

Proposed District Plan Change 25

Introduction of a Tertiary Education Precinct

Summary of Submissions

Publicly Notified:

19 June 2012

Further Submissions Close:

03 July 2012 at 5.00pm

PUBLIC NOTICE

Public Notification of the Summary of Submissions on Proposed District Plan Change 25 to the City of Lower Hutt District Plan

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

Hutt City Council has prepared the summary of submissions received on

Proposed District Plan Change 25 – Introduction of a Tertiary Education Precinct

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

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

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

<http://www.huttcity.govt.nz/Your-Council/Plans-and-publications/District-Plan/District-Plan-changes/District-Plan-change-25>

Copies can also be requested by contacting Hutt City Council:

Phone: (04) 570 6666 or

Email: district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz

Further Submissions close on 03 July 2012 at 5.00pm

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

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

Post: Environmental Policy Division, Hutt City Council, Private Bag 31912, Lower Hutt 5040;

Deliver: Council Administration Building, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt

Fax: (04) 570 6799;

Email: district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz

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

The further submission must be written in accordance with RMA Form 6 and must state whether or not you wish to be heard on your submission. Copies of Form 6 are available from the above locations and the Council website.

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

Tony Stallinger
Chief Executive

19 June 2012

Table of Content

DPC25/1	Greater Wellington Regional Council.....	10
DPC25/2	Carolyn Wadsworth.....	10
DPC25/3	Hilda Burgess.....	11
DPC25/4	Janet Milne.....	11
DPC25/5	Phyllis & Paul Andersen.....	12
DPC25/6	Dwight Christian Poutoa.....	13
DPC25/7	Deborah Michelle Poutoa.....	13
DPC25/8	Stephen Charles & Jane Frazes Parson.....	13
DPC25/9	Sarah Beth Antunovic.....	14
DPC25/10	Tyrone Lee Phillips.....	14
DPC25/11	Robert Roy Carr.....	15
DPC25/12	Denise Carr.....	15
DPC25/13	Mr Baden Atkin.....	15
DPC25/14	Leon & Ruth Cooke.....	16
DPC25/15	Matthew Earles.....	17
DPC25/16	Roger Bagshaw.....	17
DPC25/17	Lesley Dokter & Peter Wilson.....	18
DPC25/18	Jo Raverty.....	19
DPC25/19	Denis Lea.....	20
DPC25/20	Khiem Trong Nguyen.....	20
DPC25/21	Ruth Margaret Burton.....	21
DPC25/22	Alfred Memelink.....	23
DPC25/23	Thomas Reedy.....	23
DPC25/24	Kathryn Mary Reedy.....	23
DPC25/25	Department of Conservation.....	24
DPC25/26	Michael Debney.....	24
DPC25/27	Angela Zhen Liu.....	24
DPC25/28	Petone Community Board.....	25
DPC25/29	William D L Cooper.....	26
DPC25/30	Carla Richelle Cooper.....	26
DPC25/31	Cuong Ngoc Do and Hau Thi Lai.....	27
DPC25/32	Barry & Wendy Delwyn Rozenberg.....	27
DPC25/33	Wellington Fish & Game Council.....	29
DPC25/34	Lesley Kennedy & Menno van der Laan.....	29
DPC25/35	Merran Bakker.....	30

DPC25/36	Josephine & John Jones.....	32
DPC25/37	Ken & Val Fitzmaurice	32
DPC25/38	Alice Elizabeth Pollock.....	32
DPC25/39	Dr Barnaby, C H May	33
DPC25/40	Kathryn Joyce Vinten.....	33
DPC25/41	Barbara Gibbs	33
DPC25/42	Mrs Mavis Anne Rayner	34
DPC25/43	Tui Kent	34
DPC25/44	Graeme Lyon	35
DPC25/45	Peter & Nicola Prichard.....	36
DPC25/46	Ian Hawij.....	37
DPC25/47	Suzanne Debra Hartley.....	38
DPC25/48	Mrs Siân Bisson	39
DPC25/49	Julie Dennison	40
DPC25/50	Mary Horner	40
DPC25/51	Tui Lewis.....	41
DPC25/52	Rachael Badham.....	43
DPC25/53	Sally Davina Selwood.....	43
DPC25/54	Katherine Jane Clarke.....	44
DPC25/55	Marja Verkerk for Vert Company Ltd	45
DPC25/56	Jude Wachswender	45
DPC25/57	Patrick & Bridget Gower.....	46
DPC25/58	Wellington Institute of Technology.....	47
DPC25/59	Charles Avery.....	49
DPC25/60	Rosy & Kevin Moar	50
DPC25/61	Nick Miller & Jan Simmons.....	52
DPC25/62	New Zealand Historic Places Trust, Pouhere Taonga.....	53
DPC25/63	Roger Thackery.....	54
DPC25/64	Michele [Mishi] Berecz.....	56
DPC25/65	Roger Chandler.....	56
DPC25/66	Terence Broad	57
DPC25/67	James Kwing	57
DPC25/68	Craig McKirdy	58
DPC25/69	Simon & Wendy Rogerson	59
DPC25/70	Anita Patel	60
DPC25/71	Laura Newton-King.....	60

DPC25/72	Clinton Maulder	61
DPC25/73	Patricia Fraser.....	61
DPC25/74	Dannie John Warren.....	62
DPC25/75	Bocarda Print.....	62
DPC25/76	Barbara Scott.....	62
DPC25/77	Nikki Chiappini & Brian Cole.....	63
DPC25/78	Patricia Alexandra Fraser	64
DPC25/79	Dannie Warren	64
DPC25/80	Iain Jenkins	64
DPC25/81	Kylie & Andrew Morrell.....	65
DPC25/82	Emani Iosefo.....	66
DPC25/83	A Powers.....	66
DPC25/84	High Street Residents	67
DPC25/85	Tina Syme for Royal New Zealand Plunket Society	69
DPC25/86	Petone Planning Action Group.....	69
DPC25/87	Andrea and Warwick Bolton	78
DPC25/88	Bryan Thompson for Petone Corps, Salvation Army.....	79
DPC25/89	Pat Sviatko.....	79
DPC25/90	Frank Steven Sviatko	80
DPC25/91	Anthony Joseph O'Connor	80
DPC25/92	Michiko Ammon.....	80
DPC25/93	Ranka Sunko	81
DPC25/94	Judith Kathleen Exley	81
DPC25/95	Lisa Michelle Wilde.....	81
DPC25/96	David Tripp	82
DPC25/97	Nikki Bennett (Salvation Army Petone Playgroup).....	82
DPC25/98	Jolene Hendry (Salvation Army Playgroup).....	82
DPC25/99	Jamie Dawson.....	83
DPC25/100	Karen Ferguson	83
DPC25/101	Sharon McKendrick	84
DPC25/102	Tessa McGuinness.....	84
DPC25/103	Megan Hughes (Salvation Army).....	84
DPC25/104	Helen Tripp (High Street Craft Group).....	85
DPC25/105	Margaret Nicholas (High Street Craft Group)	85
DPC25/106	Lesley Whitlock (High Street Craft Group)	86
DPC25/107	Sue Moran (High Street Craft Group).....	86

DPC25/108	Lorraine Driskel (High Street Craft Group).....	86
DPC25/109	Beryl Henderson (High Street Craft Group)	87
DPC25/110	Michael McCrorie	87
DPC25/111	Alan and Jenny Mumford.....	87
DPC25/112	Albert and Geraldine Wayers.....	88
DPC25/113	Flora Beblidakis	88
DPC25/114	Rose and Humphrey Foote.....	89
DPC25/115	Cathy and Mike Reid	89
DPC25/116	Vakharia Mukesh.....	89
DPC25/117	Victoria Sutton.....	90
DPC25/118	Suega Boot	90
DPC25/119	Rochelle Griffin.....	91
DPC25/120	Wilma Cook	91
DPC25/121	MJ Sammons	91
DPC25/122	CJ Cosford.....	92
DPC25/123	Peter and Catharina Philipsen.....	92
DPC25/124	D Gordon	92
DPC25/125	Sue Howard	93
DPC25/126	Faith Lawson.....	93
DPC25/127	Chris Skinn	93
DPC25/128	Jonathan Mahoney.....	94
DPC25/129	Graham Nesor	94
DPC25/130	Paul McGillicuddy.....	94
DPC25/131	Hazel Nesor	95
DPC25/132	Gordon Craig	95
DPC25/133	Jo St Just	95
DPC25/134	Susana Lemisio	96
DPC25/135	Mark and Anne Godfrey.....	96
DPC25/136	Peter Cartwright.....	98
DPC25/137	Esme Cartwright	98
DPC25/138	A Hansen	99
DPC25/139	Mike Fisher	99
DPC25/140	Patrick Williams.....	100
DPC25/141	Lorraine Williams.....	101
DPC25/142	Reg and Anne Cotter	102
DPC25/143	Kathryn Delahunty	102

DPC25/144	Mark Phegan	103
DPC25/145	Katrina Mannix	103
DPC25/146	Maara Heather	104
DPC25/147	Vasu Govind	104
DPC25/148	David Goldsbury	105
DPC25/149	Matt Goldsbury	105
DPC25/150	Diane Goldsbury	105
DPC25/151	Kevin Goldsbury	106
DPC25/152	Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated	106
DPC25/153	John and Kathleen Yardley	125
DPC25/154	Nelson Street Trust.....	143
DPC25/155	Scott Sonneman	161
DPC25/156	Helen Kneebone	161
DPC25/157	Raelee Jenson Manesh Kumar	161
ADDRESS FOR SERVICE – PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 25		164

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 25

Any new text that is proposed to be added is underlined, while any text proposed to be deleted has been ~~struck through~~.

DPC25/1 Greater Wellington Regional Council				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
1.1	Amendment 30 [14A (iii) 1.2.1 On-site Parking Provision for Activities – Policy]	Support	The submitter states that the proposed approach would enable car parking provision to be more flexible, avoiding excessive on-site car parking areas, with consideration of how existing on-street and on-site car parking is utilised, how it can be more efficiently utilised, and based on actual parking demands.	That Hutt City Council notes our support for these provisions.
1.2	Amendment 31 [14A (iii) 1.2.1 On-site Parking Provision for Activities – Explanation]	Support	The proposed amendments are found to be consistent with Regional Policy Statement Policy 9 and the Regional Travel Demand Management Plan.	

DPC25/2 Carolyn Wadsworth				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
2.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The submitter believes any action that allows a tertiary institution to sprawl into residential areas unconstrained as this plan change will entitle it to, will spell the eventual death knell for the vibrant historic township, shopping precinct character, and community spirit Petone now has and should be preserved for future generations.</p>	That Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/3 Hilda Burgess

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
3.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form because Plan Change 25 will allow changes to the residential and recreational areas on its boundary. PC25 would not protect the residential and recreational areas which neighbour the proposed precinct. PC25 fails to appropriately manage and provide for the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area, and in particular with the low density residential area.</p> <p>The precinct concept should only apply to the main campus area, and not to any outlying areas.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>That Hutt City Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject Plan Change 25 in its current form. • Remove outlying areas from a so-called Tertiary Education Precinct. • Adopt amendments and decisions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/4 Janet Milne

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
4.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 is contrary to s5 and s7 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>As currently worded, PC25 would result in inappropriate effects on (including but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding area.</p> <p>In its current form PC25 fails to appropriately manage and provide for the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area, and in particular with the low density residential area.</p> <p>The Section 32 report that accompanies PC25 fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.</p>	<p>That Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environment Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>

DPC25/5 Phyllis & Paul Andersen

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
5.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 is contrary to s5 and s7 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>As currently worded, PC25 would result in inappropriate effects on (including but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding area.</p> <p>In its current form PC25 fails to appropriately manage and provide for the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area, and in particular with the low density residential area.</p> <p>The Section 32 report that accompanies PC25 fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.</p>	That Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environment Association Incorporated in its submission.
5.2	General – Height, setbacks, car parking, permitted activities, non-notification	Oppose	<p>The submitters have enjoyed living in Petone for 45 years and have seen many changes within the community during that time.</p> <p>The submitters have seen some negative impacts allowed by councils for the Tertiary Institutes (under various names) e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tower block built with no consultation and is an ugly building. • In 1980, a plan was announced to put a designation on homes and streets around the Polytechnic and this caused a great deal of anxiety to many residents. • Houses have been acquired by WelTec (and its predecessors), have been subsequently removed and this has reduced the quantity of residential housing stock. • More and more WelTec parking allowed in surrounding streets and the Recreation Ground which makes it difficult for residents when they have visitors/tradesmen in attendance. Increased traffic alongside play areas makes it less safe for children and once the car park on O block is enlarged it 	

			<p>will make it unpleasant for the submitter as they live on the edge of this driveway.</p> <p>PC25 seems only to consider the needs of WelTec and doesn't consider the effect they would have on residents living close by.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

DPC25/6 Dwight Christian Poutoa				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
6.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/7 Deborah Michelle Poutoa				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
7.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/8 Stephen Charles & Jane Frazes Parson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
8.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 is contrary to s5 and s7 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational</p>	That Hutt City Council adopts the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environment Association

			<p>areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>As currently worded, PC25 would result in inappropriate effects on (including but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding area.</p> <p>In its current form PC25 fails to appropriately manage and provide for the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area, and in particular with the low density residential area.</p> <p>The Section 32 report that accompanies PC25 fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.</p> <p>PC25 gives residents less protection against future developments. I.e.: the proposal to build 12m high buildings without planning permission.</p>	Incorporated in its submission.
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------

DPC25/9 Sarah Beth Antunovic				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
9.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/10 Tyrone Lee Phillips				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
10.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/11 Robert Roy Carr

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
11.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/12 Denise Carr

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
12.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/13 Mr Baden Atkin

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
13.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>As a next door neighbour to WelTec, the submitter requests that any redevelopment of any part of WelTec be in keeping with the residential character of the neighbourhood. The current buildings are historic mistakes and must not be perpetuated.</p>	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/14 Leon & Ruth Cooke

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
14.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters state that WelTec who function as a business should not be extended privileges that affect neighbouring residential owners, without those homeowners having a right to challenge them as per the current plan.</p> <p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitters generally support the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject PC25 in its current form. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points.

DPC25/15 Matthew Earles

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
15.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 is contrary to s5 and s7 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>As currently worded, PC25 would result in inappropriate effects on (including but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding area.</p> <p>In its current form PC25 fails to appropriately manage and provide for the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area, and in particular with the low density residential area.</p> <p>The Section 32 report that accompanies PC25 fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.</p>	<p>That Hutt City Council adopts the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environment Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>

DPC25/16 Roger Bagshaw

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
16.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject PC25 in its current form. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

			<p>These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points.
--	--	--	---	---

DPC25/17 Lesley Dokter & Peter Wilson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
17.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values</p> <p>These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject PC25 in its current form. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points.

			<p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitters generally support the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

DPC25/18 Jo Raverty				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
18.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject PC25 in its current form. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points.

DPC25/19 Denis Lea

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
19.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject PC25 in its current form. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points.

DPC25/20 Khiem Trong Nguyen

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
20.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject PC25 in its current form. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-

			<p>areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>called precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC25/21 Ruth Margaret Burton				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
21.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject PC25 in its current form. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission. • Make changes to respond to the

			<p>and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	submitter's submission points.
21.2	Amendment 5 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Policies]	Oppose	The existing conditions should not be seen as a baseline. As far back as 1982 the development was found inappropriate. The very best urban design should be mandatory so further adverse effects on the amenity values of existing properties are avoided.	That any developments do not have deleterious effects on residents.
21.3	Amendment 21 [6A 2.2 General Business Activity Area (Controlled Activities)]	Oppose	The submitter supports the Petone Planning Action Group submission Cuba Street has been subject to educational creep for many years. It is essential that developments be subject to resource consent to avoid: haphazard development, increased height and uncontrolled development solutions.	
21.4	Amendment 22 [6A 2.3 General Business Activity Area (Restricted Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	The maximum acceptable level is: Discretionary Activity status for a business area for non-compliant buildings.	
21.5	Amendment 23 [6A 2.3.1 General Business Activity Area (Matters in which Council has restricted its Discretion and Standards and Terms)]	Oppose	There is a need for a sunset clause to remediate the area when WelTec decides to leave. The Massey Plan for Mount Cook should be considered as a model for better planning.	

DPC25/22 Alfred Memelink

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
22.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes PC25 in its current form mainly due to potential unwanted developments that it could allow to occur on the area currently occupied by the WelTec car park on the corner of Udy and Britannia Streets. The Britannia street frontage of this block should continue to comply with the current town planning code that applies to the rest of Britannia Street in order to retain the character and historical aspect of the street. It is also a historical street and ideally single story houses/bungalows could be moved onto or built onto the Britannia Street frontages of this block to retain the character.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/23 Thomas Reedy

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
23.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/24 Kathryn Mary Reedy

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
24.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/25 Department of Conservation

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
25.1	General – Bracken Street precinct	Oppose	<p>The submitter advises that land included in PC25 (Sections 978 and 979 at the road end of Bracken Street, plan included in submission) is owned by Her Majesty the Queen and is administered through the Kapiti Wellington area office of the Department of Conservation, Wellington (DOC).</p> <p>The land is subject to a 33 year lease to Petone Borough Council (now Hutt City Council) from 1 July 1983 for the purposes of developing public playing fields and a depot to be used for servicing Council's parks and reserves. The lease is for a fixed term and expires on 30 June 2016. There is no right of renewal, and no right of free holding.</p> <p>Council subleased part of the land to Shandon Golf Club in 1983 and it is understood that another part was subleased to WelTec for the teaching of native plant nursery techniques.</p> <p>The submitter does not believe the land should be included in PC25 as the future use of DOC's land past the expiry of the lease and removal of improvements has not yet been contemplated.</p>	

DPC25/26 Michael Debney

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
26.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the planned change and states that WelTec does not stand in isolation but spreads out within a suburban area. WelTec should follow the same consents processes as everyone else in the community.	That no change is made to the District Plan.

