

# **Proposed District Plan Change 12**

**AMENDMENTS TO RESIDENTIAL PROVISIONS AND  
FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS CHAPTER**

## **Amended Summary of Submissions**

**Publicly Notified:**

**19 May 2009**

**Further Submissions Close:**

**19 June 2009 at 5.00pm**

**City of Lower Hutt District Plan – Proposed District Plan Change 12**  
**Amendments to Residential Provisions and Financial Contributions Chapter**  
**Summary of Submissions**

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
Nicholas Gabriel Ursin [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-001	1.1	Ch 3 Definitions Accessory Building	-	Spa pools cannot be defined as a “ <i>building</i> ”, particularly a portable spa or if it is not fixed or part of a structure. No point in maintaining this description if it can be argued otherwise.	Exclude spa pool from the definition of accessory building.	Y
		1.2	Ch 3 Definitions Building	-	Exclusion (d) – Introducing a lower deck height level when there was previously a higher level will make the new provisions unworkable as people will argue that their deck was existing prior to the Plan Change. Will lead to costly disputes.	Reject the proposed amendment and retain the existing exclusion (d) of the building definition, and amend the height to 1m.	
		1.3	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation and Reason (a) Net Site Area	-	Resources are wasted on hearings where applicants seek to breach provisions on the basis that their proposal only requires minimal departure. There should be clearly defined rules and anything outside this should be non-acceptable.	Specific net site areas be stated in the District Plan.	
		1.4	Rule 4A 2.1.1(g) Permitted Activity Conditions - Home Occupations	-	Resident’s use of shipping containers is on the increase and has an effect on values and rates, particularly if on rental properties.	Add the following to the end of sub-clause (viii): <u>/or any industrial or shipping container.</u>	
		1.5	Rule 4A 2.3.1(b)(i) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	-	Existing areas are already being unreasonably extended. Amendment 4A 2.3.1(b)(i) should be reviewed and given more consideration in relation to traffic and parking as can see repetition of traffic and parking problems at schools. Why impose further problems.	Delete clause. If not then require applicants to prove or show that existing services such as sewage, waste water and off-street parking can cope with proposed development.	
		1.6	Rule 4A 2.4.1(c) Assessment Matters	-	-	Delete places of assembly from sub-clause (iii).	
		1.7	Rule 12.2.1.7(a) Financial Contributions – Reserves	-	A maximum amount is helpful but inflation reduces this on a continuing basis. Also covers commercial and industrial developments which should be subject to higher contributions because of their effects.	-	
Michael Devine [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-002	2.1	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose intention to allow housing to be built on smaller sites. Nice to have a yard and garden but this would be lost if this change	-	-

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
Lower Hutt 5011					was permitted. There would be a social cost such as car parking, and noise and animal complaints. At present Lower Hutt has substantial land to be built on. Do not need to take this step at this stage.		
Stuart Alan McMillan [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-003	3.1	Zoning	-	Owns property at 70 Maungaraki Rd., Korokoro. Present zoning does not allow for too much development. It would be helpful if there was a way to change this.	-	Y
Merilyn & Christopher Savill [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Auckland 1052	RM16-4-12C-004	4.1	Zoning	-	Own property at 2 Dillon St, Lowry Bay (1,745m <sup>2</sup> ). Zoned for a single dwelling. Increasing number of older couples who no longer require large properties. Due to lack of retirement accommodation in the area they are being forced to live elsewhere. Little account has been taken of the needs of older retirees in the higher density. Both the individuals and the community suffer. Submitter would like to build a number of town houses on their property to satisfy this present need and those that will arise in the future.	That the zoning of the property at 2 Dillon St, Lowry Bay be reviewed to achieve its potential.	-
John Pfahlert [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-005	5.1	Higher Density Residential Area	-	Property at 4-6 Cottle St is well within 5 min walk of a corner dairy however is not included. To walk to Avalon is an 8min walk. Tenants regularly walk to shops at the corner of Tennyson Ave and High St, but many al-so walk to the Avalon shops. The choice of an approx 5min walk to the edge of particular shopping centres is loose. Any property within 5mins walk of any corner dairy should be high density. It would extend the pro-posed zone coverage but would be a more logical application of the intent of the plan change. At the least, specifically requests that properties at the High St end of Cottle St be included in the high density area. This area already has quite an amount of infill housing with several blocks of flats or multi unit housing.	Extend the higher density residential area to cover either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All properties within a 5min walk of any corner dairy;</li> <li>OR</li> <li>• Properties in the Gordon St/Cottle St area of Avalon within a 5min walk of the shops at Tennyson Ave /High St intersection.</li> </ul>	Y
		5.2	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition –	-	Landscaping and amenity can be provided with permeable surfaces as low as 10%. The basis for the 30% is not clear.	Provide better justification of the 30% permeable surfaces requirement before it is	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			Permeable Surfaces			adopted.	
		5.3	New provision	-	One issue not reviewed is fence height. A 1.8m boundary fence is the norm. In reducing the setback from boundaries some consideration should be given to the type and design of fencing allowed. Supports a solid fence height max of 1.8m, but suggests that trellising be allowed up to 2.5m to provide improved amenity and shielding between neighbours, where a solid 2.5m fence would be inappropriate.	Amend the fencing rules to allow construction of trellising on top of a 1.8m fence up to 2.5m.	
		5.4	Entire Plan Change	Support	Generally supports the changes, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deletion of reference to comprehensive residential developments;</li> <li>• Removal of minimum site area where 3 or more dwellings are proposed;</li> <li>• Proposed recession plane;</li> <li>• Increasing site coverage to 40%;</li> <li>• Reducing setbacks to 1m; and</li> <li>• Introduction of design guides.</li> </ul>	-	
Helen Vercoelen ██████████ ██████████ Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-006	6.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(e) Permitted Activity Condition - Site Coverage	Support	Supports the proposed Plan Change provided attached amendments are made.		Y
Colin Herbert Tradebuilt Ltd ██████████ ██████████, Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-007	7.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Condition – Recession Planes	Support	Supports the adoption of a single angle of 45 degrees to ensure a user friendly “one off” non confusing measurement.	Change the recession plane angle to 45 degrees.	Y
J & D Bowles, K & R Whitmore & Others ██████████ Lower Hutt 5010	RM16-4-12C-008	8.1	Childcare Facilities	-	Neighbourhood is increasingly concerned with noise and traffic problems associated with an IHC property run as a child care respite facility at 49 Brunswick St. The dwelling is not suited to IHC use due to lack of sound proofing. Noise is reverberated and amplified around the neighbourhood. The type of noise varies. Supervisor qualifications and maximum number of children per day should be modified. There are also ongoing noise problems caused by children sleeping over. Under the Plan Change there does not appear to be any guidelines pertaining to the operation of	Resource consent requirement be applicable to IHC care facility type operations.	N

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					childcare facilities (including night-time) for IHC children.		
Neil Cook McKenzie [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5019	RM16-4-12C-009	9.1	Rule 4A 1.1.2 Local Area Issues – Higher Density Residential Development	-	The words ‘should be provided along major transport routes’ is extremely vague and could be interpreted as referring to almost any road.	Delete wording “ <i>should be provided along major transport routes</i> ” and reword so the meaning is precise and clear.	N
Leonard Martin Douglas Kane [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-010	10.1	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation and Reason (a) Net Site Area	Oppose	Is not clear what the minimum size of dwellings would be where there are 3 or more dwellings on a site. Residents of the affected areas should be given an opportunity to voice their opinion.	Reconsider Holly Gr, Maungaraki.	N
		10.2	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation and Reason (g) Net Site Area	Oppose	Privacy will be compromised.	Retain original wording.	
		10.3	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Condition – Minimum Yards	Oppose	Would eliminate the privacy currently enjoyed. Do not wish to lose any more privacy.	Reconsider Holly Gr, Maungaraki.	
		10.4	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition – Building Length	Oppose	A structure longer than what is currently allowed would compromise sun and light access, increase shadowing and interfere with the existing view.	Reconsider Holly Gr, Maungaraki.	
		10.5	Rule 4A 2.3.1(a) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwelling houses	Oppose	Oppose development of 3 or more dwellings on Holly Gr due to pressure on existing limited off street parking, pedestrian traffic hazard with respect to the playground, and that it is no exit.	Reconsider Holly Gr, Maungaraki.	
		10.6	Rule 4A 2.4.1(c)(ii) Assessment Matters for Discretionary Activities – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	-	Do not want the unique bush character of Maungaraki destroyed. High density would ruin streetscape. Would also lose significant amount of sunlight, daylight and privacy.	Exclude Holly Grove and Maungaraki.	
		10.7	Rule 4A 2.4.1(c)(iii) Assessment Matters for Discretionary Activities - Residential development of	-	Public transport currently cannot handle the needs of Maungaraki. Pointless planning for high density if infrastructure is not in place.	Reconsider Holly Gr, Maungaraki.	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			3 or more dwellings				
		10.8	Ch 14A Appendix 3 Parking Standards	Oppose	Object to 1 car park per dwelling where there are 3 or more dwellings on a site.	Reconsider Holly Gr, Maungaraki.	
		10.9	Notification	-	If dwellings are erected under the high density provisions will residents in the Grove be notified or consulted?	-	
Simon Byrne [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-011	11.1	Ch 3 Definitions Accessory Building	Support	Clarifies the status of sleep outs and aligns the definition with court decisions.	-	
		11.2	Ch 3 Definitions Building	Support in Part	Supports the proposal that small low decks should generally not form part of site coverage. However wording is too vague and may potentially lead to difficulty in interpretation and unintended exploitation of rule.	Change the wording of sub - clause (d) as follows: "One or more deck less than 500mm in height and where uncovered parts of the deck are not to exceed a total area of 50sqm (such decks can be physically attached to other buildings)"	
Wigley & Roberts Ltd PO Box 30 239 Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-012	12.1	Various	Support	Supports Amendments 1 to 11, 13, 16-18, 20-35, and 37-39.	-	Y
		12.2	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation (a) Net Site Area	-	It appears that the last sentence of the explanation starting "a specific net site area..." should be deleted as for 3 or more dwellings on a site no minimum site area is required.	-	
		12.3	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation and Reason (g) Accessory Buildings	Support	Is a good addition to the District Plan.	-	
		12.4	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Condition – Minimum Yards	-	Support amended changes and seeks an additional condition be included. In most infill housing cases there is approximately 3m adjoining the existing dwelling to provide access to a new rear lot. It is not normally possible to provide a 3m ROW and an additional 1.5m setback. This creates necessity for resource consent which is invariably approved. The non-compliance with the 1.5m setback generally has no additional adverse effects.	Seeks inclusion of an additional condition which states that where an existing building abuts a ROW boundary on an infill subdivision, the side yard to the ROW may be reduced to zero provided the building is at least 2.8m from the opposite side of the ROW.	
		12.5	Rule 4A 2.1.1 Permitted Activity Condition – Permeable Surfaces	-	Understands that 40% of site can be used for site coverage which leaves a balance of 60%, half of which has to be in a permeable surface.	-	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		12.6	Rule 12.2.1.7(a) Financial Contributions – Reserves	-	The changes give advantages to high value land in the centre of the City. However seeks amendment to make it more equitable to all parties. Agrees with the amendment for rural areas.	Seeks to amend reserve contributions in urban areas so that it is set at a flat rate of 5%.	
		12.7	High Density Residential Areas	-	Reason for requested amendment is to retain the strong mature residential flavour of some of our larger inner-city properties. These properties give Lower Hutt its character.	Amend the High Density Residential Areas to reduce the amount of infill housing within the central Lower Hutt area, particularly Penrose St, Hautana St, Huia St, Myrtle St, Cornwall St, Laings Rd, Queens Gr and Chilton Gr.	
Kenneth & Belita Pereira [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-013	13.1	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation and Reason (a) Net Site Area	Oppose	Is not clear what the minimum size of dwellings would be where there are 3 or more dwellings on a site. Residents of the affected areas should be given an opportunity to voice their opinion.	Reconsider Holly Gr, Maungaraki.	N
		13.2	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation and Reason (g) Net Site Area	Oppose	Privacy will be compromised.	Retain original wording.	
		13.3	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Condition – Minimum Yards	Oppose	Would eliminate the privacy currently enjoyed. Do not wish to lose any more privacy.	Reconsider Holly Gr, Maungaraki.	
		13.4	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition – Building Length	Oppose	A structure longer than what is currently allowed would compromise sun and light access, increase shadowing and interfere with the existing view.	Reconsider Holly Gr, Maungaraki.	
		13.5	Rule 4A 2.3.1(a) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwelling houses	Oppose	Oppose development of 3 or more dwellings on Holly Gr due to pressure on existing limited off street parking, pedestrian traffic hazard with respect to the playground, and the fact that it is no exit.	Reconsider Holly Gr, Maungaraki.	
		13.6	Rule 4A 2.4.1(c)(ii) Assessment Matters for Discretionary Activities - Residential development of	-	Do not want the unique bush character of Maungaraki destroyed. High density would ruin streetscape. Would also lose significant amount of sunlight, daylight and privacy.	Exclude Holly Grove and Maungaraki.	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			3 or more dwelling houses				
		13.7	Rule 4A 2.4.1(c)(iii) Assessment Matters for Discretionary Activities - Residential development of 3 or more dwelling houses	-	Public transport currently cannot handle the needs of Maungaraki. Pointless planning for high density if infrastructure is not in place.	Reconsider Holly Gr, Maungaraki.	
		13.8	Ch 14A Appendix 3 Parking Standards	Oppose	Object to 1 car park per dwelling where there are 3 or more dwellings on a site.	Reconsider Holly Gr, Maungaraki.	
		13.9	Notification	-	If dwellings are erected under the high density provisions will residents in the Grove be notified or consulted?	-	
Denise Glugas [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-014	14.1	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose the changes to Buick Street. Consent should continue to be sought from residents in the area.	Not to continue with proposed changes.	Y
Ane Alexandra Williamson [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-015	15.1	Rule 4A 2.4(m) Discretionary Activities - Residential development of 3 or more dwelling houses	Oppose	The current infrastructure cannot cater for the increase in dwellings and consequent population. The Council cannot afford the infrastructure upgrade. How does the Council envisage the changes will benefit the City?	Council reconsiders and amends the proposed density of dwellings within the Hutt City Council boundaries.	-
Collen Hurley [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-016	16.1	Rule 4A 2.3(i) Restricted Discretionary Activities and Rule 4A 2.3.1(i) Matters of Discretion – Childcare Facilities	-	Problems with childcare facilities could/would ensue well below 30 children. The assessment criteria does not deal with all the issues as more general amenity and streetscape effects are likely as well as traffic, parking and noise effects. Childcare centres are not compatible in quieter residential streets. Can also be cumulative effects so stipulation of no new centres in close proximity to an existing centre is necessary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That more general amenity and streetscape effects have to be assessed</li> <li>• Childcare centres for more than 5 children be full discretionary.</li> <li>• A proximity restriction such as 250m be instituted.</li> </ul>	Y
Norman Hickmott [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-017	17.1	Rule 4A 2.3(i) Restricted Discretionary Activities and Rule 4A 2.3.1(i) Matters of Discretion – Childcare Facilities	-	Problems with childcare facilities could/would ensue well below 30 children. The assessment criteria does not deal with all the issues as more general amenity and streetscape effects are likely as well as traffic, parking and noise effects. Childcare centres are not compatible in quieter residential streets. Can also be cumulative effects so stipulation of no new centres in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That more general amenity and streetscape effects have to be assessed</li> <li>• Childcare centres for more than 5 children be full discretionary.</li> <li>• A proximity restriction such as 250m be instituted.</li> </ul>	Y



Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					close proximity to an existing centre is necessary.		
Lorna Lovegrove [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5012	RM16-4-12C-018	18.1	Rule 4A 2.3(i) Restricted Discretionary Activities and Rule 4A 2.3.1(i) Matters of Discretion – Childcare Facilities	-	Problems with childcare facilities could/would ensue well below 30 children. The assessment criteria does not deal with all the issues as more general amenity and streetscape effects are likely as well as traffic, parking and noise effects. Childcare centres are not compatible in quieter residential streets. Can also be cumulative effects so stipulation of no new centres in close proximity to an existing centre is necessary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That more general amenity and streetscape effects have to be assessed</li> <li>• Childcare centres for more than 5 children be full discretionary.</li> <li>• A proximity restriction such as 250m be instituted.</li> </ul>	Y
Claire Lane [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-019	19.1	Rule 4A 2.3(i) Restricted Discretionary Activities and Rule 4A 2.3.1(i) Matters of Discretion – Childcare Facilities	-	Problems with childcare facilities could/would ensue well below 30 children. The assessment criteria does not deal with all the issues as more general amenity and streetscape effects are likely as well as traffic, parking and noise effects. Childcare centres are not compatible in quieter residential streets. Can also be cumulative effects so stipulation of no new centres in close proximity to an existing centre is necessary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That more general amenity and streetscape effects have to be assessed</li> <li>• Childcare centres for more than 5 children be full discretionary.</li> <li>• A proximity restriction such as 250m be instituted.</li> </ul>	Y
Eleanor Wright [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5012	RM16-4-12C-020	20.1	Rule 4A 2.3(i) Restricted Discretionary Activities and Rule 4A 2.3.1(i) Matters of Discretion – Childcare Facilities	-	Problems with childcare facilities could/would ensue well below 30 children. The assessment criteria does not deal with all the issues as more general amenity and streetscape effects are likely as well as traffic, parking and noise effects. Childcare centres are not compatible in quieter residential streets. Can also be cumulative effects so stipulation of no new centres in close proximity to an existing centre is necessary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That more general amenity and streetscape effects have to be assessed</li> <li>• Childcare centres for more than 5 children be full discretionary.</li> <li>• A proximity restriction such as 250m be instituted.</li> </ul>	Y
Lance Pairi [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-021	21.1	Rule 4A 2.3(i) Restricted Discretionary Activities and Rule 4A 2.3.1(i) Matters of Discretion – Childcare Facilities	-	Problems with childcare facilities could/would ensue well below 30 children. The assessment criteria does not deal with all the issues as more general amenity and streetscape effects are likely as well as traffic, parking and noise effects. Childcare centres are not compatible in quieter residential streets. Can also be cumulative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That more general amenity and streetscape effects have to be assessed</li> <li>• Childcare centres for more than 5 children be full discretionary.</li> <li>• A proximity restriction such as 250m be instituted.</li> </ul>	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					effects so stipulation of no new centres in close proximity to an existing centre is necessary.		
Claire Jackson [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-022	22.1	Rule 12.2.1.7(a) Financial Contributions – Reserves	-	Agree with proposed amendments. Yet Rural Areas are not included. Seeks a refund as it is a unique situation as is the only one in general rural to pay the fee and if it is being changed then it is morally right. Subdividing in the general rural area has nothing to do with the residential area.	Refund the money submitter has paid for two-lot subdivision in general rural area.	Y
James Michael Pryor [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-023	23.1	Higher Density Residential Areas - Maungaraki	-	Maungaraki is unsuitable for higher density development. Changes should result from a problem and should be in accordance with the wishes of the residents of the area. The proposed high density zoning of the Western Hills has no mandate from the locals. There is not the capacity to create additional building sites between or amongst the existing houses. Increasing density is not practical in Maungaraki.	Delete Maungaraki Higher Density Residential areas.	Y
Christine Viggars [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-024	24.1	Entire Plan Change	Support	In order for the Hutt Valley to grow and develop to meet the needs of residents it is vital that the change be adopted. The population is continuously growing, as is the demand for land. More and more people are moving towards apartments and townhouses. Sees benefit to both new and existing residents.	-	N
Mrs Shanti Gandhi [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5011	RM16-4-12C-025	25.1	Higher Density Residential Areas	Support	Amendment to residential areas around shopping centres and transport routes is the way towards progress e.g Birch Street, Waterloo	-	N
Mr Babubhai Nagin Gandhi [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5011	RM16-4-12C-026	26.1	Higher Density Residential Areas	Support	Needed an amendment to residential areas around shopping centres and transport routes e.g Birch Street, Waterloo	-	N
Housing New Zealand Corporation Tonkin & Taylor Ltd PO Box 2083 Wellington Attn: Nathan Baker	RM16-4-12C-027	27.1	Entire Plan Change	Support	Generally supports the approach taken and believes that the amendments would result in higher quality urban design and amenity.	-	Y
		27.2	Rule 4A 1.1.2 Higher Density Residential	Support	Supports the use of design guides to ensure quality site design. Proposed guideline is aligned with HNZC guidelines. It is important	Accept Amendments 7 and 8.	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			Development – Policy (c) and Explanation		that all higher density housing be consistent with the Design Guides to ensure quality.		
		27.3	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation and Reason (a) Net Site Area	Support	Would allow for higher density capacity on sites. Considers that there would be no adverse effect from removing the requirement for 3 or more dwellings, as consistency with the Design Guides would still be required.	Accept Amendment 12.	
		27.4	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation (f) Building Length	Support	Provision is overly onerous and difficult to interpret. The intent of the rule is adequately covered by yard setback, recession plane and site coverage standards.	Accept Amendment 13.	
		27.5	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Condition – Minimum Yards	Support	Amendments provide for additional flexibility and may be useful in ensuring quality site design, including outdoor amenity and functional use of the site.	Accept Amendment 15.	
		27.6	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Condition – Recession Planes	Support	The current rule is overly onerous. The proposed amendment would adequately mitigate potential effects from building bulk over neighbouring sites.	Accept Amendment 16.	
		27.7	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition – Building Length	Support	Provision is overly onerous and difficult to interpret. The intent of the rule is adequately covered by yard setback, recession plane and site coverage standards.	Accept Amendment 18.	
		27.8	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition – Permeable Surfaces	Support	30% permeable surfacing is considered to be sufficient to ensure on-site amenity is maintained. However, the requirement should be no higher than 30% as this may impact on the ability to provide practical dwelling sizes and access legs.	Accept Amendment 19.	
		27.9	Rule 4A 2.3(a) Restricted Discretionary Activities – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	-	As a result of the amendment this rule will become stricter, controlling three or more dwellings as opposed to 5 or more. Requests that the amendment does not become more onerous. While it is likely to result in a higher number of resource consents, it is also likely to ensure responsible development is occurring. Considers the Restricted Discretionary activity status appropriate.	Provide clarification on how the amendment results in the benefits outlined on page 114 of the Section 32 report.	
		27.10	Rule 4A 2.3.1(a) Matters of	Support	Generally supportive of the use of design guides for higher density housing. Proposed	Accept Amendment 23.	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings		Design Guides are practical and are not unreasonably onerous.		
		27.11	Rule 4A 2.3.1(b) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	Support	Many of HNZN tenants do not own vehicles and therefore ease of access and proximity to public facilities is an important consideration for higher density developments.	Accept Amendment 24.	
		27.12	Rule 4A 2.4(m) Discretionary Activities – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	-	Amendment would mean that any residential development of 3 or more dwellings within particular General Residential Activity Areas and within Higher Density Residential Areas is a Discretionary Activity. This does not seem to promote and is not consistent with other amendments proposed.	Provide clarification on why residential development of 3 or more dwellings has a higher activity status within the Higher Density Residential Areas than within General Residential Activity Areas.	
		27.13	Ch 14A Appendix 3 Parking Standards	Support	Requiring 2 carparks is onerous and could inhibit effective site design. HNZN considers 1 carpark per dwelling is acceptable to meet the needs of residents.	Accept Amendment 37.	
Jim McKenzie [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-028	28.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Condition – Yard Requirements	Oppose	Properties in neighbourhood are similar shape and size – long and thin. Changes to recession plane and building length will significantly impact on quality of life in the neighbourhood through introduction of large bulky buildings and reduced natural sunlight. Attached solar drawings for the Waterloo area to submission, which depict the elevation the sun rises above the horizon and the time the sun reaches a given elevation. Overlaid on these drawings is the current and proposed recession plane. The effect of change in recession plane from 37.5 degrees to 45 degrees is a 33% increase in the time the sun is below the recession plane horizon during winter.	Retain existing rule regarding side yards.	Y
		28.2	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Condition – Recession Planes	Oppose		Retain existing rule regarding recession planes.	
		28.3	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition – Building Length	Oppose		Retain existing rule regarding building length.	
Avison Family Trust [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-029	29.1	Residential Density	Oppose	Oppose change of residential density for St Columbans Monastery, St Columbans Grove, as it will be out of keeping with the existing neighbourhood and in conflict with 4B of the District Plan.	Delete St Columbans Monastery from amendment.	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
Debbie Summers [REDACTED] Eastbourne	RM16-4-12C-030	30.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Condition – Yard Requirements	Oppose	Oppose reduction of side yards from 1.5m to 1m as can create overbearing structures close to boundaries, increasing bulk and shade.	Decline amendment to “ <i>All Other Yards</i> ”.	Y
		30.2	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c)(iii) Permitted Activity Condition – Recession Planes	Oppose	Oppose deletion of sub-cause (iii). People need light and sun. Reducing angle will cause adverse effects.	Decline deletion of sub-clause (iii).	
Brain Froggatt [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5010	RM16-4-12C-031	31.1	High Density Residential Areas	Oppose	Low cost infill or high density housing has never been a solution, just another problem. It deprives residents of adequate living space and lowers socio-economic standards. Only advantage is to increase rates income. Increased social costs will however far outweigh financial benefit. Still plenty of land in the region for building.	Not proceed with the High Density Residential amendments	N
Rick Mooney Maungaraki Community Association	RM16-4-12C-032	32.1	High Density Residential Areas - Maungaraki	-	Very limited number of sites (in Maungaraki) would be able to realise any opportunity. When slope and nature of area are considered public do not believe the area would suit high density development.	-	
		32.2	Building Length	-	Some changes have potential to cause considerable problems – building length may allow views to be blocked.	-	
		32.3	Accessory Buildings	-	Accessory building change may lead to problems especially if land was sloping.	-	
		32.4	Entire Plan Change	-	Believe that Maungaraki is no less special than Korokoro and consideration should be given to consistent policy on the hills. All areas from Haywards to Korokoro are affected by the same key issues.	-	
		32.5	Design Guides	-	Concern about enforceability of design guides. Does not address the special character of the area.	-	
Christopher Hay [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-033	33.1	Infill Housing	-	Infill housing without the mandatory requirement for the retention of exiting trees, vegetation and open space does not meet the purpose of the RMA. Council should ensure that this is taken into account through a specific requirement in the District Plan or Design Guides.	Respond to issues raised.	Y
		33.2	Design Guides	-	The statement in Amendment 10 is inconsistent with Amendment 7. This raises		

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					<p>questions of exactly what the Design Guides are supposed to achieve. Council should look at clarifying the wording of the policy. Amendments 23 and 28 refer to different terms for Design Guides. This needs to be clarified. Are they referring to the same guidelines? Using the term neighbourhood in the guide allows too much leeway for the introduction of designs which do not reflect the character of the immediate area. The siting and layout of buildings should reflect those in the immediate vicinity. Amendment 23 should be reworded to read "<i>consideration shall be given to how the proposal complies with the [Design Guidelines]</i>". This imposes a more rigorous test than the concept of "addresses". The guidelines should be based on several mandatory requirements (development must be in accord with the character of the immediately adjoining area). Once these have been met then there would be flexibility for the developer about siting and design within the more general parts of the guidelines. Any amendment or variation to the Design Guide must be the subject of public consultation.</p>		
		33.3	Infrastructure	-	<p>One principal issue arising from residential intensification is the capacity of the existing stormwater and wastewater systems. Previous experience with infill housing has seen systems which were adequate for the existing residential development suddenly being unable to cope with the additional load. It seems appropriate that the developer who is placing the extra pressure on the system pay a levy towards upgrading the system.</p>		
		33.4	Section 32	-	<p>Statements in the evaluation which refer to inefficient use of Council's resources, Council processing efficiencies and property values do not seem to be contemplated by the purpose and principles of the RMA. This</p>		

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					suggests that Council may have taken non-RMA matters into consideration in selecting relevant options and that the option selection process is flawed.		
Sean Irion [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-034	34.1	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation and Reason (f) Building Length	Support	Support amendments and hope they get accepted as soon as possible.	Make amendment 13 operative.	Y
		34.2	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation and Reason (g) Accessory Buildings	Support		Make amendment 14 operative.	
		34.3	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Condition – Yard Requirements	Support		Make amendment 15 operative.	
		34.4	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Condition – Recession Planes	Support		Make amendment 16 operative.	
Trevor James O'Connor [REDACTED], Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-035	35.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Condition – Recession Planes	Support	Support changes to recession plane requirements.	Proceed with proposed changes.	N
Karen Lee Ewart [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-036	36.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Condition – Recession Planes	Support	Support changes to recession plane requirements.	Proceed with proposed changes.	N
Peter James Forde [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-037	37.1	Higher Density Residential Areas	Oppose	No higher density residential areas. Not enough room for young ones to play and will reduce market price of the area.	-	Y
Michelle Faye Loader [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-038	38.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Condition – Recession Planes	Support	Will eliminate confusion and errors. See the change being minor with minimal effects to neighbouring properties.	Proceed with proposed change	N
Miss Marguerite Elizabeth Bennett [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5010	RM16-4-12C-039	39.1	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Do not agree with any changes leading to smaller sites, greater building coverage, change to accessory buildings or extension of higher density residential areas. These changes add stress to stormwater, water table and the valley environment. Infill housing has ruined many areas and added flood risk.	Keep present status quo.	N

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
Tyrell Close (Dan Jackson) & Kathryn Wylie [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-040	40.1	Rule 12.2.1.7(a) Financial Contributions – Reserves	Oppose	Oppose having to pay rural contributions (had to pay \$11,000) as rural cannot subdivide less than 40 acres and it was family land passed to next generation.	Expect money back as it was not in the District Plan – not law.	Y
Ian & Rosemary Humphrey [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-041	41.1	Higher Density Residential Areas	Oppose	The proposal will adversely affect the quality of life and living environment for people in affected areas. It can result in more neighbours, more disturbances and less visually pleasing environment. Will adversely affect property values and is unfair. It will make the affected areas less desirable to live in as opposed to the unaffected areas. It is not widely supported by ratepayers and there has been insufficient consultation and information. A minimum lot size of 300sqm is too small.	First preference: keep existing zoning and do not make any additions. Second preference: make additions to Higher Density Residential Areas only in areas immediately surrounding the Lower Hutt CBD. Third preference: change all residential zoning to Higher Density Residential. While undesirable it would be fair.	Y
Ron McIvor [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-042	42.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Condition – Yard Requirements	Support	If parking is provided at the rear of the site then the front yard could be reduced to 3m as carparking requirements can be met at the rear and there is no need to allow a 5m yard for parking in the front yard.	-	Y
		42.2	High Density Residential Areas - Wainuiomata	-	Decision sought would increase the area of Higher Density Residential zoned land along the main arterial route in Wainuiomata. Many of the sites in this area fit the criteria of the District Plan. Many of the sites are 809sqm which provides ample scope for development that would comply with the standards. For example 129 Wainuiomata Rd.	Amend the High Density Residential Areas to increase the proposed area further northeast along Wainuiomata Road from what is proposed at the Davis Gr intersection to the intersection with Parkway Rd.	
Henry Steele [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-043	43.1	Rule 4A 1.2.1(g) Policy and Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition – Permeable Surface	Oppose	A number of floods have affected the Waiwhetu and Awamutu Streams. Floods are made more severe due to increased runoff from further building, infill housing and increase in impervious surfaces. Minimum permeable areas are necessary.	Amendments 9 and 19 – increase proposed minimum to 40% for all zones.	Y
		43.2	Rule 4A 2.1.1(e) Permitted Activity Condition – Site Coverage	Oppose	A number of floods have affected the Waiwhetu and Awamutu Streams. Floods are made more severe due to increased runoff from further building, infill housing and increase in impervious surfaces. Increased density will increase flood risk in Waiwhetu	Oppose Amendment 17. And include stormwater management in the Design Guides with a requirement for low impact designs.	



Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		43.3	Rule 4A 2.3.1(a) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	Oppose	and Awamutu catchments. Amendments appear to give Council discretion to permit high density housing almost anywhere. This is not acceptable. High density housing provisions should not include stream/river catchment areas (from Naenae, through to Waiwhetu to Moera) where increase in stormwater run-off poses an increased flood risk.	Oppose Amendment 23.	
		43.4	Rule 4A 2.3.1(b) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	Oppose		Oppose Amendment 24.	
		43.5	High Density Residential Areas	Oppose		Oppose Amendment 40.	
		43.6	Rule 4A 1.2.1(i) Policy, Rule 4A 1.1.2(c) Policy, and Rule 4A 1.1.2 Explanation – Design Guides	Oppose	A number of floods have affected the Waiwhetu and Awamutu Streams. Floods are made more severe due to increased run-off from further building, infill housing and increase in impervious surfaces. Measures must be put in place to minimise rain water run-off and ensure the water quality will not impact the stream ecology due to contaminants.	Amendments 7, 8 and 10 - include stormwater management in the Design Guides with a requirement for low impact designs.	
		43.7	Rule 4A 2.4.1(c) Assessment Matters - Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	Oppose	Amendment 28 - include stormwater management in the Design Guides with a requirement for low impact designs.		
Irene Davis [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-044	44.1	High Density Residential Areas - Wainuiomata	Oppose	Wainuiomata has plenty of flat land. It should be kept as a residential suburb, it's better for the health and well being of its residents.	Much more communication should be offered before this review is considered.	Y
Lorna Adair Taylor [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-045	45.1	High Density Residential Areas	Oppose	There is plenty of land to be used.	Leave things as they are.	Y
Mr Gavin Bateson [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-046	46.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Condition – Yard Requirements	-	The combined effect of the amended yard requirement and the exclusion of eaves up to 0.6m from building coverage means that buildings can be built within 0.4m of a fence line. This is too close and will adversely affect neighbours.	Revert to original 1.5m yard requirement.	Y
		46.2	High Density Residential Areas – Copeland St	-	Hard to rationalise why a small number of houses on Copeland St and other streets in vicinity have a different zoning from other houses on the streets. The amendment will	Remove Copeland St from the Higher Density Residential Area.	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					forever change the peaceful character of these streets. Also infrastructure may not be adequate to handle higher population densities.		
Kevin Collins Design Network Hutt Ltd PO Box 30614 Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-047	47.1	Rule 4A 2.1 Permitted Activities	-	It is currently unclear whether it is permitted to demolish a dwelling. If it is not permitted it is non-complying, which could force a home owner through a notified application just to demolish a dwelling.	That the activity of demolition and relocation of existing dwellings be included more clearly under the Permitted Activity rule.	Y
		47.2	Ch 3 Definitions Building	-	If this were adopted steps and stairs would therefore be excluded from site coverage and yard requirements.	Exclude step and stairs from the definition of building no matter how high the deck is.	
		47.3	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Conditions – Yard Requirements	Oppose	A 1m yard requirement would significantly change the amenities of the City. The only exception to this should be when the existing exterior wall line is to be continued to avoid unnecessary stepping in of the building perimeter. Projected windows that do not have a foundation would be acceptable to encroach into the yard by up to 0.5m but up to a maximum length of 3m.	-	
		47.4	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Conditions – Recession Planes	Support in part	With the existing street widths and 3m front boundary requirement additional shading on the street is minimal and the public are not adversely affected.	That the front boundary to the road be excluded from recession plane compliance.	
		47.5	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Conditions – Yard Requirements	Oppose	Opposed to accessory buildings being built on boundaries. Was used prior to 1995 and caused a lot of trouble. It can be very imposing.	Seeks 1m minimum yard requirement up to 6m in length for accessory buildings.	
		47.6	Residential development of 3 or more units	Support	Support residential development of 3 or more units but the wording could be clearer with regards to not having to comply with the 400sqm net site area. Seems harsh if you are only planning 2 units.	-	
		47.7	Design Guides	Oppose	Oppose the Design Guides.	-	
		47.8	Ch 3 Definitions Yard Requirements	-	Currently it is measured to the cladding. Claddings however vary in thickness.	Change the definition for yard requirements to be measured to the perimeter wall framing or outer edge of the foundation, whatever is the closest.	
		47.9	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity	-	This would avoid the need for an addition to an existing dwelling to be stepped back	Exclude accessory items such as corner facing	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			Conditions – Yard Requirements		20mm for cladding to avoid a resource consent.	boards, window joinery, sills, switchboards, taps, down-pipes, spouting, gas meters, plant hooks, light switches, aerials and flashings from yard requirements.	
		47.10	Rule 4A 2.1.1(e) Permitted Activity Conditions – Site Coverage	-	Coverage calculations should exclude the thickness of all claddings that are not supported by a foundation.	-	
		47.11	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Conditions – Building Length	Support	Support deletion of maximum building length.	-	
		47.12	Ch 3 Definitions Yard Requirements / Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Conditions – Yard Requirements	-	Roof overhang dimensions for the purpose of yard encroachments should be taken from the outside line of the framing in the same manner in which yard setbacks are proposed to be measured. It should also exclude fascia, bargeboard and any spouting.	-	
		47.13	Rule 4A 2.1.1(e) Permitted Activity Conditions – Site Coverage	-	Roof overhang dimensions for the purpose of site coverage calculations should be taken from the outside line of the framing in the same manner in which yard setbacks are proposed to be measured. It should also exclude fascia, bargeboard and any spouting.	-	
Rene Look	RM16-4-12C-048	48.1	Entire Plan Change	-	Will no longer look like a garden city but a clutter.	Turn down proposed Plan Change 12.	Y
Ken Jackson [REDACTED] RD1 Wainuiomata	RM16-4-12C-049	49.1	Rule 12.2.1.7(a) Financial Contributions – Reserves	Support in part	Support in part that \$5000 is a set contribution in rural residential areas.	Rural areas be deleted from paying any reserve contribution; or as a compromise make \$4000 a set contribution in rural areas.	Y
Megan Ellen Powell [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-050	50.1	Rule 4A 2.3.1(i) Matters of Discretion – Childcare Facilities	-	Relates to sub-clause (i)-(iii). Allows no inward focus for the provision of the safety for children or users in the delivery and exiting of child care facilities in residential or main road areas. Suggest allowing drop off points within grounds instead of focus on staff parking.	Alteration of Amendment 25 as follows: (i) Consideration for safe drop off points where in a built up residential zone off a main road; (ii) The safe and efficient movement and	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
						<p>availability for pedestrian access taking into consideration surrounding environmental factors such as main roads;</p> <p>(iii) Secure and safe drop off points. Inclusion of an inward focus taking into consideration surrounding traffic and delivery and pick up of children when adjacent to main roads.</p>	
		50.2	Ch 14A Appendix 3 Parking Standards	-	Allows no inward focus for the provision of the safety for children or users in the delivery and exiting of child care facilities in residential or main road areas. Suggest allowing drop off points within grounds instead of focus on staff parking.	<p>Alteration of Appendix 3 for educational services as follows:</p> <p>(i) Consideration for safe drop off points where in a built up residential zone off a main road;</p> <p>(ii) The safe and efficient movement and availability for pedestrian access taking into consideration surrounding environmental factors such as main roads;</p> <p>(iii) Secure and safe drop off points. Inclusion of an inward focus taking into consideration surrounding traffic and delivery and pick up of children when adjacent to main roads.</p>	
Helen Alexander Bruce [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-051	51.1	Design Guides, Building Length, Accessory Buildings Recession Planes and Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	-	Supports policy for consideration of the protection of sunlight, daylight and privacy of adjoining properties. Height, location, intensity and scale must be managed. Concern for future development of neighbouring site and expects Amendment 24 to provide protection.	Seeks assurance from Council that they will abide by the policy and that Council will administer this principle both within and outside the High Density Residential Area.	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
Les Roberts Waiwhetu Stream Working Group c/o Industrial Research Ltd PO Box 31 310 Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-052	52.1	Purpose of Plan Change	-	An opportunity has been lost in the Plan Change and as a result the City's rivers and streams are likely to be adversely affected. By increasing residential densities and increasing levels of impermeable surfaces there will be an overall increase in stormwater run-off, with resulting increases in inputs such as sewage, sediment and pollutants entering streams and an increase in the likelihood of flooding.	The purpose of the Plan Change be amended to acknowledge Councils commitment to reducing flooding, along with sustainable urban design, subdivision and development.	Y
		52.2	Streams	-		Include moves to prevent increases in the peak water flows to streams, and measures to improve quality of in-flows.	
		52.3	Streams	-		Council review work undertaken by other Council's to reduce the impact of urban development through a variety of low impact and water-sensitive approaches.	
		52.4	Low Impact Urban Design	-		Council pay attention to the principles of 'Low Impact Urban Design and Development' (LIUDD) in the development of all plan changes affecting residential, business and commercial activity areas.	
		52.5	Rule 4A 1.2.1(g) Policy and Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition – Permeable Surface	-		Amendments 9 and 19 – increase proposed minimum permeable requirement to 40%.	
		52.6	Urban Density and Impermeable Surfaces	-		Urban density and impermeable surfaces provisions only be provided as permitted activities where mitigation is provided.	
		52.7	Design Guides	-		Amendments 7, 8, 10, 23 and 34 – Stormwater and LIUDD be given priority in the Design Guides.	
		52.8	Rule 4A 2.4 Discretionary Activities and Rule	-		Amendment 27 and 28 – include stormwater management as part of the assess-	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			4A 2.4.1(c) Assessment Matters - Residential development of 3 or more dwellings			ment criteria.	
		52.9	Rule 4A 2.1.1(e) Permitted Activity Conditions – Site Coverage	Oppose	Strongly oppose. Will increase amount of higher density in the Waiwhetu and Awamutu Stream catchments, increasing flooding risk, with no mitigation requirements. As a result of amendments, in effect it means high density development can happen anyway. Oppose the piecemeal approach that would be allowed to high density development.	-	
		52.10	Rule 4A 2.3.1(b) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	Oppose		-	
		52.11	High Density Residential Area	Oppose		-	
Wendy Roberts PO Box 30525 Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-053	53.1	High Density Residential Areas	Oppose	Social experiment that will lead to ghetto's in the future.	Withdraw amendments in their entirety.	Y
A & J Stevens Wellington	RM16-4-12C-054	54.1	High Density Residential Areas	Oppose	Oppose extension of high density area. Current areas are considered sufficient to meet the needs of the City given population projects of Stats NZ. Question effect on health and well being of residents. Concerned that it will also lead to ghetto areas.	-	
		54.2	Height of flagpoles	-	Should be a height restriction above ground level to limit the height of flagpoles. While most cause no problem, those erected to a great height on a prominent location can become a blot on the landscape and adversely affect residents.	-	
Matthew Amos Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-055	55.1	High Density Residential Areas	-	In principle agree with proposal. Concerned that the Plan Change includes areas that are more than 5 min walk from transport hubs and that properties selected for inclusion do not seem to have been chosen consistently i.e Waterloo and Woburn Stations. Unclear what hubs or shopping areas have been deemed important enough to encourage high density development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification of which transport hubs and shopping centres are to be covered by the Plan Change; and</li> <li>• Review the high density area to restrict them to all properties that lie within a 5 min walk of transport hubs and shopping centres.</li> </ul>	N

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
The Catholic Schools Board Ltd c/o Paul Thomas Environmental Management Services Ltd PO Box 29024 Wellington	RM16-4-12C-056	56.1	Education	-	The Crown Law Office has concluded that the Minister is financially responsible for the operation of state integrated schools and therefore has authority to designate them in the District Plan. The most efficient and effective time to designate them is through the plan review process. The existing provisions place unreasonable constraints on the evolution and development of existing schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That existing state integrated schools in the residential zone be designated through this plan review; Or if there is a legal constraint to this relief then:</li> <li>Amend the provisions so that existing state integrated schools are permitted activities within the residential zone.</li> </ul>	Y
Ontrack c/o Karl Check PO Box 593 Wellington 6140	RM16-4-12C-057	57.1	Rule 4A 1.2.1(j) Policy – Design Guides	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about presence of high density housing adjacent to the rail without consideration to amenity. May impact on the ability to operate and maintain a safe and efficient rail network in the future. Residential environments are typically sensitive to noise and vibration impacts often associated with rail operations. Maintenance is scheduled during evenings and early morning to minimise impact to passenger and freight logistics. While infrequent, it is essential and will often have an unavoidable noise component. Opportunity to address potential reverse sensitivity effects through this Plan Change.</li> <li>Support introduction of design guide. While not best planning mechanism to address reverse sensitivity effects it is good planning practice to include acoustic privacy in any design guide. Also suggest visual privacy be explicitly clear.</li> </ul>	Make the following amendment to Policy (j): <i>“To establish Design Guides to control other aspects of design, such as quality of onsite amenity, visual and acoustic privacy, integration of buildings...”</i>	Y
		57.2	Rule 4A 2.3(i) Restricted Discretionary Activities – Childcare Facilities	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As for first bullet point above.</li> <li>Encourage Council to provide scope within the Plan to facilitate assessment of activities that can be sensitive to surrounding land uses.</li> </ul>	Retain Amendment 22 as drafted.	
		57.3	Rule 4A 2.3.1(a) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As for first bullet point above.</li> <li>With increasing demand for rail services combined with expectations for higher levels of living amenity, the potential for</li> </ul>	Seeks an additional assessment criteria under Rule 4A 2.3.1(a) as follows: <i>(v) Reverse Sensitivity Consideration shall be given</i>	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			dwelling		reverse sensitivity effects to impact on rail operations is of concern.	<i>to whether the noise and vibration effects arising from nearby railway operations will impact on amenity levels within the site to an unacceptable level. The proposal should include mitigation measures to avoid these effects where appropriate.</i>	
		57.4	New provision	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As for first bullet point above.</li> <li>Requires an additional amendment to provide consistency in the structure of the District Plan in respect of reverse sensitivity. To maintain a clear policy framework the changes requested to Rule 4A 2.3.1 necessitates a new policy under 4A 1.1.2.</li> </ul>	Seeks new policy under Rule 4A 1.1.2 as follows: <i>(d) To recognise and assess potential reverse sensitivity impacts on railway operations from new higher density residential developments.</i>	
		57.5	Rule 4A 2.3.1(b) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As for first bullet point above.</li> <li>Stance to integrate suburban residential development with public transportation facilities aligns with the NZ Transport Strategy. Consideration should also be given to safety within corridors and walk/cycle ways.</li> </ul>	Recommend the following change to Amendment 24: <i>(i) In addition to the above, on any site... , are accessible within <u>safe and reasonable walking distances</u>.</i>	
		57.6	Rule 4A 2.3.1(i) Matters of Discretion – Childcare Facilities	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As for first bullet point above.</li> <li>Appropriate for Council to include reverse sensitivity as a matter in which Council restricts its discretion. Childcare facilities are sensitive to noise and vibration associated with normal operation of rail.</li> </ul>	Seeks inclusion of an additional matter under 4A 2.3.1(i) as follows: <i>(v) Reverse Sensitivity Consideration shall be given to whether the noise and vibration effects arising from nearby railway operations will impact on amenity levels within the site to an unacceptable level. The proposal should include mitigation measures to avoid these effects where appropriate.</i>	
		57.7	Rule 4A 2.4.1(c) Assessment Matters – Residential Development of 3 or more dwellings	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As for first bullet point above.</li> <li>For consistency within the Plan, recommends the same approach taken to Amendment 24 be adopted. Proposed change will encourage safety.</li> </ul>	Amend Rule as follows: <i>(iii) Whether public transport facilities... , are accessible within <u>safe and reasonable walking distances</u>.</i>	



Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		57.8	Design Guides	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As for first bullet point above.</li> <li>Design guides should include an additional section to address acoustic privacy. While not best planning mechanism to address reverse sensitivity effects it is good planning practice to include acoustic privacy in any design guide. Much easier to address acoustic matters at the design stage rather than as remedial works. Also suggest visual privacy be included.</li> </ul>	Include a new section within the Design Guides to address visual and acoustic privacy.	
		57.9	High Density Residential Areas	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As above for first bullet point.</li> <li>In its current form the Plan Change does not provide for any consideration of reverse sensitivity effects. The expansion of Higher Density Residential onto new sites adjoining the corridor or rail workshops poses a future risk to operations. Must oppose these new areas unless suitable provisions can be included in the Plan Change to address concerns.</li> </ul>	Removal of any additional sites of Higher Density Residential from the planning map where the site is directly adjoining land covered by a designation for railway purposes, including the section of land off Leighton Ave covered by a railway purposes designation.	
Sunil Vadnerkar [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-058	58.1	High Density Residential Area	Support	Supports the proposed high density residential areas and housing provisions as a owner of a property in Wainuiomata which is very large and hard to maintain.	Approve Plan Change 12.	Y
Beverley Anne Tyler [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5010	RM16-4-12C-059	59.1	High Density Residential Area	-	The significant increase in higher density residential areas will change the whole character of the residential areas. We need more family homes not less. For the future growth of the City families should be encouraged to come here.	Restrict coverage of the High Density Residential Area to ensure more family homes remain in the valley floor.	N
		59.2	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Conditions – Yard Requirements	-	All these factors affect a neighbourhood's amenity.	Rear and side yard requirements should remain at the present 1.5m.	
		59.3	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Conditions – Recession Planes	-		The recession plane from all boundaries should be the lesser of present planes applied i.e. 37.5 degrees from all boundaries, not 45 degrees.	
		59.4	Maximum Height of Buildings	-		Height of all residential activity areas should be restricted to a max. of 2 storeys (7m).	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
East Harbour Environmental Association Inc c/o Felicity Rashbrooke PO Box 41-029 Eastbourne 5013	RM16-4-12C-060	60.1	Ch 3 Definitions Accessory Buildings	-	Questions whether the definition should restrict accessory buildings to single storey structures. Opposes multi storey accessory buildings, especially if they are located on a boundary.	-	Y
		60.2	Ch 3 Definitions Buildings	Support	Supports the changes relating to decks.	-	
		60.3	Ch 3 Definitions, Rule 4A 1.2.1 Policy (g) and Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Conditions – Permeable surfaces	Support	Support definition of and provisions for permeable surfaces.	-	
		60.4	Rule 4A 1.1.2 Policy (c) and Rule 4A 1.1.2 Explanation and Reasons – Design Guides	-	Supports the development and use of design guides as a tool to manage effects on amenity. However needs to be more specific about ways in which responses to design guide recommendations can be translated into resource consent conditions. Examples provided relating to outdoor space and protection of vegetation. Failing this a minimum net site area of 300sqm per dwelling should be retained.	-	
		60.5	Rules 4A 1.2.1 and 4A 1.2.1(f) Explanation and Reasons – Building Length	Oppose	Opposes the removal of controls on building length. To preserve amenity the present controls should be retained. Important to maintain amenity of our residential areas. Challenge reasoning and need for change. Increase in number of non-compliance may reflect fact that domestic dwellings have got larger and do not sit on the sites as well as smaller buildings of the past did.	-	
		60.6	Rule 4A 1.2.1(a) Explanation and Reasons – Net Site Area	-	Supports retention of net site area as a means of regulating development. Oppose deletion of minimum site area for development of 3 or more dwellings in the General Residential Activity Area. Reserve judgement on its application to High Density Residential Areas until the effectiveness of the proposed Design Guides can be assessed.	-	
		60.7	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity	Oppose	Such a reduction would increase the sense of crowding and reduce amenity. Might be	-	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			Conditions – Yard Requirements		appropriate in High Density Residential Areas. Important to maintain amenity of our residential areas. Challenge reasoning and need for change. Increase in number of non-compliance may reflect fact that domestic dwellings have got larger and do not sit on the sites as well as smaller buildings of the past did.		
		60.8	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Conditions – Recession Planes	Oppose	Present conditions reflect the reality of shading differences with aspects and thus should be retained. Simplification should not be used as a reason. In some situations this change could intensify adverse shading effects.	-	
		60.9	Rule 4A 2.3(a) Restricted Discretionary Activities and Rules 4A 2.3.1(a) and (b) Matters of Discretion - Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	Oppose	Provision for 3 or more dwellings on a site has great potential to undermine residential amenity over large parts of the City. Such development will not just be confined to high density areas. Once application gains consent under discretionary processes the environment is modified and approval of subsequent non-complying applications is more easily granted. Adverse cumulative effects are generated. These effects could be moderated if the net site areas provision were retained for development of 3 or more dwellings in the General Residential Activity Area.	Considers a minimum net site area of 400sqm should be specified for multi-unit development within the General Residential Activity Area.	
		60.10	Ch 14A Appendix 3 – Parking Standards	Oppose	2 car parking spaces per dwelling is more realistic given current patterns of car ownership per household. 1 carpark per dwelling will result in loss of amenity through increased parking on the street.	Development of 3 or more dwellings should be required to provide 2 off street car parks per dwelling.	
		60.11	High Density Residential Areas	Oppose	Opposes large scale expansion of the High Density Residential Areas. Do not believe that this maintains and protects the existing amenity of these areas and is of a scale not justified by the likely needs in the immediate future. A more carefully managed programme of intensification within more carefully selected areas is needed. Potential for residential intensification within existing high density areas is already great. Change	The areas designated High Density Residential should be significantly reduced.	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					not considered consistent with purpose and principles of RMA and criteria used for including some areas and excluding others are not explained. The process has not been transparent and consultation cannot be regarded as adequate.		
		60.12	Ch 4 Appendix General Residential 17	-	Concerned that the title "Eastern Bays High Density Residential areas..." could be misleading. The area is not High Density Residential.	A title "Excluded areas referred to in Rules 4A 2.3 and 4A 2.4" would be more appropriate.	
Bernard Anton Hiestand [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5010	RM16-4-12C-061	61.1	High Density Residential Area - Maungaraki	Oppose	Oppose due to problems with existing drainage services, particularly relating to past discharges from sewer line and subsequent land slip. Council engineers have made mention that when Maungaraki was first developed in the 60's the diameter of the sewage pipes were never intended to cope with the number of properties the area has grown to. General problem of insufficient capacity still exists. It is inappropriate to increase the density of housing in the area without having first increased the capacity of sewage and stormwater pipe work to cope with the increased loading.	Delete Maungaraki from proposed High Density Residential Area.	Y
R C Moore [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5014	RM16-4-12C-062	62.1	High Density Residential Areas	-	Oppose the change until there have been investigations of the ability of the zone to cope with the increase in stormwater runoff. Virtually no publicity about the change, few residents are aware of it even though a substantial proportion of residential properties would be affected. Boundaries of high density area have been decided by a very crude measure. In Wainuiomata most high density areas could require a walking speed of over 6km/h to achieve 5 mins. It is unlikely many residents would be capable of this. Main concerns relate to consideration of capability of these areas to cope with additional stormwater runoff, infiltration and flooding problems, loss of trees and traffic effects. While comments relate to Wainuiomata it is likely that other areas of City would be affected. The boundaries of	Withdraw the change until investigations have shown which areas are capable of coping with additional stormwater runoff.	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					the High Density Residential Area should be confined solely to those areas which are capable of coping with additional stormwater runoff without causing increase in flooding. For this reason Hyde St, Best St and Fitzherbert Rd should not be included.		
Philip Deere [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5010	RM16-4-12C-063	63.1	Notification	-	Would like additional buildings (over 3m high) to be notified to at least the neighbouring properties, particularly situation of additional 'close to boundary' structures.	-	-
Lesley Sutherland [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-064	64.1	In-fill Housing	Oppose	Strongly oppose the proposal to relax the criteria for in-fill housing in Hutt City.	Keep status quo.	Y
Lawrence Sutherland [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-065	65.1	In-fill Housing	-	Would rather keep the District Plan as it is or possibly even tighten the criteria for infill-housing.	Status quo or more public consultation.	N
Nada & Pado Ryan [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-066	66.1	High Density/In-fill Housing	Oppose	Oppose high density infill housing. Reduce property side effects and residents amenity values and this will stop the attraction for families in the area with there being no advantage over buying in built up Wellington City.	In-fill housing must be stopped.	Y
Clayton J Davison [REDACTED], Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-067	67.1	In-fill Housing	Oppose	Reduced size of property makes it less attractive for families to move to and reside in the Hutt.	In-fill housing must be stopped.	Y
Roderick and Elizabeth Gillespie [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5010	RM16-4-12C-068	68.1	Entire Plan Change	-	Rely on Council's vision to produce a Plan which protects amenities and will allow the City to grow, while maintaining an environment in which we wish to live and work. In the case of Plan Change 12 the Council's vision is severely flawed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of high density zone is too great;</li> <li>• Will permit development which has the potential to severely adversely affect neighbouring properties;</li> <li>• Zonings seem randomly drawn and there are often no buffer zones between differing residential zones;</li> <li>• Not convinced that the stormwater and sewage disposal infrastructure is capable of coping with development of this type and magnitude.</li> </ul>	Would like Council to take a step back and reconsider the Plan Change. Would like them to try to envisage the City fifteen years on if it goes ahead.	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
Nicola Bray [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-069	69.1	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Will afford little protection to residents. Dismayed at extent of the proposed high density area and concerned about the negative effect of proposed changes. Proposal will drastically affect the appearance and character of the City and quality of life it gives us. Negative impacts relate to: runoff; provision of services; vegetation cover; increased traffic and noise; loss of privacy; and increased pressure on car parking. Council's vision for the Hutt is clearly not consistent with that of many residents.	Review or rescind the proposals.	Y
Alex Edmonds Stirling Real Estate Ltd 44-58 Queens Drive Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-070	70.1	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Changes are widespread and comprehensive and would be a backward step. Infill housing in the City has resulted in built up, shoddy, undesirable housing where residents are subject to problems such as shared driveways, insufficient privacy and lack of play areas for children. Produces overloads to already overloaded services, resulting in inadequate drainage, runoff and flooding. Rather than promote infill housing on a grand scale should carefully consider how we want the residential face of City to look and function.	Do not proceed with proposed changes.	-
Sarah and Steven Williams [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-071	71.1	High Density Residential Area – St Columbans Grove	Oppose	Oppose Plan Change as it will be out of keeping with the existing neighbourhood and is in conflict with 4B of the Plan.	Delete St Columbans Monastery from the amendment.	Y
Dorothy Frances Fox [REDACTED] 5012	RM16-4-12C-072	72.1	High Density Residential Area - Petone	Oppose	Proposal allows for greater density in housing in the area between The Esplanade, Petone and Jackson Street. This area is already overcrowded, polluted and congested. Other factors relate to health and safety of people living and operating in the area, also with regard to lack of reasonable resources relative to space. Further, the area is on ground that moves.	Retain the present situation with a reduction of further intensive developments and density.	Y
Desmond and Judith Bowles [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-073	73.1	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Criteria/guidelines formulated raise serious questions as to why there is such a concentrated focus on transport and shopping. No explanation in document. More	Wider in-depth community consultation, a high degree of protection of amenity values and reduction of the	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					information should be made available. Fundamental right of property owners to protect existing amenity values will be greatly impacted. Issues with close living (lack of parking, shading, noise, lack of privacy) cannot be mitigated. Proposed changes are not consistent with the purposes and principles of the RMA. High density zones could be reintroduced within commercial areas if intensified areas need to be created. Adequate drainage systems are not seen to be considered. Adequate protection of historical dwellings is not included. Flat land lacks added protections that hilly terrain offers therefore more land space is paramount. The Plan Change reduces choice. High density living should be stopped until a definite demand dictates such a huge area of zone alteration. High density living and cluster shops do not reduce cars/traffic.	scale of area to protect existing amenity values.	
Mrs Ronda Coyle [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-074	74.1	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose provisions for high density housing. More consultation within the affected areas is necessary due to such a major change affecting so many people. Impact to the community, culture, and services needs to be thoroughly researched/assessed in a consultative process.	That Plan Change does not go ahead.	Y
Cheryl McCullagh [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-075	75.1	Rule 12.2.1.7(a) Financial Contributions – Reserves	Support	Oppose Status Quo. Support amending to provide a maximum dollar value.	Support proposed option for rural/rural-residential as it is not consistent as it stands.	Y
Andrew Curran [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-076	76.1	High Density Residential Area – St Columbans Grove	Oppose	Oppose the change and want existing provisions to remain. Effect on Military Road and St Columbans Gr homes will be extreme as to value and environment.	Delete proposed Plan Change in this location.	Y
Alicetown Community Association Conrad Malcolm Adam [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-077	77.1	High Density Residential Areas and provisions relating to multi- housing	Oppose	Oppose the reduction of restrictions on type, size and length of buildings near shopping/commercial centres. Some areas such as Alicetown have a “special character” which should be protected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special character areas to be protected from inappropriate developments.</li> <li>• Alicetown to be noted as a special character area of interest.</li> </ul>	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
Geraldine Mary Laing [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5011	RM16-4-12C-078	78.1	Rule 4A 1.2.1(f) Explanation and Reasons – Building Length	-		Under Amendment 13 set a specific length in relation to adjacent sections so that the onus is not on the neighbours to object.	Y
		78.2	Rule 4A 2.1.1(g) Permitted Activity Conditions – Home Occupations	-	Commercial occupation, craft or profession will be allowed to be established on the same site as a dwelling without setting any noise, odour or time of operation restrictions. Do not consider any further permitted activities should be allowed in or adjacent to residential areas as they can change from what was initially envisaged. Even a craft which could be noisy. Uses Waterloo Bus Depot as example.	Preferably delete; Or impose tight operating restriction 8am to 5pm as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weekdays only;</li> <li>• Grant a noise waiver on the premises so that complainants do not have to wait 30 mins after an initial noise complaint.</li> <li>• Impose odour, dust, and light restrictions;</li> <li>• Make it a condition of continued commercial use when a property is sold, that agreement to continuation of the use is given by 3 residents either side and similarly on the opposite side of street.</li> </ul>	
		78.3	Planning Map 3	-	Why has South Hautana St to Woburn Station been excluded – seems eminently suitable for train, bus and shop access. Understand Totara Cres area of Woburn and Military Rd are Special Residential due to their areas of tree. In Totara Cres the tree size is unsuitable and will have to be removed at some time. Creates a “them and us” social distinction.	Consider the areas noted in the Plan Change.	
		78.4	Section 32 – High Density Residential Area	-	Evaluation of zone provision options (page 110): Option 2 may be founded on false premises. 5 min walk is a minimal time. 8-10 mins should be acceptable. Using out of date stereotype of elderly people. May enjoy shopping in a completely different area. Quick turnaround small bus services at peak times and multiple bicycle stands at railway	Status quo – retain the boundaries of the High Density Residential Area and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow amalgamation of sections;</li> <li>• Establish regulations to allow grouped small housing as per the Plan Change on amalgamated sections;</li> </ul>	



Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					stations could solve transport problems. The numbers who may be housed in the areas contemplated do not justify the envisaged upheaval to the residential environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow similar courtyard housing for elderly;</li> <li>• Allow housing with small gardens, for those who wish to use them on divided single sections;</li> <li>• Allow blocks of flats with regulated surrounds;</li> <li>• If Daly St does not go through use it to establish a dedicated revolving fund to facilitate above bullet points.</li> <li>• Designate suitable parts of established shopping areas as suitable for craft workshops.</li> </ul>	
Graeme Lester Lyon [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 5012	RM16-4-12C-079	79.1	Ch 3 Definitions, Rule 4A 1.2.1 Policy (g) and Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Conditions – Permeable surfaces	-	A minimum of 30% permeable area (with permeable decks included) is a positive move.	-	Y
		79.2	Rule 4A 1.1.2 Policy (c) and Explanation and Reasons, Rule 4A 1.2.1 Policy (j) and Rule 4A 2.3.1(a) Matters of Discretion – Design Guides	-	Development of design guides is a positive step and one to be supported. Landscape and open areas issues need to also be addressed in terms of ensuring plentiful open space within and around high density areas and quality outdoor living areas for each residential unit.	-	
		79.3	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Conditions – Building Length	-	A maximum building length of 20m needs to be retained. Was instituted to stop development of sausage blocks – they are still not desirable.	-	
		79.4	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Conditions – Yard Requirements	-	Side and rear yards should be totally re-considered. Rather than blanket reduction there should be a rationale for the existence of yards coupled with the possibility of no side yard in some instances.	-	
		79.5	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Conditions –	-	Keep current differentiated recession planes. Sunlight is more valuable and possible on some boundaries than on others.	-	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			Recession Planes				
		79.6	Rule 4A 2.1.1(e) Permitted Activity Conditions – Site Coverage	-	Proposed blanket 400m radius/5 min walking distance is too generic. May not be appropriate to have a solid mass of higher intensity development all around any town centre. Thought needs to be given to building types, shapes, and sizes that might work in particular places.	-	
		79.7	Rule 4A 2.1.1(g) Permitted Activity Conditions – Home Occupations	-	Parking space requirements seem over the top when multi units are only meant to require one park per dwelling. Where are the parks going to happen as in existing properties only the front yard may be possible for parking use.	-	
		79.8	Rule 4A 2.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Childcare Facilities	-	In a residential area up to 30 children is too many. Major difference in noise and other effects between 5 and 30 children plus staff. Childcare centres in residential areas should be no more than 12 or 15 children and need to have at least 3m distance between outdoor play areas and neighbouring residential sites. They also need to provide all day parking for staff and parents drop off/pick up. Childcare facilities in residential areas should be full discretionary, not restricted.	-	
		79.9	Rule 4A 2.3.1 (b) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	-	Reads as though there could be 3 or more dwellings on any residential site. Needs to be deleted. Alicetown needs to be left out totally or it should be designated a character area with protection against demolition of houses built before 1930. Alicetown is a gateway to Petone from the north and is very close in character to Petone.	-	
		79.10	Rule 4A 2.4 (m) Discretionary Activities - Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	-	Agree that development of 3 or more dwellings in Petone, Eastern Bays and Moera residential areas should be fully discretionary.	-	
		79.11	Ch 14A Appendix 3 – Parking Standards	-	1 parking space per dwelling is not necessarily going to be sufficient. Young adults plus parents own cars. Work plus private	-	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					vehicles. As public transport system is far from perfect this relaxation could cause problems in the future.		
		79.12	Entire Plan Change	-	The Plan Change should be more considerate of individual community desires rather than one size fits all. Should be identification in Plan Change of management of an urban design approach for each suburb as to where high density housing should be provided for. Especially in Alicetown, Petone and Eastbourne. The existing character should not be detracted from yet in the Plan Change there appears to be no attention to identifying community characters and possibilities.	-	
Regional Public Health c/o Julie Williamson High Street Private Bag 31 907 Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-080	80.1	Rule 4A 1.1.2 (c) Policy – Design Guides	-	Quality of medium to high density housing and adherence to design standards appropriate to the local context is pivotal in ensuring it is both acceptable to the community and achieves health and well being gains. Vital design guides are given sufficient regulatory weight to ensure that future development avoids the adverse effects of ill-considered housing with low aesthetic values. Would like to see the Design Guides actively manage the quality of development and its surrounds.	Amend Policy 4A 1.1.2(c) as follows: <i>(c) That Design Guides be developed to <u>ensure</u> higher density development <u>achieves a high quality living environment that maintains and enhances onsite amenities and consistency with surrounding residential character.</u></i>	Y
		80.2	Rule 4A 1.1.2 Explanation and Reasons and Rule 4A 1.2.1 Policy (j) – Design Guides	Support	It is vital that all higher density development are controlled through the use of design guides that include reference to the surrounding areas and spatial relationship between units within the development. Care also needs to be taken to ensure developments have sufficient usable outdoor leisure space.	-	
		80.3	Rule 4A 1.2.1 (g) Policy and Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Conditions – Permeable Surfaces	Support	A minimum permeable surface requirement will assist the sustainable management of stormwater across the City and assist in reducing flood hazard. Also support design that incorporates designated water retention areas/swales.	-	
		80.4	Rule 4A 2.3(a) Restricted	Support	Removes the anomaly in which multi-unit developments of between 3 and 5 houses		

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			Discretionary Activities – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings		was not previously covered in the District Plan.		
		80.5	Rule 4A 2.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Childcare Facilities	Support	Will enable better management of adverse effects of early childhood centres within residential areas. Facilitates the establishment of centres in residential neighbourhoods and discourages childcare operations from prioritising industrial and commercial sites. It also ensures residential neighbourhood needs are provided for.	-	
		80.6	Rule 4A 2.3.1(a)(i) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	-	Quality of medium to high density housing and adherence to design standards appropriate to the local context is pivotal in ensuring it is both acceptable to the community and achieves health and well being gains. Vital design guides are given sufficient regulatory weight to ensure that future development avoids the adverse effects of ill-considered housing with low aesthetic values. Would like to see the Design Guides actively manage the quality of development and its surrounds.	Amend Rule 4A 2.3.1(a)(i) as follows: <i>Consideration will be given to how the proposal <u>meets the requirements of the Higher Density Design Guidelines.</u></i>	
		80.7	Rule 4A 2.3.1(b) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	Oppose	The Plan Change already proposes a sizeable increase in the number of sites designated High Density Residential, without needing to extend this to more outlying areas. Discretionary permission of developments outside his area will not achieve aims for compact urban form that have driven this change.	Delete proposed amendment 4A 2.3.1(b)(i).	
		80.8	Rule 4A 2.3.1(j)(iv) Matters of Discretion – Childcare Facilities	-	Support inclusion of provisions. Also encourage centres be sited near transport hubs to reduce reliance on private vehicles. Noise of early childcare facilities in a residential area has been raised as a nuisance. However rules restricting outdoor play are not in the child's or communities best interest. While consideration needs to be given to residential neighbours, it is most important that children in childcare facilities	Amend Rule 4A 2.3.1(j)(iv) as follows: <i>(iv) Noise</i> .... <i>With respect to non-compliances, consideration shall be given to any method or measure proposed to mitigate adverse noise effects of the proposal so</i>	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					are protected from adverse environmental conditions.	<u>long as it does not adversely impact on the health and wellbeing of children and staff at facilities.</u>	
		80.9	Rule 4A 2.4.1(c) Assessment Matters – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings		Do not believe the Design Guide is comprehensive enough to ensure high quality urban development. The assessment matters must explicitly include consideration of the quality and accessibility of pedestrian networks in the area as well as access to quality open and green spaces. Pedestrian prioritised networks support social cohesion, mental wellbeing and physical activity. The importance of green and open space to wellbeing will increase as density increases. The phase ‘within 5 minute walk’ would be consistent with standards in the NZ Urban Design Protocol.	Amend Rule 4A 2.4.1(c) as follows: <i>(i) How the proposal <u>meets the requirements of the Higher Density Housing Design Guidelines.</u></i> <i>(ii) ...</i> <i>(iii) Whether public transport facilities, <u>high quality pedestrian networks and green space, and non-residential services such as education facilities, places of assembly, medical and emergency facilities, and small retail activities which provide for residents daily needs, are accessible within 5 minutes walk.</u></i>	
		80.10	Ch 4 Appendix General Residential 18 – Design Guides for Higher Density Housing		Would like to see acknowledgment in the Design Guides of the importance of ensuring high density development improves equity of access to quality housing for Hutt City citizens. Believe that measures need to be taken in the Design Guides to ensure housing affordability is not adversely affected by higher density housing development. Importance of involvement of communities in the design of the public spaces in the vicinity of higher density housing will be valuable to ensure surrounding amenity values are not compromised. As private outdoor space reduces in size more emphasis is needed on the provision of quality public spaces. In addition to consideration about placement of windows and doors for community safety, would like to see consideration of both quality of building fabric and window	Amend the Design Guides as follows: <i>Aims for Higher Density Housing:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>That everyone has access to a quality standard of affordable housing.</u></li> </ul> <i>Guidelines</i> <u>Quality of design and construction</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The design guide provides more visual examples of good quality design and construction solutions.</u></li> </ul> <i>Fitting in the Neighbourhood</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Those communities are involved in the design of public spaces around</u></li> </ul>	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					articulation in respect of neighbourhood nuisance.	<u>high density housing.</u> <u>Privacy and Safety</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>That positioning of living spaces, ablution services, windows and doors of neighbouring units is designed to mitigate against nuisance from neighbourhood noise.</u></li> </ul>	
Kathteen & John Yardley [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-081	81.1	Entire Plan Change		The timing allowed to read, understand and file a submission is unreasonably short and unfair. Weltec have been approved expansion as a non-complying activity to increase site coverage, increase student numbers, develop a large carpark, among other activities. This has dramatically changed the residential character and amenity values of Kensington Ave and the adjoining residential streets. This area needs to be treated as a special case in any District Plan review. The residential character and amenity values have been destroyed and it is time Council addressed residents concerns and mitigated the damage on residential character and amenity values. Council has been very selective with respect to high density areas. Submitter's property is adjacent to major transport routes and commercial centres, yet high density is much lower than the density of the non-residential neighbour.	Want Council to be fair and equitable in its dealings with residential owners.	Y
Steve & Jill Douglas [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-082	82.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Condition – Recession Planes	Oppose	Oppose deletion of this requirement on the basis that in the Hutt Valley exposure to sunshine is as important as insulation for ensuring the health of homes. Any change that increases shading of adjacent properties in these circumstances is undesirable.	At least the current recession plan requirements be retained for special zones or any zones where High Density housing is not proposed.	N
Kylie Mason [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Wellington	RM16-4-12C-083	83.1	High Density Residential Areas	-	Too extensive and could lead to large scale changes to character of the Hutt Valley. While great idea to locate them around commercial centres, either the number of centres need to be reduced or the position from which these areas are calculated needs	-	N

