitality of Jackson Street, Petone and further undermine retailing in Lower Hutt CBD.</p> <p>The objectives and policies for the Petone Mixed Use Area are not supported by the proposed rules. There is a mismatch between the objectives/policies and the outcome that will result from the proposed rules.</p> <p>The following provisions undermine the stated objectives/policies and do nothing to address the identified issue:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permitted threshold for retail activity;</li> <li>• Failure to promote the consolidation of larger format retailing and smaller retail stores;</li> <li>• The lack of any control on the location and design of new residential developments;</li> </ul>	<p>Jackson Street (west end).</p> <p>Develop rules based on the recommendations of the retailing report commissioned by Council.</p> <p>Amend the rules to ensure that they implement the stated objectives and policies.</p> <p><i>“Ensure the rules adequately address the issue of reverse sensitivity to provide for the continuation of existing business and the provision of adequate (amenity) of any new residential activities”.</i></p>
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The introduction of significantly increased height limits while maintaining 100% site coverage with only limited setback and recession rules.</li> </ul> <p>The plan change does not address the issue of reverse sensitivity or provide adequate protection for new or existing uses being established in the area. Consideration should be given to developing precincts within the plan change area, with clearly defined expected levels of amenity, that support mixed use while ensuring that existing uses do not get displaced by more sensitive activities (e.g. residential). In addition, residential activities should provide their own amenity onsite and not rely on 'borrowed amenity' i.e. views/sunlight which could be lost when an adjoining site is developed.</p> <p>The submitter states that they are not opposed to development in the plan change area. The area is well located to provide easy access to Wellington City and opportunities to improve the contribution this area makes to Hutt City should be provided for. However, the contribution existing businesses currently make to Petone and the Wider Hutt Area has been seriously underestimated by the plan change and not addressed in any way within the Section 32 analysis.</p> <p>The area is at the entrance to Petone and as such greater recognition needs to be given to good urban design outcomes.</p>	
109.2	General -Section 32 Analysis, Transportation and Preferred Uses	Oppose	<p>The Section 32 report fails to consider important information, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for existing business uses to be disadvantaged by increased land uses associated with the "blanket" 30m height limit and mixed use zoning;</li> <li>Potential for existing businesses to be adversely affected by reverse sensitivity issues which are likely to arise when</li> </ul>	<p><i>"The Section 32 analysis is not comprehensive and does not consider the costs and benefits of all available options/outcomes or provide rational for the proposed rules. As such the rules should be amended to be consistent with the technical reports and further work should be done to understand the potential impacts (e.g. traffic) of the proposed rules".</i></p>

			<p>residential uses are mixed with light industrial uses and the potential for those businesses to be forced to relocate (i.e. the economic impact of the loss of business to Petone and/or the wider Hutt City area);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The risk of significant relocation of stores from the Main street area and the potential for significant vacancies and the deterioration of the quality of retail tenants in the main street, which may undermine the overall economic and social value of the centre; and</li> <li>• The traffic issues for the Esplanade which would result from significant residential and retail development adjacent to this major District Distributor, such as the effect of increased pressure from pedestrians, and local and turning traffic.</li> </ul>	
109.3	General – Transportation	Oppose	<p>Traffic impacts associated with mixed use development along The Esplanade should be addressed as part of the plan change process. The increased level of development has the potential to significantly impact on the operation and functioning of this road.</p>	
109.4	General – Natural Hazards and Maximum Building Height	Oppose	<p>The Plan change area is subject to a number of significant natural hazards including liquefaction, ground rupture and sea level rise. The level of intensification of use facilitated by the plan change should be very carefully considered.</p> <p>The plan change gives very little recognition to these issues. The plan change should be delayed until the findings of the Royal Commission on the Canterbury earthquakes are available, and any subsequent new legislation has been introduced. It is irresponsible to actively encourage significant intensification in such a hazard prone area in advance of these findings.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the permitted height level for new buildings, level of development and intensification within the ground rupture zone, the resilience of new building</p>	<p>Ensure the rules take into account the risks posed by ground rupture and liquefaction, and ensure new development is resilient to sea level rise.</p>

			development, and the provision of information so that informed choices can be made.	
--	--	--	---	--

<b>DPC29/0111 – Marie Robb on Behalf of SizeUp Ltd and SizeUp Properties Ltd</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
111.1	General – General, Transportation, Retail Floorspace and Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter has concerns about the environmental outcomes of the plan change, including traffic congestion and poor traffic management, inadequate design control over new development and the potential adverse effects on the existing shopping precinct from ‘unfettered’ retail development at the western end of Petone. The submitter is concerned that the proposal would undermine the Jackson Street heritage precinct.</p> <p>The submitter is of the view that the street has heritage features with a special character that is rare and worth preserving – both in the fabric of the buildings and the street they relate to. Development within the street, or at the periphery needs very careful consideration to avoid damage to this highly valued and valuable Jackson Street Historic Area.</p>	Reject the plan change in its current form
111.2	General – Retail Floorspace and Character	Oppose	<p>The Jackson Street Heritage Area faces significant challenges including maintaining the economic viability of businesses. The use of existing small buildings is threatened by costs associated with repairs, maintenance and earthquake strengthening. Inappropriate demolition of heritage and subsequent redevelopment remains a risk to the integrity of the historic area. Any re-centering of the vital retail hub from its traditional location will have negative effects.</p> <p>Existing rules work as they are and businesses have continued</p>	Present zoning be maintained as it is now.

		<p>and been established in Jackson Street <i>“in reliance of the present zoning which was set following extensive consultation between Hutt City Council and the Petone community”</i>. Businesses have also been led to believe that the area would remain protected because of its particular character.</p> <p>The proposal may compromise the work taken to preserve this unique environment and may threaten the viability of the retail strip as a whole.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the Council creating the existing zoning and establishing the Jackson Street Programme to rejuvenate the area. Jackson Street relies on its point of difference (distinct character) for its survival, and its ability to attract visitors from further afield.</p> <p>The present zoning separates the two commercial areas with large stores at the western end of Jackson Street (or adjacent) and small retail outlets and businesses in the heritage precinct of Jackson Street.</p>	
--	--	--	--

<b>DPC29/112 – Joanne Sunde, Barker and Associates on behalf of McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited.</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
112.1	General		<p>The submitter identifies McDonalds as operating numerous restaurants throughout New Zealand, including a store with a drive-through operation within the plan change area.</p> <p>The premise in the plan change area contains on-site parking and signage and operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.</p>	

			The site sits just within the area zoned Petone Commercial Activity Area 2, with adjacent land to the south and site zoned General Business.	
112.2	Amendment 4 Amendment 10 and Residential Amenity	Oppose	<p>The submitter is of the view that high-level amendments are needed to Clause 5B 1.1.2 regarding Issues, Objectives and Policies for the Petone Mixed Use area to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to reverse sensitivity effects on existing development in this zone.</p> <p>It is essential that residential activities are designed and located so as to address reverse sensitivity, e.g. buildings design with adequate noise attenuation measures.</p> <p>Further, it is important that the objectives and policies recognise that a lower level of residential amenity is expected in this zone, when compared to traditional suburban residential zones.</p> <p>In the absence of the relief sought being granted, the plan change is considered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;</li> <li>• Be inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA Act;</li> <li>• Not warrant approval in terms of the tests in Section 32 of the RMA; and</li> <li>• Be contrary to sound resource management practice.</li> </ul> <p>The issue of reverse sensitivity is of increased importance due to the proposed permitted activity status for residential activities within an expanded Petone Commercial Activity Area 2 zone. This would replace the current provision where residential activities are a Discretionary activity.</p>	<p>Such amendments to the Plan Change provisions that are required or desirable in order to address appropriately and adequately the matters raised in this submission including, as a minimum and by way of example, amendments to the following effect:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend the Issue, Objective and Polices at Clause 5B 1.1.2 to reflect the above amendments set out in part 4.2(i) of this submission.</li> <li>Amend Permitted Activities Rule 5B 2.2.1 to include “Drive Through Retail” to reflect the amendment sought in part 4.2(d) of this submission.</li> <li>Such further or alternative relief to be appropriate and desirable in order to respond to the matters raised above.</li> <li>Any consequential relief required to give effect to the specific amendments noted above.</li> </ol> <p>Part 4.2(i) of the submission suggests the following changes to Clause 5B 1.1.2.</p> <p>Add the words <u>whilst acknowledging potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing developments in the area</u> to the proposed issue.</p> <p>Add the words <u>while recognising that amenity values in Zone are lower than in suburban Residential Zones</u> to Policy (a).</p> <p>Amend policy (e) to Restrict certain <u>new</u> activities, including industrial activities, which may be incompatible with other activities and/or degrade the character and amenity values of the Petone Mixed Use Area.</p> <p>Replace the word “areas” at the end of Policy (g) with “zones”.</p>



		<p>McDonald's is concerned that the plan change has not sufficiently addressed reserve sensitivity effects in respect to existing business activities in the plan change area. In particular, McDonalds is concerned that the potential establishment of residential activities adjacent and opposite the site could have reserve sensitivity effects with respect to the drive-through component and 24/7 operation of the restaurant.</p> <p>McDonald's are generally satisfied with the listed permitted activities, but request that 'Drive Through Retail' (as currently defined in Chapter 3 of the District Plan) be a permitted activity.</p> <p>The consequence of not including "Drive Through Retail" as a Permitted Activity is that a full discretionary resource consent would be required for <i>"this part of the existing business if, for example, changes were made to the drive-through's layout/configuration. This can not have been the intention of the plan change provisions"</i>.</p> <p>Attached to the original submission is a mock-up of how the relief sought (if adopted) would appear in the District Plan.</p>	<p>Add new policy (i) that reads <u>Residential development should be managed, designed and located so as to avoid or mitigate any potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing commercial development in the locality.</u></p> <p>Add a new paragraph under points (a) to (d) Explanations and Reasons which reads:</p> <p><u>For mixed use areas with a business and residential activity mix to work well, compatibility issues need to be managed. These issues arise between different forms of development (bulk/scale) and also in relation to the effects of certain activities (noise, glare, emissions, parking). The zone's provisions are designed to manage these issues while recognising that a mixed use residential/business environment offers a different lifestyle than that found in a suburban residential or business area.</u></p> <p>Add the words <u>whilst acknowledging reverse sensitivity</u> to the end of the last sentence under Explanations and Reasons.</p>
--	--	---	--

DPC29/113 – Mark Kirk-Burnnand on behalf of Autostop Group Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
113.1	Amendment 5	Oppose	The submitter states that more encouragement is required for small retail and cafes along The Esplanade, to support local residents there and visitors to the beach, rather than focusing	Plan amendments which better encourage The Esplanade 'strip' properties to cater to visitors and local users of the waterfront area.

		small retail solely along Jackson Street.	
--	--	---	--

DPC29/114 – Finn Brian Quentin Collins				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
114.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that whilst they support development in Petone West, it needs to be done properly, with a focus on protecting the nearby Jackson Street Heritage Precinct. New developments in the area must enhance Petone’s special character. This is crucial, given that Petone was the first Wellington settlement and is becoming increasingly recognised as a valuable historical area in the Wellington region.</p> <p>They refer to the advice of Development Economics Ltd. that <i>“careful consideration needs to be given to the development as it could see a potential 30-60 retail tenants move out of the existing Jackson Street heritage precinct into new buildings in Petone West, which could affect the economic benefit projections.”</i></p> <p>Requiring a ‘design resource consent’ for all development would match the aim of transforming this into an attractive and functional mixed use environment.</p>	Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments.
114.2	General – Retail Floorspace, Character and Transportation	Oppose	<p>The Plan Change does not protect the traditional shopping street of Petone.</p> <p>The Plan Change allows for large retailing, without adequate consideration of traffic and parking implications.</p> <p>Allowing retail development up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> could affect Jackson Street historical precinct and cause irreparably damage</p>	<p>Reinstatement of rules which limit the smallest shops in the plan change area to 500m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Reinstatement of rules with establish a maximum size for retail developments at 3,000m<sup>2</sup>.</p>

			<p>to the character and uniqueness of Petone’s historical past. The submitter states that that this provision goes against the recommendations made on floorspace limits by Council officers, in response to economic and social effects mentioned in the Development Economics Ltd. report.</p> <p>The proposed changes would remove the current ability of engineers to ask for contributions to traffic measures, such as roundabouts etc. etc. for retail operations over 3,000m<sup>2</sup>. Retail developments over the existing floorspace limit can have considerable traffic generation effects.</p>	
114.3	General – Design Guidelines, Activity Status, Maximum Building Height, Natural Hazards, Foreshore and Character	Oppose	<p>The Plan Change allows for residential development without adequate design quality, including no open space requirement per unit or daylight or sunlight access.</p> <p>Residential activities on Jackson Street also need to be subject to current design guideline, so that the existing character of Jackson Street is protected.</p> <p><i>“The Council should also take ‘officers’ advice to stipulate lower building heights in the highest risk areas and a 6-metre setback along The Esplanade, which will maintain a green vegetation edge along The Esplanade and allow for traffic management into the site forming a transition between the beach, foreshore reserve, road and building frontage.</i></p> <p><i>I would like to see that transition to be aesthetically designed by landscape architects to create a stunning feature with an emphasis on native plants, in particular nikau palms, which were originally in large numbers in the Hutt Valley before settlement”.</i></p>	<p>Design resource consent should be required for all developments in the entire Petone West area.</p> <p>Controls and design guidance that ensures that future residents have access to adequate living conditions and outdoor area in all types of residential development.</p> <p>The same provisions regarding design guides and quality that apply to the Central Area should be applied through Petone West and not just on The Esplanade, Hutt Road and Jackson Street.</p>
114.3	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The Plan Change allows for tall buildings and residential and educational activities to be established everywhere in the area, including in a high hazard area of the Wellington Fault.</p>	<p>Limit building heights within the Wellington faultline area to 10m.</p> <p>Make residential and education facilities unlikely in the high hazard area.</p>

114.4	General – Maximum Building Height	Oppose		Limit building height across the proposed area to 15m.
-------	-----------------------------------	--------	--	--

DPC29/0116 – Joyce Kellett				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
116.1	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern regarding the proposed heights of buildings. They do not agree that buildings up to 30m should be permitted.</p> <p>The submitter also refers to a lack of green areas.</p>	That the Council takes notice of the objections as put down by the Petone Community Board.

DPC29/118 – Hazel Neser				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
118.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter wants to see a plan change that enhances Petone’s unique and special character, not ruin it.</p> <p>The submitter is of the view that the plan change is ill-considered with no thought given to the unique character of Jackson Street and the value of having a small boutique shopping area that attracts people from the Greater Wellington region.</p>	Reject plan change in its current form and make amendments as requested.

118.2	General – Retail Floorarea	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern that uncontrolled growth is likely to lead to boring and standardised modern urban design with ‘yawn factor’. That cheap national retail stores will destroy local boutique shops and the vitality and personality of the area. The submitter refers to the Lower and Upper Hutt CBD’s as an example of where this has occurred.</p> <p>Proposed retail rules allowing up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> size retail anywhere in the plan change area are too permissive and will undermine both Jackson Street and other commercial areas in the Hutt Valley.</p>	<p>Keep the minimum and maximum floor area of retail activities between 500m<sup>2</sup> and 3000m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Any additional retail development allowed only on the western part of Jackson Street, where it has been allowed in the past.</p>
118.3	General – Design Guidelines, Foreshore and Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter is not opposed to economic growth, but this requires careful direction and management.</p> <p>Any development has to be of high quality appropriate design and ensure good environmental and community outcomes are achieved</p> <p>The lack of quality design guides or inclusion of setbacks on The Esplanade, or the encouragement of urban parks and landscaping will result in poor quality development, especially undermining Petone’s Foreshore’s amenity value.</p> <p><i>“It is vital that Petone should retain its charm and character, as this is what attracts people to the area, not large impersonal malls or ugly functional modern urban design that makes urban areas so oppressive because of their permissive height and size”.</i></p>	
118.4	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose		<p>Permitted height and site coverage be reduced. Provision made for green spaces.</p>

DPC29/119 – Morris Te Whiti Love

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
119.1	General		The submitter identifies themselves as a Trustee of Te Tatau o te Po Marae and Trustee of Te Puni Urupa in Te Puni Street and having a long involvement with matters of Māori heritage in the Lower Hutt District.	
119.2	General – Archaeology and Cultural Heritage		<p>Te Puni Urupa is a listed heritage site and is located centrally within the area subject to the plan change. <i>“The urupa or burial ground was close to the original site of the wharepuni, Te Tatau o Te Po, and at least two sites for Pito-One Pā. This area around the Te Puni Urupa for Māori and particularly Te Atiawa remains of enormous historical and cultural significance. Not only was the area from Nevis Street through to Victoria Street along the old beach, the side for many Pā, kainga and urupa, but also was the site of extensive gardens and other cultural activities. The beach, which was located further inland than it is today was the locality of the Tauranga waka where the hundreds of waka or canoe which were used for fishing, transport and welfare. In short this was an area highly used by Māori prior to colonisation”.</i></p> <p>At the very least, a part of this area should preserve a clear recognition of the important Māori historical presence in Petone. This presence is strongest for the historic urupa in Te Puni Street which has been partially preserved by being held as Māori land. <i>“The original urupa was larger and connected to the west to the old site of Te Tatau o te Po and to the east with the original Pito-one Pā. The eastern extent of this pā was around Victoria Street. Close by Victoria Street on this coastal zone are the remnants of another old urupa (location shown on map attached to original submission). This urupa or burial ground was recognised by the Gear Meat Company. The urupa was avoided to the extent that the old Gear Meat railway line went around it. The current building (ex IBM Building) also</i></p>	<p>That the plan change be amended.</p> <p>The Petone Commercial Activity Area 2 – Mixed Use is amended to exclude the area between the Te Puni Urupa and The Esplanade.</p> <p>The Te Puni Urupa should be surrounded by a recession plan which extends from 2.5m above ground level and then at 45° on the east, north and western sides. To the south maximum building height should be 8m.</p> <p>The ‘old Māori urupa’ as shown in the Pito-one Town Board Map of 1886 of around 1 acre be designated as a heritage area which would preclude building over this site (map attached to original submission).</p>

		<p><i>avoids the site with a small grass area being left as recognition. This particular area could form a part of the formal recognition of the old Pā and urupa which are such an important part of the heritage of Petone”.</i></p> <p>The plan change should include more than a “<i>small island which is the legal extent of the Te Puni Urupa. That is the area current owned by the iwi. The environs cannot be allowed to develop into a type of ‘lightwell’ surrounded by overbearing tall buildings having no regard to its surroundings”.</i></p> <p><i>“The urupa behind the old IBM building was a burial ground that was probably not only associated with Te Atiawa from Pito-one Pā but may also been (sic) the burial place of some 6 early settlers who drowned in 1841 from a boat returning from Wellington which foundered near the beach. In this case, as it is not an active heritage site, what is required is simply a designation as a waahi tapu so the area can not be built over”.</i></p> <p>A photo of a ceremony held at the Te Puni Urupa in 1940 is attached to the original submission.</p>	
--	--	--	--

<b>DPC29/120 – John Daniels on behalf of Historic Places Wellington Inc.</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
120.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	<p>Care needs to be taken to preserve and safeguard the significant heritage values of the Jackson Street heritage retail area. <i>“This area is important in terms of the usually well preserved mixture of older building styles and varied retail uses. These qualities combined with surrounding residential population give Jackson Street a lively and busy flavour often missing from older retail areas. The buildings are representative of Petone’s history, its social character, and</i></p>	<p>Reconsideration of the proposed plan change so as to limit the scale and types of retail use allowed in Area 2 to those that would not compete directly with those in the Jackson Street heritage area.</p>

			<i>some of its prominent earlier citizens”.</i>	
120.2	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>Although the Jackson Street retail area is not directly affected, the plan change could have indirect “deleterious” effects.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that the permitted activity standards for retail activities would open up the area for smaller retail operations that would directly compete with Jackson Street. This could have a serious effect on the viability of Jackson Street as a heritage retail area. Larger retail complexes would not compete directly in the same way.</p>	

<b>DPC29/121 – James Beban on behalf of Cuttriss Consultants Ltd</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
121.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	<p>The company does not oppose the established of a mixed use activity zone in the western portion of Petone. However, the plan change is considered to require <i>“considerable amendment to provide certainty to applicants, consultants, and developers, to protect the character and amenity values of the area, and to ensure that the proposed rules are workable.”</i></p> <p>Further controls in this area will not limit or restrict development. Rather a clear direction for good, well designed development in this area will encourage further development. However, if poor and unconsidered development occurs in this area, then the future development potential of the western end of Petone will be limited.</p>	Amend the plan change as requested.



121.2	General – Design Guidelines	Oppose	<p>As a signatory to the Urban Design Protocol, it is important that Hutt City Council provides a leading role in ensuring that buildings which incorporate good urban design principles are constructed within this city.</p> <p>Although the plan change contains some limited guidelines for buildings on Jackson Street, Hutt Road and The Esplanade, these guidelines do not go far enough to ensure that good design outcomes are achieved or meet the minimum requirements, a signatory to the Urban Design Protocol should be seeking to achieve.</p> <p>The rules as currently drafted would allow a 30m high buildings, one property back from The Esplanade, Hutt Road and Jackson Street with minimum consideration of design.</p> <p><i>“The City has already experienced the outcomes of overly permissive District Plan rules, within the Central Commercial Activity Area, where there were no design controls for many years. As a result, buildings such as Westfield, Briscoes, and Rebel Sport were constructed. All these buildings are of poor design, incorporate large blank monolithic facades and detract significantly from the character of the local environment”.</i></p> <p>The Council has already recognised the importance of good design in the CBD and for multi-unit residential housing and this is supported with corresponding design guidelines. It is considered that given the importance of this area as an entrance route to the Hutt Valley, and to ensure consistency throughout the District Plan, that design guidelines are also developed for properties south of Jackson Street.</p> <p>Quality apartments should be encouraged through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum dimensions for an outdoor living area</li> <li>• Minimum apartment size;</li> <li>• Apartments and outdoor space to be orientated for</li> </ul>	<p>Minimum level of outdoor living area to be provided for each apartment, including the stipulation of minimum dimensions.</p> <p>Minimum apartment size.</p> <p>Requirement for apartment space to be oriented in a manner to achieve maximum solar gain.</p> <p>Design guidelines to apply to all new buildings, as well as alterations and additions which increase the floor area of a building by more than 5%, on properties south of Jackson Street.</p>
-------	-----------------------------	--------	--	--

			<p>maximum solar gain; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design guidelines.</li> </ul> <p>This would provide the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certainty for developers and those preparing and assessing applications as to what is required (thereby avoiding debate, subjective assessment, expensive delays and redrafting);</li> <li>• Provide an appropriate level of amenity for future occupiers;</li> <li>• Ensure apartments built are desirable to future tenants and owners; and</li> <li>• Would avoid poorly articulated buildings, which significantly detract from the amenity values and character of the local environment.</li> </ul>	
121.3	General – Natural Hazards and Activity Status	Oppose	<p>The area covered by the proposed plan change is subject to number of natural hazards including fault rupture, liquefaction and tsunami inundation.</p> <p>Section 31 of the RMA Act demonstrates that Local Councils have a responsibility to develop rules to avoid or mitigate the effects from natural hazards within their jurisdiction.</p> <p><i>“It is our opinion that the existing rules of the District Plan will not effectively address the natural hazard risk within this area for the following reasons:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The active fault rules only apply to fault rupture and not liquefaction or any other earthquake related hazard;</i></li> <li>• <i>The existing active fault rules only apply to new buildings and do not address changes in use of existing buildings.</i></li> <li>• <i>Rules relating to earthquakes only apply to flooding and slope instability and therefore do not address liquefaction.”</i></li> </ul>	<p>Building heights within the Wellington Fault Special Study Area to be limited to 12m.</p> <p>All new buildings within the area to require resource consent which includes a requirement for an engineering report to be submitted, which details how liquefaction risk will be addressed.</p> <p>Rules are developed which mean that any change in use of a building within the Wellington Fault Special Study Area (regardless of whether any alterations or additions are proposed for the building) requires resource consent, in cases where the change of use increases the number of people on the site.</p> <p>Emergency Facilities to be identified as Discretionary or Non-Complying Activities.</p>

			<p>No new rules are proposed in the plan change to address the risks of natural hazards.</p> <p>As the proposed plan change would significantly increase the development potential of this part of Petone and the potential consequence from a large earthquake, rules should ensure that the potential consequences of future development (including economic, social, cultural and health and safety) are reduced to a level which is acceptable to the Council, community, land owners and future occupants.</p> <p>Whilst restrictions on new development in this area would impose additional costs at the resource consent stage, this is considered to be comparatively small in relation to the value of the building work and will not discourage economic development in the region. A robust set of rules which encourage the reduction in risks for natural hazards will increase the marketability of the area, potentially leading to higher rents and occupancy rates of new buildings. Potential costs associated with the resource consent stage would be more than offset by having buildings which are functional following a large hazard event.</p> <p>Given the variety of natural hazards this area is subject to, it is not appropriate for emergency facilities to be identified as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Due to the post natural hazard function of emergency facilities, these activities should be identified as a Discretionary or Non-Complying Activity, which would allow an assessment of the natural hazard risk to these facilities at the resource consent stage.</p>	
121.4	General – Retail Floorspace, Transportation and Activity Status	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Retail activities of up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> in this area of Petone.</p> <p>There is no documented discussion of the implication of retail</p>	<p>A more detailed analysis be undertaken on the potential traffic effects associated with extensive retail activities occurring within the Proposed Plan Change area, and where appropriate, rules are developed to manage these effects (which may include limiting the types of retail</p>

		<p>activities of this scale (including integrated retail) occurring within this area of Petone. The economic assessment which was prepared for Council clearly states <i>“only the economic impacts of the Proposed Plan Change for small format retail, commercial and residential are estimated in this paper.”</i> Large format retail and integrated retail developments should not be allowed, as the potential effects on the commercial viability and vitality of shopping centres are completely unknown and could be significant.</p> <p>The Council has invested heavily in the ‘Making Places’ program for the revitalisation of the CBD, which has significant support for the local community including developers. The CBD could continue to decline if extensive areas of small scale retail or large integrated retail activities are able to occur as permitted activities in the plan change area. This outcome would be contrary to the desired outcomes of the ‘Making Places’ program.</p> <p>The Council needs to create a co-ordinated development strategy for the whole of the Hutt Valley which allows for the progressive development of areas, without development in one area of the Hutt, undermining other areas in the Hutt.</p> <p>The existing retail rules for the Petone Commercial Activity Area – Area 2 are working well and have provided a distinction in the retailing activities which occur at the western end of Jackson Street, compared to the small stores located to the east of Victoria Street. The plan change as written could remove this distinction and result in more vacancies along Jackson Street.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the economic assessment which was prepared for the proposed plan change which states <i>“It should be noted that while 100% of the new retail development is likely to be the result of the Proposed Plan Change, the net</i></p>	<p>activities which can occur on a site).</p> <p>Retail activities are limited to between 500m<sup>2</sup> to 3000m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Retail activities over 3,000m<sup>2</sup> identified as a Discretionary Activity, with a requirement for an economic assessment and traffic report to be provided with each application.</p> <p>Retail activities over 3,000m<sup>2</sup> and integrated retail developments of any size be identified as either Discretionary or Non-Complying Activities, with the requirement for an economic impact assessment to be submitted with the application, so that the effects of the development on the existing commercial centres of the Hutt Valley can be assessed.</p> <p>Retail activities less than 500m<sup>2</sup> be identified as a Restricted Discretionary Activity, with discretion limited to the impact of the retail activity on the <i>“existing Jackson Street precedent”</i>.</p> <p>The term ‘precedent’ is considered to be a typing mistake by Council officers and it is considered likely that the author intended the term ‘precinct’ instead.</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p><i>economic impact may be much lower than calculated here. Property Economics have advised that in their view much (if not most) of the below development will displace retail activity in Jackson Street”.</i></p> <p>The plan change documentation does not appear to consider in any depth the potential traffic effects associated with a wide variety of retail activities occurring in this part of Petone. The Esplanade is a heavily used road and prone to congestion, as is the Hutt Road/Jackson Street intersection.</p> <p>There may be the opportunity for new buildings over 12m in height, which contain residential or commercial activities, being able to allocate a maximum of 10% of their Gross Floor Area for retail activities as a permitted activity. This would provide recognition that these buildings are likely to bring an increased number of people into the area, and therefore it is appropriate that some additional small scale retail activities (i.e. cafes, dairies etc.) may be required to assist with servicing to their needs.</p>	
121.5	General – Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Oppose	<p>The plan change provides little recognition of the Community Iwi Zone which applies to a single property in the plan change area. Under the rules of the proposed plan change, it would be possible for a 30m high building to be constructed 3m from this site. A building of this height would dominate and shade the urupa.</p> <p>As the development potential of the site is similar to that of the General Residential Activity Area under the existing provisions of the District Plan, permitted development rules which apply to properties abutting residential areas should also apply to sites abutting the Community Iwi zone. This amendment would ensure that any development which occurs on properties next to the urupa is respectful to the community and cultural values of the site.</p>	Permitted development rules which apply to properties abutting residential areas should also apply to sites abutting the Community Iwi zone.