DPC25/27 Angela Zhen Liu

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
27.1	General	Support	The submitter supports Plan Change 25. The submitter emphasizes the need to	

			consider the economy in this city and advises against being too narrow minded. The submitter further states that the city should allow WelTec to grow without lengthy consultation with everybody in the community on every matter.	
--	--	--	---	--

DPC25/28 Petone Community Board

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
28.1	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter is satisfied that all concerns, except for matters noted in relief sought, raised with respect to the first draft of the precinct have been addressed and that there will be no adverse effects on neighbouring residents.</p> <p>The submitter acknowledges that WelTec plays a major role in the economy of Petone and the Hutt Valley.</p> <p>The submitter recognises a number of changes have been made to the plan which reflect comments made by the Petone Community Board such as reducing the recession planes, increased setbacks and new landscape and screening requirements.</p> <p>The submitter states that the maximum building height of 12m for the Udy Street site and the O Block land should be amended to reflect the existing height limit of 8m.</p> <p>The submitter thinks it is important to remember that this proposal stems from the Petone Vision document and the Review of the District Plan for Petone.</p> <p>The submitter recognises that WelTec is located in a residential area and that there has been an education institution located in this part of Petone since 1906.</p> <p>WelTec is currently not recognised in the District Plan currently, as it previously was since an amendment to the RMA removed the rights of polytechnics and universities with respect to the District Plan to designate land.</p> <p>The submitter states that the question of carparking has been an issue since about 30 years that is subject to another process and consultation exercise as the precinct only includes land owned or leased by WelTec.</p> <p>The submitter does not support suggestions that WelTec should move.</p> <p>Overall the initial issues have been addressed and any proposals outside the</p>	Amend PC25 to reflect original Petone Community Board request in regards to building height in Udy Street carpark and the O Block land.

			rules will be notified.	
At its meeting on 28 th May 2012 the Petone Community Board endorsed its submission retrospectively – this was a decision carried by division as follows:				
<u>For</u>		<u>Against</u>		
Mr Davidson		Mrs Lewis		
Mr Branch		Mr Foese		
Mr Cole		Mr Fisher		
Cr Jamieson				
Total: 4		Total: 3		
In addition the community board resolved the following unanimously:				
<i>“That the Board:</i>				
<i>(i) acknowledges that many residents in the vicinity of WelTec harbour serious concerns regarding Proposed Private Plan Change 25; and</i>				
<i>(ii) encourages the District Plan Subcommittee to take cognisance of residents’ views when considering its recommendations on submissions to Proposed Private Plan Change 25.”</i>				

DPC25/29 William D L Cooper				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
29.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/30 Carla Richelle Cooper				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
30.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/31 Cuong Ngoc Do and Hau Thi Lai

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
31.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitters generally support the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject PC25 in its current form. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points.

DPC25/32 Barry & Wendy Delwyn Rozenberg

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
32.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 is contrary to section 5 and section 7 of the RMA.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association</p>

			<p>areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>As currently worded PC25 would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, in particular the low density residential area.</p> <p>The Section 32 Report fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.</p>	Incorporated in its submission.
32.2	General – Traffic	Oppose	<p>The submitters state that the current level of activity is acceptable to them most of the time. The submitter would not like to see the current limit on number of students and tutor rise more than 10 more students and 2 more tutors.</p> <p>The submitters are concerned about speed, noise and the presence of trucks on Bracken Street.</p> <p>The submitters do not want to see any WelTec staff or students parking in Bracken Street at any time.</p> <p>The submitters support other residents in Kensington Ave, Cuba St, Britannia St, Udy Streets etc.</p> <p>The submitters suggest alternatives for transporting students to and from the campus and believes that because WelTec is in a low density area they should provide their own requirements on site, such as adequate parking for staff and students, loading bays, disposal areas etc. in a way that will not be nuisance to their neighbours.</p>	
32.3	General – building height and site coverage	Oppose	<p>The submitters state that the existing WelTec buildings which are 3-4 stories high are more than enough and that if WelTec is allowed to cover more land, sunlight, shade and ground drainage and dampness will become issues.</p> <p>The submitters believe that WelTec should not be able to do any more than a local resident can do; the regulations should be the same with the only exception being car parking (excluding trucks) so that there are fewer cars parked on streets around the WelTec facilities.</p>	

DPC25/33 Wellington Fish & Game Council

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
33.1	General – Bracken Street area	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that PC25 includes land on Bracken Street which is currently owned by DOC and leased to HCC, and through which the Te Mome Stream flows. It is understood the current lease will expire in 3-5 years with no right of renewal.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that if the current proposal is granted then works that could be undertaken, have the potential of significantly adversely affecting the Te Mome Stream and consequently the Hutt River, through land disturbance, sediment discharge and the removal of riparian vegetation.</p> <p>The submitter has registered with DOC an interest in establishing a junior fishing area in the waterways at the Bracken Street reserve. There have been discussions of the possibility of vesting the area to the submitter for junior anglers. It would have been expected that HCC would have consulted with the land owner and those with potential land interest prior to the notification of the Plan Change.</p> <p>The health of the Te Mome Stream plays a vital role in maintaining the health of the main trunks of rivers, such as the Hutt River. They also offer essential trout nursery habitat and provide critical habitat for trout during low flow periods or periods of environmental stress.</p> <p>Under the Local Government Act (2002) HCC needs to take into account, not only the social and economic wellbeing of the community, but also its environmental wellbeing.</p>	That the application in its current form be declined.

DPC25/34 Lesley Kennedy & Menno van der Laan

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
34.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the Plan Change in its entirety.</p> <p>The submitters state that the proposed changes as they stand will significantly affect their home, their neighbours and the general residential amenity along with recreational aspects of the surrounding neighbourhood.</p>	<p>That the plan change be rejected and the status quo be maintained.</p> <p>If not rejected, that HCC make the amendments, insertions, deletions and</p>

			The submitters state that historically WelTec have ignored the rules and blatantly ignored resident's concerns and requests (details in full submission) and that PC25 would give WelTec the right to ignore residents and do whatever they please.	additions sought by the Petone Planning Action Group as a minimum.
34.2	Amendments relating to height, recession planes, site coverage etc.	Oppose	The submitters state that the proposed changes relating to height, recession planes, site coverage etc. would have a significant impact on property value, the shading on their property, their visual privacy and the visual aspect of the neighbourhood. The submitters object to the current height of the WelTec buildings in Kensington Avenue being used as the baseline – especially as these did not conform to the rules at the time of their construction.	That there should be design guidelines with regards to renovation or building of new structures.
34.3	Inclusion of Bracken Street in the Education Precinct	Oppose	WelTec no longer provides level 4 and 5 horticulture courses, and this area has only been used in the past few years.	That Bracken Street not be included as part of the precinct.
34.4	Amendments referring to General Residential Activity Areas (Discretionary Activities)	Oppose	The submitters oppose any changes that would allow WelTec to do anything without notification to residents and with no input from residents possible.	
34.5	Inclusion of leased land or buildings in the precinct	Oppose	The owners of buildings/land leased by WelTec should not be able to utilise the proposed provisions of the Precinct to build larger buildings or increase site coverage.	
34.6	Amendments referring to the definition of Education Precinct	Oppose	The submitters oppose specifically the inclusion of Student Accommodation, Social and Retail as part of the Precinct. This would enable WelTec to build student hostels and establish takeaway stores and shops and thereby dramatically change the nature of the residential street that the submitter lives in. It would contribute to noise, rubbish and traffic. The submitter questions the definition of social – does it include bars?	Student accommodation, retail and social should be excluded from the definition.

DPC25/35 Merran Bakker				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
35.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. PC25 is contrary to s5 and s7 of the Resource Management Act 1991. PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational	That Hutt City Council adopts the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environment Association Incorporated in its submission.

			<p>areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>As currently worded, PC25 would result in inappropriate effects on (including but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding area.</p> <p>In its current form PC25 fails to appropriately manage and provide for the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area, and in particular with the low density residential area.</p> <p>The Section 32 report that accompanies PC25 fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.</p> <p>The submitter questions why the council is promoting a precinct rather than helping WelTec look for more suitable alternatives.</p> <p>The submitter emphasises that the size of WelTec's existing buildings is out of scale with a residential neighbourhood and should not be used as a starting point for expansion.</p>	That PC25 be heard by an independent commissioner or commissioners.
35.2	Amendment 1 [3 – Definitions]	Oppose	The loose definition of tertiary education activities in Amendment 1 means that student accommodation could be built on the Udy St corner. This would bring noise both day and night, an unspecified amount of extra traffic and parking thus irretrievably damaging residential amenity.	That any activity that operates outside normal business hours be precluded from the Udy Street site.
35.3	General – Maximum Building Height	Oppose	12 metres building height allowance is out of scale with the surrounding area, including the Udy Street commercial properties. Building to this height even with recession planes at southern boundaries would seriously impact the neighbourhood feel of the submitter's area, by dominating their skyline.	That the height limit for all buildings in the residential areas remains at 8 metres.
35.4	General – Design Guide	Oppose	The lack of design guidelines and the preclusion of notification give further cause for concern about what could be built on the Udy Street site with no chance for residents' input.	That a design guide is included for any new buildings that gives protection to residential amenity (sunlight, building mass, views)
35.5	Amendment 12 [4A 2.3 General Residential Activity Area – Restricted Discretionary Activities]	Oppose	The lack of design guidelines and the preclusion of notification give further cause for concern about what could be built on the Udy Street site with no chance for residents' input.	That the non-notification clause is removed.
35.6	General – Udy Street site	Oppose	Any activity which brings more people into the area will have impacts on both traffic and parking.	That the Udy Street site be retained as a car park.

35.7	General – Heritage	Oppose	The heritage qualities of Britannia Street could be undermined by inappropriate building on the Udy Street site.	Any development on the Udy/Britannia Street site should be restricted to fit in with this special neighbourhood
------	--------------------	--------	--	---

DPC25/36 Josephine & John Jones				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
36.1	General	Oppose	The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That Hutt City Council adopts the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environment Association in its submission.

DPC25/37 Ken & Val Fitzmaurice				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
37.1	General	Oppose	The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That Hutt City Council adopts the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environment Association in its submission.

DPC25/38 Alice Elizabeth Pollock				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
38.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That Hutt City Council adopts the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environment Association in its submission.

DPC25/39 Dr Barnaby, C H May

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
39.1	General	Oppose	The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That Hutt City Council adopts the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environment Association in its submission.

DPC25/40 Kathryn Joyce Vinten

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
40.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas. PC25 does not 'provide more certainty for both local residents and WelTec' as stated.	That Hutt City Council adopts the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environment Association in its submission.

DPC25/41 Barbara Gibbs

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
41.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That Hutt City Council adopts the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environment Association in its submission.

DPC25/42 Mrs Mavis Anne Rayner

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
42.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That Hutt City Council adopts the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environment Association in its submission.
42.2	General – Britannia Street	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that the unusual character of Britannia Street calls for consideration. The submitter has no objection to ‘school room’ type buildings on the Udy Street/Britannia Street corner but finds that ‘high rise’ residence would not be suitable and the best use is car park.</p> <p>The submitter suggests that WelTec could look farther afield for another building as the students all seem to have cars.</p>	

DPC25/43 Tui Kent

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
43.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form as the proposed height of buildings and other aspects of PC25 could have negative effects on the Petone neighbourhoods around WelTec.</p> <p>In its current form, PC25 will provide certainty for WelTec but not for residents.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area, not to any outlying areas.</p> <p>WelTec is exempt from paying rates so ordinary ratepayers are paying for the expense of HCC adopting this Plan Change and other matters to do with costs re WelTec in our community – this should not be the case.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that 71 Cuba Street has been included in PC25 and proposed WelTec precinct. WelTec do not lease or own any part of it as far as the submitter knows.</p> <p>PC25 means that N Block could be worse than what has been given consent for</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Remove 71 Cuba Street totally • Make changes to respond to the submitter’s submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

			<p>– which would mean even more students wanting to find parks in the surrounding streets.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future WelTec activities and developments, including detailed management of height, scale, mass and design such as in the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington City Council’s District Plan for Massey University.</p> <p>The submitter states that there need to be triggers that would require WelTec notification and Surveyor sign off (paid for by WelTec) if there are any future building developments.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

DPC25/44 Graeme Lyon				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
44.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>In its current form, PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.</p> <p>That a commissioner hear this plan change, preferably someone familiar with the local scene.</p>
44.2	Amendment 1 [Chapter 3 – Definitions]	Oppose	The definition is too broad, allowing everything.	Tighten the definition for tertiary education needs.
44.3	Amendment 3 [4A 1.1.4 General Residential Activity Area (Non-Residential Activities – Policies)]	Oppose	An inadequate definition.	<p>Make the following amendments to 4A1.1.4 (d) by deleting the words ‘recognise and’ and inserting the word ‘residential’ before ‘environment’:</p> <p>(d) To recognise and provide for tertiary education activities in Petone within a defined Precinct, while avoiding, remedying and mitigating the adverse effects on the</p>

				<u>residential</u> environment, particularly on the character and amenity values of the neighbourhood.
44.4	Amendment 4 [4A 1.1.4 General Residential Activity Area (Non-Residential Activities – Explanation and Reasons)]	Oppose	The precinct size is wrong. Areas with no or low buildings, and leased properties should not be included.	Delete the properties listed as Bracken Street, Udy Street and Elizabeth Street.
44.5	Amendment 5 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Policies)]	Oppose	Current building should not be the baseline, as some of these are not suitable for the site and environment.	The underlying residential character of the suburb needs to be the standard for any new or redevelopment.
44.6	Amendment 9 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Explanation and Reasons)]	Oppose	The proposed 12m height is too much, all should be 8m.	The maximum height should be 8m. Especially, all properties in Udy Street, Elizabeth Street and Bracken Street must be restricted to preferably one, maybe two stories.
44.7	General – non-notification	Oppose		All amendments that provide for non-notification should be deleted.

DPC25/45 Peter & Nicola Prichard				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
45.1	General	Oppose	The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission. That Council appoint an independent commissioner to hear this plan change who shall provide a level of continuity around WelTec resource consents and PC25.

45.2	Amendment 1 [Chapter 3- Definitions]	Oppose	The submitters are concerned that the definition in its current form is so broad, that there will be adverse effects on unknown development.	That the definition of Tertiary Education Activity be amended to that of the Education Act, and only reflect the activities already permitted on the Kensington Avenue campus.
45.3	General – development controls	Oppose	Increasing height, bulk and location for WelTec properties will adversely affect the submitter’s residential character and amenity, by further destroying existing privacy on their eastern boundary. The submitters are concerned about protecting privacy, morning sunlight, a feeling of being boxed in, light pollution, high and low frequency noise and total uncertainty. Lesser adverse effects are loss of green space, contributing to neighbourhood ecology and ecological corridors.	That Design Guidelines are introduced with any such Plan Change associated with a WelTec precinct. That shade modelling of adjoining properties is undertaken, particularly 50 Buick Street, to mitigate any adverse effects of any changes set out in Plan Change 25. That any proposed plan change is amended so Council shall be required to appoint an independent compliance monitoring party of existing resource consents, rules, conditions and guidelines.
45.4	General – extent of tertiary education precinct	Oppose	The submitters are concerned about the extent to which Lots outside the traditional campus area are proposed within the precinct area.	That Lot 5 8120 and Lot 5 8120 (diagram in full submission) be removed from the WelTec Precinct.
45.5	General - Carparking	Oppose	The submitters oppose WelTec accessing O Block parking, via Petone Recreational Grounds. All vehicles in Petone Recreational Ground are a significant hazard, which will result in another fatality and could be easily mitigated if access was off Elizabeth Street. This would add to the amenity of Petone Recreation Ground, the Student’s Campus and benefit the community.	

DPC25/46 Ian Hawij				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
46.1	General	Oppose	The submitter is deeply concerned that PC25 jeopardizes the privacy, noise control and security on their property and that they could potentially lose significant sunshine on their property which will impact on their family, garden, living space and even solar panels for heating which they are currently considering.	That the Hutt City Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Make changes to respond to the submitter’s submission points.

			<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC25/47 Suzanne Debra Hartley				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
47.1	General – Height and maximum coverage	Oppose	<p>The submitter strongly opposes the change as the property and residences of Buick Street community could be potentially drastically affected.</p> <p>Increasing the maximum building height and maximum coverage of land usage is of great concern to the submitter</p> <p>The submitter's property directly adjoins the WelTec campus boundary and has been the submitter's family home since 1935. Community is a very important part of Petone and its unique village atmosphere – an education precinct does</p>	That the plan change be reconsidered, especially in regards to height of buildings and boundary encroachment.

			not sit comfortable surrounded by residential property. The submitter finds that exempting WelTec from resource consent is a dangerous precedent.	
--	--	--	--	--

DPC25/48 Mrs Siân Bisson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
48.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/49 Julie Dennison

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
49.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

DPC25/50 Mary Horner

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
50.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-

			<p>areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>called precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC25/51 Tui Lewis				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
51.1	General – Entire plan change	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed plan change due to a loss of residential and recreational amenity and character as well as adverse effects on residential values, social impacts and community values and historic areas and historic character if the current proposal is accepted.	<p>That Council reject the plan change.</p> <p>If the plan change does go ahead, that HCC, as a minimum, make the amendments, additions, insertions and deletions sought by Petone Planning Action Group in their submission.</p> <p>That the Council please request Christine Foster to assist with this proposed plan change process (hearing).</p>
51.2	General – Amendments relating to height, recession	Oppose		

	planes, bulk and site coverage etc.			
51.3	General – Amendments relating to the definition of a Tertiary Education Precinct	Oppose	The inclusion of Student Accommodation would mean that WelTec could build 3 story student hostels wherever they wanted within the Precinct. The submitter questions whether they would also be able to establish takeaway stores and shops.	
51.4	General – Discretionary activities in General Residential Activity Areas	Oppose	Any changes affecting any residential boundary need to be notified – a precinct shouldn't take away the fact WelTec is a neighbour surrounded by residential homes. It doesn't excuse them from being a good neighbour.	
51.5	General – Inclusion of land leased by WelTec	Oppose	The inclusion of any land leased by WelTec needs to be removed from the proposed precinct, once it is zoned WelTec may as well purchase the land.	
51.6	General – N Block and Udy/Britannia Street corner	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the site on the corner of Udy and Britannia Streets and N Block on Cuba Street would be allowed to build up to 12m and be more intrusive than what was previously proposed in WelTec's recent resource consent for N Block.	
51.7	General – Bracken Street area	Oppose	Should not be included in the precinct. WelTec no longer run horticultural courses.	
51.8	General – Traffic survey comments	Oppose	The submitter hopes that WelTec will not be allowed to use this information to justify their plan change – nor be allowed to include any fact or data relating to the survey when the plan change goes to hearing. The submitter comments that the timing is wrong for the traffic survey and the plan change submission phase to be run concurrently.	
51.9	General – Petone Recreation Grounds, Signage and maximum height of buildings	Oppose	The submitter requests that stronger wording be used to future protect the Recreation ground from being towered and dominated over by WelTec buildings. Height restriction plus less site coverage would allow open spaces, light, wind filtering and view shafts. WelTec signage into the Recreation ground needs to be placed below Petone Recreation ground signage. Restrict the amount of signage within the recreation ground and its surrounds.	