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					to be altered so that the overall number of properties affected are reduced. Also needs to be better rationalisation of the location of the areas and geographic boundaries should be used. Potential conflict by having high density areas bound by Special Residential Activity Areas. Suggest bounding around Special Residential Activity Area remain within General Residential. Consideration should be given to whether Alicetown should be within the High Density Area as many properties are too small to be subdivided.		
		83.2	Ch 3 Definitions Building	-	Removal of decks under 0.5m in height from the definition should be supported as they have no real apparent building bulk.	-	
		83.3	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Conditions – Building Length	-	Rule should be maintained as it prevents neighbours being subject to continuous building facades. If this rule is kept better guidance is needed to define a suitable separation distance between structures which are both under 20m in length but which have a combined length of greater than 20m.	-	
		83.4	Rule 4A 2.1.1(g) Permitted Activity Conditions – Home Occupations	-	Allowing commercial activities creates some tension as visitor accommodation is a discretionary activity yet is also within the definition of a commercial activity. Suggest that either visitor accommodation is removed from the definition for a commercial activity or visitor accommodation is permitted up to a maximum number of people and be included within the definition of a residential activity.	-	
		83.5	Rule 12.2.1.7(a) Financial Contributions – Reserves	-	Further thought needs to be given to the changes and potential ramifications which would arise if the changes go through. The Plan Change would result in expansion of higher density areas, and the increase in the number of smaller properties. With smaller properties it is more difficult for people to provide for their external recreation needs and thus demand and expectations for Council Parks increases. By limiting reserve contribution to \$10,000 per urban allotment	-	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					you are assuming an average price of \$133,000 which is a relatively low land value. Resulting effect would be the developer does not pay the full price of the demand on recreational services. Better way would be for a percentage calculation to be maintained for urban areas but a capped limit on rural areas		
		83.6	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Conditions – Recession Planes	-	Changing the recession plan rule combined with the 1m yard setback will result in a large increase in permissible shading. Would like to have seen shading diagrams produced. Given the reduction in side yard a strong consideration should be given to making the recession planes standardised at either 37.5 or 41 degrees to ensure that adequate daylight and sunlight is maintained to neighbouring properties.	-	
		83.7	Multi-unit housing	-	Supports the use of design guides for multi-unit housing but has concerns about the enforceability of Rule 4A 2.3.1(b). Provides no certainty as to whether an application is restricted discretionary or not and is open to interpretation. Provides no strong guidance and would be impossible to determine whether an application meets the criteria.	-	
		83.8	Ch 3 Definitions Accessory Building	-	Definition needs to be amended as by excluding habitable rooms, sleep outs and rumpus rooms attached to a garage essentially become non-complying which seems too strict.	-	
		83.9	Childcare Facilities	-	These facilities can have a detrimental effect on the character of an area. Proposed change would not allow Council to consider character effects as it is not a matter to which discretion has been restricted. To avoid potential effects, either the number of children needs to be reduced or the restricted discretion criteria needs to be expanded to allow wider assessment of effects such as character and visual amenity. Preferably childcare centres over 5 children be listed as discretionary.	-	



Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		83.10	Other Structures	-	With new technology the Plan needs to be updated so these are reflected and allowed. Particular consideration needs to be given to solar panels, heat pumps and domestic wind turbines and whether such structures should be excluded from the yard, recession plane or height rules. Probably not appropriate for wind turbines but consideration should be given to yards for heat pumps and recession planes for solar panels as neither are bulky and ensure developments are more sustainable. Consideration should also be given to restricting the proliferation of large satellite dishes as they are often not in keeping with the residential area.	-	
		83.11	Rule 4D 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Conditions – Site Coverage	-	Needs to be amended so that reference to decks over 20sqm is removed in order to make it consistent with the General Residential Activity Area.	-	
		83.12	Permeable Surfaces	-	The explanation and reasoning needs to be addressed so to provide guidance as to whether a proposal which did not meet this would meet the anticipated environmental outcomes sought under the Plan.	-	
		83.13	Car parking	-	Conflict between carparking requirement for subdivision and construction of a second dwelling. The Plan requires 2 carparks are provided onsite for new dwellings. This should be worded so that 2 onsite carparks are provided on the net site area for each respective dwelling. Would bring the construction of a second dwelling in line with the subdivision requirements and would close the loophole associated with people providing carparking in unsuitable locations and then trying to subdivide in the future where carparking is unable to be provided.	-	
		83.14	Right of ways	-	The standards and terms for subdivision limit the number of dwellings off a right of way, yet this does not apply to landuse consents. Resulting effect is that a loophole is created and the adverse effects associated with traffic on access ways are unable to be	-	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					controlled with landuse consents.		
		83.15	Vegetation Clearance	-	Vegetation clearance rules are very permissive and do not recognise the important of vegetation to amenity values within the Residential Activity Areas. Furthermore the rules are difficult to apply as there is no guidance. Ideally the area of vegetation clearance should be reduced and an explanation on how to apply these rules included.	-	
		83.16	Ch 4 Appendix General Residential 16 Maximum Height	-	Does not clearly demonstrate how to apply maximum height and maximum overall height. A new appendix should be developed as part of the Plan Change which shows the difference between maximum height and maximum overall height.	-	
		83.17	Demolition of Buildings	-	Under permitted activities the demolition of buildings is not identified. As such, technically, resource consent is required. This should be amended and demolition of dwellings included as a permitted activity (provided they are not protected).	-	
Gerard Bourke & Trish Coley [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-084	84.1	High Density Housing	Oppose	It will result in many negative effects on residents. Issues include: infrastructure is struggling; current water shortages; greater water run-off resulting in more flooding; increase in social issues; reduction in areas for children to play in safe environment; traffic issues; character of older established areas would be destroyed; and reduction of distance of building from the boundary.	Stop Plan Change 12.	Y
Attn: Sarah Clarke Cuttriss Consultants PO Box 30 429 Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-085	85.1	Ch 3 Definitions Accessory Buildings	Support	It is not explained clearly enough why accessory buildings can't include a habitable room such as a bedroom but without a kitchen and bathroom which would make it an independent dwelling. Otherwise support the change.	Recommend the changes are adopted as drafted.	Y
		85.2	Ch 3 Definitions Buildings and Rule 4A 2.1.1(e) Permitted Activity Conditions – Site Coverage	Neutral	The limit of height of decks should be increased to 1m provided that it is not closer than 2m to a boundary. This would mean if a deck was over 1m it would be subject to yard setbacks and site coverage requirements which is considered to be a more than	-	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					reasonable position. Support amendment with changes suggested.		
		85.3	Ch 3 Definitions Comprehensive Residential Development, Dwelling House and Residential Facility and Rule 4D 2.3(c) Discretionary Activities	Neutral	Comprehensive development of a site is a widely understood concept but the current definition is relatively misleading and perhaps it is better to delete it as proposed.	-	
		85.4	Ch 3 Definitions, Rule 4A 1.2.1(g) Policy and Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Conditions – Permeable Surface	Oppose	Unclear how this provisions would be enforceable. This is not the type of information shown on a building consent and areas could easily be covered in an impermeable surface without Council's knowledge. Would be difficult to tell which surface was new and which was existing prior to the change.	Further commentary is required under the explanation and reasons to support this provision as done for net site area through to accessory buildings. Also recommend the following amendment to Policy (g): <i>To ensure <del>establish</del> that a minimum permeable surface area is established on sites to be developed to assist with the sustainable management of stormwater.</i>	
		85.5	Rule 4A 1.1.2 (c) Policy - Design Guides	Support	Generally support. As the Design Guide is included in the Plan Change it would only be appropriate to outline what weight to give this document and be less vague about its relevance.	Recommend they are adopted with the following amendments: <i>(c) That <del>design guides be developed to direct and encourage higher density development be encouraged</del> where it is in general accordance with the direction provided by the urban design guide (Appendix 18) and where it maintains and enhances on site amenities and consistency with the surrounding residential character.</i>	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		85.6	Rule 4A 1.1.2 Explanation and Reasons – Design Guides	Support	Support the changes.	Recommend the changes are adopted as drafted.	
		85.7	Rule 4A 1.2.1(j) Policy – Design Guides	Support	Support these changes. Suggest amendments to ensure that appropriate weighting is given to the Design Guides.	Recommend the changes are adopted as drafted and suggest that <i>'establish'</i> be replaced by <i>'To ensure that the developments are in general accordance with...'</i> .	
		85.8	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation and Reasons, Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Conditions and Appendix General Residential 18 – Building Length	Support	Support the changes.	Recommend the changes are adopted as drafted.	
		85.9	Rule 4A 1.2.1(a) Explanation and Reasons – Site Area	Support	The description of density is misleading as higher density is often shortened to high density. High density is where you have apartment buildings stacked on top of one another. Recommend the use of the term 'medium density' throughout the District Plan. Consider that further explanation could have been provided in the Section 32 to outline why no minimum net site area is applicable when three or more dwellings are proposed and why the three dwellings threshold was chosen. Compliance with the Design Guides should be required for two or more dwellings rather than three as this would provide a greater sense of consistency.	-	
		85.10	Rule 4A 1.2.1(f) Explanation and Reasons - Accessory Buildings	Support	Adds further explanation. Support the changes.	Recommend the changes are adopted as drafted.	
		85.11	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Conditions – Yard requirements	Support	Generally support changes. Council has not done sufficient investigations in regards to altering this rule. The S32 states that 54% of consents involved side yard non-compliances and hence it is proposed to	Recommend the changes are adopted as drafted.	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					reduce the yards. Has analysis been done to show that reduction in side yard setback will reduce this percentage of consents? Need to be certain that the rule change will achieve the outcome sought. Note that Wellington City does not have side and rear yard requirements expect for a few exceptions. The side yard is not a very useable space. The height of buildings in relation to boundaries will still be moderated by the recession plane requirements. Another option would be to allow 1m yards in the high density area and retain 1.5m yards in other residential areas. May go further towards retaining existing amenity.		
		85.12	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Conditions – Recession Planes and Appendix General Residential 15 and 16	Support	These changes simplify the requirements and bring them into line with the adjoining Councils standards of what is considered to be acceptable levels of shading.	Recommend the changes are adopted as drafted.	
		85.13	Rule 4A 2.1.1(g) Permitted Activity Conditions – Home Occupations	Neutral	Neutral on this change.	-	
		85.14	Rule 4A 2.3(a) Restricted Discretionary Activities and Rule 4A 2.3.1(a) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	Support	Support the changes. Also it should be made clearer in the Discretionary Activity Rule that no minimum site area applies in relation to the development of three or more dwellings.	Recommend the changes are adopted as drafted.	
		85.15	Rule 4A 2.3(i) Restricted Discretionary Activities and Rule 4A 2.3.1(i) Matters of Discretion – Childcare Facilities	Support	Consider this is appropriate given that the matters for which discretion are restricted are generally the main issues raised in an application such as this. For these reasons support the changes.	Recommend the changes are adopted as drafted.	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		85.16	Rule 4A 2.3.1(b) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	Support	This would be a positive change as it enables properties outside the high density area to be considered, thus allowing for more reflection on site specific unique circumstances than currently existing. Support the changes.	Recommend the changes are adopted as drafted.	
		85.17	Rule 4A 2.3.2 Restricted Discretionary Activity (a) – Other Matters	Neutral	This amendment re-numbers the reference to the permitted activity conditions. Neutral on this change.	-	
		85.18	Rule 4A 2.4(m) Discretionary Activities, Rule 4A 2.4.1(c) Assessment Matters – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings, and Appendix General Residential 17	Neutral	Understood that Petone will be the subject of a future plan change tailored more specifically. Are neutral on this. Rule makes intensification more difficult in Eastern Bays and Moera. Reasons for excluding these two areas are not apparent and should have been explained further in the Section 32. Note that Moera is already largely high density and is well connected to public transport and walkable facilities. Eastern Bays has both a bus and ferry service and various walkable facilities. Perhaps the assessment matters need to further to provide guidance as to why this distinction has occurred. Due to lack of explanation it is difficult to say whether we can or cannot support the changes.	-	
		85.19	Ch 4 Appendix General Residential 17, Rule 4A 2.1.1 (j) to (y) and Rule 4A 2.3.1 (b) to (h)	Neutral	Involves re-numbering. Neutral on this change.	-	
		85.20	Ch 4 Appendix General Residential 18 – Design Guides	Support	Support the inclusion of the Design Guides. No specific area requirement has been included for private outdoor space. Would provide the development community with a greater sense of certainty if the amount of space required was specified. If smaller areas are proposed then the consent can consider this. Otherwise some developers will simply do the minimum required. In addition consider that it should be a permitted	-	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					activity condition applying to only the high density areas.		
		85.21	Rule 12.2.1.7(a) Financial Contributions - Reserves	Support	Support the idea of the capped contributions but consider that further investigations need to be undertaken to back up the changes. No justification or analysis has been provided. This change was not signalled in initial consultation. Needs to be some transparency in regarding to summarising existing reserves stocks, outlining what improvements could be made and where further acquisitions are proposed to justify the changes. Based on current information do not believe this would be a defensible position.	-	
		85.22	Ch 14A Transport Appendix 3 – Parking Standards	Support	Support the change as it is consistent with encouraging the use of public transport and walkability of residential area.	-	
		85.23	Subdivision		The Plan Change does not recognise that redeveloped sites with three or more dwellings will most likely be considered as joint subdivision and land use consents or that subdivision will follow construction of the dwellings. Further changes need to be made to the subdivision chapter to make sure it is consistent with the residential rules where three or more dwellings are proposed and it should be clarified that there will be no minimum allotment areas for the subdivision as well as the net site area for the dwelling.	-	
		85.24	High Density Residential Areas		The Section 32 should have included more information about how the high density areas were excluded, including disclosing the edges of particular shopping centres. Otherwise how can anyone understand the Plan Change in respect of their property?	-	
		85.25	Rule 4A 2.1 Permitted Activities		A further connection needs to be added in relation to Permitted Activities. The Plan currently lists permitted activities but this section does not say that the activity is permitted subject to compliance with the permitted activity conditions. This link would make the Plan clearer for a first time reader rather than it being implied.	-	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
Alan Wilmore Webb ██████████ ██████████ Eastbourne	RM16-4-12C-086	86.1	Entire Plan Change		Having settled on which areas are suitable for High Density Residential, that the Council ensure that the integrity of the Plan is maintained and that proposed subdivisions less than specified are declined.	Council puts some integrity back into the District Plan.	Y
Ole Anderson Quadrille Construction Ltd Po Box 38917 Wellington Mail Centre	RM16-4-12C-088	88.1	Ch 3 Definitions Accessory Buildings	-	Support the amendments, however the word habitable is not defined in the Plan Change or District Plan. Clarity for this would enable certainty in decision making. As a guideline advise that a sleepout with amenities such as a toilet, hand basin and shower are permissible for an accessory building. Seems to be in line with the District Plan – additional living space. The addition of cooking facilities could promote the space to an additional residential building.	Seeks a definition of habitable room, space or building.	Y
Cardno TCB c/o Peter Daly PO Box 13 142 Wellington	RM16-4-12C-089	89.1	Ch 3 Definitions Building	-	A threshold of 1.5m for retaining walls is consistent with the requirements of the Building Act and the threshold used by other territorial authorities.	Request that the definition of building exclude retaining walls up to 1.5m height (rather than 1.2m) and decks less than 1m (rather than 500mm).	Y
		89.2	Ch 3 Definitions Permeable Surface	-	Refers to various surfaces that are not considered a permeable surface including any areas that fall within the definition of building coverage and decks that do not allow water to drain through to a permeable surface. However, decks over 500mm in height are now included in the definition of building. Hence it is unclear if a standard timber deck over 500mm high which drains to bare earth will be considered permeable or impermeable.	That the Plan Change is amended to accommodate issues raised.	
		89.3	Rule 4A 1.2.1(a) Explanation and Reasons – Net Site Area	Support	Supports the provision for no net site area for developments of 3 or more dwellings. Allows more innovative design and still allows development to be controlled through other bulk and location standards	-	
		89.4	Rule 4A 1.2.1(f) Explanation and Reasons, Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Conditions,	Support	Support Council justification for removing this rule. Adverse effects of buildings can be sufficiently controlled through rules for maximum height, recession planes, yards and site coverage. Rule is not used	-	



Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			and Appendix General Residential 18 – Building Length		commonly by other councils.		
		89.5	Rule 4A 1.2.1(f) Explanation and Reasons – Accessory Buildings	Support	Supports removal of yard provisions for an accessory building.	-	
		89.6	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Conditions – Yard Requirements	Support	Supports changes to yard provisions as they allow greater flexibility for higher density housing.	-	
		89.7	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Conditions and Appendix General Residential 15 and 16 – Recession Planes	Support	Supports this simplification of recession plans as the 2.5m and 45 degrees is commonly used by most territorial authorities. It also avoids any confusion to homeowners considering future extensions or property work.	-	
		89.8	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Conditions – Permeable Surfaces	Support in part	<p>Support intent but raise the following questions and suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it apply to all forms of residential development? A common requirement of high density housing is low maintenance useable outdoor areas in all weather. On small sites 30% of the site for permeable surfaces may create lawns and gardens that are larger than required. Suggest requirement be reduced to 25% for residential development of 3 or more dwellings.</li> <li>Does it apply to all residential areas? Properties on the stony valley floor may provide suitable drainage but hill suburbs clay soil does not absorb water easily. Recommend that Council apply this requirement only to the General Residential zone and that all other residential zones are exempt from this requirement. Noted that other residential zones have higher minimum site area requirements and it is unlikely that the 35% requirement would be breached.</li> </ul>	That the Plan Change is amended to accommodate issues raised.	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What additional considerations will be required should this requirement not be met?</li> <li>• Could any mitigation options be available as a permitted activity?</li> <li>• How will this be regulated? Most homeowners will not realise that resource consent is required.</li> <li>• No industry standard on permeable surfaces and many materials that may be considered permeable in reality are often not.</li> </ul>		
		89.9	Rule 4A 2.3(a) Restricted Discretionary Activities – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	Support	Supports removal of Comprehensive Residential Development and provision for residential development of 3 or more dwellings on any site (with exception of the excluded areas). It is more common for developments to consist of 3 or 4 units rather than 5 or more.	-	
		89.10	Rule 4A 2.3.1(a) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	-	The Design Guides will provide an indication of good higher density residential development. However, as these are guidelines rather than rules it is uncertain how these will be imposed and how non-conformity will be assessed.	That the Plan Change is amended to accommodate issues raised.	
		89.11	Rule 4A 2.3.1(b) Matters of Discretion – Residential development of 3 or more dwellings	Oppose	Opposes the Councils consideration of public transport facilities and non-residential services on the grounds that it appears to favour those sites close to facilities with less regard to the Design Guide criteria.	That the Plan Change is amended to accommodate issues raised.	
		89.12	Ch 4 Appendix General Residential 17 – Maximum Height	-	Seeks further improvements to the diagrams for maximum height measurement. The diagrams can be confusing, particularly to those unfamiliar with District Plan standards and should be amended to show more realistic building profiles. The definition for height (maximum and maximum overall) should also be simplified.	That the Plan Change is amended to accommodate issues raised.	
		89.13	Rule 12.2.1.7(a) Financial Contributions – Reserves	Support	Supports the maximum level of contribution of reserves.	-	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		89.14	Ch 14A Appendix 3 – Parking Standards	Support	Allows increased flexibility in such developments and reflects market trends for single garages in multi-unit developments.	-	
		89.15	Rule 4A 2.3(b) Restricted Discretionary Activities - Removal of vegetation	-	For a 400sqm site 35% is only 140sqm which is likely to be totally used by buildings. Therefore a driveway and access would exceed the 35% vegetation removal limit.	Requests that “or 35% of the site, whichever the lesser” be deleted from Rule 4A 2.3(b).	
Stephen James Penno [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-090	90.1	Design Guides	-	Significant increase in areas available for infill housing. Important changes are managed carefully. The Design Guides become the major tool for managing new development and their effects. The problem is that they are only guidelines. Discretion is given to Council how the guidelines are interpreted and how they are applied. Creates risk of inconsistency and lack of transparency in approval process. Resolution is to replace with a mandatory development code. Use words such as “will” instead of “should”. Cannot risk the consequences of an inconsistent or trial and error approach.	Seeks a mandatory design code in place of a design guide.	
		90.2	High Density Residential Area – Willoughby Street	-	Section of Willoughby Street proposed for inclusion in Higher Density Residential Area. One side of one end of the street has been included. Natural boundaries, or where these are not suitable, following the rear properties between the streets is a sensible approach applied to other zones/areas and ensures each neighbourhood and street will maintain a common character. There is no feature on Willoughby Street that creates a natural boundary between zones. Creates the possibility that one small section of the street will be developed out of character with the rest of the street. Solution to move the new zone boundary to follow the rear of the properties between Penrose St and Willoughby Street.	Minor change to High Density Residential Area zone boundary on Willoughby Street.	Y
New Zealand Institute of Surveyors c/o A David Gibson	RM16-4-12C-091	91.1	Ch 3 Definitions Building	-	Generally support intention. Request that the threshold for decks to be excluded be increased from 500mm to 1m. A threshold	That the Plan Change be approved with the deletions and amendments as	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
<p>██████████ ██████████ Wellington 6022</p>					<p>for 1m would be more consistent with other District Plans. It is also more closely aligned with the current threshold of 1.2m in the site coverage exclusion. Request that the threshold for including retaining walls as buildings be raised from 1.2m to 1.5m. A threshold of 1.5m is consistent with the Building Act provisions and is also consistent with other Wellington Region Council's.</p>	<p>suggested.</p>	
		91.2	Ch 3 Definitions Permeable Surface	-	<p>Agree with the principal of encouraging permeable surfaces on sites in order to reduce stormwater run-off, the definition needs refinement. Note that a permeable surface must be grassed or planted in trees. However it would be legitimate to include bare soil or gravelled or stony surfaces. Also note that items falling within the definition of building coverage are excluded. However there is no definition for building coverage. Request that allowance be made for minor pathways to be constructed.</p>		
		91.3	Rule 4A 1.2.1(a) Explanation and Reasons – Net Site Area	-	<p>Generally Support.</p>		
		91.4	Rule 4A 1.2.1(f) Explanation and Reasons, Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition and Appendix General Residential 18 – Building Length	Support	<p>Support removal of conditions. The other bulk and location rules adequately control the potential adverse effects of building together with the Design Guides.</p>		
		91.5	Rule 4A 1.2.1(f) Explanation and Reasons – Accessory Buildings and Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity – Yard Requirements	Support	<p>Support amendment to yard setback requirements and exception for an accessory building within a side yard.</p>		

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		91.6	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Condition and Appendix General Residential 15 & 16 – Recession Planes	Support	Support simplification of the recession plane requirement. Also request further amendment to exclude road boundaries from the recession plane requirement, given that a 3m front yard is also required.		
		91.7	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition – Permeable Surface	-	Requirement needs to be refined and tailored for different situations. There should be varying minimum standards for a permeable surface area depending on the soil types and development density provided. Estimated impermeable areas for typical residential development as follows: 400sqm – total impermeable = 65% and 300sqm – total impermeable = 72% (takes coverage, access, outdoor courtyard and other paths into consideration). The minimum of 30% in the General Residential areas could largely be achievable. However in high density areas it could be difficult to achieve. Appears to be no analysis of the impact of the new condition in the Section 32 report. Request that the minimum permeable surface area is 30% except in High Density Residential Areas where the minimum should be 25%. Also request further amendment to provide a new category within the Restricted Discretionary Activities section for when the minimum permeable areas is not provided, with accompanying matters of discretion.		
		91.8	Rule 4A 2.3(a) Restricted Discretionary Activity and Rule 4A 2.3.1(a) Matters of Discretion – Residential devel- opment of 3 or more dwellings	-	Generally support.		
		91.9	Ch 4 Appendix General Residential 17 – Maximum	-	Request that the Appendix be replaced because the diagrams are too simplistic and do not convey the intent of the diagram. In		

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			Height		addition, the diagrams appear to contradict with the definitions of maximum height and maximum overall height.		
		91.10	Rule 12.2.1.7(a) Financial Contributions – Reserves	Support	Support the introduction of a maximum limit per lot on reserve contributions.		
		91.11	Ch 14A Appendix 3 – Parking Standards	Support	Support parking reduction.		
Simon Brown [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5010	RM16-4-12C-092	92.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Conditions – Recession Planes	Oppose	The change will adversely affect neighbouring properties privacy and sun. Current property owners have invested in their properties, including taking advantage of available sun and privacy and should be entitled to some protection of this. Current recession plane rules correctly recognise that more consideration and protection is needed for neighbouring properties to the south. Do not accept that the current rule is unreasonably restrictive to development.	Reject amendment and retain existing recession plane rule.	
Kathryn and Terry McGavin [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-095	95.1	High Density Residential Area – Maungaraki	Oppose	Opposed in principle to extension of High Density Residential Area in Maungaraki. Concerned about the great number of changes proposed at the same time and that Eastern Bays, Petone and Moera have not been included. Do not think that adoption of the Plan Change is desirable or that there is a proven need. Raises issues with greater building coverage, design guides, onsite parking, and extension of the high density area in Maple Grove and Barberry Grove. Need to maintain Hutt's character.	Abandon Plan Change 12 in Maungaraki and reassess other areas.	Y
Jane Johnston [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5011	RM16-4-12C-096	96.1	High Density Residential Area	-	Support the need to review the residential provisions however the Plan Change does not go far enough to encourage intensification and consolidation of built urban form. The S32 report does not provide a rationale for the new zoned area being 5min walking band. The proposed Regional Policy Statement and Regional Growth Strategy both envisage intensification to 10mins walking distance as the rule of thumb.	That the High Density Residential Area be extended to include areas within a 10min walking distance from the edge of the shopping areas. The same should also be applied to all areas within a 10 min walking distance (approx 800m) from all train stations and other key public transport nodes.	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		96.2	Mixed Use Area	-	Intensification of the key shopping and transport nodes should provide not only for high density but for high density mixed use intensification. If provisions are not a bit broader and cover a greater area opportunities will be lost.	Specify the predominant use must be residential but that compatible uses may also be housed within the section and revise the Design Guides to include urban design guidance pertinent to mixed use development, including commercial uses.	
		96.3	Rule 4A 2.1.1 (f) Permitted Activity Conditions – Permeable Surfaces	Support	Support the 30% site permeable provision.	-	
		96.4	Rule 4A 2.1.1 (e) Permitted Activity Conditions – Site Coverage	-	No rationale provided for the 40% site coverage. Why not 50% or 60%? The 40% ought to be a minimum footprint if the intention is to achieve intensification of people and housing choice.	Provide for greater site coverage for more units within a lot. The maximum ought to be set at 50% or 60% and the Design Guides strengthened to ensure appropriate onsite treatments and offsite connectivity and coherence.	
		96.5	Design Guides	-	The Design Guide is very internal to a particular lot in question. While that serves one part of the purpose of a design guide, good quality urban design demands each lot must not be treated in isolation but must be set in its context. Very few of the lots currently zoned high density or proposed high density are of sufficient scale to warrant stand alone consideration.	Revise the Design Guides to include off site context treatment. Each lot must be developed in line with good quality urban design, not just housing design or within lot design.	
		96.6	Rule 4A 2.1.1 (c) Permitted Activity Conditions – Recession Planes	Support	Support the revision to 45 degrees.	-	
		96.7	Comprehensive Residential Development	Support in part	Support removal of the term comprehensive residential development but seek appropriate provisions to encourage urban intensification, rather than simply high density residential development.	-	
		96.8	High density Residential Area	-	Seek amendments so that mixed use could be encouraged in a way that brings these uses together better, to consolidate urban	Reconsider the areas zoned High Density Residential to include areas connecting not	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					form and function.	only to key shopping areas and train stations but also key education precincts located near or between these areas.	
		96.9	High Density Residential Area – Knights Rd	-	The proposed High Density Residential area has been applied to parts of Knights Rd and to Cudby St. This block provides an example where there is easily a natural extension of the rezoned area which includes the Waterloo train station, Hutt Intermediate and up to the CBD.	Rezone the block bordered by Knights Rd, Willoughby St, Wilford St and Pohutukawa Rd within the new High Density Residential Area.	
		96.10	Rule 4A 2.1.1 (b) Permitted Activity Conditions – Yard Requirements	Support	Support the changes to the yard provisions.	-	
		96.11	Ch 14A Appendix 3 Parking Standards	Support	Support the changes to the parking requirements.	-	
		96.12	Accessory Buildings	Support	Support the provisions for accessory buildings.	-	
		96.13	Rule 12.2.1.7(a) Financial Contributions – Reserves	Support in part	Support the reserve contribution provisions however the section needs to clarify these will be required for subdivisions and not for developments.	-	
NZ Transport Agency c/o Olena Harrison PO Box 5084 Lambton Quay Wellington 61545	RM16-4-12C-097	97.1	Entire Plan Change	-	The Plan Change proposes a strategic step towards achieving some of the shorter term impacts that the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding (GPS) seeks. The proposed amendments encourage an integrated planning approach by adopting strategic land use zoning that will help make the best use of the existing transport networks. The Plan Change also supports the vision of the Wellington Regional Land Transport Strategy whereby people will need to travel less and live closer to their main destinations for work and play. Overall it is considered that the Plan Change is aligned with the NZTS, GPS and Wellington Regional Land Transport Strategy for growth within Hutt City.	-	N
		97.2	Design Guides	-	Whilst support the introduction of the Design Guides, considers that the amenity values it	-	



Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					seeks should also include reverse sensitivity effects of land use development on existing transportation routes. To this end the Design Guides could include methodologies that protect key transport routes from reverse sensitivity effects.		
		97.3	Ch 14A Appendix 3 Parking Standards	-	Support the reduced car parking requirements for multi-unit housing. Such a requirement will help encourage greater use of public transport, cycling, walking and car pooling and thus help reduce reliance on the private motorcar.	-	
		97.4	Cycling and Walking Strategy	-	Understands that the Plan Change has been premised on a number of existing Hutt City Council policies, including the Cycling Strategy and Hutt City Walking Strategy. Supports the use of these policies when considering land use development in Hutt City as this will help to encourage the uptake of walking and cycling as alternative modes of travel.	-	
Richard William Perry Johnston Lawrence ██████████ ██████ ██████████ Wellington 6140	RM16-4-12C-098	98.1	High Density Residential Housing	Oppose	Objects to all aspects of the change which liberalise controls allowing an increased density of residential housing, including: increase in site coverage; reduction in side yards; encroachment of accessory building into side yard; liberalisation of building envelope planes; and amendment to home occupation exception. Grounds for objection include: increased density conflicts with historical cultural needs of the majority of citizens; increased density will be destructive of the cities heritage as a garden residential city; higher density housing does not provide for needs of most families and triggers social problems; liberalisation of site coverage controls permits larger homes but does not necessarily create increase in population; increased density creates excessive stress on infrastructure; and increased density does not ease traffic congestion.	Delete proposed amendments relaxing restrictions on high density development which are redevelopment of mature residential areas. And satisfy high density goals by apartment and townhouse construction in locations that will not adversely affect existing residential areas – Riverside and Greenfields areas.	
Petone Planning Action Group	RM16-4-12C-099	99.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity	Support	A minimum 30% permeable area is a positive move. Have been told permeable	-	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
c/o Pam Hanna PO Box 33 326 Petone 5046			Condition – Permeable Surfaces		decks under 1m do not require building consent, so the 500mm might not make a lot of sense.		
		99.2	Design Guides	Support	Development of design guides is a positive step. However landscape and open area issues need to also be addressed in terms of ensuring plentiful open space within and around any higher density areas. A useable outdoor courtyard area is needed for each residence with minimum dimensions. The Design Guides themselves do not seem strong enough or detailed enough.	-	
		99.3	Rule 4A 2.4 Discretionary Activities – Residential Development of 3 or more dwellings	Support	Agree that development of 3 or more dwellings in Petone, Eastern Bays and Moera residential areas should be fully discretionary.	-	
		99.4	Rule 4A 1.2.1(a) Explanation and Reasons – Net Site Area	-	What is proposed is no minimum physical site size, plus no minimum size of residential units, smaller side yards, reduced recession planes and buildings longer than 20m. This could result in unsightly long rows of very small residential units. How will bulk and location issues be managed?	-	
		99.5	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition – Building Length	-	This rule was instituted to stop the development of what were referred to as sausage blocks. They are still not desirable. Yards, recession planes and site coverage are stated as three standard bulk and location requirements that Councils rely on instead of trying to control building length. The Plan Change seeks to reduce these requirements so how will bulk and location issues be managed?	Maximum building length of 20m needs to be retained.	
		99.6	Minimum Size for Residential Units	-	Set a minimum size for residential units to avoid the unsustainable examples in Auckland.	-	
		99.7	Yard Requirements	-	Rather than have a blanket reduction, there should be a rationale for the existence of yards coupled with the possibility of no side yard in some instances. Depending on the orientation – zero space in a side yard that is	Side and rear yard issue should be reconsidered.	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					then made up for in the back yard might be suitable. The Plan Change and Design Guides would need to spell out when, where and how having no yards would be acceptable. Would allow for variety in design and visual effects.		
		99.8	Recession Planes	-	Sunlight is more valuable and possible on some boundaries than others. Therefore there has to be a retained difference. Current recession planes are based on logic.	Keep current differentiated recession planes.	
		99.9	Rule 4A 2.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Childcare Facilities	-	In residential areas up to 30 children is too many. Major difference in noise and other effects between 5 and 30 children plus staff. Should be no more than 12 or 15 children and need to have at least 3m distance between outdoor play areas and neighbouring residential sites. They also need to provide all day parking for staff and parents drop off/pick up. Childcare facilities in residential areas should be full discretionary, not restricted.	-	
		99.10	Rule 4A 2.1.1(g) Permitted Activity Conditions – Home Occupations	-	Parking space requirements seem over the top when multi-units are only meant to require 1 carpark per dwelling.	-	
		99.11	Ch 14A Appendix 3 Parking Standards	-	One parking space per unit is not necessarily going to be sufficient as young adults own cars as well as parents, plus work cars. Transport system is far from perfect so this relaxation could cause problems in the future.	-	
		99.12	Rule 4A 2.1.1(e) Permitted Activity Conditions – Site Coverage	-	Is too blanket a change. The proposed blanket 400m radius is too generic as it may not be appropriate to have solid mass of higher intensity development all around any town centre. Thought needs to be given to building types, shapes and sizes that might work in particular places.	-	
		99.13	Rule 4A 2.3.1 Matters of Discretion – Development of 3 or more dwellings	-	This reads as if there could be 3 or more dwellings on any residential site in the Hutt and needs to be deleted. Enlarges the scope for higher density residential developments anywhere in the Hutt.	-	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		99.14	Alicetown	-	Alicetown needs to be left out of this exercise or it should be designated a character area with protection against demolition of houses built before 1930. Alicetown is the gateway to Petone from the north and is very close in character to Petone.	-	
Ruth Fletcher [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-100	100.1	Ch 4 Appendix General Residential 17	Oppose	Clarification is required regarding the meaning of the maximum height requirements. The sketch provided completely fails as an explanation.	Further amend Amendment 31 by providing further explanatory notes.	Y
		100.2	Ch 3 Definitions – Building	Oppose	Further clarification is required regarding built-in seating or barrier rails. Limits provision of decks to provide for accessibility, particularly where ground level varies. Definition also has impact on maximum length and site coverage as it pertains to fences. Does not seem reasonable to require fence areas to be measured or limited.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retain existing subclause (d);</li> <li>2. Amend subclause (d) by removing the area requirement;</li> <li>3. Provide explanatory notes regarding barrier rails to decks;</li> <li>4. Further review the definition of Building with regards to fences as it impacts on statements relating to site coverage and maximum length.</li> </ol>	
		100.3	Rules 4A 1.2.1 and 4A 1.2.1(f) Explanation and Reasons and Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Conditions	Oppose	Has potential to significantly reduce the amenity value of open space currently available to existing property owners. In conjunction with yard requirements, it encourages development of courtyard open spaces on the northern side of developments with longer walls on the southern side. For existing homeowners to the south or east this means outlook to open space on adjacent properties would be lost; likely increase in shading on open space and dwellings; and consequently loss of solar gain. Could also mean that sea views are lost.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not accept Amendments 11, 13 and 18. And before considering further change:</li> <li>2. Require modelling be completed to demonstrate the solar impact and life cost the change is likely to have for existing property owners.</li> </ol>	
		100.4	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Conditions – Yard Requirements	Oppose	While there will always be circumstances where the yards could be reduced without adverse affects, the reduction to 1m unnecessarily removes protection to existing home owners. A number of impacts: reduced	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not accept Amendment 15. And before considering further change:</li> <li>2. Require modelling be</li> </ol>	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					sunlight provision and passive solar gain; increased heating costs; and compromises yard amenity potential. Particularly when in conjunction with change to recession planes and permitted eave projections.	completed to demonstrate the solar impact and life cost the change is likely to have for existing property owners.	
		100.5	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Conditions – Recession Planes	Oppose	In conjunction with yard requirement changes, has the potential for significant additional adverse effects on existing properties located to the south or east of new developments. To be quantified sun studies would need to be completed. Effects include reduction in sunlight provision and consequent reduction in passive solar gain and increase in heating costs for affected owners.	1. Not accept Amendment 16. And before considering further change: 2. Require modelling be completed to demonstrate the solar impact and life cost the change is likely to have for existing property owners.	
		100.6	Rule 4A 2.1.1(e) Permitted Activity Conditions – Site Coverage	Oppose	Change is likely to have most impact on single level properties and property owners wishing to develop decks to take advantage of views.	1. Not accept deletion of the last paragraph of Amendment 17; and 2. Delete the reference to the area in the last paragraph of sub-clause (e).	
		100.7	Design Guides	Oppose	Provision of design guides has the potential to significantly increase the cost of resource consent applications. Gives Council significant discretion as design opinion is largely subjective. Means that resource consent applications will be subject to more uncertainty and additional costs.	1. Hold the introduction of the Design Guides; and 2. A detailed cost benefit analysis be completed which demonstrates the costs and benefits to the community, applicants and affected property owners.	
		100.8	Ch 14A Appendix 3 Parking Standards	Oppose	Change promotes development of 3 or more dwellings on a single site and is unfair to development of single or two dwelling units or homes and income.	1. Not accept Amendment 37; or 2. Further amend the car-parking requirements to make it more equitable for single and two dwelling properties.	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
R J & B M Deller [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5010	RM16-4-12C-101	101.1	Higher Density Residential Areas	Oppose	Oppose the additions to Higher Density Area, especially in Alicetown as they would affect the amenity values of the area. Most of the residential sections are quite small and multiple, multi-storey dwellings will reduce the amenity through reduced privacy, more vehicular traffic and more noise. The fault line goes through Alicetown and is it wise to increase housing density so close to the fault line especially as there is now petrol storage very close to the fault line.	Delete Amendments 12, 29 and 30. Remove additions to Higher Density Area in Alicetown.	Y
		101.2	Site Coverage	Oppose	The provisions will facilitate higher density development.	-	
		101.3	Recession Planes	Oppose	The provisions will facilitate higher density development.	Delete Amendment 16.	
		101.4	Yard Requirements	Oppose	Oppose the reduction in the width of side and rear yards.	Delete Amendment 15.	
Gaye Langridge [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-102	102.1	Ch 3 Definitions and Rules 4A1.2.1 and 4A2.1.1 - Permeable Surfaces	Support	-	That the Council should discuss Plan Change 12 more with people that the areas of High Density are proposed for and will affect.	Y
		102.2	Rules 4A1.1.2, 4A 1.2.1 and 4A 2.3.1(a) Design Guides	Support	Design guides need to cover landscaping and green areas for developments.		
		102.3	Rule 4A 2.4 Discretionary Activities	Support	Development of 3 or more dwellings in Petone, Eastern Bays and Moera General Residential Activity Areas and Higher Density Areas should be fully discretionary.		
		102.4	Rule 4A 2.3 (a) Restricted Discretionary Activities	Support	Development of 3 or more dwelling houses on any site, excluding Petone, Eastern Bays and Moera General Residential Activity Areas and Higher Density Areas should be totally discretionary.		
		102.5	Rule 4A 2.1.1 (e)	Oppose	Communities need more information.		

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
			Site Coverage				
		102.6	Rules 4A 1.2.1 and 4A 2.1.1(b) Building Length and Yard Requirements	Oppose	A lot of residents in Petone in particular are already close to their neighbours.		
Tui Lewis [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-103	103.1	Ch 3 Definitions and Rules 4A1.2.1 and 4A2.1.1 - Permeable Surfaces	Support	-	Council decisions affecting such a large part of the City should have more consultation with the ratepayers concerned.	Y
		103.2	Rules 4A1.1.2, 4A 1.2.1 and 4A 2.3.1(a) Design Guides	Support	Design guides need to cover landscaping and green areas for developments. It would be good if design guides could encourage energy savings concepts.		
		103.3	Rule 4A 2.4 Discretionary Activities	Support	Development of 3 or more dwellings in Petone, Eastern Bays and Moera General Residential Activity Areas and Higher Density Areas should be fully discretionary.		
		103.4	Rule 4A 2.3 (a) Restricted Discretionary Activities	Support	Development of 3 or more dwelling houses on any site, excluding Petone, Eastern Bays and Moera General Residential Activity Areas and Higher Density Areas should be totally discretionary.		
		103.5	Rule 4A 2.1.1 (e) Site Coverage	Oppose	Communities need more information.		
		103.6	Rules 4A 1.2.1 and 4A 2.1.1(b) Building Length and Yard Requirements	Oppose	A lot of residents in Petone in particular are already close to their neighbours.		
		103.7	Higher Density Residential Areas	Oppose	Higher Density Areas as proposed outweigh predicted growth and restrict people from growing vegetables and having their own yards to play in.		
Chilton Saint James School c/o NMA Association Ltd Po Box 5218 Wellington	RM16-4-12C-104	104.1	Rule 4A 2.4(e) Discretionary Activities – Education Facilities	Oppose	Classification of all educational facilities as fully discretionary activities in the General Residential Activity Area is unduly onerous and inconsistent with the designation mechanisms available to state funded schools. The Plan Change does not adequately provide for the sustainable management of the school's resources.	Alternative (a): Provide for a subzone provision for private education or as a scheduled site in respect of Chilton St James campus. Amend activity status for refurbishment of existing school buildings and existing outdoor facilities to controlled activity status.	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
						<p>Alternative (b): Amend the existing approach in the Plan and revise objectives, policies and criteria for new residential development and non-residential development. Amend activity status for refurbishment of existing school buildings and existing outdoor facilities to controlled activity status. Amend the activity status for new development work to a restricted discretionary.</p>	
		104.2	Rules and Design Guides	Oppose	<p>Too general to adequately promote a satisfactory quality of residential development. There is no requirement for north orientation of dwelling units, no minimum area for private outdoor space per unit, no minimum net site area for units where 3 or more units, no consideration of effects to streetscape. Criteria proposed for Rule 4A 2.4.1 (Discretionary Activities) should be included in the criteria for Rule 4A 2.3.1 (a) (Restricted Discretionary). The Plan Change does not include objective/ performance standards for different types of households. Does not provide for small parks to offset increased recreational demand or visual amenity among infill housing and redeveloped properties. Does not address the need for increased connectivity between schools, recreation/open space facilities and new housing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council should undertake structure planning and land acquisition evaluation to provide for additional open space and connections. Include open space and other designations to achieve these in areas of the General Residential Activity Area north of the Hutt Recreation Ground to the Hutt River.</li> <li>• Rules and design guides for multi-unit development should include more detailed amenity measures with minimum performance measures.</li> </ul>	
		104.3	Removal of Vegetation	Oppose	<p>Permitted criteria for removal of up to 500sqm of vegetation/40% of a site has the potential to significantly impact on the visual qualities of the Map 12 area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend Design Guides and other provisions to protect and enhance visual values and retain significant trees. Removal of trees over 8m in height should be a restricted discretionary activity.</li> <li>• Provide for vegetation</li> </ul>	



Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
						clearance of up to 200sqm, where trees are up to 8m height, as a controlled activity. For an increased clearance area classify as a restricted discretionary activity.	
		104.4	Traffic and Parking	Oppose	The Plan Change should provide for traffic and parking effects of high density housing in Waterloo Road and Knights Road vicinities and the need for on-site drop off and pick up areas associated with day care facilities and the need for on-site visitor parking where there are more than 3 units per site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include criteria to address matters, in particular the adequacy of vehicle and pedestrian access proposed for new residential development of 3 plus unit development.</li> <li>• Require staff parking for educational facilities to a ratio of 1 space per full time staff members, delete requirement for parking for students 16 years and over.</li> <li>• Provide for consideration of a reduction in parking requirements within the Chilton campus.</li> </ul>	
Brian Thomas Desmond [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-105	105.1	Rule 12.2.1.7 (a) Financial Contributions - Reserves	Support	Supports a maximum dollar value for reserve contributions. Appropriate to provide for distinction between rural and rural residential subdivisions as well because of the difference in densities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt proposed change and introduce maximum rate for rural subdivisions.</li> <li>• Refund rural developers for contributions made in the last 12 months.</li> </ul>	N
Holmes David Ltd c/o Alan Davis [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-106	106.1	Building Length	-	Beneficial to delete angle control line in respect of multi-unit development but it should be retained for single houses adjoining site also with single houses.	Retain the building length rule for single unit houses adjoining single unit houses.	N
Thomas Glendwr Gardner Evans [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-107	107.1	Entire Plan Change	Support	Seeks minor wording amendments and clarification in relation to Rule 4A 1.1.2(c), 4A 2.1.1(e) and Rule 12.2.1.7 (a)	Approve the Plan Change with attention to any minor wording changes required.	Y
John & Julie Martin [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-108	108.1	Rule 12.2.1.7 (a) Financial Contributions - Reserves	Support	Amend to remove the word "dollar" as the current wording is ambiguous.	That the rule should be amended to exclude the word dollar.	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
Emerson & Ruth Willard [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5011	RM16-4-12C-109	109.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Condition – Yard Requirement	Oppose	Opposes reduction of the width of side and rear yards from 1.5m to 1m.	Maintain the 1.5m yard requirement.	Y
		109.2	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Condition – Recession Planes	Oppose	Opposes the reduction in natural lighting in west facing sites.	-	
Emerson & Ruth Willard [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5011	RM16-4-12C-110	110.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition - Building Length	Oppose	Opposes the removal of the building length rule.	Retain the building length rule.	Y
Elizabeth Grace and Poh-Khean Tan [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-111	111.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Condition – Yard Requirement	Oppose	Opposes reduction of the width of side and rear yards from 1.5m to 1m.	Retain the existing rule.	Y
		111.2	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition - Building Length	Oppose	Opposes the removal of the building length rule.	Retain the existing rule.	
Elizabeth & Clarence Goodhue [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-112	112.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition - Building Length	Oppose	Opposes the removal of the building length rule.	Retain the existing rule.	Y
		112.2	Rule 4A 2.1.1(b) Permitted Activity Condition – Yard Requirement	Oppose	Opposes reduction of the width of side and rear yards from 1.5m to 1m.	Retain the existing rule.	
B Hogan [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-113	113.1	Design Guides	-	The Plan Change does not include the specific Design Guides referred to in the Plan Change, and therefore the public is unable to accurately or clearly establish what the anticipated environmental effects and outcomes of the proposed Plan Change will be and therefore make informed submissions. If amendments have the effect of introducing High Density Residential to that part of Petone on the northern side of Jackson Street. Any such amendments are opposed.	Further consideration of the plan Change be deferred or alternatively those components that relate to the identification of High Density Residential Ares and the development of 3 or more dwellings be withdrawn, until such time that the Design Guides are developed for consultation.	-
Mr Dave Holly [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5010	RM16-4-12C-114	114.1	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Danger of further constricting area. Preserve natural daylight, wind flow through properties, current amenity value.	Fair and equitable decision.	N