121.6	General – Wording used in District Plan		<p>There are several technical issues which need to be reviewed in relation to the wording of plan changes. Suggested amendments are made to assist in readability and ensure that the rules achieve their intended outcomes.</p> <p>Several of the rules within the plan change refer to buildings and structures, although no definition for a structure is given. It is unclear whether the definition of a structure is the same as a building.</p> <p>The suggested relief would prevent any potential issues with existing rules in the District Plan, which refers to buildings and structures.</p>	<p>Provide a definition of structure within the definitions chapter of the District Plan. This definition should be the same as that for “building” to prevent any confusion.</p>
121.7	Amendment 10	Oppose	<p>The wording for rule 5B 2.2.1 (a) implies that retail activities of any size is permitted, in addition to integrated retail developments up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup>. This interpretation appears contrary to the Section 32 report.</p> <p>Although the submitter does not support larger format retailing in this area, if this rule was to be retained, the following wording is suggested to make the intention of the provision clearer:</p> <p>5B 2.1.1 (a) Retail activities, <del>excluding</del> (including integrated retail developments activities) <del>exceeding 10,000m<sup>2</sup> in total combined floor area</del> with a Gross Floor Area of up to <u>10,000m<sup>2</sup></u>.</p> <p>Commercial garages are identified as a permitted activity in the plan change area (Rule 5B 2.2.1 (h)). This use can create significant reverse sensitivity issues for future residents and office workers, and is consistent with the definition of ‘industrial activity’ in the District Plan. For the purposes of consistency, commercial garages should be treated in the same way as an Industrial Activity in this area and be identified</p>	

			as a Discretionary Activity.	
121.8	Amendment 11(a)	Oppose	<p>The wording of rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (a) implies that a building has to cover 100% of the site, in order to be permitted, which is potentially contradictory to outdoor area and parking provisions. For readability, it is suggested that the wording be amended to</p> <p>“5B 2.2.1.1 (a) Site Coverage: <del>100%</del> <u>Up to a maximum of 100%</u>”.</p>	
121.9	Amendment 10, 11 (b) and Amendment 22		<p>The proposed rules are unclear and require clarification. There is a contradiction between the Permitted and Restricted Discretionary Activity standards under Rules 5B 2.2.1.1 (b) and 5B 2.2.2 (b) and (c).</p> <p>As it is not possible for buildings of 15m or 30m height to be constructed in all parts of the plan change area, it is suggested that rules be amended to read:</p> <p>5B 2.2.1.1 (b) Maximum Height: Maximum Height and Recession Plane of Buildings and Structures:</p> <p>(i) <del>30.0m, providing that</del> <u>12m, for properties which do not have a frontage onto Jackson Street, The Esplanade or Hutt Road</u></p> <p>5B 2.2.2 (c) The construction, alteration of, <u>or</u> addition to, buildings and structures <del>over</del> <u>between</u> 12m <u>and</u> 30m in height, except <u>where</u>:</p> <p>(i) The <del>construction</del>, alteration of, or addition to, buildings and structures where the gross floor area of the additions is less than 5% of the gross floor area of the existing building; or</p> <p>(ii) The <del>construction</del>, alteration of, or addition to, buildings and structures which does not change the external building form (floor area and height) of the</p>	

			existing building.	
121.10	Amendment 13		The wording of rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (e) (ii) is unclear about what the maximum surface and ground level site frontage requirements are for Jackson Street, Hutt Road and The Esplanade. It appears that you could have 100% of the frontage of a site on these roads covered by parking, which is contrary to the desired outcome of the design guidelines. Further clarification on this matter is required	
121.10	Amendment 14		<p>The wording of rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (f) (vi) is inconsistent. The first section of the rule seeks 5% of the car parking area to be landscaped, whilst the second part seeks landscaping of car parking areas adjoining residential areas or fronting roads. Limiting landscaping to 5%, would prevent the amount of landscaping sought for car parking areas adjacent residential areas or fronting roads.</p> <p>The wording of rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (f) (vii) applies only to the servicing of a site. As the proposed rules would allow for retail activities as a permitted activity, it is prudent that the hours of operation of these activities are limited where a site shares a boundary with a Residential Activity Area. This would prevent inherently noisy activities detracting from the amenity values of the adjoining residential activities.</p>	<p>Rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (f) (vii) to be amended as follows:</p> <p><del>(vi) (v) At least 5% of car parking areas not contained within buildings must be landscaped. Areas within the car parking area and areas adjoining residential areas and/or fronting roads must be landscaped</del> <u>A landscaping strip with a width of no less than 1m shall be provided along any boundaries which front the road (except where a vehicle crossing is required), or are shared with a Residential Activity Area. In addition, at least 5% of any on-site car parking areas must be landscaped</u>.</p> <p>Addition of new rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (f) (vi) (a) to read:</p> <p>(vi)(a) <u>Where a site abuts a Residential Activity Area retail activities (including licenced premises) shall not operate between the hours of 10.00pm and 7.00am.</u></p>
121.11	Amendment 15		The wording of rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (g) (ii) applies only to bedrooms with un-openable windows, and is already covered by the Building Act 2004. It would be appropriate for this rule to also apply to openable windows in bedrooms, so residents could rely on the windows to provide acoustic treatment when they are sleeping, while still receiving required ventilation. It is suggested that this rule be amended as follows:	<p>Rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (g) (ii) to read:</p> <p>ii) Ventilation</p> <p>Where bedrooms with <del>un</del>openable windows are proposed, a positive supplementary source of fresh air ducted from outside is required at the time of fit-out. For the purposes of this requirement, a bedroom is any room intended to be used for sleeping. The supplementary source</p>



				of air is to achieve a minimum of 7.5 litres per second per person.
121.12	Amendment 20		<p>Although the submitter does not support Emergency Facilities being identified as a Restricted Discretionary Activity in this area, they ask that should this activity status remain, a typo in the condition should be corrected.</p> <p>The term “Appearance of Buildings and Structures” appears twice. This term should be removed from the consideration of the traffic effects.</p>	

<b>DPC29/122 – Matt Roberts</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
122.1	General – Preferred Uses	Partial Support	The submitter identifies the plan area as a suitable location for high-density mixed land use with a high residential component.	
122.2	Amendment 10, Activity Status and Notification	Oppose	<p>The submitter questions how allowing retail up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> on a non-notified basis would support the goal of retaining the vibrancy and vitality of Jackson Street.</p> <p>A return to the current limit of 3,000m<sup>2</sup> would support the retention of public input on many more development proposals. Attempts to attract business should not be at the expense of the community being able to participate in decision making.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern that residential accommodation is not included on the list of permitted activities. The submitter considers the plan change area as one of the most suitable areas in Wellington to support intensive residential</p>	<p>Retain current non-notified floor space required at 3,000m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Prioritise intensive residential development near Petone railway station.</p> <p>Do not allow the development of brothels and sexual services as a permitted activity in the gateway areas covered by this plan.</p> <p>Retain education services, marae and cultural facilities as permitted activities.</p> <p>Require notified consent for demolition or removal of a building or partial demolition if this impacts on the façade.</p>

			<p>development.</p> <p>The submitter considers that Brothels and Commercial Sex Services should not be a permitted activity on Jackson Street or the Petone Esplanade, in order to protect the significant gateway status of these streets.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern that the ability to establish education and training facilities, marae and cultural centres is being removed from the list of permitted activities.</p> <p>The submitter finds the total or partial demolition or removal of buildings and structures as a permitted activity deeply concerning.</p>	
122.3	Amendment 11	Oppose	The submitter finds the proposed height provisions along the gateway routes to be concerning.	Limit building heights on Jackson Street and ensure that building scale on The Esplanade enhance the foreshores setting.
122.4	Amendment 19	Oppose	The submitter states that it is extremely disappointing to see that consideration of development effects on transport are proposed to be deleted. These provisions should be retained, especially given the proximity of the area to rail services, bus routes and cycle routes.	Ensure the effect of development on transportation, especially walking, cycling and public transport are considered by retaining these provisions.
122.5	Amendment 44 and 45	Oppose	The submitter would like to see existing provisions remain. The submitter is concerned that reference to avoiding adverse impacts from the height of building fronting onto Petone Esplanade is being deleted. The provisions provide a check and balance that building will be sympathetic to this setting.	<p>That only develop sympathetic to the Petone Esplanade is permitted by retaining the current provisions.</p> <p>The term “develop” is considered by Council officers to be a typo, as it is considered likely that the author intended the word development.</p>
122.6	Amendment 49	Oppose	The current provisions support an attractive, safe, liveable environment and should be retained.	That amendment 49 is rejected and the current provision retained.
122.7	Amendment 56	Oppose	Given the area’s proximity to public transport, the use of other transport modes need to be encouraged. Much more could be done to enhance the attractiveness and interface from Petone Station to Jackson Street.	That alternatives to onsite car parking that create a liveable city are prioritised.

			<p>Provisions focus on car parking, but not every business should need car parking. The submitter does not support the high priority given to parking over suitability of access by other means. They would like to see a requirement that supports parking of cars in one location then walking, rather than needing to drive to each store that has separate parking.</p> <p>The design of Pak'n'Save Petone is an example of the problems that can arise from car parking provisions. While the store needs car parking, the site design actively discourages pedestrian access and disrupts the street scape.</p>	
122.8	Amendment 57	Oppose	<p><i>"Given that fewer young people are applying for motor vehicle licenses and the steadily increasing costs of fuels there is less need to focus on parking for residential uses. I agree that on street parking should be for short stay rather than long stay residential traffic. Options such as car sharing schemes should be seen as an alternative to requiring considerable onsite car parking."</i></p>	That alternatives to onsite car parking that create a liveable city are prioritised.

DPC29/123 – Julia Forsyth				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
123.1	General - General Design Guide, Retail Floorspace, Maximum Building Height, Preferred Uses, Activity Status and Section 32 Analysis	Oppose	The submitter supports some provisions of the proposed plan change, but opposes the planning framework because it does not support the stated desired outcomes of the plan change itself or the Petone Vision Statement. They believe the plan change is likely to result in development which is uncoordinated, and of poor urban design and amenity. There is considerable risk that it will result in development that detracts from the significant economic and social values of the	<p>Reject plan change 29 or alternatively amend as requested.</p> <p>Amend Plan Change 29 to be consistent with the provisions shown on pages 13 and 14 of the Boffa Miskell report dated August 2012</p> <p>The year '2012' is considered by a typing mistake by Council officers and it is considered likely that the author intended the year 2010 instead.</p>

		<p>area.</p> <p>The plan change is not supported by the technical reports commissioned by the Council. This includes the August 2010 Boffa Miskell report, which recommended different building heights across the plan change area and included areas for commercial and industrial activities.</p> <p>In contrast, the plan change effectively treats the plan change area as one undifferentiated zone, with an overall height of 30m, and no clear provision for continued industrial uses.</p> <p>The key recommendations contained in the report by Development Economics 'Petone West Plan Change: Evaluation of Market Demand and Development Feasibility' regarding the location of particular types of retailing are not adopted in the plan change. Further there is no substantive discussion in the Section 32 report about how the significant risks identified, which may undermine the overall economic and social value of the centre will be mitigated.</p> <p>By providing for up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> of retail as a permitted activity, there appears to be a considerable risk of dispersed retail development, which will detract from the current economic viability of the existing Petone town centre. The submitter refers to both the estimated demand for retail floorspace over the next 10 years within the Development Economics report of 4,000m<sup>2</sup>, as well as the retail floor space allowed for the recently released Christchurch City Plan of 50,000m<sup>2</sup> to 60,000m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>The Section 32 report fails to consider relevant information. There is no discussion or information about the potential for existing businesses to be disadvantaged by increased land values associated with the 'blanket' 30m height limit and mixed</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>use zoning. There is an unrealistic expectation that the reverse sensitivity issues which are likely to arise when residential uses are mixed with existing light industrial uses, can be effectively mitigated on-site.</p> <p>Petone has historically provided and continues to provide an ideal location for a wide range of small and medium sized commercial and light industrial activities, which require relatively cheap premises. The Section 32 analysis does not consider the economic effect of displacing these businesses and what other options are available if they are forced to relocate.</p> <p>The objectives and policies for the Petone Mixed Use Area are not supported by the proposed rules. The following provisions are considered to undermine the stated objectives and policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permitted threshold for retail activity;</li> <li>• Failure to promote the consolidation of large format retailing and smaller retail stores;</li> <li>• Lack of any control on the location and design of new residential developments;</li> <li>• Introduction of a significantly increased height limit while maintaining 100% site coverage;</li> <li>• Only setback and recession plan rules; and</li> <li>• Use of a purely non-regulatory design guide.</li> </ul> <p>The concept of different precincts in the plan change area as referred to in the Boffa Miskell report, supports mixed use while helping to ensure that existing uses do not get displaced by more sensitive uses (i.e. residential) and that there is some certainty about the amenity that can be expected in each area or precinct. The precincts could be supported by clear policies and rules. For example, residential activities may be required to provide their own amenity onsite (sunlight access, adequate</p>	
--	--	--	--

			outdoor space etc.), rather than rely on 'borrowed amenity' which can be lost when an adjoining site is developed. Providing this type of framework for mixed use development assists current and future owners, and developers because it provides more certainty than a undifferentiated mixed-zone with a very significant increase in height limit.	
123.2	General – Design Guide and Activity Status	Oppose	Urban design input through a robust restricted discretionary consent process is particularly necessary in a mixed use area, where there will a range of potentially competing requirements and expectations in terms of amenity.	Introduce a consent requirement and associated design guide to ensure that all development in the plan change area demonstrates good urban design.
123.3	General – Natural Hazards and Activity Status	Oppose	<p>Given the liquefaction prone nature of the soils and the fault rupture in the plan change area, the likely intensification of use facilitated by the plan change should be very carefully considered. There is very little recognition given to these issues in the plan change documents.</p> <p>To be actively promoting a plan change which encourages significant intensification in an identified hazard-prone area in advance of findings of the Royal Commission on the Canterbury earthquakes seems unwise.</p>	<p>Amend the relevant polices and rules to make new development within 20m of the fault rupture a non-complying activity.</p> <p>The plan change should be delayed until the findings of the Royal Commission on the Canterbury earthquakes are available and any subsequent new legislation has been introduced.</p>
123.4	General - Transportation	Oppose	There is no discussion of the traffic issues for The Esplanade which would result from significant residential and/or retail development adjacent to this major district distributor. The Esplanade is already a very pedestrian-unfriendly barrier between Petone and the foreshore. The effect of increased pressure from pedestrians and local and turning traffic is not addressed. Traffic issues need to be considered as part of the plan change process and not left until the development of each individual site.	

**DPC29/127 – Leila Macbeth**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
127.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter is of the view that the plan change would devalue the area environmentally, economically and socially. In its current form it would have a major negative impact on Petone’s unique environment, and ignores the significant economic, cultural and community benefits of heritage architecture, small and high-value businesses and people-friendly spaces.</p> <p>The submitter would like to see Petone’s community thrive, <i>“but the proposed plan shows poor urban planning, deign (design) and foresight. Petone already has a reputation for high-value retail and residential markets, and I contend that the Proposed Plan Change 29 would devalue these on an economic and social level”</i>.</p>	<p>Reject plan change in its current form and make amendments.</p> <p>The submitter wants a plan that will enhance Petone’s unique character, giving us the tools to grow and develop in a way that enhances our community’s value, not undermines it.</p>
127.3	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	Buildings 30m high with 100% site coverage would create an impersonal, unattractive, intimidating environment, exactly the opposite of what makes Petone a great place to live and visit.	<p>Petone’s small scale and low-rise skyline are valuable attributes and should be preserved, restored and used as the template for any future development.</p> <p>The maximum building height should be 12 to 15 metres, and site coverage significantly reduced to allow for large public green spaces and plenty of pedestrian access.</p>
127.5	General – Retail Floorarea, Foreshore and Transportation	Oppose	The proposed retail rules allowing up to 10,000m <sup>2</sup> will harm not just Jackson Street but the entire Hutt Valley. Large retail developments such as Queensgate mall have a profoundly negative effect on surrounding businesses and communities.	There should be no retail on The Esplanade. Traffic congestion, parking problems and pedestrian safety are just a few reasons I consider it to be a very bad idea.
127.6	General – Design Guidelines	Oppose		I want clear design requirements across all of the proposed zone, including outdoor areas and access to sunlight in all apartments.

DPC29/128 – Rosie Torbot				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
128.1	General	Oppose	The submitter would like to see more appropriate design, taking into account heritage, weather conditions, green areas, traffic congestion and earthquake stability.	Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments.
128.2	General – Building Height	Oppose		Permitted height across the whole area reduced to 12 to 15m maximum and the permitted site coverage reduced to allow for the provision of open space; sunshine (rather than it being blocked by high rise buildings) and ensure we don't encourage any more wind tunnels in a very exposed suburb.
128.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	The submitter raises concern that retail development will detract from what is currently a vibrant and unique Jackson Street. They do not want to see a repeat of what has happened in Lower Hutt, where the High Street shopping has simply died away.	

DPC29/130 – Glenn Stewart				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
130.1	General – Natural Hazards and Maximum Building Height	Oppose	<p>The submitter objects to allowing multi-level development in the Petone West area because this straddles and is adjacent to the Wellington-Wairarapa Seismic Fault Line.</p> <p>The Fault Line is a known seismic risk. The last major rupture was in 1855 and it is understood that historically there have been previous major events occurring in cycles of 150-200 years.</p> <p>The sub-soil of the Hutt river delta has been built up from</p>	<p>Reject the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>The whole area up to 500m on either side of the Fault Line should be levelled and made into Council's sports grounds, or at least be used for similar 'lightly populated' activities like the motorway and the railway link. All of the businesses would need to be re-located further north where the sporting grounds are now, subject to maintaining a suitable clear space on either side of the fault line.</p> <p>High rise residential development should be allowed for further north</p>



		<p>alluvial deposits deposited by the waterway over millennia. The river mouth has shifted at least twice since European settlement began in 1840. All of the Petone West area would be sitting on the river delta and its associated alluvial sub-soils.</p> <p><i>“It is unethical for the Council to create an environment where developers will be enabled to build high rise residential ‘silos’ to house apartment dwellers, knowing that there is a significant risk from earthquake activity, both from close proximity to fault line movement and the liquefaction of the sub-soil”.</i></p> <p>In the event of an earthquake similar to that of the Christchurch earthquakes, it would be difficult for the Council to avoid responsibility for the injury to, and loss of life of, apartment dwellings in this area.</p> <p>The suggested changes to the location of residential and commercial development would meet the Council’s objectives for increased numbers of ratepayers, more jobs, increased GDP etc. etc. without putting those same ratepayers directly in harm’s way.</p>	<p>up to the Hutt valley, adjacent to a rail head (put in a new spur as necessary).</p>
--	--	--	---

<b>DPC29/132 – Peter and Nicola Prichard</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
132.1	General – Retail Floorspace, Maximum Height and Transportation	Oppose	<p>The plan change does not provide for the protection of the traditional shopping street of Petone.</p> <p>The plan change allows for large retailing and mixed use buildings, without adequate consideration of traffic and parking implications.</p>	<p>Reinstate rules which limit height and the smallest shops in the plan change area to 500m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Reinstate rules which establish maximum sizes of retail developments at 3,000m<sup>2</sup>.</p>

132.2	General – Design Guides and Open Space	Oppose	<p>The plan change allows for residential development without adequate design quality, including no requirement for open space or daylight or sunlight access for each unit.</p> <p>No green spaces or ecological corridors are encouraged in the plan change area.</p>	Bring in controls and design guidance that ensure that future residents have access to adequate living conditions in all types of residential development.
132.3	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The plan change allows for tall buildings and residential and education activities to be established in a high hazard area of the Wellington fault.</p>	Limit building height within the Wellington Faultline area to 10m and make residential and education facilities discretionary activities.
132.4	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage and Amenity of Existing Residents.	Oppose	<p>The plan change does not provide for the protection of residential properties. Existing residential properties would be adversely affected by very high buildings situated even a couple of streets away, in addition to nearby residential apartments and mixed uses.</p> <p>The submitter specifically refers to harm to the amenities enjoyed by residents on Nelson, Fitzherbert and Sydney Streets. Impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overlooking of backyards;</li> <li>• Light and noise pollution (for example, from raised balconies);</li> <li>• Problematic on-street car parking;</li> <li>• Blocking of views of hills;</li> <li>• Loss of sunlight; and</li> <li>• Overshadowing.</li> </ul>	Limit building height that will affect existing residential dwellings to 10m.
132.5	Amendment 1, Zone Boundary and Preferred Uses	Oppose	<p>The Proposed plan change allows too great an area to be re-zoned commercial activity, particularly the street eastwards of Victoria St and Petone Ave. There is insufficient transitioning between the existing residential area (Nelson and Victoria St) and the proposed bulk retail, and proposed high rise residential apartments.</p> <p>Even an additional two storey structure on an existing building would adversely impact on the existing residential properties and the low rise character of Petone.</p>	<p>Restrict the rezoned area to the west of Victoria Street and Petone Avenue.</p> <p>The streets from Victoria St. and Petone Ave east could be redefined as a transitional zone, for commercial and residential, but limited to 10m. The area would enhance the natural linkage from Jackson St to the Esplanade and wharf.</p>

132.6	Amendment 2 and Design Guide	Oppose	<p>The wording of this amendment is considered to be at odds with the Petone Vision Statement. No mall or large- scale retail is considered acceptable. Reference is made to the protection and enhancement of the social, economic and environmental amenity of Petone’s heritage and traditional shopping area.</p> <p>Malls and in particular enclosed malls, rarely contribute to existing retail precincts.</p>	<p>Remove or revise the definition to exclude “malls” and large scale retail, but may allow for street (open air) premises partitioned no greater than 500m<sup>2</sup> and in total no greater than 3,000m<sup>2</sup>. Clear design guidance for integrating retailing into the existing Jackson St and/or Victoria St would be essential.</p>
132.7	Amendment 5, Zone Boundary, Open Spaces and Amenity of Existing Residents	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that the wording of this amendment provides little definition and detail as to what constitutes ‘high quality’ and points out that requirements appear to be limited to the main entrance way, whilst omitting the minor streets requiring high quality development.</p> <p>No green spaces or ecological corridors have been encouraged, even though mixed use areas would benefit from green space and quality landscaping. If this area is really to become a high quality mixed use space, outdoor areas and open public areas are essential for healthy vibrant places to live, work and visit. The draw card is the proximity to transportation links and Wellington CBD, so residential dwellings must compete with Wellington apartments, not be cheap alternatives.</p> <p>Reference is made to little protection affording to existing residential properties.</p> <p>The submitter is of the view that there is a high probability that initial developments will be cheap structures (apartments whacked onto existing buildings or conversions), which will not achieve the desired outcomes or enhance the amenity of the area.</p>	<p>The rezoning should be restricted initially to encourage mixed use development around the transportation node and entrance ways.</p>

132.8	Amendment 7 and Design Guidelines	Oppose	The submitter emphasises that the current wording of the plan is to “encourage” this and that, but there is little specification or strong wording like “shall”, must and responsibility.	Stronger wording is required to achieve desired outcomes for high quality design. Accompanying design guidance will assist with what is acceptable along The Esplanade, Jackson Street, Victoria/Sydney Streets and other street towards the railway station.
132.9	Amendment 8, Transportation and Infrastructure	Oppose	Car parking is considered to be already problematic. Off-street parking detracts from the street scene, so underground or discretely accessed multi-park areas should be encouraged. Residential dwellings should have access to off street car parks. Larger car parks must incorporate high quality landscaping, minimise tarmac and storm-water impacts.	Improved wording that encourages sustainable environmental design and use of sustainable transport options.
132.10	Amendment 10 and Retail Floorspace	Oppose	Large scale retail is not in line with the Petone Vision Statement. There is little evidence that large scale retail will have social, economic or environmental benefits for Petone and its existing businesses.  <i>“Lower Hutt CBD has suffered from the size and inward nature of Westfield Queensgate mall and is completely reliant on one landlord for future refurbishment/regeneration. Napier CBD on the other hand is an (sic) example where heritage buildings contribute economically, environmentally and socially to the community. The area is appealing, has a great pedestrian appeal and links to the waterfront... There are numerous examples where bulk retail (sheds) have killed traditional shopping streets in Australia, the US, and the UK, These are not place (sic) where people want to live, work and socialise.”</i>	Remove the 10,000m <sup>2</sup> limit and the permitted activities of brothels and commercial sex services.
132.11	Amendment 11 and Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage.	Oppose	The height limit is too high for the entire zone. There should be a transitional zone between Nelson and Victoria Streets, Fitzherbert and Petone Avenue is 10m in height. The entrance corridors should have set-backs, recession planes that are appropriate, in-line with the IBM, NZ Post and Racing Board buildings.	Amend the zone, heights, set-backs and recession planes. Undertake shade modelling to determine the effects on existing residential properties. Establish design guidelines for each street, what is acceptable or prepare a blueprint with modelled buildings.

DPC29/135 – Ruth Fletcher

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
135.1	General	Partial Support/ Partial Oppose	<p>The submitter states they support the proposed zoning change in principle and commend previous work undertaken by the Council to establish the community vision.</p> <p>However, the original intent of the plan change seems to have “got lost in translation” and what has been presented is a plan to maximise development opportunities. The well-intended Design Guide does not seem to be supported by the rules. The plan change does not meet the expectations of the submitter.</p> <p><i>“The proposed rules permit as a baseline solid street to street development, largely to 30m, with almost no mandatory requirement to manage the form of the building to maintain or enhance amenity. On the other hand the Design Guide represents an idealised future character, with few policies or rules to actively encourage the development of this character, and almost no reference to the reality permitted by the bulk and location rules proposed for this zone”.</i></p> <p>The submitter strongly recommends that before proceeding further, a model be built for consideration by the Council and community, showing the maximum bulk and location of development permitted by this plan change.</p>	
135.2	Amendment 5 and Foreshore	Partial Support/ Partial Oppose	<p>The submitter supports the Objective and Policies (a) to (d), but is of the view that they do not go far enough. Policy 6A 1.1.2 which currently applies to The Esplanade is not included in the new policies for the area. This policy which was intended to protect public space on the foreshore, should be retained.</p> <p>Residential and commercial development along The Esplanade is mostly setback from the road frontage and includes some</p>	<p>Add back the following policy: <u><i>“That the height, location and bulk of structures fronting The Esplanade be managed to avoid the adverse effects on the adjoining foreshore”.</i></u></p> <p>Remove the statement <del><i>“There is no landscaping requirement, however, landscaping may enhance the character of the site”</i></del>, and require landscaping be providing to The Esplanade gateway route.</p>

			form of landscaping. This has the benefit of increasing green areas along the gateway route, providing a transition in scale from the footpath to the building line and a more consistent approach along the gateway route as it transitions to the residential zone.	
135.3	Amendment 6	Oppose	The submitter questions the proposed provision for weather protection in any new development beyond Victoria Street. The proposal is considered unlikely to deliver the weather protection it promotes and at best will deliver small sections of cover to isolated pockets of new development. If the council is serious about providing weather protection, than perhaps it should be considered as a funded project.	Retain Rule 5B 1.2.2 unchanged.
135.4	Amendment 7	Partial Support/ Partial Oppose	The submitter supports the Objective and Policies a(i), a(ii) and (b) to (g), but does not support Policy a(iii). The submitter questions the benefit of this policy.	Delete Policy 5B 1.2.3 (a) (iii) <del>For Jackson Street, require buildings to maintain an active, transparent and continual frontage, as well as shelter, to provide a pedestrian focused environment along this main gateway route</del> .
135.5	Amendment 8	Partial Support/ Partial Oppose	The submitter supports the Objective and Policy, although they do not support the removal of the requirement to screen car parking adjoining roads.	Retain a requirement for car parking areas adjoining roads and footpaths to be landscaped or suitably screened.
135.6	Amendment 10 and Activity Status	Partial Support/ Partial Oppose	The proposed changes increases the maximum floor area for retail by over 300%. The removal of the minimum area requirement is likely to have an adverse effect on the character of the Jackson Street retail area. It does this by increasing retail competition and therefore threatening the commercial viability of existing small businesses. It may also discourage retention of heritage buildings requiring investment in strengthening, potentially result in an increase in vacant premises within the Jackson Street precinct, and negatively impact on Jackson Street as a retail destination. An alternative may be to change smaller retail to a discretionary activity.  The submitter does not support the increase in the size of retail developments, primarily because these types of	Retain 500m <sup>2</sup> as the minimum area requirement for retail space.  Either retain or reduce the 3,000m <sup>2</sup> maximum floor area for retail activities.  Remove (n) and (o).  Add Childcare facilities, Educational and Training Facilities and Cultural Centres.

			<p>developments typically require significant areas of car parking, offer few benefits for the local community, typically provide amenity as internal space. If the amount of space required for car parking is reduced, then possibly the 3,000m<sup>2</sup> maximum area should also be reduced.</p> <p>The submitter supports the removal of the 500m<sup>2</sup> area for commercial activities [5B 2.2.1 (b)].</p> <p>The submitter supports the change to service stations, to exclude these from gateway routes [5B 2.2.1 (e)].</p> <p>The submitter does not support 5B 2.2.1 (n) and (o), because they are considered to unfairly disadvantage existing land/business owners on these road frontages.</p>	
135.7	Amendment 11 and Foreshore	Oppose	<p>The submitter objects to the proposed height and site coverage provisions for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% site coverage promotes development which is inconsistent with existing development along this gateway route;</li> <li>• The gateway route is one of the most important in the region;</li> <li>• Open space is an important community amenity;</li> <li>• The rules do little to support the stated policies [e.g. 5B 1.2.3 (e) and (g)];</li> <li>• Need to protect the amenity of public spaces and spaces between buildings from excessive shading/daylight loss;</li> <li>• The rules encourage the maximum development and the minimum consideration of the impacts of this development;</li> <li>• Loss of views, daylight and sunlight as the area becomes more developed; and</li> <li>• Potential drop in resale values as views and daylight are progressively lost.</li> </ul>	<p>Reconsider 5B 2.2.1.1 (a) and (b)</p> <p>Review incentive based rule systems used by other authorities to encourage enhanced amenity</p> <p>Require a minimum set back of at least 6m on The Esplanade road frontage</p> <p>Require a minimum setback of a least 3m on most other roads.</p> <p>Reduce the height limit to 12m where 100% site coverage is proposed.</p> <p>Allow for height limit increases where specific amenity (such as outdoor landscaped or seating area) is provided to a road frontage.</p> <p>Allow for proportional height limit increases when site coverage is reduced.</p>

		<p>The rules potentially offer economic advantages to those property owners who wish to redevelop. Presumably increasing the development potential may also increase the unimproved rating value and possibly disadvantage existing property and business owners.</p> <p>Development is only controlled by the market, building code requirements and the proposed recession planes on the gateway routes.</p> <p>Rules for The Esplanade should provide for setbacks and transitions in scale, which ensure that amenity values for pedestrians on both sides of The Esplanade are able to be retained or enhanced. This involves a consideration of overshadowing/shading of public spaces, particularly early in the morning and late in the afternoon in the winter months when the angle of the sun is low.</p> <p>The submitter points out a need for a series of rules or incentives, which encourages good planning solutions, by offering potential financial benefits.</p> <p>The submitter puts forward suggested alternatives which offer <i>“development incentives, set a lower permitted baseline and ensures that resource consent applications still have to demonstrate that they have mitigated any adverse effects.”</i></p> <p>At present there is nothing in the plan change that promotes the type of outdoor area adjacent to the street, promoted in the Design Guide on the bottom photo of page 9.</p> <p>It is essential that setbacks and recession planes along The Esplanade be more in line with the residential zones along this route i.e. based on 2.5m on the boundary with a recession plane of 45 degrees, a setback of at least 6m with any building height above the recession plane at a specific setback distance.</p>	
--	--	--	--



135.8	Amendment 12	Oppose	The submitter does not support the amendment because they object to additional small retail space beyond Victoria Street for reasons stated under Amendments 7 and 10.	Delete Amendment 12
135.9	Amendment 13	Partial Support/ Partial Oppose	The submitter supports the deletion of part of this rule, but does not support the removal of the requirement to landscape car park areas adjacent to roads.	Retain the requirement to landscape or screen car parks adjoining roads
138.10	Amendment 19	Oppose	The reasons for the deletion of these rules are unclear. The Council must take responsibility for ensuring the potential adverse effects on the transport network are fully considered and mitigated.	Retain Rules 5B 2.2.2 (a) and 2.2.2.1 (a)
138.11	Amendment 20	Oppose		In (ii) delete <del>In this respect and important consideration is the likely impact on the continuous window display frontage requirements.</del>
138.12	Amendment 24	Oppose	As the plan change emphasises the importance of gate way routes, it also seems important to retain the requirement for notification.	Delete <del>In respect of Rules 5B 2.2.2 (b) and (c), applications do not need to be publicly notified and do not need to be served on affected persons.</del>
138.13	Amendment 31	Oppose	The submitter does not support retail developments up to 10,000m <sup>2</sup> for reasons stated under Amendment 10.	Modify to read: All retail activities <del>within an integrated retail development</del> with a gross floor area exceeding <del>10,000m<sup>2</sup></del> 3,000m <sup>2</sup> .
138.14	Design Guide	Partial Support/ Partial Oppose	<p>The submitter supports the intention of the Design Guide, but is unsure of how a guide works in practise and wonders if it will set up a complicated system and expensive process.</p> <p>Comments made on the content of the Design Guide includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questioning of the relevance of statements made;</li> <li>• Base quality should include reference to sunlight and daylight provision, outdoor courts and seating and view shafts;</li> <li>• An alternative is suggested for improving the pedestrian route along Jackson Street;</li> <li>• Questioning of whether future character is accurately described, particularly in the Summary Table;</li> <li>• Value of Assessment Guidelines is questioned, given the height and site coverage rules in the plan change;</li> </ul>	<p>Review and strengthen the Design Guide by providing policies and rules which encourage the development of the actual character described in the guide.</p> <p>Note the concerns regarding the shading of Jackson Street.</p> <p>Extend the description and section on base quality to at least also cover sunlight and daylight.</p> <p>Remove reference and photo indicating projection of upper floors over the street is acceptable or is to be encouraged.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Absence of features in the plan change to encourage high quality or relatively low-rise apartment development, yards or town-house development as shown or referred to in the Design Guide;</li> <li>• New rule requiring a percentage of any new site to be provided as outdoor courtyard is suggested; and</li> <li>• The Design Guide should not encourage the projection of upper floors over the street, although there may be cases where this could occur without adverse effects.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	---	--

<b>DPC29/140 – Kevin Collins</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
140.1	General	Support	The submitter wishes to register their support for the plan change.	