DPC25/52 Rachael Badham

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
52.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change because there will be adverse effects to existing residential and community facilities including value, historic character, traffic, parking, noise and safety. There is a lack of adequate controls over future activities including detailed management of height, scale and monitoring of parking.</p> <p>In its current form, PC25 will not protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities close to the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

DPC25/53 Sally Davina Selwood

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
53.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 is contrary to s5 and s7 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>As currently worded, PC25 would result in inappropriate effects on (including but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding area.</p> <p>In its current form PC25 fails to appropriately manage and provide for the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area, and in particular with the low density residential area.</p> <p>The Section 32 report that accompanies PC25 fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission and ensure that WelTec provides adequate off street car parking including the Udy Street/Britannia Street corner in the future.</p>

			<p>policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.</p> <p>The submitter makes specific comments on the Britannia Street/Udy Street corner carpark regarding the proposed ability for WelTec to build student accommodation with no height restrictions, reduction of light, sun and enjoyment to residents in the surrounding area. The submitter states that the residents would have no right to view proposals or object to have any redress to any such proposal under PC25.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

DPC25/54 Katherine Jane Clarke				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
54.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 is contrary to s5 and s7 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>As currently worded, PC25 would result in inappropriate effects on (including but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding area.</p> <p>In its current form PC25 fails to appropriately manage and provide for the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area, and in particular with the low density residential area.</p> <p>The Section 32 report that accompanies PC25 fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.</p>	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

DPC25/55 Marja Verkerk for Vert Company Ltd

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
55.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter comments on background and history of WelTec and states that any sites that are not owned legally and in whole by WelTec should not be considered part of the proposal. The submitter states that in the history of WelTec in Petone is one of total disregard for surrounding residents and that currently WelTec is an eyesore in the middle of a residential area.</p> <p>The submitter is convinced that as a result of the proposed plan change 'WelTec will be able to do ANYTHING they want WITHOUT any form of consent from anyone'. Further PC25 does not pay attention to the objectives in the District Plan, giving examples of 4A 1.1.1 (Residential Character and Amenity Values) , 4A 1.1.4 (Non-residential activities) and 4A 1.2.1 (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location).</p> <p>Car parking is another area of concern for the submitter as there have never been enough on site car parks at WelTec and this will only get worse. The other modes of transport constantly referred to in the WelTec submission should already be in place.</p> <p>The submitter comments on community relations, stating that WelTec has no relationship with local residents affected by their developments and for them to state that 'ensuring the development of its campus minimises any impact on residents as much as practicable, and to further develop its relationship with the neighbourhood' is erroneous.</p> <p>The submitter suggests that WelTec creates a secondary satellite campus in Petone (e.g. Petone College site) and states that there is no support for exempting WelTec from compliance requirements that the rest of Petone is obliged by law to meet.</p>	That the Hutt City Council reject the plan change as a whole and retain the status quo.

DPC25/56 Jude Wachswender

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
56.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes all the specific changes proposed by PC25. The current rules and processes should remain and be adhered to by all members of the	That the Hutt City Council rejects the plan

		community, including WelTec.	change request.
--	--	------------------------------	-----------------

DPC25/57 Patrick & Bridget Gower

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
57.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitters generally support the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.
57.2	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters criticise Council's lack of community engagement and are disappointed by the lack of consultation.</p> <p>The submitters state that they have had no notification, other than an obtuse reference in a letter about parking changes. The notification phase was too short and poorly timed, the proposed plan change on the internet was very hard to read and understand.</p>	

			<p>The submitters believe the Emerson Street community needs more time to consider the proposed plan change.</p> <p>The submitters find that while acting within the letter of the law HCC is not acting in the spirit of a responsible and responsive Council.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

DPC25/58 Wellington Institute of Technology				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
58.1	General	Support	<p>The submitter supports the Proposed Plan Change as it provides greater certainty for both WelTec and the community on the ongoing use and development on the WelTec campus.</p> <p>The submitter supports the provision of differing rules across the campus as this ensures the particular amenity of each of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Following further consultation, the submitter submits that Council could consider some minor changes to particular provisions within the proposed plan change to provide further clarity on the management of any future development.</p>	That the provisions of PC25 be retained generally, as notified, except as otherwise sought by this submission.
58.2	Amendment 1 [Chapter 3 – Definitions]	Support in Part	The submitter states that while the overall intent of the definition for “Tertiary Education Precinct” is supported, the Council could consider providing further expansion to the nature of “ancillary” activities to provide more certainty as to scale and potential nature of ancillary activities.	<p>Amend the definition of Tertiary Education Facility as follows:</p> <p><i>Tertiary Education Activities:</i></p> <p><i>means the use of land and buildings for the provision of regular instruction, teaching, learning or training by an Institution (as defined in Section 159(1) of the Education Act 1989), and includes ancillary administrative services, student accommodation ,<u>and ancillary services and facilities such as recreational, cultural, health, childcare, social, retail and car parking activities and facilities, provided such ancillary activities are minor in scale and are focused towards servicing the needs of students and staff.</u></i></p>

				And; Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submissions and relief sought.
58.3	Amendment 11 [4A 2.1.1 General Residential Activity Area (Rules – Permitted Activities – Conditions)]	Support in Part	The submitter states that the Proposed Plan Change includes a stepped back requirement for new buildings on the southern boundary with residential properties to provide an adequate level of privacy, sunlight access and building setback. While this requirement is supported, in respect of the southern boundary of the central part of the campus, between Kensington Avenue and Buick Street, the rule could be amended to clarify that this requirement also applies to the rear of the property at 50 Buick Street, which could be interpreted as the western boundary.	Amend 4A 2.1.1 as follows: (z) <i>For tertiary education activities within the Tertiary Education Precinct (as shown on Appendix General Residential 20).</i> <i>Except as outlined below, the Permitted Activity Conditions shall apply within the Tertiary Education Precinct: ...</i> (iii) <i>For that part of the Tertiary Education Precinct on the western side of Kensington Avenue –</i> (1) <i>The maximum height of buildings and structures shall be 12m, except that:</i> <i>(a) No part of any building located between 3m and 8m from the southern boundary shall be higher than 4m; and</i> <i>(b) No part of any building located between 8m and 12.5m from the southern boundary shall be higher than 8m.</i> (2) <i>The minimum yard requirement shall be 3.0m for the southern boundary</i> (3) <i>The maximum site coverage shall be 60%</i> <u><i>Note: For the purpose of this rule, “southern boundary” shall refer to that boundary with Lot 1 DP 5460 and Lot 4</i></u>

				<p><u>DP 8102</u></p> <p>And;</p> <p>Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submissions and relief sought.</p>
58.4	<p>Amendment 13 [4A 2.3.1 General Residential Activity Area {Matters in which Council has restricted its Discretion and Standards and Terms}]</p>	Support in Part	<p>The submitter states that the Proposed Plan Change includes introducing assessment criteria for considering resource consent applications for restricted discretionary activities in regard to development proposals that do not comply with some development controls: These matters relate to amenity values and landscaping and screening. While these provisions are supported, greater specificity could be provided as to the matters of discretion relating to privacy and the relationship of building design to the residential neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Amend 4A 2.3.1 as follows:</p> <p>(i) <i>Amenity Values</i></p> <p><i>The extent to which the proposal would affect adversely the amenity values of the surrounding residential area, including;</i></p> <p>(1) <i>The effect of buildings and structures on the neighbouring and surrounding residential sites and, in particular the location, design and appearance of the buildings and relationship <u>and transition to neighbouring sites.</u></i></p> <p>(2) <i>Whether the proposal would cause significant loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy of adjoining residential properties.</i></p> <p>And;</p> <p>Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submissions and relief sought</p>

DPC25/59 Charles Avery				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
59.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Make changes to respond to the

			<p>areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>submitter's submission points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC25/60 Rosy & Kevin Moar				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
60.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 is contrary to section 5 and section 7 of the RMA.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>As currently worded PC25 would adversely affect existing and highly-valued residential, recreational and community facilities. There will be adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historical character, and community and social values. These effects include the potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with the main educational and associated activities (including retail and student accommodation activities),</p>	<p>That an Independent Commissioner hear submissions and make a determination about the proposed plan change.</p> <p>That the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission be adopted.</p>

			<p>traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding area.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, in particular the low density residential area.</p> <p>The Section 32 Report fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.</p> <p>Council has not consulted with the community in good faith in preparing the plan change.</p>	
60.2	Amendment 3 [Chapter 3 – Definitions]	Oppose	<p>The definition’s reference to ancillary retail, social, cultural and recreational activities is far too broad and leaves open the possibility that any retail activity, fast-food joint or pub could be established on a residential street.</p> <p>High density student accommodation and commercial-style car-parking buildings, which would be allowed for under the current definition, would have different impact on residents than daytime instruction in classrooms.</p> <p>Residents deserve more certainty.</p>	That the definition of educational activity be tightened significantly and that accommodation and car parking be removed altogether.
60.3	General – Elizabeth Street area	Oppose	<p>There is no justification for a 12m high limit on Elizabeth Street. These properties are currently not used for education purposes and their inclusion is out of keeping with the surrounding buildings, residential or otherwise.</p>	That properties on Elizabeth Street be excluded from the zone. If they are included, then the existing normal residential rules governing the permitted height, bulk, footprint etc. be retained.
60.4	General – R Block	Oppose	<p>The submitters are concerned by the proposed rules which would govern the possible redevelopment of R block.</p> <p>R Block on Kensington Ave should act as a transition between WelTec’s large instruction/administration buildings and neighbouring residential properties.</p> <p>The submitters provide shading diagrams and requests that the R block should have the same requirements as any other residential-zones property or that if larger buildings are allowed recession planes and set-backs should apply to all non-WelTec boundaries.</p>	<p>That R Block on Kensington Avenue retain the existing normal height, bulk, footprint and design restrictions of the underlying residential zone, to act as a transition between WelTec’s large buildings and neighbouring residential properties .</p> <p>If a larger building is allowed on R Block, then the same provisions for set-backs and recession planes which are required for the southern boundary also be required for the western boundary.</p>
60.5	General – Design Guide	Oppose	<p>The submitters support design guidelines and transition zones so that WelTec buildings with an underlying residential zone are consistent with the</p>	That the rules and guidelines for what sort of building can be constructed within the

			neighbouring residential character.	precinct be amended to include design guidelines so that WelTec buildings with an underlying residential zone are consistent with the neighbouring residential character and which provide for suitable transitions between residential properties and large buildings, existing or otherwise.
60.6	General – After hours activities/Hours of operation	Oppose	Controlling activities outside of normal business hours would protect and enhance the residential amenity of properties which have underlying residential zoning and neighbours.	That rules be introduced to reasonably control the activity which can be allowed on these sites outside normal business hours including noise, lux, fumes etc.
60.7	General – Discretionary activities and non-notification	Oppose	The submitters state that the existing rules around notification do provide certainty and should not be changed The submitters question why there are provisions for discretionary activities if certainty is the goal of the plan change.	If a precinct is approved, that there be no provision for council to exercise discretion to approve consents for development outside of the rules in any way. That the rules around notification be changed so that where new buildings are proposed, residents are warned and are able to contribute to council decisions.

DPC25/61 Nick Miller & Jan Simmons				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
61.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in

			<p>and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g. the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitters generally support the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	its submission.
--	--	--	--	-----------------

DPC25/62 New Zealand Historic Places Trust, Pouhere Taonga				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
62.1	General	Support with amendments	The submitter supports the plan change with amendments to the proposed signage provisions.	
62.2	General – 13 Elizabeth Street	Support	<p>The submitter is supportive of the at 13 Elizabeth Street being included in the Tertiary precinct. At the same time the submitter is concerned with the potential effects of the proposed plan change on the historic heritage values of the building.</p> <p>The submitter describes the historic heritage value of the building and states that the plan change will not affect the Petone Magistrate’s Court status as a listed heritage building in the Hutt City District Plan.</p>	That the plan change is accepted as notified in regard to the changes affecting the Petone Magistrate’s Court at 13 Elizabeth Street, with exception of the proposed signage rules.
62.3	General - 13 Elizabeth Street - Recession Plane and Yards	Support	The submitter is supportive of the standard recession plane requirement and yard setbacks being retained at 13 Elizabeth Street. The retention of these standards will assist in retaining the residential amenity of the street and the amenity and character of the Petone Magistrate’s Court site.	
62.4	General – 13 Elizabeth Street - Site Coverage	Support	The submitter is supportive of the maximum 40% site coverage applying to the Elizabeth Street site, rather than the 60% maximum proposed elsewhere on the WelTec campus.	

62.5	General –13 Elizabeth Street - Building Height	Support	Although the proposed change increases the maximum height of buildings from 8m to 12m the submitter is satisfied that the heritage rules overlay at 13 Elizabeth Street will allow for full consideration of the effects on heritage values of the site in the case of any future development proposal.	
62.6	General –13 Elizabeth Street - Signage	Support with amendments	The submitter is concerned that an increase in the signage allowance on site may be potentially detrimental to the heritage values of the Petone Magistrate’s Court building and site. In addition, signage placed on the ground of the site may require an archaeological authority and will need to be considered for its effects on archaeology.	That an exemption to the proposed signage rules be applied to 13 Elizabeth Street in regards to the Petone Magistrate’s Court, ensuring that the heritage values of the site are taken into consideration if any new signage is proposed on site. That for the court site existing residential signage rules should continue to apply.

DPC25/63 Roger Thackery				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
63.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed plan change in its current form as it will not protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas or community facilities. There will be adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character and community and social values.	
63.2	General –Bulk, Number of occupants, Intensification,	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that the plan change looks to increase the physical bulk of the campus development which implies increasing intensity and density of use without correlating the proposed numbers of occupants, users or uses this will bring about. As no maximum numbers are set the effects, including parking and traffic effects cannot be determined.</p> <p>The continuation and increase of existing bulk together with the lack of internal relief for daylight and solar access will create adverse effects from a skyline, neighbourhood, urban design and residential amenity point of view.</p> <p>The claims of existing use rights and history to justify greater intensification are misleading and need to be corrected.</p>	
63.3	Bracken Street	Oppose	The submitter notes that 20% site coverage equates to almost 1500m ² of buildings.	

63.4	General – Protection of Residential Properties	Oppose	The protection of residential properties needs to be consistent, e.g. 7 Kensington Ave does not appear to have the same safeguards as the other side of Kensington Ave.	
63.5	General – Definition of Tertiary Education (Amendment 1)	Oppose	<p>This is a very broad definition that needs tightening up to ensure that retailing could not be started anywhere in the precinct.</p> <p>Student accommodation should be dealt with separately, as a hostel has overnight as well as daytime effects.</p>	<p>That the wording of the definition be as follows:</p> <p>Tertiary Education Facilities means the use of land and buildings for the provision of regular instruction, teaching, learning or training by an Institution (as defined in Section 159(1) of the Education Act 1989),...</p> <p>If the definition is to be retained as is, then there needs to be rules to limit the extent of retailing, social facilities, recreational activities, and childcare within the precinct.</p>
63.6	General – Non-residential Activities in Residential Areas (Amendments 3 and 4)	Oppose	<p>Any sites that are leased rather than owned by WelTec should not be included in any precinct and any General Recreation Area should not be included.</p> <p>The Bracken Street site is not needed for horticultural courses anymore and should not be part of the precinct.</p> <p>The inclusion of part of the Wormald Site at 57 Cuba Street and the sites at 69 and 71 Cuba Street are problematic - WelTec does not use 71 Cuba Street. No leased properties should be included , and what is currently owned by WelTec on core sites has to be the limit of any precinct forever– to provide certainty for residents.</p>	<p>That the Bracken Street site be removed entirely from the proposed Precinct.</p> <p>That no leased properties be included in the Precinct at all.</p>
63.7	General – Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location (Amendments 5, 6 and 9) and Scale of Precinct	Oppose	<p>Amendments 5 and 6 assume that the current situation and existing scale and intensity of the built environment on the WelTec campus is acceptable, which is not the case for residents.</p> <p>The current situation seems to be the starting point for the plan change. The submitter would like to see opportunities for improvements in the medium and long term.</p> <p>View shafts and access ways need to be maintained and increased through the Kensington Avenue site to the Petone Recreation Ground.</p> <p>The submitter states that 8m should be the maximum height in the areas zoned general residential with only two storeys able to be built and notes that 4</p>	<p>That the maximum height for any future developments on the western side of Kensington Avenue be 8m and site coverage for any future development be 35%.</p> <p>That view shafts and access ways be maintained and increased through the Kensington Avenue site to the Petone Recreation Ground.</p> <p>That the maximum height be 8m in the areas zoned general residential.</p> <p>That all new buildings have a residential</p>

			<p>storeys can be accommodated within 12m building height.</p> <p>The site at the corner of Udy and Britannia Streets needs specific consideration.</p> <p>Any new buildings should visually have a residential character and take the appearance of residential buildings to minimise effects on existing residential amenity.</p> <p>Elizabeth and Udy Street sites need to be removed from any possible precinct as they are not being used for tertiary education activities and the Udy St site is an outlying area and not part of the core WelTec area.</p>	<p>character.</p> <p>That Elizabeth street and Udy Street sites be removed from the precinct.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

DPC25/64 Michele [Mishi] Berezcz				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
64.1	General	Oppose	The submitter states that PC25 does not give owners adjacent to the precinct safeguards around future activity of their neighbour (WelTec) or provide them with resource to protect the existing residential nature of their Street (Huia Street). What future activity may be encompassed in the precinct is not sufficiently constrained. As such it is not sustainable, as the RMA requires.	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Make changes to respond to the points raised. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

DPC25/65 Roger Chandler				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
65.1	General	Oppose	The submitter states that PC25 does not give owners adjacent to the precinct safeguards around future activity of their neighbour (WelTec) or provide them with resource to protect the existing residential nature of their Street (Huia Street). What future activity may be encompassed in the precinct is not sufficiently constrained. As such it is not sustainable, as the RMA requires.	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Make changes to respond to the points raised. • Adopt the amendments, additions and

				deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC25/66 Terence Broad				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
66.1	General – zoning, activities, building form, parking and loading and signage	Support	<p>The submitter states his general overall support of the useful and practical concept of a Tertiary Education Precinct which will define and name the extent of the WelTec Campus. Such changes were introduced by the Wellington City Council for Victoria University and Wellington Polytechnic (Massey University) in the early 1990s.</p> <p>The Precinct Planning tool was a practical reality check for the University and for neighbours.</p> <p>The submitter states that educational activities are what is happening in this part of Petone using a mixture of houses, warehouses, workshops, tower blocks, parking areas etc. and these should be all called that under a coherent Town Planning umbrella.</p> <p>The submitter supports to add a new Special Activity Area (Zoning), to permit Specific Listed Activities (Activities) and to amend current thresholds (Building Form). The submitter does not comment on parking as this does affect residents of local streets and states that well located and clear signage is important for wayfinding.</p>	To add a new special activity for Tertiary Education Purposes.

DPC25/67 James Kwing				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
67.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes this plan change totally as residents such as the submitter will have less protection against future developments by WelTec such as potentially new buildings up to 12m high and new activities like student accommodation with no notification.	That HCC reject the plan change.