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
Greater Wellington Regional Council Ling Phang PO Box 11646 Wellington 6142	RM16-4-12C-115	115.1	Rule 4A 1.1.2(c) Policy - Design Guides	-	As the Design Guides are already developed, the wording of the policy should indicate that the guides should be "used".	Reword as follows: <i>That design guides be <del>developed</del> used to direct and encourage.....</i>	Y
		115.2	Rule 4A 1.1.2 Explanation and Reasons	Support	The benefits of higher density development in strategically placed locations be reflected in the policy explanation.	Add further explanation as follows: <i>...Higher Density such as multi unit housing will support more sustainable transport systems by reducing travel distances and increasing opportunities for trips to be made by active modes.</i>	
		115.3	Rule 4A 1.1.2 Objectives, Policies, Explanation and Reasons.	-	There is a lack of recognition of the importance of connection to and integration with existing facilities and infrastructure, in the current policy framework for higher density residential development in the District Plan.	Add wording as follows: Objective <i>To ensure opportunity is made for higher density residential development.....where amenity values will not be affected adversely and where there is appropriate servicing of development.</i>  Policy <i>That opportunity for higher dwelling densities be made.....where amenity values will not be affected adversely and where there is appropriate servicing of development.</i>  Explanation and Reasons <i>... The aim is to provide for the intensification of land use, which is well designed and integrated with existing infrastructure, within the urban areas. The Design Guides are used as a planning tool to facilitate</i>	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
						<u>neighbourhoods that are sustainable, well connected, and safe.</u>	
		115.4	Design Guides	-	The Design Guides should also include design elements that promote implementation of low impact, environmentally sustainable design as the Design Guides may apply to significant subdivisions within the existing urban footprint on either infill sites or brown field sites.	The Design Guides be strengthened by incorporating the key low impact environmentally sustainable design elements such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimise additional stormwater runoff resulting from development.</li> <li>• Incorporate existing watercourse into a stormwater plan that uses natural drainage to reduce runoff beyond the site.</li> <li>• Other suitable techniques that might also assist in reducing stormwater runoff including the use of rain tanks, rain gardens and permeable paving.</li> <li>• Protect areas of native bush where possible.</li> <li>• Maintain streams, watercourses and wetlands.</li> </ul>	
		115.5	Rule 4A 1.2.1(g) Policy - Permeable Surfaces	-	The policy should also aim to minimise stormwater runoff resulting from development as additional stormwater runoff can lead to erosion and degradation of water quality in the receiving environment.	Reword as follows: ... <u>To minimise runoff resulting from development by using alternative design solutions such as setting aside a set minimum permeable surface area for development.</u>	
		115.6	Rule 4A 1.2.1(j) Policy - Design Guides	-	Policy needs to better recognise the importance of the interrelationship between development and infrastructure.	Amend as follows: (i) <u>To establish Design Guides.....with surrounding development patterns and integration with existing infrastructure.</u>	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		115.7	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition - Permeable Surfaces	Support	Supports permitted activity condition (f) which requires a minimum of 30% of the net site area be of permeable surface.	-	
		115.8	Rule 4A 2.3.1 Matters of Discretion	-	Supports the inclusion of a new matter of consideration for residential development of 3 or more units outside the High Density Residential Area. However this matter is not linked to a policy that sets out the outcome to be achieved by giving consideration to this matter.	Add new Policy: <i>(d) To encourage any residential development of three or more units outside the Higher Density Residential Area (i.e. the additional sites as proposed by proposed plan change 12) to be located within reasonable walking distances to transport facilities, non-residential services and retail activities.</i>	
		115.9	Rule 4A 2.4.1 Assessment Matters	Support	Supports new assessment criteria for Discretionary Activities which considers the availability of public transport facilities, non-residential services and retail activities.	-	
		115.10	Higher Density Residential Areas	-	Some areas that are included are located within the Waiwhetu/Awamutu floodplain. Can see benefits of extending the areas, however it is important to understand that the Waiwhetu/Awamutu floodplain is directly affected by flooding and in particular the links between flood hazard risk and land use and human activities. Flood hazard affecting communities within the floodplain should be recognised through this Plan Change as is already the case in other areas of the Hutt.	The Plan Change needs to better recognise the hazard associated with building within the floodplain and other areas susceptible to flood hazard events or stormwater flooding (up to and including 1 in 100 year events), for higher density residential development.	
Lisa Shanon Heberley [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-116	116.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition - Building Length	Support	Supports the deletion of the building length rule as consent process for adding an extension cost \$6000 and 8 months delay.	Support amendment.	N
Nigel Oxley & Fiona Christeller [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-117	117.1	Ch 3 Definitions - Building	-	Submits that the exclusion of decks less than 500mm in height from the definition of Building should be revised to: 1. Allow for standard construction methods and clearances as required by the Building Code. 2. Come into alignment with the provisions for work not requiring a Building Consent.	Amend the proposed change to read: <i>(d) decks less than 1000mm in height</i>	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		117.2	Ch 3 Definitions - Building Height	-	The District Plan makes no provision for domestic energy generation. The definitions of Building and Height should be amended to include exclusions: 1. Solar panel collectors with a limit on the area and height intrusions 2. Wind power generators, both vertical and horizontal axis turbines with a limit on height, blade sweep and noise generation.	A comprehensive restructuring of the height/yard exclusions for service structures (flagpoles?) to houses by creating an appendix with the type of structures and their relevant dimensional controls set out.	
		117.3	Ch 3 Definitions – Dwelling House	-	The definition of Dwelling House needs to be clarified as it includes B&B facilities by including boarder/lodgers but then there is an exclusion for (b) visitor accommodation.	Include B&B in the inclusive section of the definition.	
		117.4	Ch 3 Definitions - Permeable Surfaces	-	Definition takes a very limited view of control methods for stormwater management. Other methods could be included: 1. Roof water storage tanks 2. Ground water collection tanks Proposal may not be suitable in some situations such as a small site in a retirement complex may benefit from providing outside spaces with paved surfaces suitable for semi ambulant occupants and holding passive solar energy.	Include provisions for meeting storm water control by various methods or combinations of methods.	
		117.5	Ch 3 Definitions - Permeable Surfaces	-	Subject to decisions on above submission, the definition is confusing.	Redraft definition as follows: <i>Permeable Surface: any part of a site which is <del>grassed or planted in trees or shrubs</del> and is capable of absorbing water.....</i>	
		117.6	Rule 4A 1.2.1 (g) permeable surface	-	Subject to decisions on above submission, amend policy.	Policy to read as follows: <i>(g) To establish a minimum storm water retention capacity to assist with the sustainable management of stormwater.</i>	
		117.7	4A 2.1.1(b)(i) Policy - Yard Requirements	Oppose	The 5m setback from the front boundary for garages and carports could result in significant loss of recreational space and permeable surfaces on the remainder of the site.	Delete Subclause (i).	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		117.8	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Conditions - Recession Planes	-	Recession planes on road boundaries should be treated in the same way as access legs/ROW boundaries. It should be calculated from either the centre line or the opposite side of the road. This will allow more designs sympathetic to existing colonial areas with 2 story buildings and gable end roof construction. It would also allow more sensible development on sites with ground rising from the road boundary. Exclude "service structures" from the recession plan.	Redraft the amendment to calculate road boundary recession planes from the opposite side of the road.	
		117.9	4A 2.1.1(e) Permitted Activity Condition - Building Coverage	-	The definition of Building within the Plan and the Building Act includes decks and other garden improvements such as pergolas, arbours, seating and fish ponds. This may not be the intention of the Plan and needs to be addressed.	Clarify the definition of Building in terms of Temporary and Moveable. Extend the list of exclusions.	
		117.10	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted activity Conditions - Permeable Surfaces	-	As currently drafted the reference to decks conflicts with definition of permeable surface if the deck is over 500mm high and is covered by the definition if under 500mm.	Remove reference to decks.	
		117.11	Rule 4A 2.1.1(g) Permitted activity Conditions - Home Occupations	-	Why is additional carparking required for people working on the site in addition to one required for the person living there. The people working on the site could park on the road during the day and thereby retain space on the site for residential use.	Redraft subclause (iii) OR delete subclause (iii).	
		117.12	Rule 4A 2.3.1 Matters of Discretion – Residential devel- opment of 3 or more units	-	The provisions for 3 or more dwellings seem to assume that it will be applied to low income areas and require that facilities are within walking distance. While it would be nice if everyone could easily walk to the local shops it is not a provision we impose on all developments. It is submitted that this will be used by a range of developments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete new matter to be considered in relation to residential development of 3 or more dwelling houses on sites located outside the Higher Density Residential Area.</li> <li>Delete clause (c) (iii) from Assessment Matters for Discretionary Activities.</li> </ul>	
		117.13	Rule 4D 2.4(g) Discretionary Activities - Dairies	-	Limits gross floor areas of dairies to 100m <sup>2</sup> . If retail access to all residential areas is to be encouraged, this should be increased to a reasonable size.	Amend subclause.	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		117.14	Building Height	-	In relation to the two methods of height control, the diagrams in Appendix 16 seem to be missing some lines and do not help clarify the meaning of the controls.	Redraft the height definitions. Redraw Appendix 16. Include reference to revised service structures if submission in respect of height is accepted.	
James Arthur Juno [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-118	118.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition - Building Length	Support	Submitter has had problems getting a new consent on an existing building previously over 20m long.	Support amendment.	Y
Belinda Jane Burgess [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5011	RM16-4-12C-119	119.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition - Building Length	Support	Submitter could not extend garage due to this rule but could if it was detached.	Support amendment.	Y
Dave Steven Heberley [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-120	120.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(f) Permitted Activity Condition - Building Length	Support	Supports the deletion of the building length rule as consent process for adding an extension cost \$6000 and 8 months delay.	Support amendment.	N
K.J Hawley & John Langford [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5010	RM16-4-12C-121	121.1	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Proposed Plan Change would destroy the special residential character of the central Hutt by permitting sites to be developed in a way which will encourage on rear yards which currently allow for trees, gardens and children's play areas.	Retention of current provisions.	Y
Linda Margaret Mead [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-122	122.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity - Recession Planes	-	Changing the recession plane for buildings to the north, west and east of an affected party from 37.5 deg to 45 deg will seriously increase the amount of sunlight lost. Coupled with the proposed removal of the building length rule and reducing the yard requirement to 1m, the effect would be serious.	Retain the recession plane requirement of 37.5 deg for the south, west and east. If simplification of the rule is necessary then make it all 37.5 deg.	Y
Hugo and Eva van Stratum [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-123	123.1	Higher Density Residential	Oppose	Opposes the high density development in our attractive (Alicetown) suburb as it is likely to create lots of willing people to live in it and make it not so attractive. Would like the status of the suburb to be in the nature and character of its Edwardian and Victorian influence to be more preserved. Do not want homes to be looking as if they are more squashed than they are already.	Council should have a look at a zero population grow policy that will hopefully increase our quality of life so pollution from fumes and noise will at least stabilise.	Y



Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
The Masonic Villages Trust C/- Paul Thomas Environmental Management Services Ltd Po Box 29024 Wellington	RM16-4-12C-124	124.1	Health Care Services	-	The Plan Change fails to provide and appropriate resource management control regime for the Masonic Villages Trust's residential care facility at Wai-iti Crescent Lower Hutt, by the retention of provisions that class existing health care services and residential facilities as discretionary activities. The activities of the facility should be given the status of a permitted activity on the site to avoid the cost and uncertainty associated with ongoing management of the assets. The Environment Court has supported the scheduling of existing non residential activities within a residential zone in these circumstances and the District Plan has adopted such an approach for the Raphael House Rudolph Steiner School in Belmont.	1. Permitted Activity status for residential facility and health care services on Lot 2 DP 23283 and part Lot 1 DP 302798 being the land associated with the existing Woburn Masonic Village at Wai-iti Crescent Lowe Hutt. 2. Amendment to the maximum height of buildings and structures for this site to 13m.	Y
Frances Geraldine Baldock [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5013	RM16-4-12C-125	125.1	Higher Density Residential Development	Oppose	Opposes the relaxation of all the protection for basic values – light, sun, space, balance and a firm recognition of Kiwi values that should not be eroded.	To maintain zoning and protection of rights of residents to reject buildings.	Y
St Orans College c/o Elizabeth Coe 550 High Street Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-128	128.1	Entire Plan Change	-	The Board would object to the Plan Change if it could result in any impacts that may be negative to the future opportunities for the college. The college would like a copy of the summary of submissions.	-	-
Grant Roberts [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-132	132.1	Higher Density Residential Areas	Oppose	There is no necessity to provide further for future growth and there should be no extension to the Higher Density Residential areas in the city. It would be particularly intrusive to introduce such areas to the Western Hills or other outlying areas of the city where such developments would have a detrimental impact on the more natural character of the environment.	-	-
		132.2	Net Site Area	Oppose	Lot sizes of less than 500m2 should not be retained.	-	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		132.3	Building Length	Oppose	The existing building length provisions should be retained.	-	
		132.4	Permeable Surfaces	Support	Supports the proposal to introduce a requirement for a minimum permeable surface area to reduce stormwater runoff.	-	
Holly Fung [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-133	133.1	Higher Density Residential Areas - Maungaraki	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to allow subdivision of land into minimum 300sqm in Maungaraki because the Maungaraki hills is a spacious, comfortable living place. It will down grade the value of houses.	-	Y
Kusel Family Trust [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-134	134.1	Higher Density Residential Areas - St Columbans	Oppose	Oppose the Higher Density Residential zoning of St Columbans Monastery as it will change the nature of the neighbourhood and affect values of surrounding properties and is in conflict with 4B of the Plan.	Delete St Columbans monastery from the amendment.	Y
Robert Bagshaw [REDACTED] Lower Hutt 5012	RM16-4-12C-135	135.1	Design Guides	-	Design guides must be detailed, specific.	Design guides must be instituted.	Y
		135.2	Site Coverage and Permeable Surfaces	-	Site coverage must be carefully planned incorporating permeable surfaces.	Permeable surfaces must be instituted.	
		135.3	Higher Density Residential Areas	-	-	Residential development of 3 or more dwelling houses of sites in Petone, Eastern Bays, Moera must be fully discretionary.	
Margaret & David Kennedy [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-136	136.1	Childcare Centres	-	The assessment criteria do not deal with all the issues as more general amenity and streetscape effects are likely as well as traffic, parking and noise effects. Childcare centres are not compatible in quieter residential streets, especially on constrained sites. There can also be cumulative effects so a stipulation of no new centre in close proximity to an existing centre in residential areas is also necessary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More general amenity and streetscape effects have to be able to be assessed.</li> <li>• That any granting of consent for childcare centres for more than 5 children is fully discretionary, not restricted discretionary.</li> <li>• That a proximity restriction such as 250m be instituted.</li> </ul>	Y
Bob Gillies [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-137	137.1	Childcare Centres	-	The assessment criteria do not deal with all the issues as more general amenity and streetscape effects are likely as well as traffic, parking and noise effects. Childcare centres are not compatible in quieter residential streets, especially on constrained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More general amenity and streetscape effects have to be able to be assessed.</li> <li>• That any granting of consent for childcare centres</li> </ul>	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
					sites. There can also be cumulative effects so a stipulation of no new centre in close proximity to an existing centre in residential areas is also necessary.	for more than 5 children is fully discretionary, not restricted discretionary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That a proximity restriction such as 250m be instituted.</li> </ul>	
David Service [REDACTED] Upper Hutt	RM16-4-12C-138	138.1	Childcare Centres	-	The assessment criteria do not deal with all the issues as more general amenity and streetscape effects are likely as well as traffic, parking and noise effects. Childcare centres are not compatible in quieter residential streets, especially on constrained sites. There can also be cumulative effects so a stipulation of no new centre in close proximity to an existing centre in residential areas is also necessary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More general amenity and streetscape effects have to be able to be assessed.</li> <li>That any granting of consent for childcare centres for more than 5 children is fully discretionary, not restricted discretionary.</li> <li>That a proximity restriction such as 250m be instituted.</li> </ul>	Y
Ruth Margaret Gilbert [REDACTED] Eastbourne	RM16-4-12C-139	139.1	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation and Reasons (a) - Net Site Area	-	No minimum net site area requirement for 3 or more dwellings on a site could lead to substantial loss of amenity to adjoining properties and surrounding areas.	No change to Rule 4A 1.2.1	N
		139.2	Rule 4A 1.2.1 Explanation and Reasons (f) - Accessory Buildings	-	There should be no encroachment of side and rear yards just because it is an accessory building. This could have an adverse effect on adjoining properties and make the appearance of high density where this was not attended.	No change to Rule 4A 1.2.1	
		139.3	Yard Requirements	-	The existing situation should not be changed and should stay at 1.5m or it will increase the sense of overcrowding and reduce amenity of the area.	Yard requirement to stay at 1.5m	
		139.4	Recession Planes	-	This should be kept the way it is. The reasons for having differences for different aspects is because of summer and winter sun effects. It makes no sense to change this and changing it will affect amenity.	No changes to recession planes.	
		139.5	Carparking	-	All new developments should require space for 2 cars per dwelling. This reflects current trends of 2 car households.	All new developments to allow for 2 car spaces.	
Nick Miller [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	RM16-4-12C-140	140.1	Higher Density Residential Areas – Petone and	-	Include areas along Cuba Street and Victoria Street which face on to the main transport route as High Density Residential. Along this	That consideration be given to extending the High Density Residential Areas to	Y

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Sub- mission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
Lower Hutt			Alicetown		route there are several small retail blocks, a railway station and a swimming pool, sports ground and the Workingman's Club. It makes sense to maximise the population able to access these facilities	include areas along the main public transport routes in Petone and Alicetown.	
Tomothy Edward ██████████ Auckland 1150	RM16-4-12C-145	145.1	Higher Density Residential Areas - Lot 1 DP 90369	-	Requests that Lot 1 DP 90369 be rezoned from General Recreation to High Density Residential as it is in private ownership.	Rezone Lot 1 DP 90369 as High Density Residential.	N
Eastbourne Community Board c/o Derek Wilshere ██████████ ██████	RM16-4-12C-146	146.1	Entire Plan Change	-	The proposed changes generally give effect to the policies the Board has previously substantially supported. However, the Board states its disappointment that its submission regarding control of development and recognition of the special character of the coastal margin were not discussed and have not been recognised here.	-	N
Violet Mavis Walshe ██████████ Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-147	147.1	Higher Density Residential Areas	Oppose	Objects to the high density housing.	That the Council not approve this change.	N
James McTaggart ██████████ Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-148	148.1	-	-	Trees and shrubs that are blocking the views of neighbours and overhanging people's driveways, be reduced in height and width. More consideration should be given when permitting two storey houses that block views and sun.	-	N
Sue Lafrentz ██████████	RM16-4-12C-149	149.1	Higher Density Residential Areas	-	Council needs to take into account the effects of multi-unit housing close to suburban shopping centres and what it costs to the ratepayers; more noise, lack of privacy and residents who do not take care of the complex. There will be a demand for greater housing choice but building multi storey housing is not the answer. The elderly need ground level complexes in a village setting. Families require a house with grounds for their children. Areas of housing should be preserved especially in Petone and Alicetown. Need good quality buildings of high standards.	Height of all developments restricted to two storeys and no earthworks allowed to increase the building to three storeys.	

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
		149.2	Yard Requirements	Oppose	Do not agree that side and rear yards requirements are reduced to 1 metre. Building close to the boundary will increase shading effects and lack of privacy.	Reduce the side and rear yard requirements to 1m only for garages and sheds and not for high density housing.	
		149.3	Net Site Area	Oppose	Do not agree that it be reduced to 300sqm.	Do not reduce to 300sqm.	
		149.4	Site Coverage	Oppose	Do not agree that site coverage be increased to 40% from 35%.	Do not increase to 40%.	
		149.5	Building Length	Oppose	Rule should not be deleted.	Do not delete building length rule	
		149.6	Permeable Surfaces	-	All developments should be designed so that there are small grassed areas to help with drainage and preventing flooding of properties.	-	
		149.7	Recession Planes	-	Proposal to change recession planes will cause an increase in bulk closer to dwellings. Shading, loss of privacy and bulky building create adverse effects.	-	

#### Summary of Submissions – Addendum

Name and Details of Submitter	Submission Number	Submission Reference	Provision/Issue	Support/ Oppose	Submission Summary	Decision(s) Requested	Wish to be heard
Jeff Downs [REDACTED] Lower Hutt	RM16-4-12C-150	150.1	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Conditions – Recession Planes	Support	No more than minor adverse effects. Effective in resolving interpretation difficulties and Council resource inefficiencies.	Proceed with proposed Plan Change.	Y
		150.2	Ch 4 Appendix General Residential 15 and 16	Support	Support amendment as necessary in order to support Amendment 16.	Proceed with proposed Plan Change.	
		150.3	Rule 4A 2.1.1(c) Permitted Activity Conditions – Recession Planes	Support	Most other Councils do not have this ruling and effects can be managed other ways.	Proceed with proposed Plan Change.	
		150.4	Entire Plan Change	Support	Supportive of the reasons and recommendations stated in Part 6 of the Section 32 report.	Proceed with recommendations to proposed Plan Change	