<b>DPC29/142 – Brian Boyer and Penny Dallimore</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
142.1	General	Oppose	The submitter is of the view that the plan change does not give proper consideration to the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act and does not meet the requirements of sections 5, 6, 7, 31 and 32 of this Act.	

			<p>The rezoning is considered to be short-shorted and without adequate research into its short and long term effects. The proposal could destroy the commercial centre of Petone. It threatens its heritage centre and it will not achieve the results it predicts in either economic terms or the social and cultural well-being of the community.</p> <p>The submitter considers the reported economic benefits as overstated and misleading. They do not take into account the impact on Jackson Street and the rest of Petone in the longer term.</p> <p>There is no demand for the development which is proposed to be allowed and the proposal will not assist in creating a vibrant environment.</p>	
142.2	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that there is no need or demand for buildings above 12m height.</p> <p><i>“Whatever controls are put in place, commercial buildings and apartment blocks will look only as that. Experience has shown that they “age” extremely quickly. Commercial and retail development is virtually never part of a community.”</i></p> <p><i>The submitter adds that buildings should not occupy 100% of their building site, as that can create ugly and inhospitable corridors.</i></p>	<p>Development should be limited to low-rise buildings no more than 12m high, and be designed to moderate the effects of wind.</p> <p>Maximum building height on The Esplanade, Hutt Road, Jackson Street and other boundary streets in the Petone West should be 9m, with a recession plan of 45 degrees sloping upwards from the front boundary, up to a maximum of 12m.</p> <p>Building on The Esplanade must be setback at least 6m from the edge of the road, so that there is a clear transition from the beach to building frontages, and there is a green vegetation edge.</p>
142.3	General – Retail Floor Area	Oppose	<p>There is no need or demand for buildings smaller or larger than the existing retail size limits. Provisions would have a very negative impact on existing retailing in Jackson Street.</p>	<p>No commercial retail development should be permitted which is smaller than 500m<sup>2</sup> or larger than 3,000m<sup>2</sup>.</p>
142.4	General – Preferred Uses	Oppose	<p>Residential areas should be limited to where they already are, such as in parts of Nelson Street and Hutt Road, and east of Victoria Street and Petone Avenue, where they should be the predominant and preferred use.</p>	<p>Residential areas should be low-rise only and restricted to particular areas, such as areas bordering existing residential housing, where it will be the predominant and preferred use.</p>
142.5	General – Design Guides, Environmental	Oppose	<p>This is an opportunity to put in place the highest, latest and best standards for buildings, and for the environment they are in to be environmentally sustainable.</p>	<p>All building proposals must follow ecological principles and be built to the highest possible standards in an environmentally sustainable manner, and which will date and grow old gracefully.</p>

	Sustainability and Open Space		There must be designated green spaces and parks, including a community park. They are among the most valuable assets in any town or city.	<p>The village atmosphere and culture of Petone must be retained by all design guidelines, in a way which will not date rapidly or become incongruous or obtrusive.</p> <p>There must be at least 10% of the area in Petone West allocated as green spaces and parks, with the inclusion of a designated community park.</p> <p>There must be an over-arching requirement that all future development will have in mind the very long term existence of the community of Petone, with the elimination of any possibility of commercial or industrial “ghettos” or “wastelands”.</p>
--	-------------------------------	--	---	---

<b>DPC29/146 –Frances Mountier</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
146.1	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	The submitter refers to maintaining the special character of Petone and the Jackson Street Project.	Commercial development kept on a small-scale, not mini-malls.
146.2	General – Maximum Building Height	Oppose	The submitter opposes a change which allows building up to 30m.	Maintain existing height restrictions (not 30m)
146.3	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The submitter considers there should be lower density and lower heights through the fault area, given recent experience in Christchurch.	Lower density and height in fault zone.
146.4	General – Open Space	Oppose		Provision for Green Space.

**DPC29/149 – Stephen Shadwell**

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
149.1	General – General and Preferred Uses	Partial Support/ Partial Oppose	<p>The submitter states that they are generally supportive of the plan to introduce a mix of uses into the western end of Petone. However, the submitter raises concerns regarding specific provisions.</p> <p>A number of computer generated maps and simulations of possible outcomes from building height provisions under the current district plan and proposed plan change are attached to the original submission.</p> <p>The submitter identifies himself as a registered architect and states that maps were prepared using professional software and available resources.</p>	
149.2	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage and Amenity of Existing Residents	Oppose	<p>The proposed plan change increases the building height of buildings near residential areas. Although a permitted height of 30m already exists throughout much of the plan change area, the plan change increases the permitted height of buildings in the area, generally bounded by Victoria, Sydney and Jackson Streets and The Esplanade from 12 to 30m. Maps showing the precise boundaries of the area affected are attached to the original submission.</p> <p>This significant change will have a negative effect on the residential area immediately to the east, particularly Nelson Street.</p> <p>The submitter refers to his simulations as showing a dramatic difference in possible building heights arising from the proposed plan change. The plan change will allow current views of the western hills to be obliterated. The plan change will substitute a gradual increase in building height moving in a</p>	Lower the permitted height to 12m in the area bounded by Jackson Street, Sydney Street, Victoria Street and The Esplanade. See Figure C (attached to original submission).

			<p>westerly direction away from the residential area, with an abrupt jump in height from 10m to 30m.</p> <p>Although Amendment 7 (5B 1.2.3) Policy (e) recognises the need to restrict the height and setback of buildings at the interface with adjoining residential areas to minimise effects on amenity values, the plan change would allow significant negative effects in terms of over-dominance, shadowing and privacy.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the interface between the residential areas and the plan change area should be regarded as several blocks wide, rather than just 1 block wide and extending right to The Esplanade.</p>	
149.3	General – Design Guide	Oppose	<p>The proposed plan change requires assessment against the Design Guide only for buildings along Jackson Street, The Esplanade and Jackson Street.</p> <p>Not requiring Design Guide compliance can result in poor quality buildings and should be avoided in visually sensitive areas. The entire front line of tall buildings, will be visible from outside the Plan Change area and extend beyond those fronting The Esplanade. Urban design issues need to be managed for all buildings potentially visible from the main entrance routes as well as from the adjacent residential area.</p> <p>The proposed Design Guide should provide positive guidance to building owners and designers and provide a tool against which a proposed building’s design qualities can be measured by Council planners. The proposed Design Guide is considered to be inadequate, especially in relating to residential uses. It is a slim document (especially when compared to the Design Guide for the Hutt City Central Commercial Area), has a single guideline on building façade articulation, gives no guidance on what constitutes adequate outdoor space and requires no</p>	<p>Require Design Guide assessment against all buildings greater than 12m in height.</p> <p>Expand the Design Guide into a document comparable with the Central Commercial Area Design Guide with guidelines which address at least as broad a range of issues including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amenity value (for proposed developments as well as affected parties including the public).</li> <li>• Privacy (for proposed developments as well as affected parties).</li> <li>• Outdoor space</li> <li>• Sun access (for proposed developments as well as affected parties).</li> </ul>

			provision of such space. In contrast Design Guides in other areas offer quite specific and detailed guidelines and make expectations clear. <i>“The inference that can be drawn from the proposed Rule Change Design Guide is that expectations of Design quality for the area are being set low.”</i>	
--	--	--	--	--

DPC29/150 – Andy Christofferson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
150.1	General – General, Activity Status and Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that they object to the proposed plan change in its entirety on the basis that the proposed provisions set inappropriate/unjustified thresholds, contain inconsistencies and omissions; appear to be unsupported by the supporting documentation and Section 32 analysis; and remain unclear as to their consistency (or not) with Regional Planning Documents.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that provisions will not adequately achieve the objective and policies within the plan change that seek to protect Petone and the CBD.</p> <p>Care must be taken to ensure that mistakes made in the past in terms of the Hutt CBD, which ratepayers are now paying for in terms of development incentives to right past wrongs, are not replicated in Petone.</p> <p>The plan change is not supported by technical reports including those prepared by Development Economics regarding market demand and feasibility, and Boffa Miskell with respect to urban design.</p>	<p>I seek that Hutt City Council reject Plan Change 29</p> <p>Alternatively I seek that the Council amend Plan Change 29 to address the deficiencies within the plan change in the context of the above matters, and those I will expand upon at the hearing.</p> <p>The rules must be amended to enable a full consideration of the economic and distributional effects of retail activities on the economic viability of Petone and the Hutt City CBD.</p>

			<p>Any changes to the provisions need to be informed by robust economic assessment, and the submitter is concerned that insufficient weight has been given to the Development Economics report. Moreover, this report states that only the economic impacts of the proposed plan change for small format, retail, commercial and residential are estimated in this paper. The potential for significant effects on the economic viability of Petone and the CBD are therefore not known and the inclusion of permitted activity provisions with respect to large format retail and integrated retail developments are inherently problematic.</p> <p>The submitter states they reserve the ability to modify their stand in relation to the proposed plan change and the relief sought. They intend to expand on their comments at a further date.</p> <p>The submitter also comments that there is potential merit in the establishment of a mixed-use activity zone in Petone West.</p>	
150.2	General – Design Guide and Activity Status	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers the design guide is too limited in scope to achieve satisfactory urban design outcomes and that proposed provisions will not adequately implement the proposed objectives and policies.</p>	<p>Design guides should be extended to apply to all new buildings, as well as to alterations and additions to avoid adverse effects on the character and amenity of the area.</p> <p>Design guides must also be provided for residential uses to ensure suitable living environments, including but not limited to suitable room size, solar access and outdoor space. To this end, rules would need to be amended as appropriate, to require assessments against design guidelines. This would include the deletion of rules enabling the construction of new buildings and certain additions and alterations to existing buildings as permitted activities, and the insertion of new rules enabling assessment as a restricted discretionary activity with design matters, as a matter for discretion.</p>



150.3	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The plan change area is subject to a number of natural hazards including fault rupture, liquefaction and tsunami inundation. Given recent events and the intensification of use (and hence risk) facilitated by the plan change, such action should be delayed until the findings of the Royal Commission on the Canterbury Earthquakes are available, and any relevant legislation introduced.	
150.4	General - Transportation	Oppose	The submitter considers that there is inadequate consideration of the potential traffic effects associated with the intensification of use proposed and facilitated by the plan change. Impacts on The Esplanade, Hutt Road, Jackson Street and potentially the State Highway are of significant concern.	A thorough and detailed analysis of the potential traffic effects associated with extensive retail and other mixed use activities occurring within the plan change area, must be undertaken as part of the plan change process.  Following the outcome of a robust traffic assessment, rules need to be developed to manage traffic effects, and potentially limit certain activities.
150.5	Amendment 10	Oppose	The submitter states <i>“Rule 5B 2.2.1 (a) needs to be reworded, as the (I assume) unintended consequence of this wording is that there is no limit on retail activities (i.e. it is only integrated retail activities that are limited to 10,000m<sup>2</sup>).”</i>	

<b>DPC29/151 – Caroline Ammundsen on behalf of Greater Wellington Regional Council</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
151.1	General – Regional Policies	Oppose	<p>The submitter is interested to know how the proposed plan change will support and contribute to achieving the sustainable management of natural and physical resources in the Wellington region.</p> <p>The RMA requires the assessment of plan changes to take into account the proposed Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region 2010 (pRPS). Although the pRPS is currently</p>	

			<p>at the appeal stage, there are no outstanding appeals on sections relevant to the plan change (Sections 3.6, 3.8 and 3.9).</p> <p>The submitter points out that they have consistently given the following policy advice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• development in high risk hazard areas should be avoided;</li> <li>• not to intensify development in areas of Hutt City subject to flooding from the Waiwhetu Stream;</li> <li>• to recognise the risk and consequence of natural hazards,</li> <li>• effectively manage increased stormwater; and</li> <li>• consider climate change and sea-level rise in planning decisions.</li> </ul>	
151.2	General – Natural Hazards and Maximum Building Height	Oppose	<p>The submitters primary reasons for opposing the plan change are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“The lack of information on the flood hazard in the plan change area and therefore the absence of any provisions to avoid or appropriately mitigate flood risk.</i></li> <li>• <i>The risk of seismic activity in the plan change area and a lack of adequate provisions for buildings and development in the Wellington Fault Special Study Area”.</i></li> </ul> <p>Hutt Valley is one of the most at risk urbanised areas in New Zealand. The recent Christchurch earthquakes have highlighted how critical it is to take natural hazards seriously and plan for them in order to minimise the impacts from natural disasters.</p> <p>Seismic hazard risk in Petone West is high, as identified by the GHD natural hazards report “Natural Hazards Review and Geotechnical Considerations” February 2012. However it is not the only natural hazard which requires consideration.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u></p>	<p>Hutt City Council undertakes further investigations in order to assess the flood hazard of the plan change area.</p> <p>Hutt City Council takes appropriate actions in response to any flood hazard information regarding the plan change area, which result in reassessing the appropriateness of any intensification of development in the plan change area.</p> <p>Inappropriate development is avoided in areas at high risk of flooding and in other areas, that a minimum 1-in-100 year flood building level is applied to the plan change area.</p> <p>Hutt City Council reconsider the District Plan Subcommittee Report DPS 2012/2/63 dated 27 March 2012, which recommended on the basis of technical information that a maximum building height of 15m should apply to the existing Wellington Fault Special Study Area.</p> <p>Hutt City Council reconsider whether residential activities should be managed more carefully (i.e. restricted) in terms of location within the fault area. Associated with this, Hutt City Council may wish to consider commissioning further more detailed study to ascertain more precisely</p>

		<p>Though not potentially as severe or significant as a seismic event, a flood hazard event is the most likely hazard in the plan change area.</p> <p>Flooding from the following sources are not investigated in the GHD Natural Hazards report or other documentation provided for the plan change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flooding hazards associated with the Hutt River;</li> <li>• Stormwater runoff from the Western Hills in Korokoro Stream;</li> <li>• Local stormwater runoff;</li> <li>• Effects of climate change such as sea level rise; and</li> <li>• Coastal storm surge.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter has identified a portion of the plan change area as subject to residual flood risk from the Hutt River corridor in the case of overdesign events (greater than a 1 in 440 year flood with stopbank breaches). A map showing the area subject to residual flood risk, is attached to the original submission.</p> <p>The combined Western hills/Korokoro Stream and local stormwater flooding must be investigated with the purpose of being able to provide detailed flood hazard information, allowing the flood hazard to be effectively avoided in the first instance. Depending on the outcome of this investigative work, GWRC requests that as a minimum building levels on sites where development is approved, should be above the 1 in 100 year return period flood level with provision for safe access.</p> <p>The existing flood hazard from the Korokoro Stream is documented historically. The plan change area was extensively flooded in the December 1976 storm event. A photograph of this event and a report titled 'Report on storm of December 20 1976, Wellington Regional Water Board' is attached to the original submission. This flooding was considerable and</p>	<p>the location of the fault line in order to make more appropriate planning decisions.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>represents a significant hazard in the area proposed to be rezoned. A letter from Opus dated 23 June 2003 about the Korokoro Stream Flood Frequency is also attached to the original submission.</p> <p>Taking into account the effects of climate change and sea level rise, the flooding situation encountered in 1976 will occur more frequently than previous estimates.</p> <p><u>Seismic Hazard</u></p> <p>The Wellington Fault, one of the major faults of the Lower North Island runs directly through the plan change area. The plan change area is at high risk from amplified ground-shaking and liquefaction during a large earthquake, as identified by the GWRC seismic hazard mapping. This mapping work was overlooked in the GHD natural hazards report.</p> <p>GWRC considers that there has been a lack of recognition of the liquefaction potential of the plan change area and therefore a lack of adequate provisions to guide development in the Wellington Fault Special Study Area. They note that buildings in this study area are a Restricted Discretionary Activity, but have the same height restrictions as the rest of the plan change area.</p> <p>The proposed plan allows a maximum permitted building height of 30m and no special provisions for residential activities in the Wellington Fault Special Study Area, despite earlier recommendations that maximum height be reduced to 15m and consideration be given as to whether residential activities should be restricted.</p> <p><u>Sea Level Rise</u></p> <p>GWRC recently released a report 'Sea-level variability and</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>trends: Wellington Region, June 2012', which estimated that sea levels in the Wellington region have risen by over 0.2m in the past 100 years. The effects of sea level rises are exacerbated by storm events, which in Petone will lead to impeded drainage.</p> <p>The Council should assess the current stormwater network of the plan change area and ensure its long term functioning in the face of rising sea levels.</p> <p>As sea levels rise, it allows waves to reach higher up the beach during storm conditions and high spring tides. Beaches around the Harbour will become more vulnerable to erosion and inundation.</p> <p>The sea level variability report indicates that <i>"we should be planning for a least 1.0m of rise over the next 100 years"</i>. This is in line with previous Ministry for Environment guidance.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that the plan change take into account the potential future impacts from climate change over the next 100 years and plans for at least 1.0m of sea level rise.</p>	
151.3	General – Transportation, Retail Floorspace and Activity Status	Oppose	<p><u>Increased Congestion</u></p> <p>The submitter suggests that new development within this plan change area needs to be controlled so that the traffic impacts of activities on the adjacent road network are managed. <i>"In this regard, allowing an increase to the permitted retail floor area of 10,000m<sup>2</sup> in the plan change is unlikely to see traffic volumes managed in a way that is consistent with pRPS Policy 56(a). Typically large format retail developments are associated with the (sic) higher car trips than other activities. To better manage the impact of traffic volumes Greater Wellington suggests that retail activity should be at least a controlled activity in the plan change, with a control matter on the effects of traffic impacts to read as it would for restricted</i></p>	That larger building developments are at least a controlled activity in the District Plan, with a control matter added around traffic effects, so appropriate conditions can be included in a resource consent application to manage the effects of extra traffic on the existing transport network.

		<p><i>discretionary activity conditions. This will give Hutt City Council the opportunity to include necessary conditions around traffic management to minimise disruption to the existing transport network.”</i></p> <p>Concern is also raised that the plan change is inconsistent with Policy 7. State Highway 2 is identified as regional significant infrastructure in the pRPS and runs adjacent to the plan change area. The Esplanade and Hutt Road are within the plan change area and are main feeder routes onto State Highway 2. It is crucial that new development encouraged by the plan change, does not adversely affect the efficient operation of State Highway 2.</p> <p>The Petone Vision Statement states that current traffic volumes on The Esplanade are not economically or environmentally sustainable. Also The Esplanade has some of the highest traffic flows for heavy vehicles in New Zealand. The Regional Land Transport Strategy 2010-2040 recognises The Esplanade as a bottleneck suffering from severe congestion at peak times. The Council’s Long Term Plan 2012-2022 also identifies the need to resolve traffic issues on The Esplanade.</p> <p>Potential traffic impacts on the local road network as a result of the plan change, needs to take into account existing transport issues. This includes demand and growth anticipated from the Seaview/Gracefield area, the feasibility of an Inland Cross Valley Link and funding for improvements on The Esplanade route.</p> <p><u>Integration and Maintaining and Enhancing Viability and Vibrancy</u></p> <p>Petone is identified as a Suburban Centre in Policy 29 of the pRPS. This policy promotes the maintenance and enhancement of the viability and vibrancy of suburban centres in order to encourage investment and development.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>The submission also refers to Policy 30 of the pRPS and identifies a significant proportion of the proposed plan change as located within walking distance to Petone Railway Station.</p> <p>Petone Railway Station is on the 'Rapid Transit Network' in the Regional Public Transportation Plan and is identified as a 'regionally significant centre and strategic interchange' within this plan.</p> <p>The submission identifies future strategic transport improvements in the vicinity of the plan change, including further rail frequency and capacity improvements, a new and upgraded off-road walkway/cycleway between Petone and Ngauranga and a new SH2 Petone to SH1 Grenada Link Road with associated new Petone interchange.</p> <p>The submitter identifies Policy 56 of the pRPS as a relevant consideration, which requires plan changes to have particular regard to achieving key outcomes in the Regional Land Transport Strategy. They note that the plan change area has good proximity to strategic transport links, together with access to nearby recreational opportunities including the Petone foreshore and Korokoro recreational areas. These recreational areas would be further supported by this proposed plan change area having a wider range of mixed uses including residential/apartments, restaurants, retail, community facilities etc.</p> <p>Greater Wellington recognises the significance of Petone as a suburban centre and supports measures to ensure its viability and vibrancy. However, this does not remove their concerns about the impacts of traffic on the existing road network, particularly in relation to high traffic generating activities.</p> <p><u>Car Parking</u></p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>The submitter claims that <i>"further consideration should be given to car-parking standards for new developments within the proposed plan change area, particularly for higher density developments where the need and demand for car parking may be reduced as a result of proximity to public transport, jobs and facilities. Greater Wellington supports the design guide direction around ensuring that new car parking is provided within or behind buildings whenever possible to create safe and attractive environments along the key routes"</i>.</p>	
151.4	General – Indigenous Vegetation		<p>The submitter considers that there is the potential for significant adverse effects to occur during the construction phase of new buildings and infrastructure, resulting from this plan change. Areas of concern include the Korokoro Stream and estuary, and the Petone foreshore. The submission identifies policy 46 of the pRPS as a relevant consideration.</p> <p>GWRC add that Petone West is already highly developed, and has not been identified as having 'significant biodiversity values' under Policy 22 of the proposed Regional Policy Statement 2010. As such, Greater Wellington does not oppose the re-zoning of the area on biodiversity grounds.</p>	
151.5	Amendment 4		<p>The submitter supports the inclusion of Policy 5B 1.1.2(h) in Amendment 4, which is consistent with regional policy 46. However it is recommended that examples of methods to achieve this policy be included in the text. For example, the installation and maintenance of sediment traps and the restoration and maintenance of fish passage in culverted natural waterways.</p> <p>The submitter recommends that the 'Explanation and Reasons' in this amendment which relate to Policy 5B 1.1.2 (h) be amended to include explicit acknowledgement that adverse effects on biodiversity values, natural character, open space and amenity values are to be avoided.</p>	



151.6	Amendment 38		The submitter recommends that the Anticipated Environment Results of the plan change include reference to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity values.	
-------	--------------	--	--	--

DPC29/152 – Gerald Davidson on behalf of Petone Community Board				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
152.1	General – General and Preferred Uses	Oppose	<p>The Petone Community Board opposes the proposed plan change as written.</p> <p>The history of the area is said to feature a pattern of housing and industry/commerce together and this is something which the submitter believes the plan change should seek to replicate.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the background of the proposed plan change, including the development of a Petone Vision Statement and Draft Proposal 2010 presented by consultants Boffa Miskell. Attendees at the Petone Vision meetings are said to have agreed that current retail provisions should be retained and that residential uses should be a permitted activity in west Petone, in exchange for a reduction in permitted height limits.</p> <p><i>“This series of meetings resulted in a Vision Statement and the identification of four elements. Since the Vision Statement and its Elements reflect the views of the people of Petone, it should have been used to formulate Plan Change 29”.</i> These elements are described in detail in the original submission.</p>	

			<p>The Submitter points out that what is now proposed does not match what came out from the extensive consultation for the Petone Vision Statement and is substantially different to the 2010 Boffa draft.</p> <p>The Petone Community Board feels that the <i>“proposed plan is very permissive and disagrees with the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>The lack of reference to the Petone Vision Statement and the 2010 Draft Plan.</i></li> <li>2. <i>The allowing of small retail and big box retailing as permitted activities.</i></li> <li>3. <i>The possible height limit of 30m over most of the area.</i></li> <li>4. <i>The 100% site coverage.</i></li> <li>5. <i>The lack of allowance for Green Space.</i></li> <li>6. <i>The lack of quality design guidelines for the area.</i></li> <li>7. <i>The absence of real solutions in regard to Natural Hazards in the area.</i></li> <li>8. <i>The lack of considerations of traffic issues in and around the area.</i></li> <li>9. <i>The lack of protection for the urupa in Te Puni Street.”</i></li> </ol> <p>The Petone Community Board feel that the plan change has ignored the views people expressed in previous consultation and will, if adopted, alter the character, feel and amenity value of Petone. They add that their expectation that the plan change would acknowledge the ‘gateway’ (of Petone) and provide an attractive, softened, green entrance to invite people along The Esplanade, has not been met.</p> <p>The Board wishes to discuss the idea of having residential uses restricted to certain areas, such as areas bordering existing residential areas.</p>	
152.2	General – Retail Floorspace and	Oppose	<p><i>“Jackson Street is recognised as one of the key attractions in the City and the success story it is today is the result of 20 years of</i></p>	That the rule which currently applies to retail rules in the part of the area known as Petone Commercial Activity Area – Area 2, limiting retail

	Activity Status		<p><i>work to turn a declining retail area into a vibrant retail destination. The risk to the Street is identified in papers prepared for the City Council in respect to the Plan Change. We would suggest that the effect (of the plan change) will cause the precinct to unravel.</i></p> <p><i>The Board is concerned about the possible impacts of a very permissive Plan Change on the Lower Hutt CBD and the Moera shopping precinct.</i></p> <p><i>The greatest danger is from a small mall development in the vicinity or involving the two supermarkets and existing retailers moving out. The result of this will be that heritage buildings will be left vacant and there would be an economic decline. The matter was raised previously when a supermarket on the Gear Meat site including (sic) a mall which would replace the existing retail strip was proposed. This was dropped following the resulting controversy”.</i></p> <p>The Board states that they would agree to retain the existing retail provisions of the area.</p>	<p>to between 500m<sup>2</sup> and 3,000m<sup>2</sup> to apply in general across the area and that there be no discretionary power for the Hutt City Council to exceed this 3,000m<sup>2</sup> provision. The retail area will be restricted to the current Petone Commercial Activity Area – Area 2..</p>
152.3	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>The 30m proposed height limit over most of the plan change, overturns completely the community consensus reached in the Petone Vision Meetings and the height recommendations made by Boffa.</p> <p>The submitter states that that they support the transitional provisions for areas abutting residential activity areas.</p> <p>The Board considers that low rise buildings of 12m height would correspond with the views of the participants at the Petone Vision meetings. It would also have the benefit of preventing cumulative wind effects from tall buildings sited in the one area and mitigate natural hazard risks (such as seismic activity).</p>	<p>That on The Esplanade there is a 6m setback from the street frontage.</p> <p>That a height limit of 12m will apply across the plan change area.</p>

			<p>Petone west is particularly exposed to wind from the north and south. The area should have specific guidelines for all buildings and structures to ensure that there are no adverse outcomes in terms of shadow and wind effects. There is no overall or cumulative wind rule. Tall buildings could alter wind effects of adjacent buildings, leading to non-compliance with wind standards. Mitigating cumulative effects is difficult.</p> <p>A 6m setback from The Esplanade would reflect current provisions.</p> <p>The 100% site coverage rule appears to be at variance with the proposal to permit residential uses as a permitted activity. This rule does not acknowledge particular problems that rules would cause in narrower streets. For example, Te Puni Street could be a solid row of blocks of 30m high residential or commercial buildings on both sides of the street. This would exacerbate wind issues and contribute to acute shading issues.</p> <p>The 2010 draft plan proposed a park in the vicinity of Annie Huggan Grove. If the plan change will lead to a substantial increase in the population of Petone, it would be sensible to provide green spaces and parks.</p>	
153.4	General – Design Guides and Environmental Sustainability	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that landscaping requirements, including setbacks from streets, should form part of the Design Guidelines. These guidelines should also include Community Protection through Environmental Design.</p> <p><i>“The Board agrees with residential being a permitted activity. But the lack of real Design Guidelines for the area would lead to the worst kind of apartment development. We feel that all residential proposals here would be expected to follow urban eco-village principles as applied in Europe and North America.</i></p> <p><i>We would like to see housing development as integrated urban eco-village proposals with much stricter Design Guidelines</i></p>	<p>That strict high quality Design Guidelines apply in general across the area and to the whole structure of a building and not just the street frontage. As a minimum, the appropriate Design Guidelines from the CBD should be strengthened and be mandatory.</p> <p>That there is provision applied for substantial landscaping requirements to create green space in respect to all developments. This will mean the 100% site coverage rule will not apply. The CBD provisions for residential green spaces will become mandatory for the Petone West area.</p> <p>That the provision of a public park be investigated.</p>