DPC25/68 Craig McKirdy

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
68.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter makes comments on the following:</p> <p><u>Certainty:</u> The submitter sees no detail about what proposed activities or changes may be made in the future. When questioned, WelTec have indicated they have no current plans. The submitter concludes that if this is the case they have no need to make this proposed change.</p> <p><u>Amenity:</u> The submitter describes why he has decided to move to Petone. Any change to the content or purpose of any of the sites proposed under this precinct has the potential to impact on the submitter's amenity and as a result, their enjoyment of where they live and could potentially impact on the value of their property.</p> <p><u>Car Parking:</u> The submitter is concerned about the fact that WelTec currently do not provide the required number of car parks for their staff and students. Any increases in classes, subjects and/or services offered within the proposed precinct will bring additional staff/students to the area and residents will have no say in how this will be managed.</p> <p><u>Education Activity:</u> There would appear to be no limit on what activities may be allowed under the guise of 'Education'. This could have impacts on hours of operation and increased numbers of people and vehicles to the area.</p> <p><u>Increased Student Number:</u> Any change in what WelTec does on site will ultimate increase numbers of students and staff. Littering and loitering are already issues that the submitter experiences.</p> <p>If student accommodation is established, this would be quite a change from what it currently permissible on site and the residents and businesses of Petone should be able to say in whether such activities should be allowed.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned that the proposal removes his right to be</p>	That the proposed change in its current form be declined.

			consulted with about changes that WelTec make on sites and does not provide any certainty about the future.	
--	--	--	---	--

DPC25/69 Simon & Wendy Rogerson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
69.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitters generally support the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

DPC25/70 Anita Patel

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
70.1	Amendment 9 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scaled, Intensity and Location – Explanation and Reasons)]	Oppose	The submitter states that 12 metres is too high.	
70.2	Amendment 12 and 13 [4A 2.3 General Residential Activity Area (Restricted Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	The submitter states that compliance with Permitted Activity Conditions through Council should still occur.	

DPC25/71 Laura Newton-King

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
71.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

			<p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

DPC25/72 Clinton Maulder				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
72.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/73 Patricia Fraser				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
73.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The submitter comments that they have had bad experiences with WelTec and that if this plan change goes ahead as notified, WelTec will be able to do whatever they want.</p>	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/74 Dannie John Warren

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
74.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/75 Bocarda Print

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
75.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/76 Barbara Scott

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
76.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change. • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in

			<p>with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	its submission.
--	--	--	--	-----------------

DPC25/77 Nikki Chiappini & Brian Cole

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
77.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

			management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington. The submitters generally support the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.	
--	--	--	---	--

DPC25/78 Patricia Alexandra Fraser				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
78.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/79 Dannie Warren				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
79.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/80 Iain Jenkins				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
80.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires. PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational	That the Hutt City Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change • Remove the outlying areas from the so-

			<p>areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>called precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC25/81 Kylie & Andrew Morrell				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
81.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

			<p>and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitters generally support the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

DPC25/82 Emani Iosefo				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
82.1	General	Oppose	The submitter is in total disagreement with the Lower Hutt City Council backing WelTec for an Education Precinct Proposal. The submitter states that ratepayers of Petone must be told in advance of Council's decisions because in the end the Petone ratepayers suffer the most. The submitter asks to respect Petone's community and supports the statement of Petone Urban Environment Chairman Carl Bakker (Hutt News 24.4.2012).	

DPC25/83 A Powers				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
83.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/84 High Street Residents

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
84.1	General	Oppose	<p>While supporting WelTec’s educational objectives and confirming that a thriving tertiary education facility is pivotal to the wellbeing of the Hutt Valley the submitter states that these objectives should not be at the expense of its neighbours.</p> <p>The submitter provides extended material to describe the history of the area and the effects of WelTec’s expansion.</p>	<p>That the plan change be rejected</p> <p>That Council undertake careful policy work, consult widely, and resubmit a revised plan.</p>
84.2	General – Process for Plan Change	Oppose	<p><u>Consultation</u> The submitter states that residents were simply of what the changes would be and that consultation has fallen short of acceptable standards.</p> <p><u>Section 32</u> The submitter considers it inappropriate that Council has adopted WelTec’s evaluation. The report does not address statutory requirements adequately and makes no assessment of WelTec’s future needs. The submitter therefore considers that the Section 32 Report is inadequate and criticises that Council’s evaluation takes place in absence of any master plan for Petone.</p>	
84.3	General – Issues with the Plan Change	Oppose	<p><u>Need for Plan Change</u> The submitter finds that the need for the plan change is not established. The plan change provides certainty only for WelTec but not for other users of the residential environment. Over the last 10 years only one resource consent has been notified despite the impact which shows that the existing rules already favour WelTec over other amenity values.</p> <p><u>Precinct</u> The submitter states that a ‘precinct’ is by definition an enclosed area and that the WelTec campus is nothing of the sort – it is a discontinuous collection of properties scattered through residential and recreational land, a fractionated and congested cluster of facilities poorly designed and located for a modern tertiary institution.</p> <p><u>On-going Expansion</u> The submitter disagrees that the Plan Change aims to acknowledge WelTec’s existing and historic use of the site. The submitter considers that the plan change seeks to retrospectively validate considerable creep over recent years beyond its historic boundaries and that the creep of activities has had</p>	<p>That Council undertake a more robust analysis of the options and implications of WelTec’s needs in the context of a master plan that recognises the wide variety of uses in this area of Petone.</p> <p>That the plan change only relate to the original WelTec site bounded by Kensington Ave and the Petone Recreation Ground</p> <p>That the campus wide approach to parking be declined.</p> <p>That cycle storage be provided at a rate of one space per 10 staff and students for the whole campus that is located closer than any car park to common destinations throughout the campus, have overhead shelter and allow cycles to be secured.</p>

		<p>considerable impacts on residential amenity values.</p> <p><u>Student Numbers</u> The submitter argues that WelTec should face limits on the maximum number of staff and students on site at any time, as a way of mitigating the impact on the surrounding neighbourhood and that an agreed methodology for assessing this should be established.</p> <p><u>Existing Rules for Cuba Street site (General Business Activity Area)</u> The submitter states that while the rules regarding the Kensington Avenue site could be amended to reflect the reality of WelTec’s long-standing non-residential use, the key reason for adding the Cuba Street General Business Activity Area to avoid parking requirements.</p> <p><u>Campus-Wide Parking</u> The submitter assumes that a key reason for the precinct is to establish a “campus-wide” parking approach, offsetting existing parking requirements with off-street parking at a remote site on the precinct. The submitter argues that Campus wide parking is never going to be a reality and should not be proposed as a mitigating strategy for increased congestion in the Cuba St General Business Area.</p> <p><u>Requirements for Travel Demand Management</u> The submitter states that the plan omits any requirements for travel demand management and suggests that WelTec should establish cycle provisions, encourage the use of public transport and maintain an active car-pooling programme.</p>	<p>That WelTec to liaise with public transport providers to refine the location of bus stops, routes and timetables and report annually and publically on these discussions.</p> <p>That WelTec be required to maintain and report on an active carpooling programme.</p>
84.4	General - Conclusions	<p>The submitter concludes that a history of amenity values being adversely affected by the establishment of WelTec in the Cuba Street General Business Activity Area will be made worse by Plan Change 25.</p> <p>The proposal shifts the burden of WelTec’s poorly configured site onto surrounding residential areas and while accepting that provision of carparking can be expensive this is the why the District Plan imposes car parking requirements on a variety of land uses.</p> <p>The submitter requests that Council and WelTec co-ordinate better and consult with their host community to find more sustainable and imaginative solutions to the limitations of the current site.</p> <p>Plan Change 25 is considered to be one sided, developed with inadequate consultation and failing to recognise the detrimental impact on many residential</p>	

			and recreational amenity values.	
--	--	--	----------------------------------	--

DPC25/85 Tina Syme for Royal New Zealand Plunket Society				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
85.1	General	Not opposed	The submitter is not opposed in principle to the proposed changes to WelTec's plans to provide increased capacity for now and the future but has significant concerns regarding the potential impact on safe traffic flows and adequate parking as well as the current adequate signage.	
85.2	Traffic Safety/Parking		Plunket recently moved its clinical and Community services to 12 Kirks Avenue. The only access for parking for the facility is through the Petone recreation grounds/WelTec. The submitter is concerned that with increased traffic there is always a safety risk. The submitter has some concerns regarding access (parking) for their clients as the existing problem of students using the parking spaces on their site will probably increase with growing student numbers.	
85.3	Signage		The submitter criticises that there is currently inadequate signage which does not support safe traffic flow. Currently there is no signage that indicates that Plunket is located on site.	Clear signage to be at all entry points/car parks, identifying services and parking available on site as well as the presence of Plunket and small children.

DPC25/86 Petone Planning Action Group				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
86.1	General	Oppose	The submitter comments on the plan change in its entirety and opposes it totally in its current form as it will not protect, maintain and enhance residential and recreational areas and community facilities and there will be adverse effects on amenity values and recreational character, historic character and community and social values. The submitter does not agree with the Section 32 analysis or the parking plan or	That Hutt City Council reject the Plan Change, or at least make the changes to respond to the submission points regarding each amendment as below and remove the out-lying areas from the so-called precinct. That the Plan Change be heard by an Independent Commissioner or

			<p>the assessment of parking issues.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that the proposed plan change does not provide for the safeguards that were requested in previous consents and states that the lack of any other or at all adequate controls over future activities such as the possible height, scale, massing and design is a grave oversight.</p>	Commissioners (preferably Christine Foster as she heard the WeITec N Block application).
86.2	<p>Amendment 1 [Chapter 3 Definitions] and Amendment 10 [4A 2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Rules – Permitted Activities)]</p>	Oppose	<p>This is a very broad definition that needs tightening up to ensure that retailing could not be started anywhere in the precinct.</p> <p>Student accommodation should be dealt with separately, as a hostel has overnight as well as daytime effects.</p> <p>Amendment 1 (Definitions) needs to be considered with Amendment 10 (General Residential Activity Area - Permitted Activity conditions). There is no justification for some activities (cultural, health, childcare, social, retail) to be considered ‘ancillary’ to the main purpose of a Tertiary Education Activity. If cultural, health, childcare, social and retail activities are proposed they should be dealt with as if they are being put into a residential area and specific provisions (parking) should relate to that activity and not be bundled into the precinct provisions.</p>	<p>That the wording of the definition be as follows :</p> <p>Tertiary Education Facilities means the use of land and buildings for the provision of regular instruction, teaching, learning or training by an Institution (as defined in Section 159(1) of the Education Act 1989),...</p> <p>If the definition is to be retained as is, then there needs to be rules to limit the extent of retailing, social facilities, recreational activities, and childcare within the precinct.</p>
86.3	<p>Amendment 2 [4A 1.1.4 General Residential Activity Area (Non-residential activities – Issue)]</p>	Oppose	<p><i>“and provide social and economic benefits to the community” needs to be deleted</i> .The emphasis should be on the district plan providing for activities that are for the ‘public good’ of the city and provide benefits to the wider community but not at the expense of the local community.</p> <p>The wording as proposed could be used by other organisations/activities which could equally argue that they provide social and economic benefits to the community. This change could provide the basis for creep of all types of activities into residential areas across the whole of Hutt City.</p>	<p>That 4A 1.1.4 be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>Non-residential activities in residential areas can support residential activities and provide social and economic benefits to the community. Such activities can have significant adverse effects upon surrounding residential properties. These adverse effects need to be avoided, remedied or mitigated to ensure that residential amenity values and character are maintained and enhanced.</i></p>
86.4	<p>Amendment 3 [4A 1.1.4 (d) General Residential Activity Area (Non-residential activities – Policies)]</p>	Oppose	<p>As this policy relates to the General Residential Activity Area the word ‘residential’ needs to be added before the word ‘character”. (Same for Amendments 4 and 9.)</p> <p>The policy should avoid, remedy and mitigate all adverse effects of the precinct on the environment. The word ‘particularly” should be changed to ‘including’.</p> <p>Use of the word ‘recognise’ adds a level of presumption regarding what exists at present and should be deleted.</p>	<p>That 4A 1.1.4 (d) be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>(d) To recognise and provide for tertiary education activities in Petone within a defined Precinct, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects on the environment, particularly including the <u>residential</u> character and</i></p>

				<i>amenity values of the neighbourhood.</i>
86.5	Amendment 4 [4A 1.1.4 General Residential Activity Area (Non-residential activities – Explanation and Reasons)]	Oppose	<p>Any sites that are leased rather than owned by WelTec should not be included in any precinct and any General Recreation Area should not be included.</p> <p>The Bracken Street site is not needed for horticultural courses anymore and should not be part of the precinct.</p> <p>The inclusion of part of the Wormald Site at 57 Cuba Street and the sites at 69 and 71 Cuba Street are problematic - WelTec does not use 71 Cuba Street. No leased properties should be included, and what is currently owned by WelTec on core sites has to be the limit of any precinct forever– to provide certainty for residents.</p> <p>The first paragraph needs to be deleted as the wording seems out of character with the District Plan wording and the existing development is not acceptable and future development needs to look for better outcomes and reduced impact on the local community.</p> <p>The last addition states that specific controls are added but only limited effects are addressed and the wider residential amenity effects, traffic movements are not addressed and various amendments attempt to preclude notification in the future on any issue.</p> <p>The precinct should apply to the main area of WelTec activity, with the outliers retaining their current status and no presumption of the range of activities in the definition. Thus the description needs to be modified and the Plan Map changes to remove the areas in Bracken Street, Elizabeth Street and Britannia Street from the precinct.</p> <p>There needs to be a cap on the maximum number of staff and students on site at any one time (1200 students and approximately 300 staff). This is relevant in terms of parking facilities and associated social effects.</p>	<p>That the Bracken Street site be completely removed from the proposed precinct.</p> <p>That no leased property be included and what is currently owned by WelTec on core sites be the limit of any precinct forever.</p> <p>That the first paragraph proposed in Amendment 4 be deleted.</p> <p>That the description be modified and the Plan Map be changed to remove the areas in Bracken Street, Elizabeth Street and Britannia Street from the precinct.</p> <p>That a cap on the maximum number of staff and students on site at any one time be introduced.</p>
86.6	Amendment 5 [4A 1.2.1 (k) General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and location)]	Oppose	<p>The existing should not be seen as a baseline to work from and the very best urban design for any future development should be a minimum requirement.</p> <p>The amendment needs to be modified to include design guides and to relate to adverse effects on amenity values of nearby areas not just ones abutting the site.</p> <p>The words ‘recognise the existing scale and intensity of built development in the Precinct’ need to be deleted.</p>	<p>That design guides be included.</p> <p>That the words “<i>recognise the existing scale and intensity of the built development in the Precinct</i>” be deleted.</p>

86.7	Amendment 6 [4A 1.2.1 (b) General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and location – Explanation and Reasons – site coverage)]	Oppose	<p>Amendments 5 and 6 assume that the current situation and existing scale and intensity of the built environment on the WelTec campus is acceptable, which is not the case for residents. The current situation seems to be the starting point for the plan change. The submitter would like to see opportunities for improvements in the medium and long term.</p> <p>View shafts and access ways need to be maintained and increased through the Kensington Avenue site to the Petone Recreation Ground.</p>	<p>That the maximum height for any future developments on the western side of Kensington Avenue be 8m and site coverage for any future development be 35%.</p> <p>That view shafts and access ways be maintained and increased through the Kensington Avenue site to the Petone Recreation Ground.</p>
86.8	Amendment 7 and Amendment 8 [4A 1.2.1 (c) and (d) General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and location – Explanation and Reasons – recession plane and yards)]	Oppose	<p>There needs to be clarity as to the definition of ‘adjoin’ as abut has been ruled to mean touching.</p> <p>There also needs to be a definition of excessive shading.</p> <p>The submitter does not agree with no recession plane requirement and no minimum yard setback applying to internal precinct boundaries.</p> <p>The building length rule for the residential activity needs to be applied.</p> <p>Any future development adjoining or near a residential site should have further setbacks and reduce any existing shading. Boundary setbacks need to apply to eastern and western boundaries as well as any southern ones.</p>	<p>That the boundary setbacks apply to internal precinct boundaries.</p> <p>That the boundary setbacks apply to eastern and western boundaries as well as any southern ones.</p> <p>That the building length rule applies.</p>
86.9	Amendment 9 [4A 1.2.1 (e) General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and location – Explanation and Reasons – height)]	Oppose	<p>8m should be the maximum height in the areas zoned general residential with only two storeys able to be built.</p> <p>The site at the corner of Udy and Britannia Streets needs specific consideration.</p> <p>Any new buildings should visually have a residential character and take the appearance of residential buildings to minimise effects on existing residential amenity.</p> <p>Elizabeth and Udy Street sites need to be removed from any possible precinct as they are not being used for tertiary education activities and the Udy St site is an outlying area and not part of the core WelTec area.</p>	<p>That the maximum height be 8m in the areas zoned general residential.</p> <p>That all new buildings have a residential character.</p> <p>That Elizabeth street and Udy Street sites be removed from the precinct.</p>
86.10	Amendment 11 [4A 2.1.1 General Residential Activity Area (Permitted Activities – conditions)]	Oppose	<p>An 8m height limit is sought along with 35% site coverage everywhere in the residential activity area. Yards and recession planes should apply internally as well as on boundaries. Well maintained landscaping would be better screening than solid fences of 1.5 or 1.8m.</p> <p>It is important that no external living areas (such as balconies) can be built above ground level anywhere in the proposed precinct and that windows in new buildings are designed not to overlook nearby residents or are opaque, and light</p>	<p>That there be an 8m height limit, a limit of 35% site coverage and yard setback and recession planes apply to internal boundaries within the precinct.</p> <p>In 4A 2.1.1 there needs to be an (a) after the proposed (z) that reads as follows:</p>

			spill and other effects need to be taken into account.	<i>The number of staff and students within the precinct at any time to not exceed 1200 (students) and 300 (staff).</i>
86.11	Amendment 12 [4A 2.3 General Residential Activity Area (Restricted Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	If activities can't meet precinct provisions they should be Non-complying, or at the very least fully discretionary activities, and should be publicly notified. The submitter opposes the preclusion of notification.	That any activities which can't meet precinct provisions become non-complying or at least fully discretionary activities.
86.12	Amendment 13 [4A 2.3.1 (k) General Residential Activity Area (Matters in which Council has restricted its discretion)]	Oppose	It is considered these matters should be assessment matters for Discretionary activities or embedded in policies to be considered when Council is looking at a Non-complying activity. There is no mention of traffic effects, parking effects, hours of operation, noise etc. - all of which contribute to residential amenity and need to be included. The starting point is again recognising what already exists and not what it should look like in the future, which is what it should be concentrating on. There should be a design guide that sets out principles for quality design for any future development in the precinct.	That a design guide that sets out principles for quality design for any future development in the Precinct be introduced.
86.13	Amendment 14 [4A 2.4 (n) General Residential Activity Area (Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	Amendments 12 – 14 as currently worded in effect allow WelTec to do anything without notification and with no input from residents possible. The plan change would allow more than double the consented height of N block without notification and undertake a development of the Udy St site of up to 12m without notification.	That such matters should be non-complying and require full notification.
86.14	Amendment 15 [4A General Residential Activity Area (Appendices)]	Oppose	The has major problems with the maps as they seem to portray more coverage in Cuba Street than is detailed in the s32 evaluation of sites. Leased sites should not be included in the Precinct and especially not the Bracken Street site on reserve land. Udy/Britannia Street and Elizabeth Street sites should not be included.	That the Bracken Street site, Udy/Britannia St and Elizabeth Street sites be removed from the Precinct.
86.15	Amendment 17 [6A 1.1.1 General Business Activity Area]	Oppose	The definition of WelTec should be the same throughout and not be added to in this policy so the wording after the comma in (d) needs to be deleted. If need be this 'providing for tertiary education on a local and regional basis' could replace the wording the submitter wish to be deleted in the first added paragraph in Amendment 4. The word 'accommodate' needs to be replaced with 'provide for where appropriate.	That 6A 1.1.1 be amended as follows: <i>'Accommodate Provide for where appropriate tertiary education activities within the Tertiary Education Precinct, which provides for tertiary education on a local and regional basis.'</i>

86.16	<p>Amendment 18 [6A 1.1.1 General Business Activity Area (Explanation and Reasons)]</p>	Oppose	<p>None of the changed wording is necessary, and the second sentence especially needs deleting.</p> <p>Residents around the Cuba Street area have witnessed the creep of WelTec into this part of the General Business Area and any use has been established by stealth instead of in a spirit of being a good neighbour.</p>	<p>That 6A 1.1.1 be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>The range of non-industrial activities accommodated also includes training facilities, conference centres, places of assembly and places of worship. Tertiary education activities are accommodated within the Tertiary Education Precinct, of which, that part on Cuba Street is located within the General Business Activity Area.</i></p> <p>WelTec and its predecessors have historically provided tertiary education activities within the area in Cuba Street and the activity is an established use on the site providing important tertiary education including vocational education and applied research. These non-industrial activities are provided for where the potential generated effects do not have an adverse effect on the amenity values of the area and the environment</p>
86.17	<p>Amendment 19 [6A 1.1.3 General Business Activity Area (Environmental Effects - Issue)] and Amendment 20 [6A 1.2.1 General Business Activity Area (Effects on Amenity Values - Issue)]</p>	Oppose	<p>The word 'accommodated' needs to be replaced with 'provided for where appropriate' and 'where there is an interface with residential' needs to be added after the comma in each of 19 and 20.</p> <p>The proposed changes have the potential to open up all sorts of activities being allowable anywhere in the Hutt in any part of the current or any future General Business Activity Area – it should only be referring to Tertiary Education Activities.</p> <p>A new amendment 6A 2.1.1 (r) should be introduced which puts a cap on the maximum number of students and staff on site at any one time - this is particularly relevant to parking facilities and associated social effects which extend into surrounding residential areas. Any change which will increase the on-site student and staff population will be assessed in terms of parking.</p>	<p>That 6A 1.1.3 be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>Business Activities (commercial and industrial activities) and other activities accommodated <u>provided for where appropriate</u> within the General Business Activity Area, <u>where there is an interface with residential</u> have the potential....</i></p> <p>That 6A 1.2.1 be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>The sites, structures and buildings used by business activities (commercial and industrial activities) and other activities accommodated <u>provided for where appropriate</u> within the General Business Activity Area, <u>where there is an interface with residential</u> have the potential....</i></p> <p>That a new amendment 6A 2.2.2 (r) be added</p>

				which limits the maximum number of students to 1200 along with approximately 300 staff.
86.18	Amendment 21 [6A 2.2.1 (b) General Business Activity Area (Controlled Activities)]	Oppose	If activities can't meet Precinct provisions they should be Non-complying, or at the very least fully Discretionary, and should be publically notified. The submitter opposes the preclusion of notification.	That activities that cannot meet the Precinct provisions be Non-complying activities or fully Discretionary.
86.19	Amendment 22 [6A 2.3 (i) General Business Activity Area (Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	Amendments 21 and 22 try to secure no opposition for anything WelTec might propose within the precinct part of the General Business Activity Area. The preclusion of notification is strongly opposed and any non-complying buildings and structures should be at the very least Discretionary Activities for the General Business Activity Area.	That the preclusion of notification be deleted. That any activities that cannot meet the Precinct provisions be at least Discretionary Activities.
86.20	Amendment 23 [6A 2.3.1 (i) General Business Activity Area (Matters in which Council has restricted its discretion)]	Oppose	The matters listed in Amendment 23 should all be Discretionary matters and the issues of traffic effects, parking effects, hours of operation, and noise need to be included and dealt with. Any effects of an activity in the General Business Area needs to be kept within this area and not be allowed to be mitigated through provisions of parking e.g. in an adjoining residential zone or any part of a Tertiary Education Precinct with underlying residential zoning.	That all matters listed be discretionary matters and traffic effects, parking effects, hours of operation, and noise be included.
86.21	Amendment 24 [6A General Business Activity Area (Appendices)]	Oppose	Appendix B map is misleading as it appears to include at least one Lot not listed in the description of Lots involved in the evaluation.	
86.22	Amendment 25 [Chapter 7 Recreation and Open Space (Introduction)]	Oppose	As WelTec has only been using the Bracken St site for a few years and has decided not to continue with a degree course in Landscape Design the second sentence that is proposed needs to be deleted. The whole site should not be part of the precinct. The submitter refers to his previous submission on the terms 'accommodate' and 'historically' and opposes in principle the use of recreation land in this way.	That the Bracken Street site be removed from the Precinct. That the second sentence of the amendment be deleted. That the word ' <i>accommodate</i> ' be replaced by ' <i>provided for where appropriate</i> ' and the word ' <i>historically</i> ' be deleted.
86.23	Amendment 26 [7A 1.1.4 Recreation and Open Space (Non-Recreational Activities)]	Oppose	The proposed change could apply anywhere in any Recreational Activity Areas by WelTec or anyone. The submitter questions how a two storey building covering 20% of the site is not going to adversely affect the open space. Tertiary Education activities should be provided for only as an exception and	

			once it is demonstrated there are no other suitable sites in the district suitable for the activity, and any adverse effects on residential amenity etc. can be managed.	
86.24	Amendment 27 [7A 2.1 General Recreation Activity Area (Permitted Activities)] and Amendment 28 [7A 2.1.1 General Recreation Activity Area (Permitted Activities - Conditions)] and Amendment 29 [Appendix 1 – Recreation and Open Space]	Oppose	Proposed amendments 27, 28 and 29 are unacceptable in what is and should be recreation and open space area. Amendments 25 to 29 need to be deleted in total.	That amendments 25 to 29 be deleted in total.
86.25	Amendment 30 [14A (iii) 1.2.1 (b) Car and Cycle Parking]	Oppose	The submitter questions what ‘adequate’ parking means and states that the use of the words <i>‘recognising the existing nature, level and extent of car parking in and around precinct’</i> suggests that it should never be any better than it is now and that the current situation would be the baseline for future definitions of whether effects might be more than minor. The submitter requests the words ‘predominantly residential’ to be inserted before ‘area’ and disagrees with any development in the General Business Area relying on parking in any residential zone part of a Precinct. The policy needs to be rewritten to focus on maintaining and improving residential amenity, and it need to promote moving to no reliance on on-street parking. There needs to be a ‘sunset clause’ – about reliance on on-street parking to be stopped in say 5 years from any plan provisions being approved. The submitter agrees with none of the current Amendment 30 wording as it should be about improving the residential amenity rather than making it worse.	That the policy be rewritten to focus on maintaining and improving residential amenity and promote non-reliance on on-street parking. That the words <i>‘predominantly residential’</i> be inserted before <i>‘area’</i> . That a sunset clause about reliance on on-street parking being stopped 5 years from any plan provisions being approved be introduced.
86.26	Amendment 31 [14A (iii) 1.2.1 Car and Cycle Parking (On-site parking provision for	Oppose	The submitter criticises that there is no information about how the aim referred to in Amendment 31 can be achieved and questions how the number of staff/students will be established and monitored.	That a cap on the total number of students and staff who can use the precinct at any one time be introduced and monitored.

	activities – Explanation and Reasons])		<p>There needs to be a cap one the number of people who can use the Precinct at any one time.</p> <p>The total number of students and staff provided for is 1200 plus 300 staff- needs to be added at the end of the first paragraph of Amendment 31.</p> <p>The aim needs to include the removal of WelTec reliance on on-street car parking through the introduction of a sun-set clause about how this will cease within around 5 years.</p> <p>The emphasis of the second paragraph needs to change from the existing situation to a future situation that is directed towards maintaining and enhancing residential amenity.</p> <p>The plan change does not mention/promote the need for linkages to public transport and there is no mention of pedestrian walkways – it is totally vehicle orientated for travel.</p>	<p>That a sun-set clause be introduced.</p> <p>That the emphasis of the second paragraph be changed from the existing situation to a future situation which maintains and enhances residential amenities.</p>
86.27	Amendment 32 [14A (iii) 2.1 (b) Car and Cycle Parking (Location of Car Parking Spaces)]	Oppose	'May' needs to be changed to 'Must' and Precinct needs to mean a centrally located area and not any outlying areas or sites not currently used for tertiary education.	That the word ' <i>may</i> ' be changed to ' <i>must</i> '.
86.28	Amendment 33 [14A (iii) 2.2 (b) Car and Cycle Parking (Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	<p>The submitter requests the addition of a cap on total student and staff numbers.</p> <p>Any parking off site is requested to have non-complying activity status – particularly if parking on a Residential Activity Area site might be involved.</p>	<p>That words such as '<i>Or where the total number of students and staff in any precinct exceeds 1200 (students) and 300 (Staff)</i>' be added to the provision.</p> <p>That any parking provided off site have a non-complying activity status.</p>
86.29	Amendment 34 [14A (iii) 2.2.1 Car and Cycle Parking (Assessment Matters for Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	The submitter questions how the demand would be identified and by whom and requests that any reduction in kerbside parking needs to be built in.	
86.30	Amendment 35 [Appendix 3]	Oppose	The submitter questions how any of these numbers will be able to be agreed on or monitored and states that this is not workable.	
86.31	Amendment 36 [14B 2.1.1 (c) Signs]; and Amendment 37 [14B 2.2 Signs (Controlled Activities)]; and Amendment 38	Oppose	<p>There is no logic provided for 3m² signs and any content must only be related to Tertiary Education Activities.</p> <p>When on a site abutting (or across the road from or able to be seen from) a residential area, signs should be a Discretionary Activity to protect residential amenity and be notified.</p>	

	[14B 2.2 Signs (Controlled Activities)]; and Amendment 39 [14B 2.2 Signs (Restricted Discretionary Activities)]		Signs referred to in Amendment 39 need to be non-complying and notified. No flashing lights on any signs that can be seen from a residential area should be possible. The submitter does not agree with non-notification as suggested.	
--	--	--	--	--

DPC25/87 Andrea and Warwick Bolton				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
87.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas. Changes would impact Graham St residents through increased noise, traffic, disruption. WelTec has already transgressed current consents.</p> <p>PC25 is contrary to s5 and s7 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>As currently worded, PC25 would result in inappropriate effects on (including but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding area.</p> <p>In its current form PC25 fails to appropriately manage and provide for the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area, and in particular with the low density residential area.</p> <p>The Section 32 report that accompanies PC25 fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.</p>	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/88 Bryan Thompson for Petone Corps, Salvation Army

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
88.1	General – Campus-wide parking proposal; Inclusion of Cuba Street site in Precinct; Lack of cap on student numbers; Lack of inclusion of travel demand management requirements	Oppose	<p>The submitter explains that the Salvation Army has been operating community activities from the Cuba St premises for many years and seeks to be a positive presence in the community by supporting people in need, building stronger families and community and inviting people to consider faith.</p> <p>Ease of parking is critical for all the activities.</p> <p>Parking has become harder over the last 8 years as WelTec has built up its presence on its Cuba St site especially for play group which starts at 10 by which time all available parking is often taken by people attending WelTec. Potential evening or weekend courses will create difficulties for out of hours activities offered by the Salvation Army.</p> <p>The increasing congestion on the corner of Cuba St and High St, together with increased traffic on High St is of concern given the number of children attending activities at the Salvation Army premises.</p> <p>The submitter asks Council to recognise the important and pre-existing community activities in the area that are increasingly being affected by traffic congestion from WelTec. The campus wide parking proposal will not be effective – students will not walk from Udy St. Parking restrictions proposed by Council will provide protection for residents but keep the Salvation Army in direct competition with WelTec students.</p>	<p>That Cuba Street General Business Activity Area be excluded from the campus wide parking proposal.</p> <p>That Cuba Street General Business Activity Area be excluded from the Tertiary Education Precinct.</p> <p>That an all over cap on student and staff numbers on site at one time be included.</p> <p>That requirements to encourage transport options other than private motor cars be included.</p>

DPC25/89 Pat Sviatko

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
89.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.</p>

DPC25/90 Frank Steven Sviatko

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
90.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/91 Anthony Joseph O'Connor

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
91.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/92 Michiko Ammon

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
92.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/93 Ranka Sunko

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
93.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/94 Judith Kathleen Exley

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
94.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/95 Lisa Michelle Wilde

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
95.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The submitter will fight to ensure its special character is not destroyed and points out that sensitive development and enhancements are the way forward while residents must be given the opportunity to comment on any plans at all stages.</p>	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/96 David Tripp

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
96.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/97 Nikki Bennett (Salvation Army Petone Playgroup)

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
97.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The submitter supervises the Salvation Army Petone Playgroup which runs Wednesday and Friday mornings and points out that many parents bring their babies/toddlers in cars, therefore need to park close, not several blocks away. Approximately 30 – 50 families attend each session. It is a huge community programme which provides a great service to the families who attend – no parking would prevent people benefitting from playgroup and be a big deterrent.</p>	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/98 Jolene Hendry (Salvation Army Playgroup)

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
98.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded	That the Hutt City Council adopt the

			<p>it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The submitter is a volunteer at the Salvation Army play group on Wednesday's and Fridays. The submitter states that already parents have to walk quite far from where they are parked to get to us. If there are less parks it makes it more difficult for them, then less people may attend and it will be a loss for the local community.</p>	<p>amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

DPC25/99 Jamie Dawson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
99.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The submitter states that public parking needs to be available around the Salvation Army building for parents with young babies and toddlers going to playgroups.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.</p>

DPC25/100 Karen Ferguson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
100.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The submitter states it is trouble finding a park for playgroup on a Wednesday</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.</p>

			and Friday.	
--	--	--	-------------	--

DPC25/101 Sharon McKendrick				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
101.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The submitter finds it hard to find car park when taking her daughter to playgroup.</p>	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/102 Tessa McGuinness				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
102.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The submitter states that it is already hard to find a park for play group on Fridays and she often has to walk a long way in the rain with two children. Less parking would mean they may stop being able to come.</p>	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/103 Megan Hughes (Salvation Army)				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
103.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded	That the Hutt City Council adopt the

			<p>it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The submitter finds it hard to park coming on a Wednesday and occasional Sunday to Salvation Army and has to walk far to get there as limited parks.</p>	<p>amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

DPC25/104 Helen Tripp (High Street Craft Group)				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
104.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The submitter states that finding a park when people come to this not for profit community group is often prohibited by over parking from WelTec students.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.</p>

DPC25/105 Margaret Nicholas (High Street Craft Group)				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
105.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.</p>

DPC25/106 Lesley Whitlock (High Street Craft Group)

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
106.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/107 Sue Moran (High Street Craft Group)

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
107.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/108 Lorraine Driskel (High Street Craft Group)

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
108.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/109 Beryl Henderson (High Street Craft Group)

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
109.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/110 Michael McCrorie

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
110.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/111 Alan and Jenny Mumford

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
111.1	General	Oppose	The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/112 Albert and Geraldine Wayers

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
112.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitters generally support the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

DPC25/113 Flora Beblidakis

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
113.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.</p>

DPC25/114 Rose and Humphrey Foote

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
114.1	General	Oppose	The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/115 Cathy and Mike Reid

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
115.1	General	Oppose	The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/116 Vakharia Mukesh

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
116.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/117 Victoria Sutton

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
117.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/118 Suega Boot

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
118.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 is contrary to s5 and s7 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>As currently worded, PC25 would result in inappropriate effects on (including but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding area.</p> <p>In its current form PC25 fails to appropriately manage and provide for the interface between WeITec and the surrounding area, and in particular with the low density residential area.</p> <p>The Section 32 report that accompanies PC25 fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.</p>	That Hutt City Council adopts the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environment Association Incorporated in its submission.

DPC25/119 Rochelle Griffin

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
119.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/120 Wilma Cook

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
120.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/121 MJ Sammons

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
121.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/122 CJ Cosford

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
122.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/123 Peter and Catharina Philipsen

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
123.1	General	Oppose	The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/124 D Gordon

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
124.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.0	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/125 Sue Howard

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
125.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/126 Faith Lawson

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
126.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/127 Chris Skinn

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
127.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/128 Jonathan Mahoney

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
128.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/129 Graham Nesor

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
129.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/130 Paul McGillicuddy

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
130.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/131 Hazel Neser

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
131.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/132 Gordon Craig

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
132.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/133 Jo St Just

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
133.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/134 Susana Lemisio

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
134.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

DPC25/135 Mark and Anne Godfrey

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
135.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters state that WelTec and its predecessor have been part of the community landscape for many years and that WelTec has grown in direct conflict with the residential zoning, causing degrading effects on residential</p>	<p>That the plan change be refused.</p> <p>That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought</p>

			<p>amenity.</p> <p>The submitters consider that most of the recent resource consents have met widespread resistance from the community – principally due to traffic, parking and immediate neighbour effects and comment that the HCC has chosen to support a plan change in favour of WelTec, presumably to allow further development without community consultation.</p> <p>The proposal has no community genesis, and has been adopted as HCC’s proposal with no apparent justification, considering the community’s long-standing objection to continued expansion of the impacts of the WelTec sites.</p> <p>The submitters have seen no new evidence of significant demand justifying such a need</p> <p>The submitters support the proposed amendments submitted by the Petone Urban Environmental Association and ask that the plan change be heard by an independent commissioner or commissioners.</p>	<p>by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.</p> <p>That the plan change be heard by independent commissioners.</p>
135.2	General - Resource Management Act		<p>The submitters consider that granting the proposed plan change will significantly moderate the community’s ability under the RMA to manage its own impacts in favour of one user. The potential wider community impacts of a non-residential user in a residential zoned area require the protection of the RMA. The community has shown its opposition to unfettered development of the WelTec site, and removal of the protection effectively allows a district plan change to overrule RMA protections. The plan change proposal is seen as a method proposed to defeat the community’s efforts to protect its amenity rights.</p> <p>The submitters assume that WelTec would have alternative options and could invest in other sites in Petone</p> <p>The submitters find that the plan change is a method of avoiding reasonable controls on the impacts on the community.</p>	
135.3	General - Udy Street/ Britannia Street site		<p>The submitters describe that WelTec has previously proposed changing this site from parking to a high density, medium rise residential hall.</p> <p>The fundamental impact of the plan change would be to allow WelTec to proceed with a hostel on the site and approximately 80 residential students and their visitors moving up and down the street between the site and Jackson Street. This would have severe impacts on the after-hours traffic volumes on Britannia Street.</p>	

			The submitters are opposed to the proposed plan change for its potential unchallengeable impact on their street and because they would lose the right to challenge such a change of use if the plan change proceeded.	
135.4	General - Parking		The submitters state that WelTec presently imposes significant parking impacts on residential streets in Petone and struggles to match its site and student capacity with parking facilities. In some streets there is insufficient parking for residents and their visitors. The submitter is opposed to the plan change as it would give WelTec further right to impact the existing community.	
135.5	General - Heritage sites		The submitters state that the area contains a number of buildings which HCC deems heritage sites and that allowing WelTec relatively unfettered development rights would lessen the community's rights to protect these sites.	
135.6	General - Department of Conservation (DOC) property		The submitters point out that the proposed plan change appears to include DOC land at Sladden Park and that HCC has no power to grant such zoning over this reserve land.	