			<p><i>rather than just apartment blocks per se... High quality Design Guidelines are required in this plan change to ensure there is high quality development and to attract investors who value quality development....</i></p> <p><i>The Board supports strong Design Guidelines which incorporate the current best thinking on environmental sustainability, self-sufficiency and community building. Petone should draw on the (overseas) experience and learn the lessons of others to encourage 'green development'."</i></p>	
152.5	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>There should be no residential development close to or within the Wellington Fault Area. The Board also questions permitting emergency services in this hazard prone area.</p> <p>This area has serious potential natural hazards. Seismic risk and its consequent damage appears to have been 'glossed over' in the plan change.</p> <p><i>"Geologically the area is crossed by the Wellington Fault in a diagonal way. The soils in the area are light and prone to liquefaction. The area is barely above sea level with a high natural water table. The most recent study into sea level rise is predicting a 1 metre rise in the next 100 years. A change in levels will have a knock on effect with respect to the water table; the water table will be closer to ground and then there is the issue of sea water incursion".</i></p> <p>The question of seismic risk has emerged in Christchurch. Clearing parts of Petone is not a feasible option and the most sensible option in relation to seismic risk is a higher design standard with strict guidelines.</p> <p>The Building Act is said to make no reference to liquefaction, tsunami or seismic rupture and therefore it cannot be relied upon to remedy these matters.</p>	<p>Strict Design Guidelines for buildings, infrastructure and facilities that provide real solutions, which allow survival of lives and the buildings in the event of liquefaction, tsunami or seismic rapture.</p> <p>That a higher design standard to applied to take regard of the substantive seismic risk in the area.</p> <p>No residential development close to or within the Wellington Fault Area.</p>

152.6	General - Transportation	Oppose	<p>The Plan Change makes little reference to the impact of increased traffic in this area and therefore provides no solutions.</p> <p>The submitter has requested to see a full traffic assessment that examines impacts from increased residential development and which provides mitigation.</p>	
152.7	General – Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks greater protection for the urupa in Te Puni Street. The area is an historic site and a site with special significant to Te Ati Awa.</p> <p><i>“The Board would seek to ensure that a greater set back, similar to that which would be applied to a single residential dwelling, be applied to enhance the urupa”.</i></p>	<p>That in regard to the Te Puni Street urupa of the Te Ati Awa iwi there be a 12m height limit for buildings abutting the urupa, a recession plane requirement, an 8 metre rear yard setback, a 3m side yard setback and adequate approved screening of storage, car parking and servicing areas from any buildings abutting the urupa.</p>

*Submission supported by Submitters 73 – Andred and Rebecca Saker, 116 – Joyce Kellett and 160 – Ralph Wynne-Griffiths.*

<b>DPC29/0153 – Carl Bakker on behalf of PUEA Inc. (Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated)</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
153.1	General Amendment 4 Amendment 7 Amendment 10	Oppose	<p>The submitter identifies the primary purpose of PUEA is to sustain and enhance the Petone urban environment and the amenity of residents. The group has a membership of approximately 30 persons.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the need to ensure that amenity and business productivity are maintained or enhanced. In the long</p>	<p>Reject the plan change in its current form, undertake a re-evaluation of the underlying economic analysis, reshaping the changes required to enhance residential and urban amenity and productivity including the amendments as requested.</p> <p>An independent and rigorous review of the underlying economic analysis on which most of the Plan proposal rely, followed by a</p>

		<p>run they want Petone to be a better place to live and in which to do business. This may mean, as in Christchurch, that land supply is actually restricted and accompanied with very clear urban planning to ensure that improved land use and amenity emerges.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the underlying demand analysis and development feasibility on which the proposed changes are based are deeply flawed. The report provided by Development Economics provides no justification or evidence for its estimates for future business, its results do not appear credible and household demand and all estimates are said to be <i>“merely self-referenced”</i>. The submitter expresses doubts regarding the predicted anticipated growth in retail floorspace of 82% between 2011 and 2031, compared to a population increase of 6.5% over the same time period. The submitter refers to Development Economics as appearing to be a one-person company facing liquidation in the Auckland High Court as at 2 August 2012.</p> <p>There are real risks that the proposed changes could reduce amenity and productivity within Petone West and more importantly could result in reduced effectiveness in other parts of Petone and the Hutt. A retail study by Market Economics prepared for Auckland Council in 2008 concluded that <i>“it is important to adequately provide for the substantial growth in floorspace in the City, without occasioning a substantial dispersal of retail floorspace across the Business areas, and undermining the retail and wider roles of the centres network.”</i></p> <p>The objectives of the area need to be strengthened, but more fundamentally, the proposed interventions need to be reviewed so that they consistently support delivery of the objectives, for which they fall well short as currently set out.</p>	<p>rethinking of the interventions most likely to deliver improvements to amenity and urban productivity. This would almost certainly result in changes to 5B 1.2.3 so that the coverage was more extensive, and 5B 2.2.1 is more limited in permitted activities.</p> <p>A clear goal to maintain or improve amenity and productivity both in the area without causing adverse effects elsewhere in the Hutt. This would require a change to the Objective in 5B 1.1.2 that replaces <del>avoiding or mitigating adverse effects on the amenity values and character of the area and the overall receiving environment</del> with <u>maintaining and enhancing the amenity values and character of the area and the overall receiving environment.</u></p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>As currently worded, the plan change would result in inappropriate effects on the heritage character, look and feel of Petone.</p> <p>The opportunity to explore ways of actually creating enhanced urban amenity, especially for potential residents is not explored or encouraged.</p>	
153.2	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	Buildings 30m (ten or more stories) high with 100% site coverage across nearly all the area proposed is far too permissive and would detract from the character and amenity values of the area.	Permitted height reduced to 10m maximum and the permitted site coverage reduced to allow for the provision of green spaces (landscaping).
153.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The proposed retail rules will undermine Jackson Street, as they are too permissive.</p> <p>No retail should be permitted on The Esplanade due to parking difficulties and the potential to undermine Jackson Street.</p>	Retailing to be kept as at present to 500m <sup>2</sup> minimum and 3000m <sup>2</sup> maximum outside the heritage precinct, with Jackson Street as the focus of any retail development.
153.4	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned that the high natural hazard risks in this area have not been recognised.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the Council needs to learn from the Christchurch experience.</p>	Develop rules that minimise loss of life and property in the zone. This includes the need for new rules to limit development in the proximity of the Wellington fault, and rules which address the liquefaction and tsunami risks.
153.5	General – Design Guides	Oppose		<p>Clear design guideline for all new buildings across all of the proposed zone that includes outdoor areas for each residential unit and ensures access to sunlight. These guidelines must ensure that future buildings are designed in a manner which is respectful to the character of Petone and ensure that there is a high quality entrance route to the Hutt Valley.</p> <p>Application of a coherent design guide across the entire area.</p>



DPC29/0154 – Brendan Hogan

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
154.1	General - General and Preferred Uses	Neutral	<p>The submitter identifies that their submission is neutral and they could support the plan change, subject to the suggested relief sought.</p> <p>The submitter supports the intent and thrust of the proposed plan change to provide for mixed use at the western end of Petone. This area has many positive attributes that make it suitable for mixed use development and higher residential development including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility to all modes of transport (vehicular and non-vehicular).</li> <li>• Accessibility to a wide range of commercial, recreation and social amenities and services.</li> <li>• Identification of Petone in the Wellington Regional Strategy as a sub-regional centre that has appropriate attributes as a node for residential and business intensification.</li> <li>• Potential to add to the vibrancy of Petone and Hutt City with associated economic benefits; and</li> <li>• Potential to relieve pressure for intensification and loss of amenity in the character housing residential areas of Petone.</li> </ul>	To approve the proposed plan change 29 subject to amendments.
154.2	General – Maximum Building Height	Oppose	<p>A maximum building height of 3 or 4 stories for Permitted Activities would be appropriate for the built and natural environment of Petone.</p> <p>The proposed maximum building height is inappropriate and will have adverse environmental effect on the urban design, built amenity, established character of Petone and the broad landscape character at the northern end of the harbour.</p>	Reducing the maximum building height for Permitted Activities from 30m down to a maximum of 3 or 4 stories.

			<p>The dominant landscape element in this part of Petone is the western and eastern hills and long flat linear nature of the valley floor and harbour foreshore. The few existing tall modern office blocks at the western end of Petone are inappropriate and adversely affect the natural landscape character of the locality, and further duplication of 30m high buildings will compound this effect.</p> <p>The scale of 3 or 4 storey buildings are of the 'human scale' appropriate in a windy climate, and a good fit for Petone. They sit comfortably within the urban fabric/built environment and built character of the commercial area of Petone. Recent apartment developments along the length of Jackson Street at 3 and 4 stories successful integrate into the scale of the built environment of Petone.</p> <p>It is also questionable whether the scale of development and enormous floor space that could be provided with 30m high buildings could result in a glut of business/commercial floor space and compete with other commercial centres such as Lower Hutt CBD. The suggested height would therefore control the amount of additional business/commercial floorspace provided as a permitted activity.</p>	
154.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Partial Support/ Partial Oppose	<p>Careful consideration needs to be given to the size of the permitted floorspace, so that it does not compete with the small shops along Jackson Street.</p> <p>The submitter does not oppose the provision of retail floor space in the mixed use zone, but it should provide a complementary function to, and not compete with the small shop function of Jackson Street. Different types of retailing and different types and sizes of retail floor space, can function in a complementary manner so that the area becomes a retail/commercial destination and each different type of retail area compliments each other.</p>	<p>Incorporating controls on the size/type of retail floor space within the Proposed Plan Change area so that new development in Petone West provides for a different type of retailing (e.g. Show rooms, larger format, department stores) from that in the established Jackson Street precinct and does not compete with its small retail shops/cafes/bars/restaurants.</p>

		<p>Therefore careful consideration needs to be given to ensure that the permitted retail floor space at the western end of Petone provides for a different type of retail mix/floor space size than the smaller retail 'floorplates' along Jackson Street. The established Jackson Street precinct could then benefit from a wider customer base.</p> <p>The submitter points out that they would not support retail floor sizes in the plan change area that would compete with and empty the small shops/cafes/restaurants in the established retail strip of Jackson Street. That would destroy its vibrancy and success.</p>	
154.4	General – Natural Hazards	<p>The plan change should incorporate measures to manage the risks and promote resilience in response to the Region's natural hazards, which include flooding, seismic activity and tsunamis.</p> <p>Development applications in the plan change area will need to include appropriate assessments and technical information on how the design addresses the natural hazards. These natural hazards are not unique to Petone and it is a matter of managing the risk and designing for resilience. This is likely to result in higher development costs for new development in the plan change area. A positive effect of the requested reduction in building height from 30m to 3 to 4 stories will make engineering foundation costs and design responses more manageable and affordable.</p>	<p>Incorporating measures such as appropriate assessments and technical information to accompany development applications in order to manage the risks and promote resilience in response to natural hazards.</p>

DPC29/155 – Ann Neill on behalf of New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
155.1	General – General, Retail Floorspace and Heritage	Oppose	<p><i>“While the NZHPT supports in principle the concept of mixed use rezoning within the western area of Petone, NZHPT does not support the proposal in its current form. NZHPT is willing to review its position on receipt of further information as requested”.</i></p> <p>NZHPT supports the mixed use proposal as it would allow for an array of activities that would complement the Jackson Street heritage area. For example residential activities, within this area of Petone would encourage more sustainable transport options and subsequently Jackson Street retail area would have more foot traffic and this would create positive economic gains.</p> <p>The Jackson Street area illustrates aspects of Petone’s history. The shops along Jackson Street played a valuable supporting role through this period of early development and today are an important reminder of the district’s past. The economic viability of Jackson Street is significant to Petone. The Jackson Street Heritage Area has significance for the immense public esteem it holds and interest vested in it. Over many years, the public and community groups have used and supported the retail and other activities of Jackson Street, recognising that this street is very special.</p> <p>NZHPT is aware that there has been a research paper for the Petone West Plan Change named <i>‘Development Economics (2012): Evaluation of Market Demand and Development Feasibility’</i> that weighed up the costs and benefits of the plan change and its effects on the wider area. It indicated that the plan change will have economic effects which can be expected</p>	That the reference to heritage in the plan change be replaced with ‘historic heritage’.

			<p>to adversely affect the vitality and viability of Jackson Street. There is substantive evidence that the plan change would result in new speciality retail in the location and this would mean the relocation of existing tenants from the main street area.</p> <p>The submitter refers to The Technical Report <i>“Economic Impact of the Proposed Petone West Plan Change”</i> conducted by Hutt City Council which states that <i>“as a result of the plan change that up to 40-80 small stores could be established and potentially relocated from the Jackson Street area”</i>.</p> <p>Recommendations are made to avoid damage to the highly valued and valuable Jackson Street Historic Area.</p> <p>The term historic heritage rather than heritage is better aligned with the definition under the RMA.</p> <p>Attached to the original submission are copies of articles from ‘Petone’s First 100 Years (1940)’ and a historic map of the Petone/Lower Hutt area.</p>	
155.2	Amendment 4	Oppose	<p>In relation to the proposed issue for Area 2, NZHPT note a lack of policies to reverse unintended consequences on Jackson Street and the Central Commercial Activity Area. Although proposed policy (b) attempts to address this issue, there are no methods to tackle how this policy would be achieved. The submitter agrees with the report by Development Economics that in many cities in NZ, that unless there is an evidential basis to the policy, it will be unlikely that the Council will be able to manage the dispersal of retail activity.</p>	<p>Original floor space for retail activities to be reinstated.</p> <p>Inclusion of policies in Rule 5B 1.2.3 that would support a minimum retail floorspace in Area 2.</p>
155.3	Amendment 7	Oppose	<p>The proposed issue for Petone refers to recognising effects on heritage, although there are no policies that reflect the effects on heritage for any building.</p>	<p>An additional policy that states:</p> <p><u>(h) Manage new buildings to be designed to manage the adverse effects</u></p>

				<u>on historic heritage.</u>
155.4	Amendment 10	Oppose	<p>NZHPT is concerned about the removal of a minimum of 500m<sup>2</sup> from the original rule. As this would allow for boutique retail precincts or similar development that would have detrimental effects on the vitality and viability of the Jackson Street retail area. A good example of this is Otaki, whereby a retail hub with boutique shops was formed off Arthur Street, which has contributed to the deterioration of the viability of the Otaki Main Street area. <i>“There is evidence and case law that any recentering of the vital retail hub away from its traditional location (in this case Jackson Street) will have adverse effects.”</i></p> <p>Whilst the proposed rules do not allow for large malls, as any development over 10,000m<sup>2</sup> would require resource consent, developers could circumvent the rule by developing two malls and interconnecting them by virtue of a pedestrian passageway or thoroughfare.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the findings of the report by Development Economics regarding the possible relocation of stores from the main street area to the plan change area and that this would potentially result in <i>“significant vacancies and deterioration in the quality of retail tenants in the Jackson Street area which may undermine the overall economic and social value of the centre”</i>.</p> <p>The submitter notes the recommendation in the above report that smaller speciality retail shops be consolidated in the Jackson Street main street area, as there is presently a minor oversupply of small speciality retail shops in Petone.</p> <p>To ensure the protection of the retail hub of the Jackson Street area, it is critical to reinstate the minimum floor space of 500m<sup>2</sup>.</p>	<p>Amendment of permitted activities standards for retail activities to ensure that a series of malls with a thoroughfare of pedestrian passageway between these malls are not established.</p> <p>The Council promotes the consolidation of smaller speciality retail shops in the Jackson Street main street area by way of objectives, policies, methods and rules.</p> <p>Use of non-regulatory tools to incentivise land-owners with heritage buildings by encouraging adaptive re-use, waiving resource consent fees, and encouraging owners to apply to various heritage funds for earthquake strengthening (including NZHPT’s own incentive fund).</p> <p>That Rule 5B 2.2.1 (a) be amended to read:</p> <p>Retail activities, excluding integrated retail developments exceeding 10,000 m<sup>2</sup> in total combined retail floor area <u>with a gross floor area not less than 500m<sup>2</sup></u></p>
155.5	General - Design Guide	Oppose	<p><i>“NZHPT supports the development of the Petone Mixed Use area design guide, however we note that the design guidance does not incorporate the design guides into the District Plan as</i></p>	

			<i>a method, or as an assessment criterion”.</i>	
155.6	General - Archaeology		A Heritage Overlay covering the plan change area is attached to the original submission. <i>“R27/268 (indicated on the Heritage Overlay) is a recorded kainga site, the site of the original Pito One Village. Pito One Village was the Te Atiawa kainga where the first New Zealand Company settlers arrived in 1839 and negotiated the sale of land before establishing the short lived settlement of Britannia beside the Hutt River. The cemetery associated with it is still intact, located on Te Puni Street. Archaeological remains related to this settlement may survive beneath the standing buildings similar to the remains of Te Aro Pa in Wellington City”.</i>	

<b>DPC29/156 – Hone Ridley</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
156.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan in its entirety.  The plan is considered to lack good vision and needs amending. The plan change is far too permissive. Anything goes.	It is requested that an Independent commissioner be part of any hearing panel.
156.2	General – Maximum Building Height	Oppose		Keep the current small low-rise scale that Petone has now as a basis for any future development.
156.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	The plan change will undermine existing retail businesses in Petone and Lower Hutt.	Don't allow full retail, small size or mall size retail in the new zone. Keep the same Commercial Area 2 of current District Plan enforces. Protect the Jackson Street retail amenity.
156.4	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The submitter refers to the risk to people and property by intensifying residential and commercial growth in the natural hazard area.	Learn from the Royal Commission on Christchurch earthquake findings and delay the district plan change until this report is through.
156.5	General – Design Guides	Oppose		Apply high quality design guidelines for the whole plan change area. Consider using similar, or an improved version of the current CBD

				design guidelines.
156.6	General – Foreshore and Maximum Site Coverage	Oppose	The Gateway entrance to Petone is overlooked.	Esplanade gateway. Better landscaping with deeper setback requirements – this should be a stunning entrance to Petone and the foreshore.
156.7	General – Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Oppose	The submitter raises concern regarding future developments around the urupa.	Cultural respect to the area surrounding the urupa is needed. Consider much lower building heights on the 3 boundaries with green space requirements too.

<b>DPC29/157 – Katherine Jane Clarke</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
157.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that they support a mixed use zone and that they are not opposed to economic growth, but they do oppose the “<i>very permissive plan change</i>”.</p> <p>As currently worded, the plan change would result in significant adverse effects on the heritage character, look and feel of Petone.</p>	<p>Reject plan change in its current form and make amendments.</p> <p>The submitter wants to see a plan change that will offer excellent guidelines and positive direction for this iconic site on Wellington Harbour. It needs to offer quality design guidelines for this whole zone, which will also govern the look and feel at the entrance to Petone and affect the whole community for many years to come.</p> <p>Overall the submitter wants to see a plan change that will enhance Petone’s unique and special character – not ruin it.</p>
157.2	General – Design Guidelines, Foreshore and Open Space	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the lack of design guidelines in the plan change.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the western end of Petone as the gateway to Lower Hutt. There is a need to create an attractive gateway and favourable impression of the city.</p>	<p>The submitter wants to see clear green design guidelines for all new buildings across all of the proposed zone that have the provision of outdoor areas for each residential apartment and rules to ensure access to sunlight in all apartments. These guidelines must ensure that future buildings are designed in a manner in harmony with the character of Petone.</p>



		<p>High quality guidelines must be included so that aesthetically pleasing high quality development occurs.</p> <p>Good design will future proof the look of this important gateway. It prevents cheap and nasty buildings, and poor design, adversely impacting on the look and feel of Petone and Lower Hutt.</p> <p>Good design creates a 'human scale' currently lacking in the proposed changes. <i>"After the Briscoes building 'disaster' of ugliness – the Lower Hutt CBD design guidelines were tightened. Yet, the proposed plan change guidelines are permissive enough to allow this type of building. Once built buildings remain for decades..."</i></p> <p>Developers want detailed guidelines creating certainty. Significant design guidelines are commonly provided in other plans. The 'market' does not drive good design, and left alone will result in poorly designed buildings built to the lowest standard.</p> <p>The lack of quality design guides or inclusion of setbacks on the Esplanade, or the enabling of urban parks and landscaping, will result in poor quality development, especially undermining Petone foreshore's amenity value.</p> <p>There is a lack of recognition of The Esplanade as a gateway entrance.</p> <p>Landscaping and green space requirements are required to create a pleasant look and feel.</p> <p>Solar optimum allowances similar to those in general residential zones are necessary to create pleasant living spaces, and attract good quality owners and tenants.</p>	<p>The submitter wants to see green spaces, incorporated into design such as Christchurch is doing with their redeveloped Central Business Area.</p> <p>Inclusion of high-quality design guidelines and urban planning for the area to increase its amenity value. Especially interacting with the harbour and Esplanade.</p>
--	--	--	---

			The submitter questions the consistency of the plan change with the Council being a signatory to the Urban Design Protocol, which aims to raise the standard and quality of urban design.	
157.3	General - Transportation	Oppose	<p>The submitter objects to the proposed one car parking space for two apartments for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The closeness of Petone station does not mean residents will not own a car. Experience in Auckland CBD, is that apartment owners keep a car a travel outside the city on the weekends.</li> <li>• The proposed rules will result in an inability to find short or long-term parking and increase the difficulty of navigating streets, such as passing parked cars, especially on narrow streets.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter states that as a resident of Nelson Street, they find that most street parks are full during the day and that there are no parks available on Saturdays.</p>	Off-site car parking requirements are inadequate. Parking and traffic requirements need further work. Every residential dwelling requires at least one carpark.
157.4	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>Buildings 30 metres high with 100% site coverage across nearly all the area proposed is far too permissive and would detract from the character and amenity values of the area.</p> <p>Canyons of high buildings could destroy a sense of human scale resulting in excessive shading that undermines the attractiveness of the area.</p>	<p>The submitter wishes to see the permitted height across the whole area reduced to a maximum of 12 to 15m and the permitted site coverage reduced to allow for the provision of green spaces and landscaping.</p> <p>There is no protection of the current important views of the hills from the floor of the valley in Petone and also the important views from the hills outcome Petone to the wharf and the Foreshore etc. Such protections need to be included and can be achieved by restricting permitted building height and evaluating over height buildings on the basis of their effects on views and other urban design elements.</p>
157.5	General – Amenity of Existing Residents	Oppose	The submitter does not support 10m tall buildings on sites abutting residential activity areas. Nor 30m high buildings near sites abutting residential areas (for example the section of Sydney Street which does not adjoin Nelson Street). This could significant impact on afternoon sun and create wind problems.	

			The submitter would support a height of 6m and a setback of 8m or greater on sites abutting residential properties and the widening of the abutment area to also include both sides of streets abutting to residential areas or a reduction.	
157.6	General – Retail Floorarea	Oppose	<p>Proposed retail rules will undermine Jackson Street and other commercial areas in the Hutt Valley as they are too permissive. The submitter does not want to lose Jackson Street.</p> <p>All large retail developments should include a requirement for consideration of the economic impact on the Jackson Street precinct.</p>	<p>The existing retail rules should as they are at present with 500m2 the minimum and 3,000m2 the maximum outside the heritage precinct. Any further retail development only be allowed in the part of the proposed area along the western end of Jackson Street that is has been allowed in the past (and not expanded to apply throughout the proposed new zone) and certainly not up to 10,000m2. This has a proven track record over the last twenty years and should stay as it is. Petone is a shopping destination and experience, not a mall.</p> <p>The submitter especially does not believe that there should be retail permitted on The Esplanade due to traffic congestion, wind, parking difficulties and the potential to undermine Jackson Street.</p>
157.7	General – Natural hazards	Oppose	<p>The submitter is very concerned that the high natural hazard risks in the plan change area have not been given strong recognition. Current rules and regulations are too low and do not cover the risks of tsunami and liquefaction.</p> <p>The Christchurch experience has shown that there are significant economic and community issues and adverse consequences for individual ratepayers and business owners, if buildings and communities are unable to quickly recover from major earthquakes.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern that ‘broken down’ derelict buildings would litter the gateway to the city for years to come, following an earthquake.</p> <p>It would be a great disservice to the city and ratepayers if we build to standards far too low to support the recovery of</p>	<p>The submitter expects HCC to learn from the Christchurch experience, develop and apply rules that will help minimise loss of life and property in the zone. This includes new rules which limit development in proximity of the Wellington Fault, and rules which address the liquefaction and tsunami risks and includes buildings which can be used after major natural hazards.</p>

			<p>buildings following a major earthquake. <i>"We must use current <u>best practice</u>."</i> (Author's own emphasis).</p> <p>Unless the actual earthquake fault line is identified, all building in the high risk zone should be built to standards which assume they are on the fault and should be adequately designed and constructed to be reusable and safe to use after major earthquakes.</p> <p>The incorporation of Tsunami 'safe' buildings to act as evacuation spaces are vital.</p> <p>The increased number of people living and working after the plan change, will make it unlikely that they would be able to make it to higher ground due to congestion on the roads, liquefaction and other earthquake effects.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

<b>DPC29/158 – Pamela Scowen</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
158.1	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage, Open Space and Environmental Sustainability	Oppose	<p>30m high buildings and no green spaces will decrease the liveability of Petone.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the 100% maximum site coverage.</p>	<p>Cap building height at 10 – 12m.</p> <p>Make sure all residential development adheres to high standards of 'green' construction.</p> <p>Include 10-15% green space.</p>
158.2	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose		Ensure all buildings are engineered to the highest possible standard.

DPC29/159 – Chris Drayton

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
157.1	General – General, Character and Design Guidelines	Oppose	<p>The submitter identifies themselves as a local resident of Petone since 2006 and that the submission is made of behalf of himself and his family.</p> <p>The family moved to Petone from Auckland, <i>“specifically because of its history, maritime and village character, social and amenity values and attributes including the beach, character housing and the Jackson Street retail environment. We also chose to live here because we believe there is potential for Petone to be an even better and more vibrant place.</i></p> <p><i>To achieve that, the quality of the existing environment needs to be maintained and enhanced...I do not believe Plan Change 29 as currently worded will achieve that outcome for Petone, and worse, I consider it has the potential to undermine it and adversely affect a number of the attributes that make it attractive...</i></p> <p><i>Some of the aims behind the mixed use zone are laudable. However as it stands, we doubt whether Plan Change 29 will achieve that without adversely affecting the things that make Petone special, including the Jackson Street retail precinct, the links to the beach and harbour and its historic character. All new development – in Petone or anywhere else – should be managed to ensure that it is of high quality design, follows good environmental principals, incorporates current best practice in urban design and is not achieved at the expense of the existing community or businesses”.</i></p> <p>As currently worded, the plan change would result in significant</p>	<p>Reject plan change in its current form and make amendments.</p> <p>The Council needs to withdraw Plan Change 29 as it is currently drafted and revise it to better make the most of the potential for this coastal and historic area, and to redress the balance struck between those who wish to develop the area to its maximum capacity and the existing environment, community and businesses.</p> <p>Providing an overall co-ordinated plan for the redevelopment of the area, including firm but flexible requirements for the look and feel of the buildings, landscaping and other assets.</p>

			<p>adverse effects on the heritage character, look and feel of Petone, as well as its business attributes and in turn its fragile, but steadily improving social and economic wellbeing.</p> <p>The submitter states that it is difficult to discern why there is a need to allow such an unfettered approach, when some sensible limits, performance standards and design requirements will maintain and enhance the existing environment. More sensible design rules or performance standards (rather than guidelines) reflecting current best practice, are needed to achieve a reasonable balance.</p> <p>The submitter questions the 'alleged' economic benefit of zone change of \$294 million and the creation of 722 jobs. <i>"This conclusion strikes me as outlandish and evidently reliant on highly optimistic assumptions. Even if this figure is true, concern is raised that this money and jobs will not be added to the local economy, but be drawn from other parts of Petone and the Hutt"</i>.</p>	
159.2	General – Retail Floor area and Activity Status	Oppose	<p>The proposed retail rules allowing any size retail up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> anywhere in the plan area is considered to be too permissive. The submitter states that opening up this area to virtually unrestricted retail use is likely to 'suck' limited capital and customers from established parts of Petone and the wider Hutt, and will inevitably compete with, and undermine the historic Jackson Street precinct and the Hutt Central Commercial Activity Area. New retail uses in this area need to be carefully matched to potential increases in overall demand, say through new residential developments in the zone.</p> <p>The submitter points out the Jackson Street retail strip is becoming a regionally significant asset, which needs to be protected and enhanced.</p>	<p>Maintaining the existing retail rules with 500m<sup>2</sup> the minimum and 3,000m<sup>2</sup> the maximum outside the heritage precinct; or if that is not accepted:</p> <p>Require discretionary resource consents for new small and large scale retail, which would require the Council and applicant to expressly consider the potential adverse effects on the existing retail base on Jackson Street and the wider Hutt.</p> <p>Discourage retail uses on The Esplanade, due to traffic congestion, parking difficulties and the potential to undermine Jackson Street.</p>
159.3	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>Buildings 30m high with 100% site coverage across nearly all the area proposed is unnecessarily lax. It will create the cheapest possible development opportunities at the expense of</p>	<p>A reduction in the permitted height to a maximum of 15m, but allow discretion to go higher if design requirements and performance standards are met.</p>

			the existing environment, businesses and community.	A reduction in the permitted site coverage to allow for green spaces and significant landscaping.
159.4	General – Design Guidelines, Foreshore and Open Space	Oppose	Without strong amenity design rules, setbacks and spaces for urban parks and landscaping, the height and site coverage provisions will result in unco-ordinated, poor-quality development, undermining Petone West and the foreshore’s growing amenity and recreational value. For such an ambitious and aggressive change to the current rules, a much more coherent overall plan is required, akin to the sort of urban renewal projects seen at Britomart or Auckland’s Wynyard quarter.	<p>Plan Change 29 needs to provide quality design requirements which will maintain or increase amenity values and encourage an attractive look and feel at the entrance to Petone. These guidelines must ensure that future buildings and urban planning are properly co-ordinated, reflect current best practice and designed to be respectful to the character of Petone.</p> <p>Establishing clear and best practice design requirements and performance standards for all new buildings, designed to provide a high standard of amenity in the zone, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate setback requirements;</li> <li>• Landscaping requirements;</li> <li>• Outdoor areas for new residential apartments; and</li> <li>• Access to sunlight.</li> </ul>

<b>DPC29/160 – Ralph Wynne-Griffiths</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
160.1	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage, Retail Floorspace and Amenity of Existing Residents	Oppose	<p>The increase to the permitted height to 30m will adversely affect the views from the submitter’s property in Korokoro.</p> <p>The permitted height, together with the increase in the number of size of retail developments and allowing 100% site coverage will encourage large “box” style buildings, which will also detract from the view and amenities currently enjoyed by the</p>	To remove or change the proposed plan change to conform to the Petone Community Board’s vision.

			submitter.  The increase in the permitted size and number of retail developments will adversely affect the businesses already established in Jackson Street and thereby undermine the 'village' quality which is so appreciated by those who live in and visit Petone.	
--	--	--	--	--

DPC29/163 – Kristin Aitken on behalf of NZ Transport Agency				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
163.1	General – General, Preferred Uses	Part Support/ Partial Oppose	<p>The NZTA supports in part the proposed plan change. It may withdraw its opposition to specific elements of the proposed plan change, if it is amended as requested.</p> <p>The NZTA considers this location to be appropriate for mixed use due to its proximity to key transport modes. Petone West is well located within the land transport network for the Wellington Region. The area has good public transport connections and easy access to SH2 and major local roads such as Hutt Road and The Esplanade. The NZTA considers that changes to the planning regime in this location offer an opportunity to further improve this area of Hutt City, including the promotion of better use of public transport, particularly for commuters, in preference to car based travel.</p> <p>The submitter states that the Council may wish to consider additional provisions to ensure that a mixed range of land uses such as retail, residential and office development is achieved. It would be undesirable for the area to have one primary land use such as residential dominate, without the office space for</p>	The plan change be amended as requested or by amendments which achieve the same effect.



			residents to be employed in.	
163.2	General – Transportation, Retail Floorspace and Activity Status	Oppose	<p>In the interests of space saving and the absence of decision/relief sought under general commentary, the two columns of reasons and decision/relief sought have been merged.</p> <p>The NZTA seeks to ensure that district plan provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Achieve best integrated planning practice, in particular by promoting use of public transport, and walking and cycling</i></li> <li>• <i>Recognise and provide for the safe and efficient functioning of the state highway network</i></li> <li>• <i>Contain land use development controls to ensure that the safe and efficient functioning of the land transport network is not adversely affected.”</i></li> </ul> <p>The NZTA has a direct legislative requirement to ensure the safe and efficient operation of State Highway 2 (SH2) and has an interest in the safe and efficient operation of the local transport network, including The Esplanade and Hutt Road.</p> <p>The Esplanade, Hutt Road and SH2 are all high volume roads that already experience significant pressure during peak periods. SH2 at Petone intersects with The Esplanade and Hutt Road via the Petone interchange. This is a particularly congested location, which is of strategic significance for the movement of freight. Heavy vehicles use The Esplanade to access the industrial area at Seaview. The Hutt Road is an important feeder road, which provides access to Lower Hutt. Existing traffic congestion on The Esplanade is recognised in the Regional Land Transport Strategy 2010-2040 and Hutt City Council’s Long Term Plan 2012-2022.</p> <p>With an increased intensity of development in the Petone West area, traffic movements will increase, particularly at peak times. Potential effects arising from increased traffic movements are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increased journey times for strategic traffic from Seaview and Lower Hutt connecting with Wellington;</li> <li>• tailbacks onto the State highway network from northbound traffic;</li> <li>• impaired functioning of Petone interchange;</li> <li>• adverse traffic impact on NZTA’s investment in the local road and state highway network; and</li> <li>• compromise of future projects and investment in terms of reduced journey time savings and need to plan for additional capacity. Projects referred to are the Petone to Grenada Link Road, Petone to Ngauanga cycleway and reconstruction of the Petone Interchange with associated investigations into improved wider connections, such as connections to Seaview and the need for upgrades to The Esplanade.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter is concerned that <i>“The proposed plan change provides for a permissive regime that does not enable an assessment of the</i></p>	

			<p><i>proposed activity's effects on the transport network thereby running the risk of compromising NZTA's investment" and the Council's growth objectives. "The proposed plan change provides for levels of development that area likely to adversely impact on the safe and efficient functioning of the transport network, in particular, The Esplanade, Hutt Road and SH2".</i></p> <p>The NZTA does not agree with the conclusion in the Section 32 report that the proposed plan change will give effect to the Wellington Regional Policy Statement, including Policy 56. The NZTA does not consider Petone West to be an area well serviced by existing infrastructure, which can be upgraded over time to meet future needs. The NZTA is concerned that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"The impact on the wider network, particularly The Esplanade and SH2 from additional traffic on the local network, including heavy vehicles, has not been appropriately assessed or addressed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Upgrades to existing transport infrastructure have not been appropriately recognised and provided for but may be necessary as a result of the more permissive regime proposed for the plan change. Appropriate measures need to be in place for the collection of financial contributions for transport upgrades, including State highway purposes.</i></li> <li>• <i>While the area is well located in terms of transport infrastructure, much of that infrastructure (mainly roads) is already at or nearing capacity at peak times."</i></li> </ul> <p>NZTA express concern that the plan change will not enable the Council or NZTA as an affected party, <i>"to assess the transport effects of a development through the resource consent process. Nor does it enable an assessment as to whether a developer should contribute to the upgrading of transport infrastructure to support the level of development proposed. The NZTA is particularly concerned that retail activities up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> in total combined floor area are provided as a permitted activity.</i></p> <p><i>A permissive planning framework makes it difficult to predict the type and scale of development that may occur and therefore to assess the effects of any proposed development on the transport network (type and volume of traffic). The proposal to provide for a mixed use zone with permissive provisions is likely to place pressure on the existing transport network causing capacity and safety issues around the SH2/Hutt Road interchange and further compromising the efficient movement of freight to Seaview along The Esplanade".</i></p> <p>Financial contributions would be required if upgrades are to occur in line with development. It is important that financial contributions are able to be taken for use on the local road network, as well as any public transport or state highway infrastructure affected by the proposals.</p>	
163.3	Amendment 4	Oppose	<p>Traffic effects are not specifically mentioned in the objective for Area 2 in Rule 5B 1.1.2</p> <p>Proposed policy 5B1.1.2 (g) fails to link traffic effects to the transport network.</p>	<p>Objective 5B1.1.2 is amended as follows:</p> <p><i>"To provide for a mixed use activity area ... and the overall receiving environment, <u>including the transport network.</u>"</i></p>

			<p>The is no reference in the explanation for the proposed objective of Section 5B1.1.2 to effects from heavy vehicles and to traffic effects associated with large format retail activities.</p> <p><i>“The NZTA considers that the proposed plan change fails to manage large format retail activities or provide an appropriate regime for assessment of traffic effects. There does not appear to be any management of these types of activities in terms of the transport network.”</i></p>	<p>Policy 5B1.1.2 (g) be amended as follows:</p> <p>Ensure that effects likely to be generated by each activity, such as noise, dust, odour and traffic are managed to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on the amenity values and character of both the areas and properties in nearby residential areas, <u>and on the safety and efficiency of the transport network.</u></p>
163.4	Amendment 8	Oppose	<p>Changes are requested to the Proposed Issue and Objective for 5B1.2.4, in addition to a new policy to provide for a maximum car parking regime. THE NZTA considers a maximum parking regime is appropriate because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good public transport is available at Petone, so that commuters, in particular, are provided with a range of choices rather than being dependent on private vehicles.</li> <li>• The road network surrounding Petone experiences heavy demands at various times of the day. It is the interest of all parties to minimise traffic growth on these roads, until appropriate upgrades can be implemented.</li> <li>• It is consistent with best integrated planning practice to make communities, particularly mixed use communities less car orientated and more pedestrian friendly.</li> </ul>	<p>A new final sentence is added to proposed Issue being:</p> <p><u>Finally, provision of carparking can have adverse effects by encouraging commuters to travel by private vehicles rather than public transport, increasing traffic movements through already congested areas, and reducing pedestrian safety and amenity values in the area.</u></p> <p>Objective 5B 1.2.4 is amended as follows:</p> <p>To ensure that the adverse visual <u>and transport</u> effects arising from car parking <del>areas</del> are avoided or mitigated.</p> <p>New proposed Policy 5B 1.2.4 (b) be drafted as follows:</p> <p><u>Manage the design, location and scale of car parking areas, to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on the transport network.</u></p>
163.5	Amendment 10, Activity Status and Building Height	Oppose	<p>The proposal to provide for retail activities up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> as a permitted activity could result in more than minor changes to the road network in this part of Hutt City and potentially more than minor traffic effects, depending on the interpretation of Rule 5B 2.2.1 (o).</p>	<p>Rules to prevent additional vehicle crossings, turning and parking movements to avoid or mitigate any potential effects on the safe and efficient functioning of Hutt Road, The Esplanade and SH2.</p> <p>Commercial, retail activities and warehouses with a floorarea greater than 3,000m<sup>2</sup> be provided as a restricted discretionary activity to enable</p>

			<p>The proposed plan change may result in additional direct access onto Hutt Road and The Esplanade near on and off-ramps to the SH2. Hutt Road and The Esplanade are already running at a poor level of service in peak periods and additional accessways are likely to degrade this even further.</p> <p>Depending on the extent of impacts resulting from the retail activities, upgrades to the roading and public transport network may be required to enable safe and efficient movement of people. Without an appropriate resource consent process in place, these costs would fall upon HCC and the NZTA. Having these types of activities as permitted, absolves the developer of any costs for upgrade works needed on public roads or even for them to discuss with the Council, the best way for the development to be connected to the road network.</p> <p>The proposed plan change proposes a maximum building height of 30m. This would enable more intensive development with increases in potential floor area than the current district plan provisions that provide for a maximum building height between 12 and 30m. NZTA considers that a maximum floor area needs to be set for potentially larger scale activities such as commercial and retail activities and warehousing.</p>	<p>the Council to fully assess the effects of a proposal.</p> <p>Rule 5B 2.2.2 be amended to include the following clause:</p> <p><u>(e) All commercial activities, retail activities (including integrated retail developments) and warehouses exceeding 3,000m<sup>2</sup> in total combined floor area.</u></p> <p>Or alternatively Rule 5B 2.2.1.1 be amended to provide a maximum floor area of 3,000m<sup>2</sup> for commercial and retail activities and warehousing.</p>
163.6	Amendments 10 and 21	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks clarification as to whether Rules 5B 2.2.1 (o) and 5B 2.2.2 (b) are intended to just capture changes to existing buildings or not.</p> <p>NZTA notes that Rule 5B 2.2.2 (b) mixes the standards and terms and matters over which the Council has restricted its discretion. They suggest that new construction and alterations/additions be split into two separate groups.</p> <p>Rule 5B 2.2.2 (b) (v) should be amended to include reference to the level and type of traffic generated.</p>	<p>Rule 5B 2.2.2.1(b)(v) be amended to read:</p> <p>Traffic effects, including effects on the transport network <u>(including the level and type of traffic generated)</u> and the suitability of site access and site servicing arrangements.</p>

163.7	Amendment 15	Support	The NZTA supports the provision of noise insulation standards to address reverse sensitivity effects in the Petone Mixed Use Zone. The mixed use area is close to SH2 and makes provision for residential activities. There is the potential for reverse sensitivity effects associated with proximity to SH2.	
163.8	Amendment 24	Oppose	<p>Rule 5B 2.2.2 specifies that restricted discretionary applications do not need to be publicly notified or notified on a limited basis. An amendment is sought to ensure that NZTA is able to assess and submit on a proposed retail activity greater than 3,000m<sup>2</sup> in floor area.</p> <p>The submitter would also like to ensure that they have the ability to submit on commercial and other large scale activities that may have adverse traffic effects on the State highway and the strategic routes of Hutt Road and The Esplanade.</p>	<p>Amendment to rule 5B 2.2.2 as follows:</p> <p><u>The NZ Transport Agency must be notified of any proposal in terms of Rule 5B 2.2.2 (e).</u></p>
163.9	Amendment 57 and Activity Status	Oppose	<p>NZTA supports the provision of residential activities as a permitted activity, as part of a mixed-use zone. However, concern is raised that this could increase demands on the roading network during peak demand periods, from an increase in commuter traffic. To address this issue, it is requested that that parking standards be amended, to allow the use of maximum parking car parking standards. NZTA would like to work with the Council to determine what might be an appropriate maximum level of carparking.</p> <p>NZTA considers that the creation of a successful mixed use zone in this area will make a minimum parking standard for residential activities unnecessary. Residents will have good access to supermarkets, other retail activities, services and public transport. Discouraging private vehicle use through the lack of provision of on-site parking will encourage patronage of public transport and assist in managing future traffic volumes associated with future residential development in this area.</p> <p>The submitter notes that some apartment developers would</p>	<p>Amendment of rule 14A (iii) 2.1 (c) as follows:</p> <p><u>All activities within Area 2 – Petone Mixed Use: the maximum number of parking spaces is 70 per site or integrated retail development.</u></p> <p><del>Residential activities within Area 2 – Petone Mixed Use: The minimum parking requirement for residential activities is 1 space for every two residential units.</del> <u>There is no minimum parking requirement.</u></p> <p>That a maximum number of parks be stipulated in the District Plan, with any additional parking being a Discretionary Restricted Activity. This would require a change to Rule 14A(iii)2.1 (c) (ii).</p> <p>Amendment to rule 14A(iii) 2.2.1 – Assessment Matters for Discretionary Activities to include the following additional section:</p> <p><u>(c) (iii) – More than xx parking spaces</u></p> <p>- <u>The impact of the traffic on the safe and efficient operation of the</u></p>

			<p>choose to provide parking, while others will not.</p> <p>The intended continued use of minimum car parking standards would impact on the efficiency of the road network.</p>	<p><u>road network.</u></p> <p>- <u>Measures proposed to reduce vehicle movements to and from the site, such as new connections to public transport or travel demand management plans.</u></p> <p>Reference to 'a comprehensive development' in Rule 14A(iii) 2.1 (c)(ii) be amended to 'integrated retail development' to ensure consistency of terminology.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

DPC29/164 – Nick Leko on behalf of FIT Architects				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
164.1	General including Design Guidelines	Oppose	<p>The submission includes information about the background and work experience of the submitter.</p> <p>The submitter supports the principle of allowing suburban rejuvenation as indicated in the plan change. <i>"The proposed district plan change is however a heavily worded policy document, as is customary with district plans nationwide. It is devoid of adequate in-depth design considerations which should be developed within a parallel document for Council to use as a benchmark, in assessing future proposed documents. Generally they are called <b>master plans</b>.</i></p> <p><i>Such suburban/ urban design master plans are customary in North America, Europe and most recently in Asia.</i></p> <p><i>The master plan will offer a bold yet pragmatic vision through extensive design studies and drawings.</i></p> <p><i>District Plan Changes no matter how comprehensive in their</i></p>	<p>A comprehensive master plan is essential.</p> <p>Council needs to commission a company appropriately qualified in such work to ensure a quality evolution of amenities over the next 30-100 years. Experts in this field are generally not available within New Zealand at the level of experience that we propose. See the following websites of US based consultants that we believe offer master planning at the calibre required for outstanding results:</p> <p>Perkinseastman.com/projects.aspx?list =3409345  Eekarchitects.com  VIA San Antonio Downtown Master Plan  Perkins Eastman Architects</p>

			<i>wording, do not offer a design framework to assess proposed works. The outcome of this current method is apparent in recent developments in central Lower Hutt... The outcome is unfortunately banal".</i>	
164.2	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Partial Support	<p>The submitter supports the proposed height of 30m in certain areas. The submitter is of the view that good design and ‘human scale’ are more important factors on the quality of the environment than building height.</p> <p>Photographs are included in the submission of tall apartment buildings which are considered by the submitter to provide a more enjoyable street level, than poorly designed two-storey buildings in Lower Hutt. <i>“This is achieved by a comprehensive understanding of appropriated scaled building elements, planting, setbacks and height differences. All these characteristics are described in detail within a master plan”.</i></p>	

<b>DPC29/165 – David Kiddey, Chief Executive of Hutt Valley Chamber of Commerce</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
165.1	General	Partial Support	The Chamber, in general, supports the plan change insofar as it promotes new residential and commercial development, in an area which is generally suitable for such development.	
165.2	General – Retail Floorspace and Character	Oppose	<p>Jackson Street has changed from being a low-rent backwater to being a vibrant and interesting place to shop and visit cafes and restaurants. It has developed a character of its own and is a significant attraction to people with money to spend, while at the same time, retaining a mix of retail outlets patronised by local people.</p> <p>The Chamber is concerned that the implications of allowing</p>	

			<p>retail developments up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> may affect the viability of Jackson Street and reduce its attraction to shoppers. If this is the Council's intention, then we submit that further consideration is needed, as this has not been made clear in the proposals which have been published.</p> <p>If is not the Council's intention to reduce the viability of Jackson Street then the proposals for unrestricted retail development up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> need to be re-examined.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

<b>DPC29/166 – Graeme Ebbett on behalf of the Ebbett Family Trust</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
166.1	General	Support	<p>The submitter supports the proposal to rezone the area from General Business to Petone Commercial Area 1 and Area 2.</p> <p>This is because the existing zoning is stifling development of more intensive residential and light commercial use.</p>	<p>To approve the change.</p> <p>We would like to see the area increased to include the area both sides of Victoria Street north of Petone Avenue to the Hutt Road.</p>

<b>DPC29/167 – Emily Griffin</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
167.1	General - Character	Oppose	<p>The plan change as currently worded could result in destructive effects upon the heritage character and inappropriately affect the look and feel of Petone.</p>	<p>Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments as requested.</p>



167.2	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	Buildings 30m high with 100% site coverage spanning nearly the entire proposed area, especially retail spaces allowed up to 10,000m <sup>2</sup> is far too permissive and it would detract from the character amenities of Petone.	Permitted height across the area reduced to 15m maximum to allow for the provision of green spaces.
167.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The proposed retail rules will undermine Jackson Street, as they are too permissive, particularly the allowance of retail spaces up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>The submitter does not want the heritage part of Jackson Street killed off or revert to a run-down area, as happened to the High Street area in the Hutt, after the development of Queensgate.</p> <p>Existing retail rules have worked well and should remain as they are.</p>	Retail rules to stay as they are at present with 500m <sup>2</sup> the minimum and 3,000m <sup>2</sup> the maximum outside the heritage precinct and not expanded across the proposed zone.
167.4	General – Design Guidelines and Foreshore	Oppose	The lack of quality design guidelines will result in poor-quality development, especially undermining Petone foreshore's amenity value.	<p>Clear design guidelines for all new buildings in the proposed zone ensuring access to sunlight in all apartments, designed in a manner which is respectful to the character of Petone.</p> <p>Inclusion of respectful design guidelines and urban planning for this multi-use area.</p>

<b>DPC29/168 – Leonie Dobbs</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
168.1	General – General, Character, Retail Floorspace, Heritage and Design Guidelines	Oppose	The submitter states that they are not opposed to development in the Petone area, but would like to see the plan revised and development in line with the vision for Hutt and Wellington as a region. The plan change should not be rushed through.	<p>Withdraw the plan change in its current form and consult on more appropriate District Plan provisions for the western end of Petone.</p> <p>Protection of the heritage part of Jackson Street through reinstatement of rules that have been working for the past twenty years and limits on where retail activities can be carried out.</p>

		<p>The submitter identifies themselves as the business owner of Style and Chair JSP. They purchased their business in Jackson Street in 2007 because they liked the environment, in terms of its heritage as well as the unique shopping experience provided. The submitter is concerned that the proposed changes will destroy this environment.</p> <p>The submitter refers to an economic report commissioned by Hutt City Council which suggested that 30-60 businesses would relocate from Jackson Street to the plan change area. They believe this number could be more, subject to the need for earthquake strengthening, compliance with building code, recommendations which emerge from the Royal Commission on Christchurch and whether incentives to move are offered to existing businesses, such as rent relief. The submitter states that rent relief was offered to High Street businesses in Lower Hutt, to get them to move into Queensgate.</p> <p>It has taken 20 years for building owners and retailers to be known as the “<i>place to come and shop</i>” and Jackson Street is seen as the Jewel in the Crown of the City. New Zealand’s Heritage areas are reducing in numbers and it would be tragic if the proposal destroyed it. Building owners of both heritage and other buildings in Jackson Street will not be able to compete with new development because of overheads like insurance premiums for heritage buildings and other Council regulations.</p> <p>The statement by the Council that the redevelopment of Petone will create jobs and have large economic returns for the Hutt economy has not taken into account the current Global recession. Both the Reserve Bank and the Government have come out to say that that they now believe the economy may not grow within the next 10 years.</p>	<p>The same rules and regulations for all of Petone and not any incentives or other promises given to developers that disadvantage the rest of the community, businesses or building owners.</p> <p>Stringent guidelines – as agreed to for the redevelopment of Christchurch. This needs to cover building height, look of buildings, structure of the buildings, and in particular the hazard area in Petone west.</p>
--	--	--	--

			Petone is a very unique place with heritage, boutique shopping, Walk of Champions, sports, and community. Building owners and retailers have had to work to very restrictive resource consent rules that apply only to the Jackson Street heritage precinct and nowhere else in Hutt City.	
--	--	--	--	--

<b>DPC29/169 – Tui Lewis</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
169.1	General – General, Transportation and Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety. They believe the plan change will have negative effects on the whole community, including negative effects on future residential development, on local and other Hutt Valley retailing businesses, recreational amenities and compound traffic/parking issues.</p> <p>The submitter refers to the plan change not incorporating advice commissioned by the Council, in the years preceding this final document. The plan is considered too permissive.</p> <p>The historical village nature of Petone appeals to people and is a social attraction that draws people to the area. Economically and socially this will be undermined.</p> <p>The plan change will govern the way this community looks and feels for the next 50 years. This plan change doesn't address future proofing or the guidelines of the Petone Vision document. The plan change needs to be amended or redone to obtain these outcomes.</p>	<p>Due to the Wellington Fault Special Study Area being a major part of the plan change, the submitter would like to suggest that an independent commissioner and experts in this field form part of the hearings panel.</p> <p>Plan change to be amended or redone.</p>

169.2	General – Design Guides and Amenity of Existing Residents	Oppose	The plan lacks quality urban design guidelines and directions for a highly visible key piece of land. The submitter questions why the advice of Boffa Miskell (consultants) was ignored.	<p>Apply the best of both guidelines of CBD’s and include the findings of the urban design guideline results that Boffa Miskell previously reported on that addressed things like height, land use and good urban design for the area over the whole plan change area.</p> <p>Future residential growth in this area can be done well, if excellent rules are in place to look after both the existing business and its new neighbours – reverse sensitivity, green space, parking, sunlight etc.</p> <p>Plan changes needs to incorporate NZ Urban Design Protocol and use the seven qualities for well-designed, safer places as in the CPTED (crime prevention through environmental design).</p>
169.3	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage and Open Space	Oppose	<p>The submitter questions how the proposed maximum height of 30m, site coverage of up to 100% and absence of quality design guidelines allows for good amenity outcomes for neighbourhoods and future residents. The submitter refers to the issues of shading, lack of sunlight for new tenants and wind.</p> <p>The submitter also refers to a lack of recreational green space in this area.</p>	<p>Lower height 10-15m and site coverage.</p> <p>Don’t undermine the amenity of homes in other parts of Petone, Korokoro and Maungaraki for the sake of high-rise on the foreshore. Incorporate low-rise development to protect the view shafts to the hills and protect Korokoro and Maungaraki from losing their views to the wharf and shoreline.</p>
169.4	General - Transportation	Oppose	The submitter refers to a lack of parking and increase in traffic and pedestrian pressures on the existing local roads and the very busy Esplanade.	
169.5	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	The submitter raises concern that there has been a lack of consideration of the economic report prepared by Development Economics. The submitter refers to impacts on Jackson Street retail, as well as the Lower Hutt CBD and smaller retail zones in the suburbs.	Protect the existing retail area and businesses. Retain the large format retailing in the same zone that the <u>current District Plan</u> (author’s own emphasis) allows for. No small retail in this area. No Malls size complexes or retail spaces where a lot of smaller retailers can share the space.
169.6	General – Preferred Uses	Oppose	The submitter refers to local light industry displacement. Adding that Petone currently works well with these small to medium businesses in the area, which add to the local and regional economy.	
169.7	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The submitter is of the view that the plan change hasn’t included enough consideration of potential risk to the area and its occupants.	Apply latest protective rules for this area. Wait to see the results of the Royal Commission on Christchurch earthquake. Restrict residential, accommodation and emergency services within the Wellington Fault Special Study Area.

**DPC29/170 – Peter and Ronda Coyle on behalf of Hinau Holdings**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
170.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>Petone has a unique, vibrant mix of shops that appeal to a wide range of people, it retains quaintness and personality and is an important part of what makes Petone a great success. It attracts ever-increasing numbers of people who browse and enjoy the shopping experience and amenity value that it offers. Petone adds variety to the shopping mix on offer in the Hutt Valley region.</p> <p>The submitter finds it difficult to comprehend and understand why the Council would promote another commercial/shopping zone in their District Plan, when other areas are in decline and are experiencing issues with occupancy and retention of clients and tenants, particularly businesses on High Street and Queens Drive, Lower Hutt.</p> <p>The submitter adds that Hutt City residents have much to lose, if the Council doesn't wisely consider the long-term implications of the plan change.</p>	The submitter suggests that an Independent Commissioner be part of the hearing panel.
170.2	General – Retail Floorspace and Preferred Uses	Oppose	The submitter opposes the expansion of Petone west into a retail area.	The retention of the current District Plan rules and location of the mix of large format retail and light industry and commercial.
170.3	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed new heights and site coverage provisions.	Any new developments are restricted to 12 to 15m maximum. Lower the overall height and reduce the site coverage of the area. Allow trees and green spaces. Transition and improve the area from semi-industrial into a quality mixed-use zone.
170.4	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The submitter opposes massive growth of residential and accommodation in the Wellington Earthquake special study fault area.	That Council learn from the Royal Commission on Christchurch earthquake findings and hold off finalising the District Plan until this report is through.

170.5	General – Design Guidelines	Oppose	The submitter opposes the very permissive rules for the plan change.	That Council applies high quality design guidelines for the whole plan change area. That Council also consider an improved version of the current CBD’s design guidelines in Petone.
170.6	General – Foreshore and Open Space	Oppose	The submitter opposes the lack of any recreational space and amenity in the plan change.	Deeper setback for The Esplanade. Improvement to the entrance of Petone and the foreshore view. Inclusion of residential amenity around buildings.
170.7	General – Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Oppose		Cultural respect to the area surrounding the urupa. Consider much lower building heights on the 3 boundaries and on Te Puni Street with green space inclusion in the area too.

<b>DPC29/171 – Barbara Scott</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
171.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter objects to the plan change.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern regarding the ignoring of expert advice, such as the dismissal of the Boffa Miskell report that the Council commissioned. The submitter questions the value of paying for advice in these circumstances and asks for an explanation as to why recommendations made were not considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>The gateway area of the Hutt needs to be visually/aesthetically simulating and not an eyesore.</p> <p>The submitter states that they support the development of Petone, providing it is done in a considered, carefully planned and holistic manner that enhances the area for residents, visitors, retailers, iwi, businesses and students alike. The piecemeal approach to the development of Petone is <i>“offensive and unprofessional”</i>.</p>	

171.2	General – Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Oppose	The plan change area includes an urupa, which is the resting place of Te Puni, one of Aotearoa’s forefathers. A 3m setback for buildings or structures abutting the urupa is not considered adequate, given the maximum height allowance under the new plan.	
171.3	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	Retail space and retailers along Jackson Street need protection. Retailers in Lower Hutt have been struggling since Queensgate Mall was built. The submitter is concerned that this type of experience would be repeated.	
171.4	General – Natural Hazards and Open Space	General	The area needs to be planned considerably and carefully given the special geographical nature of the land. Low rise and green spaces are more appropriate for a fault line.	

<b>DPC29/172 R. J. Werry on behalf of Light House Cinema Limited</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
172.1	General – General, Retail Floorspace, Preferred Use and Character/Heritage	Oppose	<p>The Heritage Precinct is characterised by smaller buildings, many of which have significant heritage values. Property owners pay a special additional rate which is used to defend and promote those heritage values. The District Plan places limit on the options which property owners might otherwise have, with respect to the development of their properties.</p> <p>The Light House Cinema Building (old BNZ building), was recently upgraded to meet 100% of the seismic code. Demolition and rebuilding would have been significantly cheaper and resulted in a better design for the cinema business. However, this was anticipated to require a publicly notified resource consent, which may not have been granted.</p> <p>The submitter states that their investment interest and the</p>	<p>Plan change aspects relating to retail and shopping developments be rejected.</p> <p>Reinstatement of rules which limit the smallest shops in the plan change area to 500m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Reinstatement of rules which limit the largest shops in the plan change area to 3,000m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Protection of the traditional shopping area of Petone.</p> <p>Limits on where retail could be developed in the proposed area i.e. definitely not across the whole area.</p>

		<p>interest of other property owners in the Heritage Precinct) will be seriously undermined if the plan change proceeds. If small boutique retail shops, possibly in the form of a retail shopping complex(s) are permitted in the plan change area, the Heritage Precinct will be impossible to defend. <i>“It is precisely the fact that this could not happen in terms of the current plan which has caused property owners in the Heritage Precinct to support and invest in Area 1.”</i></p> <p>If the plan change proceeds, new retail developments in Area 2, possibly in the form of Westfield-type shopping precincts, will be easier and cheaper to build than the protection and restoration of the heritage precinct in Area 1. The only possible result would be to drain out the commercial viability of the existing retail shops in Jackson Street.</p>	
--	--	---	--

<b>DPC29/174 – Richard Te One</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
174.1	General – General, Retail Floorspace, Building Height and Amenity of Existing Residents	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that they oppose the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>The plan change will result in poor urban design for Petone and Hutt City, in addition to undermining the business and retail locations of Petone and Lower Hutt.</p> <p><i>“There is no support for the technical reports that the Council commissioned for this area.</i></p> <p><i>I oppose the fact that the objective policies aren’t consistent or supported by any of the proposed new rules in this plan change</i></p>	<p>Reject the whole plan change</p> <p>More regard is given to the urban design outcome and findings that were provided for in the Boffa Miskell report. Especially around land use, height and urban design.</p> <p>Retain the same large format retail/commercial use as in the current District Plan for Commercial Area 2. Develop and ensure good rules address future mixed-use areas, transition areas and existing businesses. Incorporate NZ Urban Design Protocol including reverse sensitivity, crime prevention through environmental design and traffic etc.</p>



			<i>for Petone Mixed use area”.</i>	<p>Amend all the rules to ensure that the stated objectives and policies are implemented.</p> <p>Retain the amenity values of existing view shafts that people in Petone, Korokoro and Maungaraki currently have to the hills and shoreline.</p>
174.2	General - Natural Hazards	Oppose	The plan change lacks recognition of issues associated with natural hazards.	<p>Delay the plan change until the results of the Royal Commission on Christchurch earthquakes are completed. That is, level of intensification, permitted height level for new buildings etc. Provision of information so people can make informed decisions.</p> <p>Restrict residential, accommodation and emergency services within the Wellington Fault Special Study area. Resilient rules in place for this area.</p>

<b>DPC29/176 – Mike Fisher</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
176.1	General – General and Character	Part Oppose	<p>The submitter identifies themselves as a member of the Petone Community Board, but emphasizes that this is a personal submission.</p> <p>The submitter states that the impact of the plan change on Petone will be dramatic and it is vitally important that the best possible decisions and guidelines are put in place to ensure that the vitality, character and historical aspects of Petone are protected and enhanced.</p>	
176.2	General – Design Guidelines and Maximum Building	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concerns as to the combined effect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed height limit of 30m;</li> <li>• 100% site cover;</li> </ul>	Apply the best of both guidelines of CBD’s and the work done in the plans produced for the area in 2010 by Boffa Miskell and seek good urban design for the whole plan change area.