DPC25/136 Peter Cartwright				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
136.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/137 Esme Cartwright				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
137.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

			areas.	
--	--	--	--------	--

DPC25/138 A Hansen				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
138.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/139 Mike Fisher				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
139.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form because it does not protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities close to the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area. The submitter questions what the effect of the plan change would have on areas of land currently leased to WelTec, should those leases expire. The inclusion of the outliers while useful to WelTec to determine a car parking formula, does nothing to allay concerns of a spread of their campus across Petone.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the inclusion of the car park on the Udy St/Britannia St corner in the precinct as development of this site for student accommodation or other buildings has always been a key concern for residents, and at odds with the residential nature of the area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas. The potential for retail activities</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Planning Action Group.

			<p>to be established in the precinct has implications for operating hours, traffic and effects on adjacent residential properties. While WelTec has made changes to the initial plan to accommodate concerns over height, shading etc., these appear to relate to certain aspects i.e. to the south, however the impact on Recreation Ground users and residents adjacent to the outliers is not necessarily addressed</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitter believes that an independent commissioner should hear the plan change which would give continuity with the WelTec N block hearing.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by the Petone Planning Action Group in its submission.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

DPC25/140 Patrick Williams				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
140.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that the plan change overrides residents' democratic rights of consultation and input into determining the nature and format of the physical composition of their community.</p> <p>The plan usurps the residents' rights by not even having to give notification of any proposed changes or developments. It gives the Council and WelTec the authority to pursue developments beyond the current restrictions and requirements.</p> <p>The submitter assumes that the intention is to circumvent normal procedures and the strong opposition expressed by residents to earlier proposed expansions into residential areas.</p> <p>The submitter states that the proposed plan is a direct attempt to impose developments on a community which it knows would not be welcome by keeping residents in ignorance of infringements or changes of standard Council structural and site requirements and procedures through dictatorial changes</p>	That Plan Change 25 be rejected in its entirety.

		<p>under the secret banner of education.</p> <p>The submitter believes that WelTec is the intruder in their residential zone with a clandestine agenda and that Council is attempting to accommodate them at the resident/ratepayers' expense.</p>	
--	--	--	--

DPC25/141 Lorraine Williams				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
141.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that the proposed plan change will have a major impact on the lifestyle and wellbeing of all residents and ratepayers by creating and educational precinct.</p> <p>It seeks the introduction of a new tertiary education precinct that will provide for the on-going development of WelTec campus and WelTec will not have to go through the normal public notified resource consent process.</p> <p>Residents will not be able to make a submission on any concerns or reservations that they may have on new development proposals.</p> <p>The submitter finds that this proposal disregards the rights of residents and ratepayers.</p> <p>The submitter asks that the existing residential zone should be preserved as one.</p> <p>Petone is a very well documented historical area and Council should be preserving its historical nature and not destroying it.</p> <p>The submitter states that Kensington Avenue is a well-kept, and well maintained street where a lot of money has been put into renovating and preserving the historical character of the homes and that they should be able to live a peaceful lifestyle and enjoy it. That will change if Hutt City Council allows this proposed plan change to proceed.</p>	That Plan Change 25 be rejected in its entirety.

DPC25/142 Reg and Anne Cotter

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
142.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitters generally support the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

DPC25/143 Kathryn Delahunty

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
143.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.</p>

DPC25/144 Mark Phegan

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
144.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/145 Katrina Mannix

Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
145.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.

			The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.	
--	--	--	--	--

DPC25/146 Maara Heather				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
146.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Petone Urban Environmental Association in its submission.

DPC25/147 Vasu Govind				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
147.1	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form.</p> <p>PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires.</p> <p>PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.</p> <p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed</p>	<p>That the Hutt City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the submitter's submission points. • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission. • Reject the proposal angle parking in Emerson Street.

			management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington. The submitter generally supports the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.	
--	--	--	---	--

DPC25/148 David Goldsbury				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
148.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/149 Matt Goldsbury				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
149.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/150 Diane Goldsbury				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
150.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

			areas.	
--	--	--	--------	--

DPC25/151 Kevin Goldsbury				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
151.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/152 Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
152.1	General – Legal Matters: Consultation	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that there has been very little consultation with the community and that which occurred was vastly inadequate. It has not been within the context of the precinct and occurred during other plan change processes where the community were unaware of a proposed precinct and were unable to make an informed comment.</p> <p>Council has failed in its duties in respected of an adopted plan change under Schedule 1 part 1 of the RMA to undertake consultation on the plan change in a manner consistent with the principles of consultation in s.82 of the LGA 2002.</p> <p>The submitter notes that while a Council is not required to consult on an adopted plan change prior to notification where a local authority does opt to undertake consultation in conjunction with the applicant this must be done in accordance with the LGA 2002.</p>	
152.2	General – Legal Matters: Assessment of Environmental Effects	Oppose	The submitter states that the AEE provided for the Proposed Plan Change is inadequate and provides very little (if any) assessment as to the adverse effects that may occur in the event it is adopted. The AEE provides no assessment on shading, bulk, privacy, height, noise, heritage or other impacts on the amenity of the surrounding residential and recreational areas.	

152.3	General – Legal Matters: Section 32 analysis	Oppose	The submitter challenges the Section 32 report for PPC25, under Section 32A, stating that it is flawed in that it fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.	
152.4	General – Legal Matters: Resource Management Act 1991	Oppose	The submitter states that in its current form, PPC 25 does not promote the sustainable management of natural or physical resources required by the RMA. PPC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.	
152.5	General – Legal Matters: Consistency with other plan provisions	Oppose	The submitter comments that the plan change is not consistent with other plan provisions such as the provisions introduced by Plan Change 12, Heritage (i.e.: the Old Court House) and matters protected and identified in the General Residential Area and Petone Recreation Area chapters.	
152.6	General – Legal Matters: Existing use rights	Oppose	The submitter states that it is unlikely existing use rights for the precinct areas and for the current activities (e.g.: on-street car parking) can be established. The submitter states that the plan change is contrary to good resource management practice in that it seeks to confirm and reinforce the existing level of non-compliance, including non-compliance with existing resource consent conditions via the plan change; the submitter says this is inconsistent with the Councils' duties to act in accordance with its own plans.	That existing use rights are properly determined and established before using them in the proposed provisions.
152.7	General – Legal Matters: 'Precinct concept'	Oppose	The submitter questions whether PPC25 creates a precinct, as opposed to creating preferential 'spot zoning'. The submitter states that many of the amendments currently proposed have the potential to undermine the precinct.	That the Council amend PPC25 in accordance with the submitter's submission, which seeks to strengthen and enhance the precinct approach. Re-write the introduction to the Precinct plan change to better reflect the precinct as a planning mechanism and to recognise the existing conflict between the nature and scale of existing Tertiary Education Activities and residents and other community and recreational activities.
152.8	General – Legal Matters: Changes to the general residential area zone desirable	Oppose	The submitter notes that several parts of PPC25 relate to matters which are outside the precinct area, and appear to be outside the scope of the plan change.	That consideration be given to amending the General Residential Area provisions of the plan. Amending the plan to make "tertiary Education Activities" outside the precinct in

				the General Residential Activity Area a non-complying activity would assist in preserving the residential character of the area and effectively maintain the integrity of the precinct.
152.9	General – Legal Matters: Independent commissioner	Oppose	The submitter considers that given that Council have adopted the proposed plan change (an action which implies support), the Council should not decide the matter itself.	That an independent commissioner be appointed.
152.10	General – Plan Change documentation: What is Proposed Plan Change 25?	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that the Proposed Plan Change as notified does not meet its purpose of <i>‘providing for ongoing use and development of the campus to meet future tertiary education needs whilst also providing greater certainty for the community’</i>. The submitter questions the purpose of PPC25 as whole.</p> <p>The submitter questions how the plan change will protect the amenity values of each surrounding area if the residential amenity values have not been properly defined in the plan change. The submitter states that amendments are required to the objectives and policies to better define residential amenity and introduce mechanisms (e.g. an urban design framework) to ensure amenity values are recognised and protected.</p> <p>The submitter supports in general the plan change’s intent to provide for the activities of the Tertiary Education provider in an appropriate way by applying rules differently throughout the campus but comments that they have addressed the matter in detail further in their submission.</p> <p>The submitter comments that there is no future development plan included as part of PPC25 and that there is no way of measuring whether the effects on the surrounding areas are being managed. The submitter feels that this lack of development plan makes it difficult to determine what the future requirements for the Tertiary Education Facility are. The submitter notes that the current approach has been to free up any planning controls to allow for flexibility in what can be built on the site in the future, as quickly as possible, presumably to respond to future tertiary education needs as they arise. The submitter considers that this approach does not represent sound resource management planning practice.</p> <p>The submitter questions the proposed changes relating to car and cycle parking and signage as well as the concurrent HCC review of on-street carparking in Petone. The submitter states that where multiple sites are involved the proximity of the sites to each other plays an important part in the optimal</p>	

			<p>management of the car parks and the overall effects of the parking overspill.</p> <p>The submitter states that it has been established that the current operation of the existing tertiary education activity Petone has significant adverse effects in terms of parking and traffic and that PPC25 appears to endorse this, seeking to maintain or potentially worsen them rather than mitigating them.</p> <p>The submitter highlights two significant issues that they feel need to be addressed for this plan change to be effective:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The provision of sufficient car parks to meet the needs of the tertiary education activity. This involves the provision of both off street and on street car parks. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) an appropriate total number of spaces relative to the number of people using the site and the activities being undertaken on the site; and (b) an appropriate split between off and on street spaces to minimise the adverse effects. 2. The management of the off street car parks to maximise their use and the management of on street car parks to minimise their effect on other residents. <p>The submitter states that the plan change also fails to deal with what may occur in the event that the site is no longer needed for Tertiary Education Activities.</p>	
152.11	General – Plan Change documentation: Scope of PC25	Oppose	<p>It is not clear by what ‘generally’ means in the first paragraph of the text under the Scope of Proposed Plan Change 25 heading.</p> <p>The submitter states that the land at 26 and 26A Bracken Street (K Block) is owned by the Minister of Conservation as a conservation area and is subject to the Conservation Act 1987. The Section 32 report wrongly identifies this as land owned by HCC. The submitter considers this is entirely inappropriate for this land to be included in PPC25 as part of the Precinct and should be deleted.</p> <p>The submitter comments that while the ownership of land is not generally an RMA issue, given the relaxation of height, bulk provisions it may not be appropriate for land that is leased and not owned by the Tertiary Education institution to be included in the precinct. Including lease sites within the precinct is problematic because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. if a leased site is included in the precinct, and developed in accordance with the precinct provisions including reliance on the off street parking provisions and campus wide parking approach, then conceivably a leased 	<p>That the following wording (or similar) be inserted by way of explanation to the introduction of PPC25 which records:</p> <p><u><i>“in past years the tertiary education institution has had some conflict with local residents because of moves to expand into the surrounding residential areas. For this reason Council generally requires the Precincts to develop within their existing boundaries to protect nearby residential neighbourhoods from the encroachment of non-residential development. Future expansion of the precinct is not prohibited, but Council seeks to ensure that any of Tertiary educational institution boundaries is</i></u></p>

			<p>site could be developed that relies on car parking on another part of the campus or the leased property could provide car parking for another part of the precinct; and</p> <p>2. in the event that the lease comes to an end and is no longer used for Tertiary Education Activities the precinct may lose off-street car parks provided on the leased site or the leased site may be left with insufficient off-street car parking because that property has been developed in reliance of the campus wide car parking approach, using the proposed formula, rather than those of the General Business Area. The building owners who would benefit from the relaxed precinct rules will also obtain a benefit as they have been able to develop their properties to a level over and above what is permitted for the underlying zone.</p> <p>The submitter states that PPC25 is more like a spot zoning approach rather than a precinct.</p>	<p><u>properly evaluated. Expansion proposals will be dealt with under the plan change process to enable a full assessment of environmental effects”</u></p> <p>That the precinct plan records that considerable scope for expansion of Tertiary Education Activities is possible at the institution’s other campuses, e.g.: the new hospitality school and Wakefield Street site in Wellington, the Petone Memorial College site and the Jackson Street site in Petone and the close management relationship that WelTec has with Whitirea all of which have space available for further development and have more preferable zoning. This recognises that the Precinct Area is a finite area that is currently subject to relatively intense development. As a result of the nature of the site, limited new development opportunities are restricted.</p>
152.12	General – Plan Change documentation: Summary of Proposed Plan Change 25	Oppose	<p>The submitter states it is inappropriate for PC25 to say it specifically provides for WelTec’s activities. The proposed definition does not reference WelTec, and PPC25 should not provide for the activities of a specific organisation. All references to WelTec should be deleted.</p> <p>The submitter states that permitted activities as currently proposed are likely to result in unacceptable adverse effects on the neighbouring residential and recreational areas. The submitter states that PPC25 shouldn’t be a mechanism to add individual activities which are not existing activities on site (e.g. student accommodation) or provide for current activities with no limitation on scale. The submitter questions the intent of the permitted activity provisions to protect the amenity of the surrounding residential areas, particularly as the residential amenity to be protected is not well defined and effects of the proposed provisions not properly understood. The permitted activity conditions need to be more tightly defined, with no discretion, and address a wider range of issues.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that the current provisions as currently drafted legitimise and confirm WelTec’s current level of non-compliance with the</p>	

		<p>operative District Plan requirements; this is not considered appropriate or acceptable to the submitter.</p> <p>The submitter states that provisions should be included in PPC25 (such as a sunset clause, stepped requirements to provide on-site parks or a reduction on reliance on on-street car parking as student enrolment numbers increase) to address the reliance of using on-street parking.</p> <p>The submitter points out that there is a contradiction on Page 6 of the Introduction of the plan change document where the heading for General Business Activity has been used twice.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed parking provisions, the submitter states that no information has been provided as to the basis of the student numbers to provide clarity as to whether they are enrolment or attendance figures. The submitter states that no information has been provided with respect to whether the staff is employment numbers or full time equivalents, is limited to academic staff of the Tertiary Education Institution or is all people who might be working in the Precinct. The submitter states that the Section 32 document does not adequately assess the various options available for parking & traffic. The submitter states that there is also no ability provided within the equation to reduce the reliance on on-street parking over time, as alluded to in Amendment 34 of the Plan Change.</p> <p>The submitter debates the ability of the precinct to comply with the proposed rules. A review of the area shows a difference in the number of carparks for the sole use of the tertiary education activity. The submitter gives details regarding car park numbers which are WelTec has sole use of and which are for the community. The submitter considers that the security of use of the leased parking is questionable for long term provision and that there is also confusion regarding whether all the existing leased and HCC carparks, considered to be the sole use of WelTec are within the proposed precinct, as they appear not to be in the proposed precinct, there is already non-compliance with the proposed rules.</p> <p>The submitter states that no details have been provided in PPC25 with respect to how the tertiary education activity is going to manage their off street parking to improve its utilisation or encourage use of sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>The submitter states that the character and amenity of the local area been defined, and there is no effects based assessment provided.</p> <p>The submitter states there are no provisions relating to controlling the subject</p>	
--	--	---	--

			matter on the signs, location, and necessity.	
--	--	--	---	--

152.13	General – Section 32 Report	Oppose	<p>The submitter notes that the assessment of matters contained has been undertaken from WelTec (as the requester’s) perspective rather than by the HCC and that their perspective may differ to those of the HCC or the community. E.g.: The S32 has stated that a Design Guide is undesirable yet HCC uses multiple design guides already and they are valid and effective planning tools, especially for precincts.</p> <p>The submitter puts forward 3 points in support of the use of design guides</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While a design guide can create a level of uncertainty for the applicant, it can also provide a better understanding of the nature and quality of the final outcome. This provides the Council and the community with a higher level of certainty and ensure a more balanced approach to managing building form; • By outlining clear objectives regarding the quality of expected design outcomes, a design guide will provide a common reference point for both the applicant and the Council in assessing the applicant’s design proposals; and • A design guide can successfully work in tandem with the amended rules/standards by providing a set of ‘qualitative’ criteria to complement the ‘measurable’ provisions of setbacks, site coverage and building height, which alone cannot mitigate the potential impact of bulk and/or address building design quality. 	
152.14	Amendment 1 [Chapter 3 – Definitions]	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that the first part of the tertiary education activities definition seems appropriate and is considered to be consistent with the definition of institution in the Education Act. However, defining the ancillary activities should be directly linked to the core business of the institution, and the current definition is too vague.</p> <p>It is appropriate for ancillary activities such as car parking and administration to be recognised as ancillary activities, but the extent needs to be limited to being for tertiary education purposes only, not open to the public and restricted to the precinct area.</p> <p>Other ancillary activities such as childcare, health and retail may be appropriate but need to be subject to rules limiting the extent and specific parking provisions.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to include other activities proposed as ancillary activities within the precinct. Student accommodation, recreational, cultural and social and other facilities have different effects from Tertiary Education Activities and more appropriate ancillary activities, including overnight effects. These activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the current definition of Tertiary Education Activities be amended as follows or similar: • Amend the second part of the definition by removing the reference to specifically ancillary activities, and to read “... <i>(the Education Act 1989), and includes ancillary activities as defined below.</i>” • Provide a new definition for ancillary activities for the following activities: administrative, car parking, child care, health, and retail. This definition needs to clearly link the ancillary activity to tertiary education activities; specify an allowable floor area; and have separate parking provisions and provide for the further matters identified in the submission.