	Height, Site Coverage and Open Space		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of setback on The Esplanade;</li> <li>• Lack of quality design guidelines;</li> <li>• Lack of recreational green space in this area.</li> </ul>	<p>Recognition that this is a key Gateway to the city and ensures that green space, good design and a transition from shoreline and transport links is paramount in these focal entranceways.</p> <p>That a 6m setback and landscaping provision together with recession plan are in place for The Esplanade.</p>
176.3	General – Retail Floorspace		The submitter raises concern regarding impacts on the vibrant Jackson Street retail zone.	Protection for the existing retail area and businesses. I believe a compromise needs to be sought, with a maximum size of 3,000m <sup>2</sup> permitted. Further study should be made of the impact of smaller businesses on not only Jackson Street, but other suburban retail areas.
176.4	General - Transportation		The submitter raises concern about the lack of parking and impacts of more traffic and pedestrian pressures on local roads, and The Esplanade in particular.	The traffic and parking issues are investigated and in particular the effects of development on traffic flows on The Esplanade and Hutt Road and parking in side streets close to the western end of Jackson Street.
176.5	General – Natural Hazards		The submitter raises concern regarding the impacts and ramifications of the Wellington fault and natural hazards, as well as the desirability of taking into account the findings of the Royal Commission on the Christchurch earthquake.	That the report from the Royal Commission into the Christchurch Earthquake is taken into consideration in due course, and greater weight is put on the effects of potential natural hazards given the proximity to the Wellington faultline.

<b>DPC29/178 – Robert Hutton</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
178.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter is not opposed to economic growth, but a district plan that does not acknowledge or appreciate the historical worth of an area <i>“is just crazy”</i>.</p> <p>The plan change would result in significant adverse effects on the heritage character, look and feel of Petone. The submitter refers to the amount of work and money that went into</p>	Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments.

			<p>producing the Petone Vision Document and that the proposed plan change is completely different.</p> <p>The submitter states that they have seen Jackson Street go from being a rundown and tired town 17 years ago into a vibrant buzzing place. The proposed plan change could undermine all the work that has to be done to lift up this community.</p> <p><i>“The plan change comes across as any developer can do what they like how they like and no one can have a say. This rushing into making these changes is short sighted...”</i>.</p>	
178.2	General – Design Guidelines and Foreshore	Oppose	<p>Any new development should have high quality design and ensure good environmental and community outcomes are achieved. New isn’t always best and big isn’t always better.</p> <p>The Council <i>“had the chance many years to rebuild and develop a new (Hutt) CBD instead of allowing big, bland, ugly buildings to dominate. Let’s not do the same in Petone”</i></p> <p>The lack of quality design guides or inclusions of setbacks on the Esplanade, or the encouragement of urban parks and landscaping, will result in poor-quality development, especially undermining Petone’s foreshore amenity value. There is also a lack of recognition of the Esplanade as a gateway entrance.</p>	
178.3	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>High rise buildings and 100% site coverage across the plan change area is far too permissive and could undermine the wider attractiveness of the area.</p>	
178.4	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that we only need to look at Christchurch to realise high rises and fault lines don’t mix well.</p>	

**DPC29/180 – John Howat**

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
180.1	General and Preferred Uses	Support	<p>The submitted identifies himself as having been in business in Petone since 1969, lived in Petone for 20 years with a long family association with the area, running a retail shop in Jackson Street and owning both residential and retail premises fronting Jackson Street.</p> <p>Petone has many advantages including a critical mass of large retailers which attract visitors/shoppers, geographic location and space.</p> <p>Retail areas are facing enormous change on two fronts, one of these is internet shopping, whereby people can shop from home and obtain the world's cheapest price and the second is the long recession, which is affecting the discretionary spending ability of many citizens. Jackson Street business' face other challenges including high rates (in relation to current turnover) and high rents.</p> <p>The obvious answer to these problems is more people and more businesses in the area. The plan proposes more shops and apartments that will result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More shopping opportunities – which will bring more shoppers to the area and advantage all Petone businesses;</li> <li>• Will expand the ratepayer pool and thereby should result in less rate increases; and</li> <li>• Will provide competition for tenants and thereby reduce rents in Jackson Street.</li> </ul>	Prompt implementation of the proposed plan change.

			Perhaps Council could use its influence to persuade those businesses that come as a result of the changes, to promote or advertise a connection with Jackson Street as a place of interest.	
--	--	--	---	--

Group Submission 6				
<i>Submitters 183 – John and Kathy Yardley and 191 Dale Wall on behalf of Body Corporate 65018</i>				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
183.1	General - Character	Oppose	<p>There is no overview and no detailed outline as to how the plan will impact on Petone as a whole, its immediate existing commercial zones, existing retail area, parking provision and major commuter roads or how this zone interacts with the present transport hubs.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern that the plan change promotes big business at the expense of the wider Petone community.</p> <p><i>“An independent planning consultant needs to be engaged to work with the community and develop a detailed urban plan for the total Petone area to avoid this ongoing incompetence, which has the ability to wreck a vibrant small coastal town”.</i></p> <p>The submitter would like to see the Council <i>“take a leadership role in the process and engage with the community and seek assistance from qualified urban designers to provide a proposal that is keeping with Petone’s historical past and provides growth and amenities for the future.”</i></p>	<p>Reject the Plan Change in its current form and engage planning expertise to develop a plan that works for all and protects Petone’s unique heritage.</p> <p>A plan change that will enhance Petone’s unique and special character, not destroy a small, vibrant coastal town.</p>

			<p>As currently worded, the plan change would result in significant adverse effects on the heritage character, look and feel of Petone, and its supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that it is left to residents to prepare submissions and source details that the Council should be providing.</p> <p>Petone is a long established small, low to medium density, residential, coastal, suburban town that has many well established amenities such as the beach, parks, schools, retail transport etc. Petone should and can continue to develop using its historical background as a basis for development, not evolve into a high rise concrete jungle.</p>	
183.2	General -Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>A significant part of the designated area has an earthquake fault line zone. The zone is not necessarily confined to the outline on a Council plan. The plan change provides no geotechnical information.</p> <p><i>“Whilst Christchurch opts for lower rise solutions and an open park-like urban design solution, Hutt City astonishingly plans concentrated high rise apartment buildings on or adjacent to a designated fault line”.</i> In addition to high density retail proposals.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that the high natural hazard risks in this area have not been given strong recognition and due consideration.</p> <p>The Council should learn from the Christchurch experience.</p>	Develop rules that will help minimise loss of life and property in the hazard zone. This includes new rules which limit development in proximity to the Wellington fault, and rules which address the liquefaction and tsunami risks.
183.3	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>Buildings 30m high (10 stories) with 100% site coverage are far too permissive and would detract from the character and amenity value of the area.</p>	<p>The small scale of Petone used as the basis for any future development.</p> <p>Permitted height reduced across the whole area to 12 to 15m.</p>

			<p>The existing small scale of Petone works and it is really important for future residents.</p> <p>There is no protection of the important views of the hills from the floor of the valley in Petone and also the important views from the hills out across Petone to the wharf and foreshore etc.</p>	<p>Reduction in permitted site coverage to allow for provision of green space and lots of landscaping.</p> <p>Protection of important views by restricting permitted building height and evaluating over-height buildings on the basis of their effects on views and other urban design elements.</p>
183.4	General – Urban Design and Foreshore.	Oppose	<p>The submitter questions the consistency of the plan change with the Council being a signatory of the Urban Design Protocol, which seeks to raise the standard of urban design.</p> <p>The lack of quality design guides or inclusion of setbacks on The Esplanade, or the encouragement of urban parks and landscaping will result in poor quality developments and will undermine Petone foreshore’s amenity value.</p> <p>There is a lack of recognition of The Esplanade as a gateway entrance.</p>	<p>Clear design guidelines for all new buildings across the propose zone, that includes the provision of outdoor areas for each residential apartment and rules to ensure access to sunlight in all apartments. These guidelines must ensure that future buildings are designed in a manner which is sympathetic to the character of Petone.</p> <p>Inclusion of high quality guidelines and urban planning for the area to increase its amenity value – especially its unique heritage feel and its interaction with the harbour and the hills.</p>
183.5	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The proposed retail rules allowing for any size retail up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> anywhere in the proposed area will undermine not only Jackson Street, but the Hutt CBD and other commercial areas in the Hutt Valley. The suggested changes to the rules are far too permissive.</p> <p>Existing retail provisions have worked well over the past 20 years and should stay as they are.</p> <p>Retail uses on The Esplanade should not be permitted due to traffic congestion, parking difficulties and the potential to undermine Jackson Street.</p>	<p>Existing rules should stay at present with a minimum of 500m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum of 3,000m<sup>2</sup> outside the heritage precinct. Retail development should be restricted to only areas where it has been allowed in the past and not expanded throughout the plan change area.</p> <p>No retail along The Esplanade.</p>
183.6	General - Transportation			<p>Practical future proof solutions to the parking issues that occur in the greater area bounded by Cuba Street, Udy Street, Hutt Road and The Esplanade.</p> <p>Study on how the present public transport systems could be better coordinated and enhanced, maybe a pedestrian overpass from Petone Station across Hutt Road.</p>

DPC29/184 – Judith Vickerman

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
184.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	The submitter is of the view that the plan change will inevitably change the unique heritage character of Petone to one of “ <i>you could be anywhere in the world</i> ”.	<p>Hutt City Council withdraws its support for the proposed plan change.</p> <p>The submitter would also like to see an independent person come in and read/hears all the submissions.</p> <p>The submitter would like the Council to consider the well-known fact and reality that <u>Petone is a unique and very special heritage area that should be maintained as such.</u> (author’s own emphasis). “<i>Its popularity has increased beyond belief during the twenty-seven years we have lived here. Cruise ships send passengers, visitors frequent the area and I am always told how lucky I am to live in the fabulous little village. I do not want to live in an area that is similar to others. It is boring, dull and aesthetically unpleasant.</i>”</p>
184.2	General – Retail Floorspace, Building Height and Site Coverage and Open Space	Oppose	<p>Rules which will allow development up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> will undoubtedly cause financial problems for the present shops and cafes.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the possible height of buildings will have severe impacts on views and access to sunlight and increase wind effects.</p> <p>The submitter objects to the lack of setback from the footpath and 100% site coverage, which doesn’t allow for landscaping.</p>	<p>The submitter would like the Council to seriously consider that once the change goes through, <u>there may well be a huge mall built.</u> (author’s own emphasis). Consider the way people are ‘welcomed’ to Petone at present and how they may be welcomed in the future – large concrete buildings lining the footpaths that give no indication of what is behind them. There is no “comeback” once the decision is made and buildings built, as with Lower Hutt’s High Street, Jackson Street may well become full of empty ‘for lease’ buildings with no life seen along its streets as businesses fail to thrive. We need to have less malls and more community street shopping and social areas.</p> <p>The submitter would like the Council to consider the height of buildings to have a <u>maximum of three storeys with recessed setbacks of non-uniform measurements and strong guidelines for landscaping</u> (author’s own emphasis) to create an aesthetically pleasing and green environment to enhance the area and our lives for all to enjoy.</p>



184.3	General – Design Guidelines	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the lack of quality guidelines, which is considered to result in cheaper looking buildings that will have a short lifespan.	The submitter would like the Council to consider <u>quality design guidelines from Architects and Landscape Architects</u> , (author's own emphasis) in order that both buildings and plantings have a look of solidarity and long life. Consider the Lower Hutt travesty of having demolished a lovely Church to now see a concrete Rebel Sports and Briscoes in its place, and Westfield which has taken much foot traffic from the lovely High Street.
184.4	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	In the case of a major earthquake occurring, no allowances are made for ensuring the people will be helped.  The submitter adds that by forward thinking and taking into account the Christchurch situation, this is a great opportunity for the Hutt City Council to really do something positive and beneficial for all in the Wellington Region.	The submitter would like the Council to consider that <u>in the case of a serious earthquake there is a strong design focus on how to help people in the area with such things as water availability and communal areas where they can congregate</u> (author's own emphasis). The submitter sees this is not only for emergencies but also for the enhancement of life in general. We need green areas and not concrete jungles.

## Group Submission 7

*Submitters 185 – Diane Fletcher, 187 – Tim Edgeler, 188 – Judith Edgeler and 189 – Roz Thompson*

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
185.1	General – Preferred Uses	Support	The submitters support the concept of a mixed use area.  The submitter believes the goals set out in the plan to foster and promote economic growth are admirable, but the receiving environment has insufficient protection.	
185.2	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	The submitters oppose provisions for retail development up to 10,000m <sup>2</sup> with no minimum size as a permitted activity.  The submitters refer to several sections of the Plan Change	Council to re-evaluate this section of the Plan 29 changes and propose further options.

			<p>Documentation and the report titled ‘Evaluation of Market Demand and Development Feasibility’ by Development Economics prepared on behalf of the Council. These are taken as <i>“evidence that Hutt City Council is committed to the elements of the Petone Vision Statement”</i>, as well as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>“recognition by Hutt City Council that smaller format retail development in the mixed use area poses significant risk to the viability of the Jackson Street retail area.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Clear independent analytical evidence that the so called ‘vibrancy’ of Jackson ST. belies the tough economic realities of operating a retail business in the area.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Clear independent analytical evidence that smaller format retail development in the mixed use area poses significant risk to the viability of the Jackson St retail aea (sic)”.</i></li> </ol> <p>The submitters point out that a decline in the number of businesses operating in the existing retail area because of unchecked development in the mixed use area, would not contribute to the village culture of Petone.</p> <p>The submitter believes there are better ways to manage the development of retail activity in the mixed use area, including reverting back to current retail provisions which limit retail to large format retail outlets.</p>	
185.3	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage, Open Space and Foreshore	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose a maximum building height limit of 30m.</p> <p>A building height limit of 30m is too high, especially along The Esplanade, Jackson Street and Hutt Road. High buildings along The Esplanade would block too much of the views of the western hills. High buildings along Jackson Street would be too much out of character with the rest of the street and cause too much shading.</p>	Buildings along The Esplanade, Hutt Road and Jackson Street to have a maximum height of 10m along the front boundary, with a recession plan of 45 degrees sloping upwards to a maximum height of 20m.

			The proposed plan lacks any planning for new open space to be created in the mixed use area. Nor any plans for new linkages from this area to the foreshore. The north side of The Esplanade could possibly be an attractive area for apartments but this area is distant from the main Jackson Street precinct. The lack of any new linkages may hamper the development of the Mixed Use area.	
185.4	General – Design Guide	Oppose	The submitters consider that there should be a greater obligation on property owners, developers, builders and designers to follow the guidelines in the Petone Mixed Use Area – Design Guide. There should be an obligation on any new development to address basic minimum standards that could be specified in the Design Guide.	
185.5	General – Natural Hazard	Oppose	The submitters raise concern as to the suitability of the Wellington Fault Line Special Study Area for the construction of 30m high buildings. They point out that given the current earthquake heightened awareness, it is surprising that the plan does not contain any special provision to restrict height in this area.	

<b>DPC29/190 – Alan White</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
190.1	General – General, Building Height and Site Coverage, Open Space, Transportation and Character.	Oppose	<p>The submitter refers to the consultative process that led to the drafting of the Petone Vision Statement and the Council’s prior investment and support for Petone.</p> <p><i>“The current proposed plan change falls well short of my interpretation of the communities and Council’s aspirational statements in the (Petone) Vision document and the advertised</i></p>	A major rewrite to align the proposed plan change more accurately to the Petone Vision objectives.

		<p><i>Plan Change conflicts with good planning principles”.</i></p> <p>The submitter states that the Council has a moral obligation to interpret the community aspirations in a manner reflective of it. The current plan change does not do this. The current draft proposal will not get the quality outcome it aspires to.</p> <p>The submitter is “dismayed” and concerned by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of emphasis on design guidance;</li> <li>• lack of open space;</li> <li>• lack of connectivity for pedestrian and cycle access;</li> <li>• lack of reference to regional transportation network (including lack of car parking provision and absence of public transport aspirations);</li> <li>• scale/size of proposed developments; and</li> <li>• conflicting uses (for example, brothels in mixed-use areas).</li> </ul> <p>The submitter refers to Hutt City as a seriously depleted commercial area that has been harmed through the Council’s promotion of large scale commercial development. The submitter is very concerned that the plan change would replicate this situation in Petone and destroy its unique village atmosphere and strong social and business environment and quality.</p> <p>The following provisions are considered to be contrary to the Petone Vision Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of design standards and planning guidance;</li> <li>• lack of restriction on scale of new development (including retail, residential, commercial and light industry);</li> <li>• encouragement of large-scale development; and</li> <li>• building height of 30m.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

190.2	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The Petone area will be adequately served for many years to come with the current level of retail park that exists (plus the proposed Countdown supermarket).</p> <p>Expanded opportunities for retail is contrary to the Petone Vision Statement and will destroy the village atmosphere of Petone.</p>	<p>Existing planning provisions relating to the Petone retail area should be retained</p> <p>Restrict large scale retail to the current Pac ‘n’ Save/ Warehouse retail park which is clearly defined and leave the mixed use area for smaller – medium scale development commensurate with a ‘village context’.</p>
190.3	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage, Activity Status and Notification	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern that provisions regarding height and setback would not provide an appropriate open quality for the entrance ways of Petone. Buildings would dominate the valley landscape.</p>	<p>Limitation of height to 15m.</p> <p>Future proposals of the scale proposed should individually be the subject to resource consent processes with public advertising.</p>
190.4	General – Infrastructure and Natural Hazards		<p>Provisions in the plan change do not address the issue identified in Section 2.6 of the proposed ‘Petone Mixed Use Area – Design Guide’ that pipe infrastructure in the Petone Mixed Use Area is at capacity.</p> <p>Greater emphasis should be placed on the storm water management implications of more intensive residential and commercial use. Especially given the low lying nature of the area generally, climate change and flooding potential.</p>	<p>A proportion of upgrades/replacement of infrastructure required to accommodate new developments should be recovered from developers as a special rate or a one off levy. Council (ratepayers) should share this cost with developers.</p> <p>Incorporation of innovative surface water management techniques.</p>
190.5	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern regarding the retention of current planning requirements within the fault line area.</p> <p>The submitter states that the Council should take the opportunity to create open space, pedestrian/cycle/ transport connectivity but allow some low density activity, if short-term limited numbers of people are involved.</p> <p>Higher building standards should be signalled now to ensure owners are aware of the potential for increased strengthening requirements for future developments in this area.</p>	<p>Development activity in the fault line area should be restricted.</p>
190.6	Amendment 1	Support	<p>The submitter supports the removal of vehicle oriented retail and larger commercial activities from the explanation for the Petone Commercial Activity Area.</p>	

190.7	Amendment 2	Oppose	The proposed definition of integrated retail development is opposed.	
190.8	Amendment 4	Part Support/ Part Oppose	<p>The submitter supports the deletion of vehicle retailing. This use is provided in the wider valley and lead to poor land utilisation in Petone.</p> <p>Policies need to be strengthened and redefined to better provide for the sustainable management of the area and better align with the principles that underpin the Petone Vision Statement.</p> <p>A copy of 'A Working Definition of Urban Villages' adopted by Bellinham Council in Washington USA is attached to the original submission. The submitter considers that the Petone Visions Statement and 'Urban Village' concept align well and provide good advice for the maintenance of urban 'villages'.</p> <p>Without greater design/planning guidance there is no mechanism to define the character and amenity values of the area, referred to in policy (a). This would increase the potential for litigation.</p> <p>Council's enthusiasm for large scale retail activities as referred to in policy (b) have had major impacts on the Lower Hutt CBD and has the potential to replicate this situation in Petone.</p> <p>Without detailed design guidance it is highly debatable that the Council will achieve 'quality living spaces' as referred to in policy (c). The achievement of quality living spaces requires a high level of building/planning design.</p> <p>The proposed policies in the plan change do not adequately cover the potential adverse effects of large scale developments allowed. The risk to the viability of the existing retail/commercial activity is acknowledged in the 'Explanation</p>	Councillors refresh themselves on both the process adopted for the Petone Vision Statement and the statement document itself.

			and Reasons' but not resolved.  The submitter states that the regional transport network, pedestrian and cycle access are totally or partially ignored and the scale of buildings proposed has the potential to destroy all aspirations of openness except perhaps on the entrance roads.	
190.9	Amendment 5	Oppose	A better definition/description needs to be given of the identity of the main entrance and gateway routes, referred to in policy (a).	
190.10	Amendment 7	Oppose	The submitter raised concern regarding the encouragement of good design as referred to in policy (b) as opposed to demanding it. The submitter is of the view that without greater controls a 'hotch potch' of poorly design buildings will ensue.  The submitter also objects to the term 'encourage' in policy (g) in relation to pedestrian spaces and linkages. A stronger statement is required to ensure the desired intentions of the policy are achieved.	Greater minimum design specification.
190.11	Amendment 8	Not stated	The submitter refers to this amendment.	
190.12	Amendment 10	Oppose	The submitter objects to permitted activity standard (a) regarding retail activity.  Object to permitted activity standard (g) regarding brothels. <i>"The impacts on surrounding communities would be significant and it is totally inappropriate. In the current plan within the current business area these permitted activities are restricted to ground floor only. In this review it is "open slather" so a brothel could be anywhere within a complex in the Mixed Use Area where crèches, pre-schools or businesses might be operating"</i> . Existing provisions relating to the existing business area are sufficient.	Retail activities should comply with the existing retail limitations pertaining to the current Petone retail area.  Large scale integrated retail developments up to or exceeding 10,000m <sup>2</sup> should not be allowed.  The deletion of brothels as a permitted use.

190.13	Amendment 11	Oppose	<p>The submitter questions the ability to achieve the aspirations in the Petone Mixed Use Area Design Guide regarding openness and connectivity, if developers are allowed 100% site coverage.</p> <p>The submitter objects to a maximum height of 30m referred to Rule 5B2.2.1.1 (b). A height limit of 15m would be more consistent with the Petone Vision Statement. Combined with additional planning guidance, this height limit would result in an appropriate scale of development for a river valley – seascape area.</p>	15m height limitation for the total area.
190.14	Amendment 14	Oppose	<p>The submitter questions whether Rule 5B2.2.1.1 (f) (vii) regarding time restrictions on servicing activities adjacent to residential premises, would impact on some of the genuine activities people might expect to find in a Mixed Use Area such as a bakery and restaurant.</p> <p>The submitter ponders whether the above rule would place restrictions on brothels adjacent residential sites, as this activity involves “servicing”.</p>	
190.15	Amendment 17	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern regarding the wording of Rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (i) regarding dust and questions whether the intention of the policy could be better expressed.</p> <p>The wording used could be problematic for the Council given the <i>“individual health sensitivities/circumstances of citizens which could change from site to site”</i>.</p>	
190.16	Amendment 19 and 20	Oppose		Retain existing requirements relating to Restricted Discretionary Activities for the existing Petone business area within the Petone Mixed Use Area.
190.17	Amendment 31	Oppose	<p>The submitter does not agree with integrated retail activity of the scale referred to (above 10,000m<sup>2</sup>) within the Petone Mixed Use Area.</p> <p>The submitter would like existing restrictions in the current</p>	



			plan retained.	
190.18	Amendment 38	Oppose	Concern is raised regarding the wording of point (d) under Anticipated Environmental Results. The proposed wording refers to the “centre” but what does this mean in relation to Areas 1 and 2 in Petone. If Area 1 – Jackson Street is the centre, this needs to be confirmed.	
190.18	Amendments 44 to 46 and 49 to 54		The submitter states that previous comments also apply to these amendments.	
190.19	Amendment 57	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern that car parking requirements would lead to an undersupply of car parking for larger scale residential developments, which would lead to heavy reliance on on-street resident parking, which would clog up the streets.</p> <p><i>“If there had been a strong emphasis and provision for the Vision Statement aspirations related to pedestrian and cycle ways, connectivity to and with the Regional Transportation System, reliance and strong messages/ reduced emphasis on vehicular activity, one car park for two residential units might have been appropriate in the Mixed Use Area. That is not the case and more realistic parking requirements on developers is (sic) sought.”</i></p>	

## Group Submission 8

*Submitters 193 – Hutt Road Holdings Ltd, 194 - Knights Road Holdings Ltd, 195 – Mursan Holdings Ltd and 196 - Empire Group Ltd and 197 - Andrews Avenue Holdings Ltd*

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
193.1	General	Support	The submitter supports the proposed rezoning.	That Area 2 is rezoned as proposed.

## DPC29/198 – Alex Edmonds

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
198.1	General and Activity Status	Oppose	<p>The submitter identifies themselves as a real estate agent employed by Stirling Real Estate Ltd with 25 years of real estate experience in the Lower Hutt Valley and Jackson Street in particular.</p> <p>The submitter refers to Jackson Street struggling to survive in the early 1990's. Building owners seemed reluctant to invest there, largely because of fear that a large new retail development, anchored by a supermarket, would be established on the old Gear Meat site at the western end of Petone.</p> <p><i>“What changed the situation and started the rejuvenation of the area were the decision of the Hutt City Council to zone the commercial areas in a way that discouraged the establishment of small businesses other than in the traditional Jackson Street retail area and to establish the Jackson Street Programme</i></p>	<p>Reject the plan change totally.</p> <p><i>“The statement in the Petone Vision that growth will be managed in an economically and environmentally sustainable manner through supporting investment with attention to design quality that reinforces and enhances Petone’s character, (to be) embodied in any plan change to do with the Petone west area”.</i></p> <p><i>“Change that is sympathetic and reinforces the heritage look and feel (in particular around Jackson Street and adjoining streets) and recognising the nature and scale of the urban fabric around Petone (which is small sale*) – as stated in the Petone Vision”.</i></p> <p><i>Proposed detrimental economic effects on the Jackson Street heritage retail precinct thought through and addressed.</i></p> <p>Work on ways to have a plan change that will enhance Petone’s unique</p>

			<p><i>(JSP)."</i></p> <p>The historic area has changed from a dying retail area to become a relatively sought after place to rent retail space for small businesses, particularly the boutique and unusual. The historic character, which the JSP seeks to preserve and enhance, has created the charm without which the area would not be able to attract visitors from outside the immediate catchment to enable it to survive.</p> <p>The present zoning and JSP need to be retained if the Jackson Street area is to survive.</p> <p>The sense of community and history that Petone has, should be preserved for future generations.</p>	<p>and special character – not ruin it.</p> <p>*The term sale is considered by Council officers as a typing mistake as it is considered likely that the term scale was intended.</p>
198.2	General – Retail Floor Space	Oppose	<p>Small retail shows outside the defined Jackson Street area needs to be prevented, because it would not <i>"merely compromise the area but slowly see its demise"</i>.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern that the proposed changes would have an even more 'devastating' effect on the existing Jackson Street area, than the severe effects caused by the Queensgate Shopping Centre (Westfields) on High Street and Queens Drive, Lower Hutt.</p> <p><i>"The latest three retail businesses opening on Jackson Street are businesses that have relocated from Lower Hutt, Upper Hutt and elsewhere in Petone rather than being new businesses. This shows that businesses are going for the people count that Jackson Street currently provides. Anything that alters that people count will alter the filling of spaces along the street."</i></p>	<p>A containment of retail development in ways that will protect the Heritage Precinct.</p>
198.3	General – Design Guide	Oppose	<p>The plan change in its current form does not address quality, character, amenity values or environmental qualities needed, and especially not in such an historic area. It would result in</p>	<p>A Design Guide that has to be used for all developments and clearly identifies matters to be assessed and that actually achieves high quality design that is fitting for such an historic area.</p>

			inappropriate effects on the vibrant historic township of Petone.	
--	--	--	---	--