			<p>have not been provided for in the rules and the effects have not been addressed.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to provide for student accommodation, recreational, cultural and social facilities in the precinct and these should be excluded from the precinct and be left subject to the underlying zoning area..</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted that Amendment 10 will also require amendment and additional criteria for ancillary activities that meet permitted criteria will need to be developed. • The reference to student accommodation is deleted. • Further consideration be given to whether recreational, cultural, and social activities are appropriate.
152.15	Amendment 2 [Chapter 4A 1.1.4 General Residential Activity Area (Non-Residential Activities – Issue)]	Oppose	<p>The emphasis of the plan change is considered unbalanced. PPC 25 should recognise the contribution of tertiary education activities to the City while recognising that the current development has adverse environmental effects beyond the boundary of the site and also recognising the benefits that the residential area provides.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to ensure that any future development maintains and enhances the residential character and amenity, and the reliance on on-street parking is reduced over time (for example a sunset clause over 10 years).</p>	<p>That Issue 4A1.1.4 be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>Non-residential activities in residential areas can support residential activities <u>and provide social and economic benefits to the community.</u> Such activities can <u>also</u> have significant adverse effects upon surrounding residential properties, <u>including adverse environmental effects (such as visual, loss of residential uses, traffic and parking and noise) beyond the boundary of the site.</u> These adverse effects need to be avoided, remedied or mitigated to ensure that residential amenity values and character are maintained and enhanced. <u>Any new non-residential development on existing sites will need to ensure any existing adverse environmental effects on the residential character and amenity are addressed, any reliance on on-street parking is reduced, and an improvement in residential character and amenity is achieved.</u></i></p>
152.16	Amendment 3 [4A 1.1.4 General Residential Activity Area (Non-Residential Activities – Policies)]	Support in part	<p>Policy 4A1.1.4 (d) is supported subject to minor amendments. The word ‘recognise’ tends to lead to provisions that reinforce the existing situation and such reference should be deleted. The policy needs to be amended to reference character and amenity to residential values. The submitter notes that the current buildings within the precinct (in particular in Kensington Avenue) are of poor quality and poor design.</p>	<p>That the intent of Policy 4A 1.1.4 (d) be retained as written with minor amendments or similar:</p> <p><i><u>(d) To recognise and provide for where appropriate tertiary education activities in Petone within a defined Precinct, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating the</u></i></p>

				<u>adverse effect on the environment, and ensuring any new tertiary education activities address any existing or potential adverse effects, particularly on the residential character and amenity values of the neighbourhood.</u>
152.17	Amendment 4 [4A 1.1.4 General Residential Activity Area (Non-Residential Activities – Explanation and Reasons)]	Oppose	<p>The reference to WelTec as a public entity is not relevant and should be deleted.</p> <p>The need to ‘recognise’ the WelTec facility is not appropriate and should be replaced with ‘provide for where appropriate’.</p> <p>The purpose of the Precinct is to ensure that the site is properly managed and developed for tertiary education to a suitable level and in a way that avoids any adverse effects on the surrounding residential environment and current effects are addressed.</p> <p>There is a need to identify what the future tertiary education needs might be, and any new development needs to be in the context of what the site is suitable for – need to introduce a cap on number of students.</p> <p>The plan change could result in large bulky buildings and this adverse effect cannot be effectively managed/mitigated. The proposed standards are insufficient to ensure a successful scale relationship between new buildings in the Precinct and adjacent residential and recreational/open space areas. The issues of building design quality and appearance are not addressed.</p> <p>The effects on residential amenity and character need to be addressed and any new development needs to improve residential character and amenity through the implementation of an Urban Design Guide for the Precinct.</p> <p>Either a sunset clause or stepped requirements to provide on-site car parking or a reduction on the reliance on on-street car parking needs to be included.</p> <p>The existing environment needs to be better defined, especially low density residential character and amenity of surrounding residential environment.</p> <p>Bracken Street and sites leased but not owned by WelTec need to be deleted from the Precinct.</p> <p>Elizabeth Street, Udy/Britannia Street and western Kensington Avenue sites should only be included in the precinct if the use of these sites is restricted to activities which are compatible with their location. Any development should be subject to a design guide.</p>	That Section 4A 1.1.4 Explanation and Reasons to the General Residential Activity Area be significantly re-written to incorporate the matters raised in the submission.

			<p>Where the precinct abuts a residential site further controls need to be introduced to address effects such as visual, privacy, noise, amenity, traffic safety and parking.</p> <p>Udy Street should be referred to as Udy and Britannia Streets throughout the document.</p>	
152.18	Amendment 5 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Policies)]	Oppose	<p>Policy 4A 1.2.1 (k) is opposed in its current form as it intends to recognise the existing scale and intensity of the current campus and sets the tone for more intensified development within the Precinct in the future. As currently drafted the rules allow development on the scale of the tower block throughout the whole precinct. This would potentially affect not only abutting but also nearby sites which needs to be reflected.</p> <p>The focus should be on avoiding and remedying effects on residential properties abutting the Precinct (as well as minimising them) and the reference should be to residential character and amenity.</p> <p>Any policies regarding building height, scale, intensity and location should be developed within an Urban Design Guide.</p> <p>If the use of an Urban Design Guide is rejected, the amendments proposed in amendments 5-11 are opposed on the basis that they would generate unacceptable adverse effects.</p>	<p>That 4A 1.2.1(k) be amended to read as follows or similar:</p> <p><u><i>'(k) To establish specific maximum height, maximum site coverage, minimum set back and recession plane standards within specific areas of the Tertiary Education Precinct to recognise ensure any future development is at a existing scale and intensity that is in keeping with the surrounding environment and suitability of the site to accommodate further development Of the built development in the Precinct– and to avoid any minimise adverse effects on the character and amenity values of abutting or nearby residential properties through the adoption of an Urban Design Guide for the Precinct.'</i></u></p>
152.19	Amendment 6 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Explanation and Reasons (b) Site Coverage)]	Oppose	<p>The Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 (b) is opposed as is provides for the nature and scale of the existing campus and as currently drafted does not look to promote better outcomes in the future.</p> <p>The provision is likely to result in adverse scale and bulk, with no light or view shafts or building variation. Site coverage issues should be developed through an Urban Design approach.</p>	<p>That the Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 relating to site coverage be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate site coverage for individual sites based on agreed Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will minimise effects and result in better development.</p>
152.20	Amendment 7 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location –	Oppose	<p>The Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 (c) is opposed as it is likely to result in unacceptable adverse effects on the surrounding environment, however, no information as to the likely impact has been provided. There is a need for an Urban Design guide to address matters to do with recession planes and setbacks.</p>	<p>That the Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 relating to recession planes be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate site coverage for individual sites based on agreed</p>

	Explanation and Reasons (c) Recession Planes)]			Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will minimise effects and result in a better development.
152.21	Amendment 8 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Explanation and Reasons (d) Yards)]	Oppose	The Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 (d) is opposed as the provision is likely to result in unacceptable effects. There is a need to have an Urban Design Guide to address matters to do with yards.	That the Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 relating to yards be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate yards for individual sites based on agreed Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will minimise effects and result in a better development.
152.22	Amendment 9 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Explanation and Reasons (e) Height)]	Oppose	The Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 (e) is opposed. There is a need to have an Urban Design Guide to address matters to do with heights in conjunction with a 8m maximum height which should apply to the Udy Street and Britannia Street, Elizabeth Street and Kensington Avenue to ensure any new development is in keeping with the surrounding residential area.	That the Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 relating to height be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate height for individual sites based on agreed Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will minimise effects and result in better development. It is requested that the maximum height be reduced from 12m to 8m.
152.23	Amendment 10 [4A 2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Rules – Permitted Activities)]	Oppose	The definition of Tertiary Education Activities needs to be modified in respect of the submitter’s comments on Amendment 1.	That the Tertiary Education Activities definition be modified in respect of submitter’s comments on Amendment 1.
152.24	Amendment 11 [4A 2.1.1 General Residential Activity Area (Rules – Permitted Activities – Conditions)]	Oppose	The permitted activity standards are opposed. By increasing the maximum building height and site coverage the plan change could result in large bulky buildings with a dominating streetscape effect and this adverse effect cannot be effectively managed/mitigated by building rules and standards alone. The proposed standards are insufficient to ensure a successful scale relationship between new buildings in the Precinct and the adjacent residential and recreational/open space areas. Neither do the standards address issues of building design quality and appearance. A maximum building height of 8 m is requested and Udy Street should be referred to as Udy and Britannia Streets. ‘Scale’ and ‘design quality/appearance’ issues are highly relevant for a successful outcome. Reducing the impact of bulk and achieving the desired level of integration between new and existing can most effectively achieved through	That the Permitted Activity Standards 4A 2.1.1 be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate Permitted Activity Standards for individual sites based on agreed Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will result in a better development. A maximum height limit of 8m is also sought.

			<p>design provisions of some kind.</p> <p>Design provisions will also address some other issues not covered by the plan change such as connectivity, CPTED issues, landscape treatment of large carparking areas and the use of landscaping to improve interfaces.</p>	
152.25	Amendment 12 [4A 2.3 General Residential Activity Area (Restricted Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	<p>The proposed Restricted Discretionary Activity status for activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity standards is opposed. As a precinct has been established that provides for a greater range of activities and concessions than would normally be allowed in a general activity area, any activities that fail to meet the standards should go through a higher test of approval.</p> <p>Without an urban design Guide it is not possible to determine whether the permitted activity standards are appropriate. Non-complying Activity status for activities that do not comply with Permitted Activity standards of a Precinct is considered appropriate and necessary.</p> <p>The note precluding public notification is also opposed, with full notification required for a Non-complying Activity.</p>	That the plan change be amended so that activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity standards 4A 2.1.1 for tertiary education activities are a Non-complying Activity with full public notification.
152.26	Amendment 13 [4A 2.3.1 General Residential Activity Area (Matters in which Council has restricted its Discretion and Standards and Terms)]	Oppose	<p>As a consequential amendment with the change of activity status sought under Amendment 12, the matters to be addressed in 4A 2.3.1 (k) need to be shifted to matters to be addressed when considering a Non-complying activity. The matters to consider need to be broadened to include the Urban Design Guide criteria not met, traffic effects, parking effects, hours of operation and light and noise.</p> <p>The amenity values in (k) (i) also require amendment to specifically relate to residential character and amenity, the need to comply with the Urban Design Guide for scale and intensity, the need to demonstrate that any adverse effects are managed, and that any future development will maintain or enhance the values to be better than they are now.</p>	That the matters included in 4A 2.3.1 (k) be moved to matters to be addressed when considering Non-complying activities and amended to address the matters outlined in the submission.
152.27	Amendment 14 [4A 2.4 General Residential Activity Area (Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	Discretionary status for activities that do not comply with the permitted activity conditions is opposed. It is considered appropriate that these activities are Non-complying Activities.	That 4A 2.4 (n) be amended to provide for tertiary education activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity standards to be Non-complying activities.
152.28	Amendment 15 [4A General Residential Activity Area (Appendices)]	Oppose	Udy Street should only remain in the Precinct if it has its own Urban Design Guide and other relief sought by the submitter is adopted.	The submitter only supports the inclusion of Udy Street site in the precinct if an Urban Design Guide is developed and the other relief sought by the submitter is adopted.

152.29	Amendment 16 [Chapter 6 Business (Introduction)]	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodated' in the introduction to Chapter 6 is opposed. To be consistent with other amendments sought in the submission, the term should be replaced by the term 'provided for where appropriate'.	That the Introduction (a) General Business Activity Area be amended by replacing the term ' <i>accommodated</i> ' with the term ' <i>provided for where appropriate</i> '.
152.30	Amendment 17 [6A 1.1.1 General Business Activity Area (Accommodation of a Mix of Activities – Policies)]	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodated' is opposed, and should be replaced by the term 'provided for where appropriate'.	That policy 6A 1.1.1 be amended by replacing the term ' <i>accommodated</i> ' with the term ' <i>provided for where appropriate</i> '.
152.31	Amendment 18 [6A 1.1.1 General Business Activity Area (Accommodation of a Mix of Activities – Explanation and Reasons)]	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodate' in paragraph 1 is opposed. Paragraph 2 essentially repeats paragraph 1 and includes phrases that reinforce the existing facility, and the last sentence suggests there are no adverse effects on amenity and the environment. The amendments are opposed. The submitter's submission on this provision is also subject to its opposition to the inclusion of leased sites within the precinct.	That the Explanation and Reasons for 6A 1.1.1 General Business Activity Area is amended as follows or similar: <i>The range of non-industrial activities accommodated also includes training facilities, conference centres, places of assembly and places of worship. Tertiary education activities are accommodated provided for where appropriate within the tertiary Education Precinct, of which, that part on Cuba Street is located in the General Business Activity Area.</i> <i>WelTec and its predecessors have historically provided tertiary education activities within the area in Cuba Street and the activity is an established use on the site providing important tertiary education including vocational education and applied research. These non-industrial activities are only to be provided for where the actual and potential adverse generated effects can be managed and the character and do not have an adverse effect on the amenity values of the area, including the adjoining Residential Activity Area, are maintained or enhanced and the environment.</i>
152.32	Amendment 19 [6A 1.1.3 General Business	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodate' is opposed and should be replaced with	That Issue 6A 1.1.3 be amended to replace the term ' <i>accommodated</i> ' with the term

	Activity Area (Environmental Effects – Issue)]		'provided for where appropriate'.	<i>'provided for where appropriate'.</i>
152.33	Amendment 20 [6A 1.2.1 General Business Activity Area (Effects of the Amenity Values of the Area – Issue)]	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodate' is opposed and should be replaced with 'provided for where appropriate'.	That Issue 6A 1.2.1 be amended to replace the term ' <i>accommodated</i> ' with the term ' <i>provided for where appropriate</i> '.
152.34	Amendment 21 [6A 2.2 General Business Activity Area (Controlled Activities)]	Oppose	The exception included in rules 6A 2.2 (b) and 6A 2.2.1 (b) is opposed as it is considered contrary to the objectives and policies of the General Residential Activity Area that intend to protect residential character and amenity values. Non-complying activity status is sought for activities that do not meet the permitted activity standards to ensure consistency throughout the precinct regardless of the underlying zoning. Precluding public and limited notification is opposed as this is not appropriate, is contrary to the principle of public participation and any adjoining residential activity area should have an opportunity for input.	That the exception in Rules 6A 2.2 (b) and 6A 2.2.1 (b) be deleted and any tertiary education activity that does not comply with a General Business Activity Area permitted activity standard, or is on a site abutting or on the opposite side of the road from a residential activity area, is a Non-complying Activity with full notification required.
152.35	Amendment 22 [6A 2.3 General Business Activity Area (Restricted Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	Tertiary education activities that do not comply with the General Business Activity Area permitted activity standards should be a Non-complying Activities, subject to notification.	That 6A 2.3 (i) be deleted and any tertiary education activity that does not comply with a Permitted Activity standard, or is on a site abutting or on the opposite side of the road from a residential activity area, is a Non-complying Activity with full notification required.
152.36	Amendment 23 [6A 2.3.1 General Business Activity Area (Matters in which Council has restricted its Discretion and Standards and Terms)]	Oppose	The matters included in 6A 2.3.1 (i) should become assessment criteria for Non-complying Activities. The same comments made in relation to the Amenity Values criteria in Amendment 13 apply.	That matters included in 6A 2.3.1 (i) become assessment criteria for Non-complying Activities, and the same amendments to Amenity Values sought for Amendment 13 be made to 6A 2.3.
152.37	Amendment 25 [Chapter 7 General Recreation and Open Space (introduction)]	Oppose	The inclusion of Bracken Street in the precinct is opposed as it is Conservation Land leased to HCC. It is understood the lease lapses in 3-5 years and there is no agreement or right for the land to be included in the Tertiary Education Precinct. All amendments to Chapter 7 are therefore opposed. If HCC decide it is permissible to include this land in the Precinct all references to the Bracken Street site are opposed on the basis that activities provided for in the precinct are unacceptable activities to occur in a conservation area. The	That the amendment to Introduction (a) General Recreation Activity Area be deleted as this is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.

			legal basis for WelTec’s current or past use of the site is questionable and the area should be used for recreation and open space. The location of the Bracken Street site makes inclusion into the precinct undesirable from a traffic and planning perspective.	
152.38	Amendment 26 [7A 1.1.4 General Recreation and Open Space (Non-Recreational Activities)]	Oppose	Same comments as for Amendment 25 apply.	That the amendment to Policy (b) be deleted as this area is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.
152.39	Amendment 27 [7A 2.1 General Recreation Activity Area (Permitted Activities)]	Oppose	Same comments as for Amendment 25 apply.	That the amendment to Rule 7A 2.1 (f) be deleted as this area is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.
152.40	Amendment 28 [7A 2.1.1 General Recreation Activity Area (Permitted Activities – Conditions)]	Oppose	Same comments as for Amendment 25 apply.	That the amendment to the permitted activity standard Rule 7A 2.1.1 (d) be deleted as this area is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.
152.41	Amendment 29 [7A General Recreation Activity Area (Appendices)]	Oppose	Same comments as for Amendment 25 apply.	That the amendment to Appendix Map “Appendix General Recreation 1” to Chapter 7A be deleted as the area is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.
152.42	Amendment 30 [Chapter 14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 1.2.1 – On-site Parking Provision for Activities – Policy)]	Oppose	<p>A campus wide on-site parking approach may be appropriate as long as the relationship between the car parks and the activities is logical and functional and subsequent actual use of the car-parks occurs.</p> <p>Bracken St should be removed from the campus wide on-site parking approach as it is too far from the majority of the campus. Udy St is also a significant distance from the main campus activities.</p> <p>The current Tertiary Education Institution does not currently provide adequate off-street (on-site) parking to meet its parking demand and this needs to be addressed.</p> <p>It is not appropriate that the plan change be used to confirm and recognise the existing nature, level and extent of car parking in and around the Precinct as this is resulting in unreasonable adverse effects on the surrounding area. The extent</p>	<p>That Policy 14A (iii) 1.2.1 (b) be re-worded in a manner consistent with the submission, including (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of the Bracken Street site from any campus wide approach to providing on-site car parking for the Precinct. • Further consideration needs to be given to whether the campus wide parking approach is appropriate, mechanism to manage the tertiary Education Activities off-street parking, given that reliance on this approach in previous consent applications has resulted in the existing

			<p>of reliance of on-street parking by an institution of this nature is entirely unprecedented and inappropriate and should be reduced.</p> <p>The reference to “...recognising the existing nature, level and extend of Carparking in and around the precinct.” is opposed and should be deleted as it would allow for the current on street sprawl of car parks to continue. A sunset clause is needed requiring the on street effects be reduced over time to those spaces available directly outside the precinct property boundaries to reduce the adverse effects. This will require further provision of off-street parking, better utilisation of existing off-street car parks and better management of traffic generated as a result of Tertiary Education activities.</p> <p>The amenity values and character of the area need to be established particularly in the context of how on-street parking may detract from that amenity value and character.</p> <p>It is noted that while some existing use rights may exist in respect of buildings and site, off-site ancillary activities such as car parking are not usually recognised as having existing use rights.</p> <p>It is considered questionable whether it is permissible to include a provision which relies on on-street parking provided in an area outside the precinct.</p>	<p>unacceptable parking situation and significant impact and effects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of “<i>Recognising the existing nature, level and extent of car parking in and around the precinct...</i>” • Development of a sunset clause requiring the on street effects to be reduced over time and to those spaces available directly outside the precinct property boundaries to reduce the adverse effects; and • Defining the residential character and amenity values to be protected and determining the effects of on-street parking on these values.
152.43	Amendment 31 [14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 1.2.1 – On-site Parking Provision for Activities – Explanation and Reasons)]	Oppose	<p>There are aspects of the first paragraph that are acceptable in principle. The reference to recognising the existing nature, level and extent of car parking in and around the precinct in the second paragraph is challenged as it implies that the existing situation is acceptable and should be maintained. The District Plan requires parking to be a maximum of 100m from the site and this non-compliance needs to be addressed.</p> <p>In the second paragraph there is a reference to “...<i>the improved management of the on-street parking resources so it is more available for residents...</i>”. This management is outside of the Tertiary Education providers control and requires HCC to implement. It is not known if any on street changes will occur and appears to be outside the scope of the Precinct.</p> <p>It is considered that ‘adequate supply of car parking’ within the precinct should be linked to staff numbers and the total number of students enrolled in courses. Provisions should also be made to recognise, develop and encourage public/alternative transport options.</p>	That the second paragraph of the Explanation and Reasons 14A (iii) 1.2.1 be amended to address the concerns raised in the submission.
152.44	Amendment 32 [14A (iii) Car and Cycle	Support in part	A campus wide on-site parking approach is considered appropriate as long as	That Rule 14A (iii) 2.1 (b) be amended by changing the word ‘ <u>may</u> be located on any