DPC29/199 – Pam Hanna on behalf of the Petone Planning Action Group				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
199.1	General – General, Preferred Uses, Character, Section 32 Analysis	Oppose	<p>The submitter identifies the objectives of the Petone Planning Action Group and that approximately 90 members make up the Group.</p> <p>The Group suggests that Independent Commissioners form the panel to hear the plan change.</p> <p>The submitter indicates that whilst they do not object to a mixed use area in principle, they are opposed to changes that will not ensure very high quality design and development at the western end of Petone.</p> <p>The Group is particularly concerned about changes to planning provisions, which has enabled Jackson Street <i>“to come back from oblivion and become <u>the</u> boutique shopping destination in the whole of the Wellington region. We can’t understand why HCC wants to undermine what is a very important place...”</i> both locally and nationally. (Author’s own emphasis).</p> <p>The plan change as drafted does not protect the historic shopping area and doesn’t fit in with the village feel and heritage character of Petone.</p> <p>The plan change ignores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the role that planning policies have played in the development of the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct;</li> </ul>	<p>Plan change to be rejected in its current form and amendments made.</p> <p><i>“Make modifications to the provisions of the Mixed Use Zone that reinstate the important complementary relationship in terms of rules and plan provisions with those that apply in Petone Commercial 1, and ensure that the two areas remain as complementary parts of the overall Petone Commercial Activity Area.”</i></p> <p>Ensure that the Petone Vision can be achieved through the provisions of this plan change.</p> <p><i>“Align the wording of Plan Change 29 so that the policies and other statements and the provisions through rules and other provisions are fully aligned.”</i></p> <p>Modify the plan provisions to reflect the above points (Refers to relationship with Petone Commercial Area 1).</p> <p>Withdraw the plan change and address all issues in this submission prior to re-notification.</p> <p>Undertake sufficient analysis to provide an adequate Section 32 analysis.</p> <p>The Group seek any additional or alternative relief to achieve the outcome sought in this submission.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That Petone is a village which has historically remained small-scale in size;</li> <li>• That future development should be based on the current scale and village nature of Petone; and</li> <li>• The usual existence of Design Guides in local authorities' second generation plans is proof that the market does not decide well.</li> </ul> <p>The plan change does not honour any part of the Petone Vision Statement, with its emphasis on Petone being a unique heritage place and the need to ensure that changes are sympathetic to the character of the area.</p> <p>The Group considers that there are many examples where the objectives and policies of proposed amendments are not consistent with proposed rules. The proposed plan change is also considered to be at odds with information, advice and recommendations received from consultants and council officers.</p> <p>The Group want to see a plan change that will enhance Petone's unique and special character – not ruin it.</p> <p>The Group considers that there are numerous problems with the Section 32 analysis for the plan change. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a reference to the Central Commercial Activity Area on page 168 of the plan change document;</li> <li>• No justification for the proposed size of up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> for retail;</li> <li>• No evidence of demand for a mixed use area; and</li> <li>• Status quo options have not been evaluated.</li> </ul> <p>The Group point out that part of Petone Commercial Area 1 is now proposed to be included in Area 2. They consider that</p>	<p>In relation to comments made on specific amendments, the Group confirms that it is open to alternative relief where that would better achieve the intent of the submission.</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>there are problems with the description of Area 2.</p> <p>The Group support the rezoning of three sites on Victoria Street (north of Jackson Street) to Petone Commercial Activity Area 1.</p> <p>Attached to the original submission are three maps with suggested changes to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 'Appendix 3 Petone Commercial 3: Main Entrance Routes which pass through Petone Commercial Activity Area 2 – Mixed use' and</li> <li>2. Planning Map A5 on page 113 of the Plan Change Document.</li> </ol> <p>The Group suggests that the Petone Commercial Activity Area 1 be expanded to include the <i>"the part of Jackson Street frontage that has the same form and function"</i> as shown on one of the maps attached to the original submission.</p>	
199.2	General – Retail Provisions	Oppose	<p>The Group raise the following concerns about the proposed retailing provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allowing retailing anywhere in the area would 'kill off' Jackson Street.</li> <li>• Potential of the plan change to degrade or undermine the vitality and vibrancy of Petone and hinder the revitalisation of the Lower Hutt CBD.</li> <li>• Allowing retail developments up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> would allow for a mall(s) to be established.</li> <li>• No management of associated traffic and parking issues is apparent.</li> <li>• There is no evidence of the demand referred in the 'Explanation and Reasons' of Amendment 4.</li> </ul> <p>The people of Petone fought against malls in the western end</p>	<p>Existing retail rules staying as they are at present with a minimum of 500m<sup>2</sup> and 3,000m<sup>2</sup> the maximum outside the heritage precinct. This has worked well over the last twenty years and should stay as it is.</p> <p>Any further retail activities only allowed in the part of the proposed along the western end of Jackson Street where they have been allowed in the past and not expanded to apply throughout the proposed new zone.</p> <p>There should in particular be no retail permitted on The Esplanade due to traffic congestion, parking difficulties and the potential to undermine Jackson Street and through retail spread.</p> <p>Limit the permitted size of retailing without consent.</p>

			of Petone in the 1970's and 1980's.	Limit the areas where retailing can establish.
199.3	General – Transportation and Amendment 4	Oppose	<p>There is no allowance for the traffic and parking issues on what are either extremely busy roads or very narrow streets.</p> <p>The plan provisions are not consistent with policy (f) under Rule 5B 1.1.2 or the second last paragraph under Amendment 4. Activities with a heavy dependence on private motor vehicles for access are not managed, with the exception of restrictions on service stations from fronting onto the three major roads. There are no controls on supermarkets and takeaways (including drive-throughs).</p> <p>Any size of retail up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> across the whole area will create a lot of traffic and parking problems.</p> <p>The need for cycle and pedestrian user friendly lanes and pathways has been ignored.</p>	<p>Other improvements to the provisions to ensure traffic and parking requirements are addressed in all new developments.</p> <p>The provision of pedestrian and cycle routes, accessways and facilities - as is stated in the current District Plan.</p>
199.4	General – Design Guidelines, Open Space, Landscaping, Environmental Sustainability and Stormwater Management	Oppose	<p>Although consent is required for buildings above 12m, the plan change clearly intends to allow and encourage 30m high buildings with 100% site coverage across most of the area, with no real design guidance. The design requirements for residential developments are minimal and will result in poor residential development.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern that the design guide would apply to development fronting a major road only and not apply to behind structures, which may be taller.</p> <p>The plan change provides no evidence that the Council has met its responsibilities as a signatory of the Urban Design Protocol. Quality design buildings attract further quality designed development and the opposite is also true.</p> <p>The Design Guide suggested is of very low quality and at the lowest possible end of requirements and guidance. There</p>	<p>Clear and much more detailed guidelines that apply to all new buildings across all of the proposed zones - based on a lot of what the Council has already agreed to for the Hutt CBD in Plan Change 14 and those for medium density housing in Plan Change 12.</p> <p>Requirements for any residential developments that include a minimum size of at least 50m<sup>2</sup> per unit, the provision of outdoor areas for each residential apartment, and rules to ensure ongoing access to sunlight in all apartments.</p> <p>Design control for all residential activities in Area 2.</p> <p>Much more compliance with the Wellington Regional Strategy expectation of quality urban form and design – as a city that looks good, feels safe and is easy to get around attracts economic growth. Historic heritage and natural hazards are also important aspects of the Proposed Wellington Regional Policy Statement that also need to be taken into account by HCC.</p>

			<p>needs to be at least a Design Guide of the quality of that agreed to for the Hutt CBD.</p> <p>The proposed provisions allow for residential development without adequate design quality including no open space requirement per unit and no requirement for daylight or sunlight access to apartments. There is no minimum size of apartment required, so a low standard of apartment development is permitted.</p> <p>There is a complete lack of open space planning. The importance of open and green spaces has been ignored. There is also a lack of landscape requirements.</p> <p>There is no encouragement of environmentally friendly possibilities such as car parking and outdoor areas having permeable surfaces. The occurrence of stormwater flooding at this end of Petone, illustrates the importance of encouraging porous surface areas.</p> <p>The lack of design controls is unlikely to lead to development attractive to the aging population.</p>	<p>Include rules and design guides to ensure that adequate residential amenity for future residents is ensured, for example plan change 12 design guide or adopt Wellington City Council's multi-unit design guide.</p> <p>Modify and improve the plan change to address the above issues by the introduction of new objectives, policies, methods and rules. (Refers to landscaping, green and environmental issues).</p>
199.5	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>The Group state that people are not happy with a maximum height of 15m at the edge of Jackson Street and they want important views of the hills and from the hills over Petone to remain.</p> <p>The height provisions would result in no amenity values at the western end of Jackson Street. Provisions could result in walls of high buildings down both sides of all streets in the proposed area. Reference is made to the absence of view shafts.</p>	<p>The permitted height across the whole area reduced to 10m maximum. Some taller buildings may be appropriate, but subject to design control.</p> <p>The proposed permitted site coverage of 100% reduced and coupled with requirements for green spaces and a lot of landscaping.</p> <p>Reinstatement of the 10m height limit along the full length of Jackson Street.</p> <p>Protection of the current important views of the hills from the floor of the valley in Petone and the important views from the hills out across to the Petone and the Foreshore. Such protection needs to be included and can be achieved by restricting permitted building height and</p>



				evaluating over height buildings on the basis of their impact on such views.
199.6	General - Foreshore	Oppose	<p>The proposed changes downgrade the significance of the Foreshore. The heights and lack of setback allowed will mean significant shading of the beach and will reduce its attractiveness and recreational use.</p> <p>The rule regarding design of buildings along The Esplanade is obscure and <i>“impossible to interpret”</i>.</p> <p>Concern is raised that buildings built along The Esplanade up to the permitted height, would be mainly seen as 30m high buildings (at their full height), despite the requirement to comply with a recession plane above the first 15m.</p>	A required setback from The Esplanade of at least 10m so that the foreshore is not shaded and made unattractive for recreational use.
199.7	General – Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Oppose	<p>The Urupa has to be accorded much more respect than allowing walls of 30m high buildings around it.</p> <p>The setback on adjoining sites should be 8m, the same as the suggested rear yard in any site abutting a residential area. The building height on the sites abutting the Urupa should be 8m maximum.</p>	Modify the rules to make provisions for setbacks and angle plane controls on all development adjoining the urupa.

199.8	Natural Hazards and Activity Status	Oppose	<p>The group raises the following concerns regarding natural hazards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Absence of new safeguards in the Wellington fault area;</li> <li>• Use of the same permitted height and site coverage standards as allowed elsewhere; and</li> <li>• The encouragement of residential development in this area.</li> </ul> <p>The Council should learn from the Christchurch experience and develop rules that will help minimise loss of life and property in the hazard zone. This needs to include new rules which limit development in proximity of the Wellington fault and rules which address the liquefaction and tsunami risks.</p>	Introduce rules to ensure that habitable buildings, education facilities or emergency services facilities are fully discretionary activities in the Wellington Fault Special Study Area, and introduce a new policy to reflect this.
199.9	Amendment 1	Oppose	<p>Clarification is required regarding the boundary of Area 2. Reference needs to be made that <i>“Area 1 (as sought to be modified by these submissions) extends into Area 2”</i>. Amendments may be required to the description of Area 1 as well.</p>	<p>Amend wording or actually show on District Plan maps the areas that are Petone Commercial Activity Area 1 and 2.</p> <p>Ensure alignment with changes are made in relation to descriptive wording of Area 1.</p>
199.10	Amendment 2	Oppose	<p>The proposed definition for integrated retail developments does not include trade supply retail, wholesale retail, yard-based retail or building improvement centres.</p> <p>The current District Plan contains a definition of an Individual Retail Activity and this additional definition is “superfluous”.</p>	Delete proposed definition.
199.11	Amendment 3	Oppose	<p>Clarification is required regarding the boundary of the mixed use area.</p> <p>Add clarification that development in this area will be subject to careful management.</p>	<p>Add words <u>subject to careful management of activities and development, reflecting the importance of the location of nearby uses.</u></p>

199.12	Amendment 4, Preferred Uses and Infrastructure	Oppose	<p>There is no evidence of the demand referred to in the issue for 5B 1.1.2 in the Section 32 report.</p> <p>There is no proof of demand for a range of complementary activities as referred to in the Explanation and Reasons.</p> <p>The admission that mixed uses could detract from existing retail areas under the above Issue needs to be dealt with and not just alluded to.</p> <p>There is nothing in the plan change to avoid or mitigate effects referred to under the Objective for 5B 1.1.2.</p> <p>The plan change will not create a vibrant and attractive mixed use area as referred to in the paragraphs under points (a) to (d) under Explanations and Reasons. Nor does it support and recognise the established activities and qualities of Petone.</p> <p>Adverse effects go way beyond those mentioned. The performance standards proposed are below those that were agreed for the Hutt CBD in Plan Change 14.</p> <p>The proposal could also lessen the opportunity for work and the number of workers in Petone, because of its desire to prevent light industrial activities in the future.</p> <p>Current businesses operating in the proposed zone need to know what activities are proposed to be restricted and how, as referred to in policy (e). People are concerned about any loss of industry and work opportunities, which could start to happen because of reverse sensitivity issues, even though these places should have prior and existing use rights.</p> <p>The term 'heavy industrial uses' is confusing as there is no definition of heavy industry in the District Plan. Clarification is sought as to whether light industry or industrial activities are</p>	<p>Add in the Issue, <u>recognition of the continuing need to have limitations on retail activities to avoid and mitigate adverse effects on Jackson Street Area 1 and the Central Commercial Area.</u></p> <p>Add in the Issue, <u>recognition of the natural hazard situation applying in the Petone Mixed Use area, and the need to limit development and activities.</u></p> <p>Add a new policy which reinstates the concept and intent of any retailing in the Mixed Use Area being complimentary to that in Area 1.</p> <p>Amend policy (e) to refer to larger-scale or noxious, hazardous or heavy industry, to enable light and small-scale industry.</p> <p>Add a policy which relates to managing natural and other hazards and risks within this area, including constraints on residential and other vulnerable activities within the Wellington Fault Special Study Area.</p> <p>Modify the 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Explanation and Reasons to indicate that discretionary control is retained over the establishment of smaller and larger retail activities.</p> <p>Modify the 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph by deleting reference to The Esplanade.</p> <p>Modify the 7<sup>th</sup> paragraph by adding reference to the existence of natural hazards in the area and the exclusion of residential activity (and other vulnerable activities) within the Wellington Fault Special Study Area shown on the plan maps.</p>
--------	--	--------	--	---

		<p>allowed.</p> <p>There is no management of larger scale retail activities as referred to in policy (b) for 5B 1.1.2. The provisions would allow harm to both Petone and Lower Hutt CBD.</p> <p>Explanation and Reasons point (a) refers to uses being complementary to the retail area of Jackson Street. Complementary requires difference. If small retail activities are allowed in the proposed zone, it will not be complementary, but rather damage the existing Jackson Street retail area.</p> <p>The plan change does not manage the establishment and operation of vehicle-orientated activities despite the wording of policy (f). Retail provisions would create a lot of traffic and parking problems.</p> <p>Creating an ‘attractive and public focussed environment’ as referred to in the above policy would require open space, landscaping, pedestrian friendly and cyclist friendly lanes and accessways. None of which the plan change takes into account or encourages.</p> <p>The submitter is unsure of the community infrastructure referred to under point (c) under the Explanations and Reasons. The western area of Petone has issues with drainage and stormwater that new development will only exacerbate.</p> <p>The two parts of the paragraph starting <i>“Retail activities are continually changing...wellbeing of the existing areas”</i> are inconsistent.</p> <p>The submitter seeks clarification on what <i>“the respective interface area”</i> refers to.</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>The submitter refers to point (d) under the Explanation and Reasons. Comments relate to perceived harm to the foreshore area as referred to under General Issues.</p> <p>The submitter provides additional comments on the Explanation and Reasons, which are covered under the General comments above.</p>	
199.13	Amendment 5	Oppose	<p>Clarification is sought as to the meaning of issues and objectives for 5B 1.1.3. What amenity and linkages are being referred to?</p> <p>The submitter raises concern that the plan provisions, including design guidance will not achieve the stated objectives.</p> <p>The submitter questions statements in the Explanation and Reasons and whether they are followed through in provisions within the plan change. They suggest that references to management are futile when <i>"nothing in the plan change really manages"</i> image and visual appearance.</p> <p>The Explanation and Reasons themselves identify a deficiency in plan provisions in relation to landscaping.</p> <p>The group considers that statements under this plan change need to be rethought.</p>	<p>Amend policy (a) to reflect that each of the three entrance and gateway routes have different requirements (for example add "each of these" in from of "areas").</p> <p>Add "visual attractiveness" to policy (b)</p> <p>Add reference to the need for larger buildings to also be managed to enhance their relationship with each other in these areas.</p> <p>Alter the final sentence under The Esplanade to say that development in this area will be required to have a setback and to provide landscaping to enhance the character and quality of development.</p>
199.14	Amendment 6	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that they do not directly oppose this amendment, but minor clarifications are sought.</p>	<p>Modify the last part of the Objective to read "on the Jackson Street Area 1 frontage".</p> <p>Delete words "and encourage circulation" in the Explanation and Reasons, as this is <i>"meaningless verbiage"</i>.</p>

199.15	Amendment 7	Part Oppose and Part Support	<p>The submitter questions the ability of the provisions of the plan change to ensure that the issue is addressed and the objective achieved.</p> <p>Many of the policy statements are not <i>“borne out in the proposed plan change as there are no requirements (to satisfy) any of these policies – so either the whole sections needs to be deleted, or rules need to be amended to carry these policies through”</i>. The same applies to words under Explanation and Reasons.</p> <p>The submitter questions what is meant by the paragraph <i>“For sites fronting...of the central area”</i>. The term ‘public environment’ needs to be explained.</p> <p>The use of some wind rules and wind protection are <i>“one of the very few positive things in this proposed plan change”</i>.</p> <p>The last two paragraphs under Explanations and Reasons are supported by the Group. However they identify the need for specific control through design guides near the boundary of existing residential areas, when height and other standards are exceeded.</p>	<p>In policy (a) (iii) it is not clear what is meant by “transparent”. This has a literal meaning which we would not necessarily support.</p> <p>Change any reference of building height of 12m to 10m (i.e. three stories maximum).</p> <p>Add a new policy to provide that buildings above 10m will be subject to a design review and consideration in terms of location, relation to other buildings exceeding 10m in height, visual impact, open space and views, relationship to nearby residential activity area and management of natural hazards risk.</p> <p>Add a new policy to say that buildings above 10m may be appropriate in this area, subject to management of their effects on the wider environment.</p> <p>Add a new policy to that in addition to control over building design for taller buildings, residential activities in all buildings will be subject to a design guide.</p> <p>Modify Explanation and Reasons to reflect the added policy.</p>
199.16	Amendment 8 and Activity Status	Oppose	<p>The words in the Explanation and Reasons appear to have no meaning. Parking is already at a premium everywhere in Petone and is not adequate.</p> <p>There also do not seem to be any real performance standards or design guidance provided that ensures on-site carparking will be provided in a manner which recognises and reflects the streetscape and visual amenity values of the area.</p> <p>The wording of the section suggests that parking is subject to design guidance, when this is clearly not the case.</p>	<p>Make all development including external carpark areas at least a controlled activity subject to design control.</p>

199.17	Amendment 9	Oppose	<p>It is inadequate to use the title of a rule as the basis of the definition of an area to which the rule applies.</p> <p>A clear plan map may remove the need for a description in the heading.</p>	<p>Ensure the plan maps clearly identify the Petone Mixed Use Area 2. If this is done there may be no need for a description in the heading.</p> <p>Ensure that any description in the heading correctly reflects the Area 2 area, as mapped.</p>
199.18	Amendment 10 and 31, Preferred Uses and Activity Status	Oppose	<p>Provisions in Rules 5B 2.2.1 (a) and 5B 2.2.3 (d) are said to be highly confusing. It seems that smaller malls are permitted, but there is intended to be no limit on the size of single shops.</p> <p>The list of permitted activities is very permissive and effectively allows a mall.</p> <p>Rules providing for industrial activities are too limited and do not provide for an established range of light industry, which can meet acceptable standards.</p> <p>It is not clear why educational and training facilities, marae and cultural centres are not to be included generally within the zone.</p>	<p>Make all development including external carpark areas at least a controlled activity subject to design control.</p> <p>Delete new (a) and reinstate current rules for retail development (i.e. permitted maximum and minimum floor space area) and limit permitted retail activities to the area they are currently limited to.</p> <p>Provide for industrial activities (subject to meeting standards relating to the hazardous facilities screening procedure, excluding item (a) in the definition of industrial activity in the Plan definition (Chapter 3).</p> <p>Move residential activities from this permitted activity list to a new list of controlled activities. Establish specific standards for this controlled activity relating to minimum unit size (50m<sup>2</sup>) and open space. Develop matters of control and design guidance specifically for this controlled activity. Include housing for the elderly as a controlled activity, but which does not need to meet the specified standards for unit size and open space.</p> <p>Specifically exclude residential, educational and emergency facilities from the Wellington Fault Special Study Area, either by activity description, or by a condition for a permitted activity.</p> <p>Provide specifically for education and training facilities, marae and cultural centres.</p> <p>Incorporate a condition which restricts any activities to a Hazardous Facilities Screening Procedure effects ratio of &lt;0.2 (Table 1, Rule 14D) and to specifically exclude all activities in 14D 2.1 from permitted activity status in this zone, given the natural hazard circumstances of</p>

				this area.
199.19	Amendment 11 and Activity Status	Oppose	<p>This is the only opportunity to create any open space in this area due to a lack of open space planning.</p> <p>A maximum height of 30m is far too high and needs to be reduced to 10m, with any proposed over-height buildings evaluated on the basis of their effect on views and other urban design elements.</p> <p>Although they submitter identifies their objection to buildings above 10m in height, they comment that the amendment suggests that buildings up to 30m in height can be built as a right, when this is not the case.</p> <p>There needs to be a setback on The Esplanade of at least 10m.</p> <p>Structures/buildings above 10m should be a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>The urupa has to be given more respect. Restrictions on buildings abutting residential areas, should also apply to sites adjacent the urupa. The height limit for buildings adjacent the urupa should be 8m.</p>	<p>Modify Rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (a) to read 80%</p> <p>Modify Rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (b) (i) to read 10m.</p> <p>Modify Rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (b) (ii) to read 10m and incorporate the angle plan control as a required condition for restricted discretionary activities in relation to 5B2.2.2 (c).</p> <p>Add a rule for a 10m setback on The Esplanade frontage.</p> <p>Modify and enhance the required protection for urupa by incorporating urupa in the heading of 5B 2.2.1.1 (f) and delete (c) (i).</p>
199.20	Amendment 12	Oppose	<p>Buildings of 15m height along Jackson Street, positioned adjacent the street frontage would create the impression of a “dark canyon”.</p> <p>Building to the front boundary and display windows is a standard urban design approach to retail areas, and is not necessarily appropriate for Petone. Given the emphasis on retaining the character of the historic Jackson Street precinct, a different approach may be desirable.</p> <p>The display window requirement is onerous for a mixed use area and is not necessarily desirable.</p>	<p>Delete requirement in 5B 2.2.1.1 (d) (i) for display windows, or reduce % requirement.</p> <p>Delete whole of 5B 2.2.1.1. (d) (ii).</p>



			<p>Much more thought is needed about how to create this area as an entrance to Petone and the Hutt. This part of Jackson Street does not have foot traffic like the historic part of Jackson Street does, so verandahs are irrelevant.</p> <p>With the retention of the existing floorspace restrictions, there is no need for a specified frontage width.</p>	
199.21	Amendment 13	Oppose	<p>There needs to be a lot more landscaping requirements, especially on the main routes and within the 10m setback on The Esplanade.</p>	<p><i>"Add new rule that indicates where setbacks are required, or at least 30% of the area shall be planted and maintained with trees which will reach a mature height of at least 5 metres, or similar".</i></p>
199.22	Amendment 14	Oppose	<p>Buildings adjacent residential properties of 10m height would have a major effect, even with a setback of 8m. The height needs to be reduced to 8m.</p> <p>The restrictions should also apply to development adjacent the urupa.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 5B 2.2.1.1 (f) (i) to refer to 8m.</p> <p>Add "or an urupa" to the heading of Rule 5B 2.2.1.1. (f).</p>
199.23	Amendment 18	Not stated	<p>The submitter seeks additional restrictions on activities as covered under General Issues.</p> <p>In association with the requested widening of industrial activities allowed, an additional general rule is required.</p>	<p>Incorporate a condition which restricts any activities to a Hazardous Facilities Screening Procedure effects ratio of &lt;0.2 (Table 1, Rule 14D) and to specifically exclude all activities in 14D 2.1 from permitted activity status in this zone, given the natural hazard circumstances of this area.</p> <p>Add provisions to achieve the above outcomes (regarding Amendment 18).</p>

199.24	Amendment 19	Oppose	The submitter seeks the retention of the existing rules 5B 2.2.2 (a) and 5B 2.2.2.1 (a).	<i>"Reinstate the wording which is proposed to be deleted in this amendment and restrict the application of the restricted discretionary rule to the area show on a map attached to submission on Amendment 43. (Note that (ii) does not appear to be in the current plan, but we seek the inclusion of these words in relation to this restricted discretionary activity. The heading may need to be modified to read 'and buildings containing such retailing activities'".</i>
199.25	Amendment 20 and Activity Status	Oppose	Emergency facilities should be excluded from the high hazard risk area.  The bulk of buildings needs to be reinstated as an important consideration. The reference to continuous display window frontage is not so important.	Delete the second sentence of (ii) above and replace by adding <u>including the bulk and design of the facility.</u>
199.26	Amendment 21 and Activity Status	Oppose	These considerations need to apply to more than just development fronting major roads.  The current Design Guide is not adequate and landscaping should be expected for every development.  There is a need to add additional considerations such as relationships to existing buildings, streets, open spaces, residential areas and impacts on views to and from the area.  This provision could also be expanded in relation to the requirement for a wind report.	Modify to also encompass all buildings in the zone which do not meet the conditions (i.e. all buildings above 8m adjoining residential areas or urupa or above 10m elsewhere in the zone).  Expand range of considerations and enhance the design guide  Cross reference to controlled activity provisions, for where a building includes residential activities.
199.27	Amendment 22 and Activity Status	Not stated	The submitter states that it may be more appropriate to bundle this amendment requiring a wind report for taller buildings, with their suggested requirement for all buildings above 10m to be subject to design control as at least a restricted discretionary activity.	Consider bundling this with an expanded Amendment 22 context.  Reference to 12m needs to be changed to 10m.

199.28	Amendment 23	Oppose	It would be difficult for development not to comply with provisions of the plan change as drafted. Consequently the amendment is considered to have no real meaning. Taken together, amendments 23 and 25 are confusing.	<p>At present there is confusion in the plan change as to whether an activity which does not comply with a permitted activity condition is a restricted or full discretionary activity.</p> <p>We are not opposed to such activities being restricted discretionary providing the matters of discretion are clear and comprehensive. But at present they are not.</p> <p>The reserve our right to oppose the inclusion of this rule.</p>
199.29	Amendment 24	Oppose	Given the importance of matters that may be addressed as restricted discretionary activities, we oppose this blanket provision.	Delete proposed clause to Rule 5B 2.2.2 (b) and (c).
199.30	Amendment 25	Oppose	This provision appears to contradict Amendment 23. If an activity becomes a Restricted Discretionary Activity by virtue of not complying with a permitted activity condition, it cannot then comply with all relevant permitted activity conditions.	<p>This needs to be sorted out in terms of Amendment 23.</p> <p>We reserve our right to oppose the inclusion of this rule.</p>
199.31	Amendment 26	Oppose	The wind rules need to apply to all new buildings above 10m.	Replace all references to 12m with 10m in the heading and rule.
199.32	Amendment 27	Not stated	The approach of this rule may be appropriate in some circumstances. Especially in relation to the requests to exclude residential, education and emergency facilities from the Wellington Fault Special Study Area and set standards relating to hazardous substances.	Retain Rule 5B 2.2.3 (a) in relation to specific circumstances, relating to natural and other hazards management.
199.33	Amendment 31	Oppose	<i>"No integrated or mall type development of any sort should be allowed. However, it is appropriate to make larger developments more than restricted discretionary. Similarly retailing that is smaller than 500m sq should also be this status, as should any retailing outside the area on the plan (attached to the original submission)."</i>	<p>Modify Rule 5B 2.2.3 (d) to read <i>"all retail activities with a gross floor area exceeding 6,000m sq"</i> and all retailing activities outside the area shown on the map attached to the original submission.</p> <p>Add new discretionary activity categories to cover the circumstances stated above.</p>

199.34	Amendment 33	Oppose	The Group states that people are concerned that this rule will have negative economic effects on Petone and people's current livelihoods. The group recommends that subject to some limitations, a permitted activity status should apply.	Delete Amendment 33.
199.35	Amendment 34	Oppose	This rule should include reference to controlled activities, such as the recommended identification of residential activities as a controlled activity.	Add controlled activities to this item.
199.36	Amendment 37	Oppose	The submitter opposes the deletion of Rule 5B 2.2.4 until all possible implications of the widening of the range of activities has been considered.  They also reserve the right to suggest additions to the list of non-complying activities during Council's consideration of submissions on the plan change.	Retain the ability to reinstate this provision and to add specific non-complying activities.  <i>"Retain the intent of the rule proposed to be deleted as Amendment 51 as a non-complying activity".</i> That is, service stations along The Esplanade should continue to be identified as a non-complying activity.
199.37	Amendment 38	Oppose	The suggested amendments to 5B 3 regarding Anticipated Environmental Results are not <i>"borne out in the rules and other provisions in the proposed plan change, and the anticipated environmental results do not acknowledge that there are two distinct elements to the Petone Commercial Activity Area"</i> .	Add wording that reflects the two specific different but complementary parts of the Commercial Activity Area and the outcomes required for both.
199.38	Amendment 40	Partial Support	The Group supports the inclusion of a specific design guide for the Petone Commercial Activity Area 2. The Design guide is considered to have some good points, although not all these good points are reflected in the Plan Change provisions.  The design guide is not considered to be strong or detailed enough. The Design Guide should be more in line with the design guide that was part of Plan Change 14 to do with Hutt CBD. Petone should not be treated as less important or requiring less care.  The Design Guide is null and void except for buildings which front onto the three major roads and buildings over 30m in height.	Review and strengthen the Design Guide in association with the submission points above, including objectives, policies, rules and other provisions to ensure that it will assist to effectively manage the built form and open and public spaces in Petone for the benefit of future generations.

			The map on page 5 of the Design Guide makes it appear that the design guide will apply to any development within the proposed zone, when this is not the case.	
199.39	Amendment 41	Oppose	The map labelled as Appendix 3 appears to extend the Jackson Street Main Entrance Route into the Petone Commercial Activity Area 1, where it would have no effect.	Limit the Jackson Street Main Entrance Route to the frontage which is actually in the Petone Commercial Activity Area 2.  Ensure map shows all streets - currently Petone Avenue is obscured.
199.40	Amendment 43	Oppose	The mapped extent of Petone Commercial Activity Area 1 is inadequate and needs to extend to Gear Street as shown on the map attached to the original submission. The heritage area notation also needs to be extended.  It needs to be clarified that the area south of the Heritage Area is intended to be within Petone Commercial Activity Area 2.  A notation needs to be added to show where the retail rules apply.	Make changes shown on Map Attachments 1 and 2 (of 2) of this submission (attached to original submission).

*Submission supported by Submitter 79 – Graeme L Lyon*

<b>DPC29/207 – Andy Conroy</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
207.1	General	Oppose	The entire plan change is opposed.	Make this a high quality plan change for a quality position on the harbour.
207.2	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	The plan is far too permissive in the high-risk area of the Wellington Faultline special study area.	Restrict building height in the Wellington Fault Study Area.  No residential building or emergency services within the Wellington Fault Study area.

207.3	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	Building height and site coverage is far too permissive for the low-rise area of Petone.	<i>“Lowering height of buildings to 15-18m. Esplanade, Jackson and Hutt Road and streets bordering residential areas need to lower again 10m. Keep development low-rise in this area”.</i>
207.4	General – Design Guidelines and Open Space	Oppose	There is a lack of any high quality design guidelines over the whole area. Guidelines for properties bordering the three major streets are not enough.  Lack of design guidance regarding trees and green space, planting, recreational connections to The Esplanade or around the urupa etc. The submitter refers to the lack of greening of the plan change area.	Inclusion of highest quality design guidelines to encourage the best and safest and greenest developments possible for this area.  Plan the area to include more green space on key sites, The Esplanade and Jackson Street west to encourage people into area.
207.5	General – Retail Provisions	Oppose	Objection to retail allowed over the entire plan change area. <i>“This will have deadly effects on our current businesses”.</i>	Retain the retail mix as it is currently – with larger shops like Kathmandu etc. in Petone West. No small retail or large malls in this area.

<b>DPC29/208 – John W Dobson</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
208.1	General	Oppose	The submitter considers the plan change to be too permissive. The submitter refers to a risk of undermining the Heritage precinct, amenity value of the area and potential economic loss for Jackson Street businesses.	Reject the plan change in its current form.
208.2	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	Submitter refers to residential apartments and building heights within the Wellington Fault-line special study area.  Liquefaction would have catastrophic consequences on buildings.	
208.3	General – Design Guidelines	Oppose		High quality design guidelines to cover the whole area.  Building guidelines to be stronger for the area, not just NZ Building

				Standards.
208.4	General – Retail provisions	Oppose	The submitter raises concern about changes to retail size being too permissive.	Retain the status quo around retail rules.
208.5	General – Maximum Building Height	Oppose	The submitter refers to excessive shading that 30m high buildings and their bulk would have on the surrounding area.	Lower the height of buildings in the proposed plan to maximum height 15m. Esplanade and Jackson and Hutt Road need to lower at street front.
208.6	General - Transportation	Oppose	Not enough car parking is allocated for the plan change area. Submitter refers to traffic implications and the proposed parking requirement of 0.5 spaces per residential apartment.	Address the potential traffic growth and parking provisions.

DPC29/218 – Jackson Street Programme Incorporated				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
218.1	General	Oppose	<p>The Jackson Street Programme is not opposed to development in the Petone area. However the creation of a second shopping precinct, only a block away from what has always been the main shopping area of Petone is likely to have far reaching impacts, not only in Petone but across the city.</p> <p>The submitter states that <i>“the proposed plan change appears to be a “rush job” that has not been well thought out. The Petone Vision document began in 2007 and had some great ideas for the future development of Petone. What has been presented instead is a document lacking in that vision and does not have an inspired vision for the taking us forward to a more sustainable future”.</i></p> <p>Petone has for 20 years promoted itself as having a number of</p>	<p>Withdraw the plan change in its current form and consult on more appropriate District Plan provisions for the western end of Petone.</p> <p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, the Jackson Street Programme reserve the right to make detailed oral comments on the provisions of the proposed Plan Change in support of its concern that the proposed Plan Change will undermine the vitality and economic basis of Petone Commercial Area 1 (Jackson Street) which the existing District Plan seeks to support.</p> <p>The Jackson Street Programme suggests that independent commissioners form part of the hearing panel.</p>

			points of different – heritage, boutique shopping, Walk of Champions, sports, community. Building owners and retailers have had to work to very restrictive resource consents rules that apply only to the Jackson Street heritage precinct and nowhere else in Hutt City.	
218.2	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The submitters refers to retail activities up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> being a permitted activity and points out that the plan change area could contain several of these developments without any means of control.</p> <p><i>“The Jackson Street heritage precinct could not compete against this development. An economic report commissioned by Hutt City Council suggested that 30-60 businesses would relocate from Jackson Street to this new area. If businesses are offered incentives – rent relief, lower insurance premiums etc. why would they not move. It has taken 20 years of hard work by the Jackson Street Programme building owners and retailers to get to where we are today. If plan change 29 is adopted then Jackson Street could well go back to what it was 20 years (ago), a run down Main Street with empty shops. Building owners of heritage buildings in Jackson Street will not be able to compete with this new development. Higher overheads, increased insurance costs, resource consent fees and then the possible loss of tenants will all take their toll. Jackson Street programme has always maintained that it was a win-win situation for Petone to have large format retail format at one end and small boutique at the other. The existing building owners would have no choice but to demolish and rebuild to ensure they remain competitive in the market place.”</i></p> <p>The proposed plan change would also have an adverse impact on the Hutt City CBD. The submitter refers to the harm caused by Westfields Mall on the Lower Hutt CBD. The economic benefits claimed by Hutt City Council are not apparent and there are many vacant premises.</p>	<p>Protect the existing retail area and businesses.</p> <p>Retain the large format retailing in the same zone that the <u>current District Plan</u> allows for. (author’s own emphasis)</p>



			<p><i>"Hutt City Council now claims that the redevelopment of Petone will create jobs and have large economic returns for the Hutt economy. Free market forces are a false economy. Relocating existing businesses from an area to a new development will only see the demise of the area businesses shifted from. There is not enough population in the whole Wellington region to sustain all these development(s)".</i></p> <p>The submitter also refers to competition from other suburban areas in the Wellington region which are in the process of reinventing themselves.</p>	
218.3	General – Maximum Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	The submitter refers to the maximum building height of 30m and maximum site coverage of 100%.	

<b>DPC29/221 – John Donnelly</b>				
<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
221.1	General – General and Character	Oppose	<p>The submitter identifies themselves as the co-owner of a business at 274 Jackson Street and landowner of the building from which the business operates. The submission also contains details of the academic qualifications and business experience of the author.</p> <p>The submitter states that they are not opposed to development per se in Petone West, but it must be of high quality design and fit in with the area.</p> <p>The correct plan, restrictions and incentives need to be put in</p>	Reject the plan change in its current form and make amendments as requested.

		<p>place, for Petone to reach its potential to develop into one of the best retail areas in New Zealand. A laissez faire approach would prevent the potential of Petone being reached. <i>“You may as well let the developers write the District Plan for HCC. The market often does not get right and when it gets it wrong it can last for a 100 years”.</i></p> <p>The submitter is of the view that the approach of the District Plan is contrary to protecting the community’s physical resources or managing them in a way that provides for its social, economic and cultural wellbeing.</p> <p>The submitter would like to see a District Plan that encourages quality development that raises the average with each new development, which is empathetic to the heritage part of Jackson Street. Anything that detracts from this should be rejected and rewritten.</p> <p>The plan change appears to misunderstand the reasons for successful development in Petone and would result in inappropriate effects on the heritage character, look and feel of Petone.</p> <p>The area needs to be able to attract custom from beyond Petone to survive The heritage character is essential for that purpose and it is vital that protection is retained against activities which would be out of character or would undermine its viability.</p> <p><i>“Jackson Street shops can be a destination because of the character of the precinct and the current whole of what Petone has. Without it, there will no longer be any attraction to differentiate Jackson Street from any other retail area.”</i></p>	
--	--	--	--

			Attached to the original submission is a copy of an article from the Hutt News regarding a local generated business stimulus package and <i>“images of Central Lower Hutt and the combined effect of Westfield mall and the worldwide financial crisis on Central Hutt Retail/CBD area.”</i>	
221.2	General – Retail Provisions	Oppose	<p>The submitter points out that the present zoning separates two commercial areas, large stores at the western end of Jackson Street and small retail outlets and businesses in the heritage precinct of Jackson Street. Through the present zoning and Jackson Street Programme (JSP), the Council has encouraged small retailers to Jackson Street, on the expectation that the area would remain protected because of its particular character. The plan change flies in the face of the previous successful approach, and threatens the area’s ability to rejuvenate.</p> <p>The submitter has recently invested \$125,000 on the strengthening and renovation of their business premise on the expectation that current planning provisions would continue. Other people have made major investments on the same expectations.</p> <p>Buildings owners in the heritage precinct have higher costs than owners of buildings in other areas, due to strengthening and maintenance. These higher costs require a size demarcation between the two commercial areas of Petone to remain competitive.</p> <p>The submitter has major concerns about flow on effects from the loss of businesses in Jackson Street, which includes the removal of the community aspect of the historic precinct and network of support which businesses provide to each other.</p> <p>The submitter questions the economic benefits of the plan change and refers to harm created to the original Hutt CBD</p>	Allowable retail spaces in the proposed plan change to be kept as at present and kept to 500m <sup>2</sup> minimum and 3000m <sup>2</sup> maximum – with the heritage part of Jackson Street the only area where retail spaces under 500m <sup>2</sup> are allowed.

			<p>from Queensgate/Westfields, despite the Council's claim of positive economic effects for the area. The plan change is considered to replicate this effect in the heritage precinct of Jackson Street.</p> <p><i>"A plan change in Petone LFR area that allows rapid development of lot of small shops (especially if undercover and in mini-mall like developments) while the worldwide recession continues and there is low growth in retail stores, would simply take tenants from one end of the street to the other and would split Petone in two. The heritage part of Jackson Street would end up with many empty buildings..."</i></p>	
221.3	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage and Open Space	Oppose	Buildings 30m high (up to 10 stories) with 100% site coverage is far too permissive without appropriate quality design rules and <i>"application of green and open spaces"</i> , would detract from the character and amenity values of the area. Especially with retail spaces allowed up to 10,000m <sup>2</sup> and 10 stories high.	
221.4	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concerns regarding the permitted height and site coverage provisions and encouragement of residential development in the Wellington Fault area.</p> <p>The submitter is of the view that the Council should proceed with extreme caution and learn lessons from the Christchurch earthquakes, especially the finding that some areas of Christchurch should never have been built on.</p>	Rules that limit risky development in proximity to the Wellington Fault and that also address the liquefaction risks in the proposed new zone area – with the aim of minimising loss of life and property in the hazard zone.
221.5	General – Design Guidelines	Oppose		<p>Clear design guidelines for all new buildings across all of the proposed zone that are of quality, raise the average, and fit in with the Heritage area. (Could still be ultra-modern, but of quality design and fit in, and be recognised as great design in 100 years time).</p> <p>Residential development of quality only permitted. This would involve an in-depth design guide that includes a minimum size of apartment/unit plus a requirement for adequate living conditions including the ongoing provision of sunlight, and a requirement relating</p>

				to outdoor areas.
--	--	--	--	-------------------

DPC29/224 – Deborah O’Connor				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
224.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety.</p> <p>The submitter would like to see <i>“Petone continue to thrive and grow as a town that is attractive to residents, iwi, business owners, workers and visitors alike. The proposed District Plan Change 29 will work against this vision as (it) lacks adequate guidance for future development and is too permissive”</i>.</p>	
224.2	General – Maximum Building Height and Site Coverage	Oppose	<p>Provisions which allow buildings up to 30m high, with 100% site coverage are too permissive, and do not take into account the village feel and small-scale of Petone.</p> <p>The submitter would like to see new buildings being required to be consistent with the small-scale of most of the existing buildings in Petone. <i>“The existing exceptions (tower buildings, “big barn” retail centres, and some social housing) I believe to be both inappropriate and eyesores. I am concerned that the overdevelopment permitted by the plan change will result in hulking buildings that are out of proportion to the human scale, create excessive shading for existing homes, block views of the hills and sky giving a closed-in feeling, and result in wind tunnels and pedestrians feeling like ants in a canyon”</i>.</p>	
224.3	General – Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Oppose	<p>The urupa in this zone is also already suffering from inappropriate development alongside and needs specific protection from further oversized development on its boundaries and nearby.</p>	

224.4	General – Design Guides, Foreshore Transportation and Open Space	Oppose	<p><i>“Planning for Petone needs to enhance and embellish the best things about Petone, and secure these for the future. To do this we need design guidelines and requirements that are appropriate for our wonderful suburb”.</i></p> <p>The submitter would like to see new buildings required to have some architectural merit and aesthetic interest, (although they do not need to replicate older styles). Styles such as concrete boxes with no softening features at street level should not be permitted.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the plan change needs to be amended to ensure that the gateway areas of Petone and The Esplanade are attractive and protected from overdevelopment. <i>“The Esplanade and beachfront is a major recreation area for the valley and this needs to be protected and enhanced, and not detracted from intrusive development with increased traffic and parking issues”.</i></p> <p>The submitter would like to see specific provision made for green space, landscaping and urban parks including trees and playgrounds. This is a particular important requirement for residential developments.</p>	
224.5	General – Retail Floorspace	Oppose	<p>The scale of retail development permitted under the proposed plan change is likely to undermine and detract from existing retail activity in Jackson Street, and may also draw further business activity away from the central Lower Hutt.</p>	
224.6	General – Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The land area covered by the proposed plan change is subject to high risk from natural hazards – earthquake, raptures, liquefaction and tsunamis. The plan needs to restrict development to a scale and design that will minimise loss of life and damage to property.</p>	

DPC29/246 Neil Curgenvon on behalf of the New Zealand Federation of Historical Societies Inc.

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
246.1	General – General, Character and Heritage	Oppose	<p>The Federation supports the Petone Historical Society with their endeavours.</p> <p>The submitter identifies the Federation as acting as a ‘umbrella’ for Historical Societies in NZ. <i>“It disturbs us, when local authorities, with good intentions, change their district plans to such an extent that it creates a detrimental effect on the heritage of a particular area within local authority catchment”.</i></p> <p>Under the Resource and Management Act, regional and district councils are responsible for protecting the heritage of their areas. Many Councils in discharging their responsibilities are drawing up design guidelines to encourage owners when altering or painting historic buildings to do so sympathetically and to encourage developers to erect new buildings in historic areas which complement the old.</p> <p>Many Councils actively encourage increased awareness of the wonderful heritage buildings in particular environments. As you walk along the historic precinct of Jackson Street, Petone you only need to glance up and across the street to become aware of some of these buildings and what their tenants have contributed towards the development of this community. This area alone offers a culture where heritage places should be valued and respected, together with an informed public through skilled professionals. Over the years sympathetic painting of heritage buildings has emphasised the architectural features and added to their presence.</p> <p>The submitter names three areas – Napier Art Deco, Lower</p>	

			Thames Street in Oamaru and Invercargill's Dee Street as thriving examples of successful use of Renovation and Colour guidelines, that have been instrumental in the revitalisation of the heritage building precincts.	
--	--	--	---	--

DPC29/247 Teremoana Sparks				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
247.1	General	Not stated	The submitter refers to the need to be careful with Te Puni Street, safety from cars and problems associated with dog droppings left in the street and local Reserve.	

DPC29/249 James Crampton				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
249.1	General- Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The submitter refers to a lack of recognition and provisions relating to predicted sea-level rises in the coming decades.</p> <p>Current estimates of predicted sea-level rise by the end of the present century range from about 0.8m to above 1.5m. The upper limits of sea level rise are unknown and estimates given in the last Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change assessment underestimate the potential impact.</p> <p><i>"Irrespective of uncertainties, sea-level rise <u>is happening</u> now, is measurable, <u>and will</u> impact on coastal areas within the coming decades". (author's own emphasis).</i></p>	Incorporation of explicit requirements for a process of managed retreat from the foreshore in western Petone.



		<p>The submitter suggests that not taking this issue into account when making planning decisions would be irresponsible.</p> <p>The issue of sea-level rise as discussed at the recent conference on sea-level rise ('Sea-Level Rise: Meeting the Challenge', Wellington 2012) should be recognised in the proposed plan change.</p> <p>There is a need to be particularly prudent in planning for Petone West given the area's proximity to the Wellington fault and risks from tsunami. The 'co-seismic subsidence' on the fault is likely to be greatest in parts of Petone adjacent the fault, that is in the region of Victoria, Fitzherbert and Sydney Streets. The submitter considers that a coastal buffer is warranted.</p> <p>The proposed plan change recognises the need to engage an earthquake specialist, but does not mention issues around sea-level rise.</p> <p>The submitter would like to see the <i>"staged creation of a coastal buffer zone that is progressively cleared of buildings in order to provide societal resilience to sea-level rise, co-seismic subsidence, and tsunami. I believe that such provision is essential in order for the council to fulfil its duty of care and avoid the risk of future litigation"</i>.</p>	
--	--	---	--

**DPC29/250 & DCP/251– Sophie Jackson and Richard Jackson**

<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
250.1	General and Maximum Building Height	Support	The submitter expresses support for the 30m maximum height limit and road frontage height provisions along the three major roads (i.e. 15m along front road boundary and 45 degree setback).	Approve the change in full.

## Appendix 1 Alphabetical Listing of Submitters

Last name	First name	Company/Organisation	Address	Address	Address	Submission number	Location of Submitter's Comments in Summary
Adams	Stephen		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/56	Group Submission 4
Aitken	Kristin	New Zealand Transport Agency	PO Box 5084	Lambton Quay	Wellington 6145	DPC29/163	163
Ammundsen	Caroline	Greater Wellington Regional Council	PO Box 11646	Manners Street	Wellington 6142	DPC29/151	151
Andersen	Katherine		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/131	Group Submission 5
Andersen	Phyllis		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/181	Group Submission 4
Andersen	Paul		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/182	Group Submission 1
Anderson	Mary-Louise		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/237	Group Submission 2
Andrews	Arthur		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/105	105
Androutsos	Nick	Greek Orthodox Community of Hutt Valley Incorporated	23 Bay Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/89	89
Anonymous						DPC29/202	Group Submission 4
Anonymous						DPC29/192	Group Submission 2
Anonymous						DPC29/205	Group Submission 4
Anonymous						DPC29/211	Group Submission 1
Anonymous						DPC29/220	Group Submission 1
Anonymous						DPC29/240	Group Submission 4
Avison	Deane		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/147	Group Submission 1
Bagshaw	Roger		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/70	Group Submission 2
Bailey	Melissa		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/59	59

Bailey	Michelle					DPC29/66	Group Submission 4
Bakker	Merran					DPC29/99	99
Bakker	Carl	Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated (PUEA)	57 Britannia Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/153	153
Barker & Associates Limited	Attn: Matt Norwell	McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Limited	PO Box 1986	Shortland Street	Auckland 1140	DPC29/112	112
Barneveld	Tash					DPC29/204	Group Submission 4
Beard	Warren					DPC29/203	Group Submission 4
Beban	James	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	PO Box 30 429		Lower Hutt 5045	DPC29/121	121
Blandford	Jane					DPC29/84	84
Blandford	Murray					DPC29/85	85
Bloor	Kathy	Settlers Motor Lodge	85 Hutt Road	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/137	Group Submission 1
Boland	Sue					DPC29/136	Group Submission 1
Boss	Dianne					DPC29/139	Group Submission 5
Boyer, Brian &	Dallimore, Penny					DPC29/142	142
Braithwaite	Mark					DPC29/1	1
Brewer	Linda					DPC29/48	Group Submission 5
Brickhill	Zandra					DPC29/75	50
Brittain	M J					DPC29/212	Group Submission 4

Brodie	Emma					DPC29/134	Group Submission 5
Burton Planning Consultants Ltd	Attn.: Keith Cullum	Z Energy Limited	PO Box 33 817	Takapuna	Auckland 0740	DPC29/52	52
Butters	Sharyn					DPC29/223	Group Submission 2
Callan	Susan	Scintilla	121 Jackson Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/16	16
Campbell	Peter					DPC29/209	Group Submission 4
Carr	Denise					DPC29/234	Group Submission 2
Chan	Basil					DPC29/97	50
Chhim	Sokha					DPC29/210	Group Submission 4
Chiappini, Nikki &	Cole, Brian					DPC29/148	Group Submission 1
Christofferson	Andy					DPC29/150	150
Claridge	Graeme					DPC29/88	88
Clarke	Katherine					DPC29/157	157
Clendon	Kelsey					DPC29/20	Group Submission 1
Collett	Phillip					DPC29/226	Group Submission 2
Collins	Finn					DPC29/114	114
Collins	Kevin	Design Network Architecture Limited	PO Box 30614		Lower Hutt 5040	DPC29/140	140
Commane	Robert					DPC29/69	Group Submission 5

Conroy	Michael		██████████		██████████	DPC29/2	2
Conroy	Andy		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/207	207
Cooke	Leon		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/141	Group Submission 5
Corrigan	Angela		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/35	35
Cox	Edward		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/115	Group Submission 1
Coyle	Peter and Ronda	Hinau Holdings	24 Hinau Grove	Wainuiomata	Lower Hutt	DPC29/170	170
Craig	Martha	Wanda Harland Design Store	148 Jackson Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/53	Group Submission 4
Crampton	James		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/249	
Cresswell	Lorraine		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/213	Group Submission 1
Daniels	John	Historic Places Wellington Inc	45 Amapur Drive		Wellington 6035	DPC29/120	120
Davidson	Gerald	Petone Community Board	35 Riddlers Crescent	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/152	152
Davis	Simon		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/22	Group Submission 2
Dempsey	Rachelle		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/102	Group Submission 5
Dickson	Ruth		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/71	Group Submission 2
Dickson	Charlie		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/72	Group Submission 1
Dobbs	Leonie	Style and Chair JSP (private submission)	137 Jackson Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/168	168
Dobbs, L	& Brohy & White, A	Jackson Street Programme Incorporated	PO Box 33017	Petone	Lower Hutt 5046	DPC29/218	218
Dobson	John		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/208	208

Dolan	Sonia	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	PO Box 2629		Wellington 6140	DPC29/155	155
Donison	Diana		██████████	████	██████████	DPC29/217	Group Submission 3
Donnelly	John		██████████████████			DPC29/221	221
Drayton	Chris		██████████	██████	██████████ ████	DPC29/159	159
Drinkwater	Sonya		██████████	██████	██████████ ████	DPC29/17	Group Submission 2
Drysdale	Fay	Build-a-Birthday	Shop 9 Clock Tower Mall 193 Jackson Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/38	Group Submission 5
Duncan	Frances		██████████████████	██████	██████████ ████	DPC29/219	Group Submission 1
Easton	Gemma		██████████████████	██████	██████ █████ ████	DPC29/144	Group Submission 1
Ebbett	Graeme	Ebbett Family Trust	70-72 Victoria Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/166	166
Edgeler	Tim		██████████████████	██████	██████████ ████	DPC29/187	Group Submission 7
Edgeler	Judith		██████████████████	████████	██████████ ████	DPC29/188	Group Submission 7
Edlin	Norma		██████████████████	██████	██████████ ████	DPC29/87	87
Edmonds	Alex		█████ ██████████████████	██████████	██████████ ████	DPC29/198	198
Ely	Mary		██████████	██████	██████████ ████	DPC29/44	44
Entwistle	Kelly		██████████████████	██████	██████████ ████	DPC29/82	Group Submission 3
Entwistle	Richard		██████████████████	██████	██████████ ████	DPC29/103	Group Submission 4
Falconer	D		██████████████████	██████	██████████ ████	DPC29/117	Group Submission 1
Fisher	Mike		██████████████████	██████	██████████ ████	DPC29/176	176

Fitzgerald	Susie		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/106	106
Fiu	Aiga		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/242	Group Submission 2
Fletcher	Ruth		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/135	135
Fletcher	Dianne		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/185	Group Submission 7
Flutey	D		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/200	Group Submission 1
Forsyth	Julia		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/123	123
Freigard	Marion		[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]	DPC29/10	10
Frostick	Debbie		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/230	Group Submission 2
Funnell	Jill		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/245	Group Submission 4
Gendall	Kirsten		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/77	77
Gibb	Angus		[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]	DPC29/5	5
Gilchrist	Jacqui		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/51	51
Godfrey	Mark and Anne		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/175	Group Submission 2
Gray	Jennifer		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/90	90
Greally	Rose		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/46	46
Greally	Theresa		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/125	Group Submission 5
Griffin	Emily		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/167	167
Gurgenvin	Neil	New Zealand Federation of Historical Societies Inc	PO Box 1625	Paraparaumu Beach	Paraparaumu 5252	DPC29/246	246



Hanna	Pam	Petone Planning Action Group	PO Box 33326	Petone	Lower Hutt 5046	DPC29/199	199
Hawthorne	Patricia		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/11	Group Submission 1
Heathcote	Steve		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/36	Group Submission 5
Hewson	Roy		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/30	30
Hewson	Joan		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/31	31
Hickmott	Norman and Annette	Foreshore Motor Lodge Ltd	5 Nelson Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/186	Group Submission 1
Hogan	Brendan		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/154	154
Howat	John		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/180	180
Huinga	Centril		[REDACTED]			DPC29/232	Group Submission 2
Hunt	Meredith		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/83	Group Submission 1
Hutton	Robert		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/178	178
Huynh	T		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/235	Group Submission 4
Hyslop	Allan		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/86	86
Insook			[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/243	Group Submission 4
Isaac	Joan		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/32	Group Submission 5
Jackson	Dianne		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DPC29/179	Group Submission 1
Jackson	Richard		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DCP/251	250
Jackson	Sophie		[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	DCP/250	250

Jenner	Marianne					DPC29/13	Group Submission 2
Jovan	J					DPC29/65	Group Submission 4
Kellett	Joyce					DPC29/116	116 & 152
Kennedy	Lesley					DPC29/9	Group Submission 1
Kennedy	Sarah					DPC29/225	Group Submission 5
Kiddey	David	Hutt Valley Chamber of Commerce	PO Box 30653		Lower Hutt 5040	DPC29/165	165
Kirk-Burnnand	Mark	AutoStop Group Limited	111 Johnsonville Road	Johnsonville	Wellington 6037	DPC29/113	113
Knight	Bevan and Naomi					DPC29/34	34
Knowles	Joseph and Debra					DPC29/95	95
Laird, Raeburn &	Keith, Arthur					DPC29/19	19
Lawson	Faith					DPC29/222	Group Submission 2
Leko	Nick	FIT Architects	3 Graham Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/164	164
Lewis	Jonathan					DPC29/162	50
Lewis	Tui					DPC29/169	169
Li	Zhou					DPC29/68	Group Submission 2
Love	Morris Te Whiti	Trustee of Te Tatau o te Po Marae and Trustee of Te Puni Urupa	15 Balmoral Terrace	Newtown	Wellington 6021	DPC29/119	119
Lovegrove	Lorna					DPC29/3	3
Lyon	Graeme					DPC29/79	Group Sub 2 & 199

Macbeth	Leila		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/127	127
Manchester	Judith		██████████	██████████	██████████	DPC29/177	Group Submission 4
Mansell	Ruth		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/76	76
Mansell	James		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/78	Group Submission 2
Mason	D C		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/61	Group Submission 4
Maunder	Eljay		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/238	Group Submission 4
McGillicuddy	Paul		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/145	Group Submission 4
McLaughlin	Melody		██████████	██████████	██████████	DPC29/173	Group Submission 4
McPhee	Julie		██████████	██████████	██████████	DPC29/244	Group Submission 3
Memelink	Alfred		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/98	98
Millar	Shayne		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/62	Group Submission 3
Millar, Nick &	Simmons, Jan		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/107	Group Submission 5
Milne	Janet		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/42	Group Submission 5
Misipeka	Debbie		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/229	Group Submission 4
Moar	Kevin		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/40	Group Submission 5
Moore	Syd		██████████	██████████	██████████	DPC29/12	Group Submission 2
Moriarity	Patrick		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/91	91
Mountier	Frances		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/146	146
Mullany	Ruby		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/239	Group Submission 2

Neil	Rochelle					DPC29/248	Group Submission 5
Neser	Hazel					DPC29/118	118
Newbald	Alison					DPC29/109	109
Nicholls	Brett	The Chocolate Story Ltd	185 Jackson Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/54	54
Nicholson	Paul					DPC29/29	Group Submission 3
Nightingale	Christine					DPC29/206	Group Submission 4
Nixey	Phil					DPC29/37	Group Submission 5
Not stated	Murray	Hutt Road Holdings Ltd	PO Box 31251		Lower Hutt 5040	DPC29/193	Group Submission 8
Not stated	Murray	Knights Road Holdings Ltd	PO Box 31251		Lower Hutt 5040	DPC29/194	Group Submission 8
Not stated	Murray	Mursan Holdings Ltd	PO Box 31251		Lower Hutt 5040	DPC29/195	Group Submission 8
Not stated	Murray	Empire Group Ltd	PO Box 31251		Lower Hutt 5040	DPC29/196	Group Submission 8
Not stated	Murray	Andrews Ave Holdings Ltd	PO Box 31251		Lower Hutt 5040	DPC29/197	Group Submission 8
O'Connor	Deborah					DPC29/224	224
Pallo	Gary					DPC29/96	Group Submission 5
Palmer	Jenny	Heroine Fashions	178 High Street		Lower Hutt 5010	DPC29/47	Group Submission 3
Pankust	Margit					DPC29/216	Group Submission 3
Parkins	Barbara					DPC29/231	Group Submission 4

Parson	Jane		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/236	Group Submission 2
Partington	Colin		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/161	Group Submission 5
Paton	Paula		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/92	92
Pitcher	Graeme	Bargain Books	195 Jackson Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/57	Group Submission 4
Pollock	Rowan		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/143	Group Submission 5
Potter	Neil	PCPatch Ltd	212 Jackson Street		Petone 5012	DPC29/33	33
Prichard	Peter & Nicola		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/132	132
Randal	Ann		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/100	100
Rayner	Estelle		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/25	Group Submission 3
Rayner	Kevin		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/26	Group Submission 4
Reid	Gary		██████████		██████████	DPC29/6	6
Reid	Anne		██████████		██████████	DPC29/7	7
Renshaw	Lorraine		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/215	Group Submission 4
Richards	Amanda		██████████		██████████ ██████	DPC29/14	14
Ridley	Hone		██████████	██████████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/156	156
Robb	Marie	SizeUp Ltd and SizeUp Properties Ltd	141 Jackson Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/111	111
Roberts	Matt		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/122	122
Robertson	Lois		██████████	██████	██████████ ██████	DPC29/74	74
Rogers	Sarah		██████████	██████	██████████	DPC29/124	Group Submission 5

Roper	Carolyn					DPC29/58	58
Russell	Cody					DPC29/214	Group Submission 2
Saker	Andred and Rebecca					DPC29/73	73 & 152
Saunders	Wendy	(Personal submission)				DPC29/81	81 and 109
Scott	Barbara					DPC29/171	171
Scowen	Pam					DPC29/158	158
Sellwood	Brent					DPC29/110	Group Submission 1
Selwood	Sally					DPC29/41	Group Submission 2
Shadwell	Steve					DPC29/149	149
Showler	Andrew	Redwood Group Limited	PO Box 6835	Wellesley Street	Auckland 1141	DPC29/80	80
Siike	Alana					DPC29/228	Group Submission 4
Skilton	Laura					DPC29/55	55
Slade	Rachael					DPC29/129	Group Submission 5
Smith	Colin					DPC29/45	45
Solomon	Jackie					DPC29/233	Group Submission 2
Sparks	Teremoana					DPC29/247	247
Steel	Janine					DPC29/18	Group Submission 2
Stewart	Glenn					DPC29/130	130

Su	Choutha					DPC29/227	Group Submission 4
Sue	Lanscella					DPC29/201	Group Submission 1
Surridge	Catrina					DPC29/63	Group Submission 3
Te One	Richard					DPC29/174	174
Thompson	Margaret					DPC29/101	101
Thompson	Roz					DPC29/189	Group Submission 7
Torbit	Rosie					DPC29/128	128
Torstonson	S. R.					DPC29/27	Group Submission 4
Treeby	Annie					DPC29/23	Group Submission 3
Treeby	Bruce					DPC29/24	Group Submission 4
Ursin	Nick					DPC29/93	93
Van	San					DPC29/60	Group Submission 4
Vickerman	Judith					DPC29/184	184
Vinten	Kathryn					DPC29/126	Group Submission 5
Vry	Julie					DPC29/49	Group Submission 3
Waldergrave	Kiri and Tony					DPC29/133	Group Submission 5
Wall	Dale	Body Corporate 65018	PO Box 22227	Khandallah	Wellington 6441	DPC29/191	Group Submission 6
Watherston	Donald					DPC29/104	104

Watson	D. I.					DPC29/15	Group Submission 2
Wynne-Griffiths	Ralph					DPC29/160	160 & 152
Webb	Terry	Natural Hazards Division, GNS	PO Box 30 368		Lower Hutt 5040	DPC29/108	108
Weeds	John	Executive Laundry (Wgtn) Ltd	PO Box 39 029	Wellington Mail Centre	Lower Hutt 5045	DPC29/39	39
Werry	R. J.	Light House Cinema Ltd	52 Beach Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/172	172
West	Anne					DPC29/21	Group Submission 1
Whitaker-Barnett	Kim					DPC29/241	Group Submission 2
White	Alan					DPC29/190	190
Whitmarsh	Roger					DPC29/138	Group Submission 5
Wieben	William					DPC29/43	43
Wigley	Graham	Wigley & Roberts Ltd	PO Box 30 239		Lower Hutt 5045	DPC29/94	94
Wilkins	Norman					DPC29/8	8
Wilson	Helen	Turquoise	188 Jackson Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/67	Group Submission 4
Wood	J					DPC29/4	4
Yardley	John and Kathy					DPC29/183	Group Submission 6
Young	Sandra					DPC29/28	Group Submission 4
Zangouropoulos	Nik	Petone Historical Society	PO Box 1339		Wellington 6140	DPC29/50	50
Zhao	Qin	Rose Petals	135 Jackson Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012	DPC29/64	Group Submission 4