	Parking (14A (iii) 2.1 – Permitted Activity Conditions (b) Location of Parking Spaces)]		<p>the relationship between the car parks and activities are logical and functional.</p> <p>The provision of off-street parking outside the Precinct causes ‘creep’ and impacts on the residential area and is not appropriate. It is considered necessary for the word <i>‘may be located on any site’</i> to be changed to <i>‘must be located on any site’</i>.</p>	<i>site...’ to ‘<u>must be located on any site...</u>’.</i>
152.45	Amendment 33 [14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 2.2 Discretionary Activities(b))]	Oppose	<p>Where parking associated with a tertiary education activity cannot comply with the permitted activity status, it should be Non-complying and require notification.</p> <p>Providing off-street parking outside of the Precinct is unacceptable and encourages ‘creep’ and derogation of the residential area.</p> <p>A Discretionary Activity rule should be developed that adopts one of the mechanisms discussed (sunset clause, stepped approach, or car parking requirements based on staff and student numbers) to reduce the reliance of the Tertiary Education Activity operations on on-street parking.</p>	That the activity provided by the amendment to Rule 14A (iii) 2.2 (b) be a Non-complying activity with full notification, with the Discretionary Activity Rules to reduce the reliance of the tertiary education activities on on-street parking be included.
152.46	Amendment 34 [14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 2.2.1 Assessment Matters for Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	<p>The proposed Assessment Matters in 14A (iii) 2.2.1 are opposed. The wording does not provide enough certainty to the requirement for the tertiary precinct to work towards reducing their reliance on on-street parking and their adverse effects within the vicinity of their property boundaries. The phrase ‘is likely to maintain’ should be replaced with ‘will maintain’. The reference to reducing reliance on on-street parking should be retained.</p> <p>The matter included as amendment to this rule should not be a Discretionary Activity and should instead become a matter of consideration for a Non-complying Activity.</p>	That the matters included in Assessment Matters in 14A (iii) 2.2.1 be included as a Non-complying Activity assessment matter.
152.47	Amendment 35 [14A Appendix Transport 3 – Minimum Parking Standards]	Oppose	<p>The standard proposed in Appendix Transport 3 is opposed. Without an indication of what the future development in the Precinct might look like, it is not possible to tell if the formula is the “...<i>the most effective and efficient for activities and development within the proposed Tertiary Education Precinct area</i>”. In keeping with the relief sought in respect of Amendment 1 the parking requirements for ancillary activities that do not come within the definition of ‘Tertiary Education Activities’ should not be assessed on this basis (e.g. retail, childcare and health). These will require different minimum parking requirements.</p> <p>The definition of the unit is inadequate and continued reliance on on-street parking is in contradiction to the intent of the wording in Amendment 34. The proposed supply calculation makes no attempt to reduce the reliance on on-</p>	That the formula included in Appendix 3 be deleted, a tighter definition of the terms ‘student’ and ‘staff’ and that the equation be replaced with an equation that uses FTE students and enrolled staff, and reduction of the on street parking provision from 300 to 63 (the number of car parks available on the adjoining road frontages on the Education Precinct). A separate further equation is required for the car parking requirements for ancillary activities.

			<p>street parking.</p> <p>The definition of 'Student' is unknown and it is not known if this refers to the total number of students enrolled or the number on site at any time. The staff number is also unknown and there is no reference to whether it relates just to teaching staff or all other staff working on the site (i.e. cleaners, grounds men or tutors). Both these definitions need to be more clearly defined.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to modify the parking requirement to an equation that uses FTE staff and enrolled students and reduce the on street parking provision from 300 to 63.</p>	
152.48	Amendment 36 [Chapter 14B 2.1.1 (c) Signs]	Oppose	<p>There appears to be no justification for allowing the maximum face area of a sign in the Precinct to be 3m², and Permitted Activity status is opposed. There is no control over the purpose, location or content of the sign and such controls are required to ensure the residential character and amenity of adjoining areas is maintained or enhanced. Signs should only be linked to Tertiary Education activities provided within the Precinct.</p>	<p>That the amendment to Rule 14B 2.1.1 (c) be deleted, with additional controls developed on the purpose, location and content of the signs, and any adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the surrounding residential area. If these standards cannot be met, a Non-complying activity should be required, with notification.</p>
152.49	Amendment 37 [14B 2.2 Signs (Controlled Activities)]	Oppose	<p>The comments on Amendment 36 apply.</p>	<p>That the amendment to Rule 14B 2.2 (a) be deleted, with additional controls sought on the purpose, location and content of the signs, and any adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the surrounding residential area (which may be a matter for a urban design guide). If these standards cannot be met, a Non-complying activity should be required, with notification.</p>
152.50	Amendment 38 [14B 2.2 Signs (Controlled Activities)]	Oppose	<p>Refer to comments under Amendments 36 & 37.</p>	<p>That the amendment to Rule 14B 2.2 (e) be deleted, with additional controls sought on the purpose, location and content of the signs, and any adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the surrounding residential area. If these standards cannot be met, a Non-complying activity should be required, with notification.</p>
152.51	Amendment 39 [14B 2.3 Signs (Restricted	Oppose	<p>Refer to comments under Amendments 36 & 37.</p>	<p>That the amendment to Rule 14B 2.3 (e) be deleted, with additional controls sought on</p>

	Discretionary Activities)]			the purpose, location and content of the signs, and any adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the surrounding residential area. If these standards cannot be met, a Non-complying activity should be required, with notification.
--	----------------------------	--	--	--

DPC25/153 John and Kathleen Yardley				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
153.1	General – Legal Matters: Consultation	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that there has been very little consultation with the community and that which occurred was vastly inadequate. It has not been within the context of the precinct and occurred during other plan change processes where the community were unaware of a proposed precinct and were unable to make an informed comment.</p> <p>Council has failed in its duties in respected of an adopted plan change under Schedule 1 part 1 of the RMA to undertake consultation on the plan change in a manner consistent with the principles of consultation in s.82 of the LGA 2002.</p> <p>The submitter notes that while a Council is not required to consult on an adopted plan change prior to notification where a local authority does opt to undertake consultation in conjunction with the applicant this must be done in accordance with the LGA 2002.</p>	
153.2	General – Legal Matters: Assessment of Environmental Effects	Oppose	The submitter states that the AEE provided for the Proposed Plan Change is inadequate and provides very little (if any) assessment as to the adverse effects that may occur in the event it is adopted. The AEE provides no assessment on shading, bulk, privacy, height, noise, heritage or other impacts on the amenity of the surrounding residential and recreational areas.	
153.3	General – Legal Matters: Section 32 analysis	Oppose	The submitter challenges the Section 32 report for PPC25, under Section 32A, stating that it is flawed in that it fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.	
153.4	General – Legal Matters: Resource Management Act	Oppose	The submitter states that in its current form, PPC 25 does not promote the sustainable management of natural or physical resources required by the RMA.	

	1991		PPC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.	
153.5	General – Legal Matters: Consistency with other plan provisions	Oppose	The submitter comments that the plan change is not consistent with other plan provisions such as the provisions introduced by Plan Change 12, Heritage (i.e.: the Old Court House) and matters protected and identified in the General Residential Area and Petone Recreation Area chapters.	
153.6	General – Legal Matters: Existing use rights	Oppose	The submitter states that it is unlikely existing use rights for the precinct areas and for the current activities (e.g.: on-street car parking) can be established. The submitter states that the plan change is contrary to good resource management practice in that it seeks to confirm and reinforce the existing level of non-compliance, including non-compliance with existing resource consent conditions via the plan change; the submitter says this is inconsistent with the Councils’ duties to act in accordance with its own plans.	That existing use rights are properly determined and established before using them in the proposed provisions.
153.7	General – Legal Matters: ‘Precinct concept’	Oppose	The submitter questions whether PPC25 creates a precinct, as opposed to creating preferential ‘spot zoning’. The submitter states that many of the amendments currently proposed have the potential to undermine the precinct.	That the Council amend PPC25 in accordance with the submitter’s submission, which seeks to strengthen and enhance the precinct approach. Re-write the introduction to the Precinct plan change to better reflect the precinct as a planning mechanism and to recognise the existing conflict between the nature and scale of existing Tertiary Education Activities and residents and other community and recreational activities.
153.8	General – Legal Matters: Changes to the general residential area zone desirable	Oppose	The submitter notes that several parts of PPC25 relate to matters which are outside the precinct area, and appear to be outside the scope of the plan change.	That consideration be given to amending the General Residential Area provisions of the plan. Amending the plan to make “tertiary Education Activities” outside the precinct in the General Residential Activity Area a non-complying activity would assist in preserving the residential character of the area and effectively maintain the integrity of the precinct.
153.9	General – Legal Matters: Independent commissioner	Oppose	The submitter considers that given that Council have adopted the proposed plan change (an action which implies support), the Council should not decide the	That an independent commissioner be appointed.

			matter itself.	
153.10	General – Plan Change documentation: What is Proposed Plan Change 25?	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that the Proposed Plan Change as notified does not meet its purpose of <i>‘providing for ongoing use and development of the campus to meet future tertiary education needs whilst also providing greater certainty for the community’</i>. The submitter questions the purpose of PPC25 as whole.</p> <p>The submitter questions how the plan change will protect the amenity values of each surrounding area if the residential amenity values have not been properly defined in the plan change. The submitter states that amendments are required to the objectives and policies to better define residential amenity and introduce mechanisms (e.g. an urban design framework) to ensure amenity values are recognised and protected.</p> <p>The submitter supports in general the plan change’s intent to provide for the activities of the Tertiary Education provider in an appropriate way by applying rules differently throughout the campus but comments that they have addressed the matter in detail further in their submission.</p> <p>The submitter comments that there is no future development plan included as part of PPC25 and that there is no way of measuring whether the effects on the surrounding areas are being managed. The submitter feels that this lack of development plan makes it difficult to determine what the future requirements for the Tertiary Education Facility are. The submitter notes that the current approach has been to free up any planning controls to allow for flexibility in what can be built on the site in the future, as quickly as possible, presumably to respond to future tertiary education needs as they arise. The submitter considers that this approach does not represent sound resource management planning practice.</p> <p>The submitter questions the proposed changes relating to car and cycle parking and signage as well as the concurrent HCC review of on-street carparking in Petone. The submitter states that where multiple sites are involved the proximity of the sites to each other plays an important part in the optimal management of the car parks and the overall effects of the parking overspill.</p> <p>The submitter states that it has been established that the current operation of the existing tertiary education activity Petone has significant adverse effects in terms of parking and traffic and that PPC25 appears to endorse this, seeking to maintain or potentially worsen them rather than mitigating them.</p> <p>The submitter highlights two significant issues that they feel need to be</p>	

			<p>addressed for this plan change to be effective:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The provision of sufficient car parks to meet the needs of the tertiary education activity. This involves the provision of both off street and on street car parks. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) an appropriate total number of spaces relative to the number of people using the site and the activities being undertaken on the site; and (b) an appropriate split between off and on street spaces to minimise the adverse effects. 2. The management of the off street car parks to maximise their use and the management of on street car parks to minimise their effect on other residents. <p>The submitter states that the plan change also fails to deal with what may occur in the event that the site is no longer needed for Tertiary Education Activities.</p>	
153.11	General – Plan Change documentation: Scope of PC25	Oppose	<p>It is not clear by what ‘generally’ means in the first paragraph of the text under the Scope of Proposed Plan Change 25 heading.</p> <p>The submitter states that the land at 26 and 26A Bracken Street (K Block) is owned by the Minister of Conservation as a conservation area and is subject to the Conservation Act 1987. The Section 32 report wrongly identifies this as land owned by HCC. The submitter considers this is entirely inappropriate for this land to be included in PPC25 as part of the Precinct and should be deleted.</p> <p>The submitter comments that while the ownership of land is not generally an RMA issue, given the relaxation of height, bulk provisions it may not be appropriate for land that is leased and not owned by the Tertiary Education institution to be included in the precinct. Including lease sites within the precinct is problematic because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. if a leased site is included in the precinct, and developed in accordance with the precinct provisions including reliance on the off street parking provisions and campus wide parking approach, then conceivably a leased site could be developed that relies on car parking on another part of the campus or the leased property could provide car parking for another part of the precinct; and 2. in the event that the lease comes to an end and is no longer used for Tertiary Education Activities the precinct may lose off-street car parks provided on the leased site or the leased site may be left with insufficient 	<p>That the following wording (or similar) be inserted by way of explanation to the introduction of PPC25 which records:</p> <p><u>“in past years the tertiary education institution has had some conflict with local residents because of moves to expand into the surrounding residential areas. For this reason Council generally requires the Precincts to develop within their existing boundaries to protect nearby residential neighbourhoods from the encroachment of non-residential development. Future expansion of the precinct is not prohibited, but Council seeks to ensure that any of Tertiary educational institution boundaries is properly evaluated. Expansion proposals will be dealt with under the plan change process to enable a full assessment of environmental effects”</u></p> <p>That the precinct plan records that considerable scope for expansion of Tertiary Education Activities is possible at the</p>

			<p>off-street car parking because that property has been developed in reliance of the campus wide car parking approach, using the proposed formula, rather than those of the General Business Area. The building owners who would benefit from the relaxed precinct rules will also obtain a benefit as they have been able to develop their properties to a level over and above what is permitted for the underlying zone.</p> <p>The submitter states that PPC25 is more like a spot zoning approach rather than a precinct.</p>	<p>institution’s other campuses, e.g.: the new hospitality school and Wakefield Street site in Wellington, the Petone Memorial College site and the Jackson Street site in Petone and the close management relationship that WelTec has with Whitirea all of which have space available for further development and have more preferable zoning. This recognises that the Precinct Area is a finite area that is currently subject to relatively intense development. As a result of the nature of the site, limited new development opportunities are restricted.</p>
153.12	General – Plan Change documentation: Summary of Proposed Plan Change 25	Oppose	<p>The submitter states it is inappropriate for PC25 to say it specifically provides for WelTec’s activities. The proposed definition does not reference WelTec, and PPC25 should not provide for the activities of a specific organisation. All references to WelTec should be deleted.</p> <p>The submitter states that permitted activities as currently proposed are likely to result in unacceptable adverse effects on the neighbouring residential and recreational areas. The submitter states that PPC25 shouldn’t be a mechanism to add individual activities which are not existing activities on site (e.g. student accommodation) or provide for current activities with no limitation on scale. The submitter questions the intent of the permitted activity provisions to protect the amenity of the surrounding residential areas, particularly as the residential amenity to be protected is not well defined and effects of the proposed provisions not properly understood. The permitted activity conditions need to be more tightly defined, with no discretion, and address a wider range of issues.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that the current provisions as currently drafted legitimise and confirm WelTec’s current level of non-compliance with the operative District Plan requirements; this is not considered appropriate or acceptable to the submitter.</p> <p>The submitter states that provisions should be included in PPC25 (such as a sunset clause, stepped requirements to provide on-site parks or a reduction on reliance on on-street car parking as student enrolment numbers increase) to address the reliance of using on-street parking.</p>	

		<p>The submitter points out that there is a contradiction on Page 6 of the Introduction of the plan change document where the heading for General Business Activity has been used twice.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed parking provisions, the submitter states that no information has been provided as to the basis of the student numbers to provide clarity as to whether they are enrolment or attendance figures. The submitter states that no information has been provided with respect to whether the staff is employment numbers or full time equivalents, is limited to academic staff of the Tertiary Education Institution or is all people who might be working in the Precinct. The submitter states that the Section 32 document does not adequately assess the various options available for parking & traffic. The submitter states that there is also no ability provided within the equation to reduce the reliance on on-street parking over time, as alluded to in Amendment 34 of the Plan Change.</p> <p>The submitter states that multi-modal mechanisms to reduce reliance on on-street parking should be part of PPC25 as there is currently nothing proposed regarding this matter. The submitter suggests buses from the rail way station and mini bus provision from the Udy Street carpark etc. should be provided for and encouraged in PPC25 and be in a manner that requires the tertiary education provider to consider and adopt them.</p> <p>The submitter debates the ability of the precinct to comply with the proposed rules. A review of the area shows a difference in the number of carparks for the sole use of the tertiary education activity. The submitter gives details regarding car park numbers which are WelTec has sole use of and which are for the community. The submitter considers that the security of use of the leased parking is questionable for long term provision and that there is also confusion regarding whether all the existing leased and HCC carparks, considered to be the sole use of WelTec are within the proposed precinct, as they appear not to be in the proposed precinct, there is already non-compliance with the proposed rules.</p> <p>The submitter states that no details have been provided in PPC25 with respect to how the tertiary education activity is going to manage their off street parking to improve its utilisation or encourage use of sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>The submitter states that the character and amenity of the local area been defined, and there is no effects based assessment provided.</p> <p>The submitter states there are no provisions relating to controlling the subject</p>	
--	--	---	--

			matter on the signs, location, and necessity.	
153.13	General – Section 32 Report	Oppose	<p>The submitter notes that the assessment of matters contained has been undertaken from WelTec (as the requester’s) perspective rather than by the HCC and that their perspective may differ to those of the HCC or the community. E.g.: The S32 has stated that a Design Guide is undesirable yet HCC uses multiple design guides already and they are valid and effective planning tools, especially for precincts.</p> <p>The submitter puts forward 3 points in support of the use of design guides</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While a design guide can create a level of uncertainty for the applicant, it can also provide a better understanding of the nature and quality of the final outcome. This provides the Council and the community with a higher level of certainty and ensure a more balanced approach to managing building form; • By outlining clear objectives regarding the quality of expected design outcomes, a design guide will provide a common reference point for both the applicant and the Council in assessing the applicant’s design proposals; and • A design guide can successfully work in tandem with the amended rules/standards by providing a set of ‘qualitative’ criteria to complement the ‘measurable’ provisions of setbacks, site coverage and building height, which alone cannot mitigate the potential impact of bulk and/or address building design quality. 	
153.14	Amendment 1 [Chapter 3 – Definitions]	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that the first part of the tertiary education activities definition seems appropriate and is considered to be consistent with the definition of institution in the Education Act. However, defining the ancillary activities should be directly linked to the core business of the institution, and the current definition is too vague.</p> <p>It is appropriate for ancillary activities such as car parking and administration to be recognised as ancillary activities, but the extent needs to be limited to being for tertiary education purposes only, not open to the public and restricted to the precinct area.</p> <p>Other ancillary activities such as childcare, health and retail may be appropriate but need to be subject to rules limiting the extent and specific parking provisions.</p> <p>Further consideration needs to be given as to whether the inclusion of other activities such as student accommodation, recreational, cultural and social</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current definition of Tertiary Education Activities be amended as follows or similar: • Amend the second part of the definition by removing the reference to specifically ancillary activities, and to read “... <i>(the Education Act 1989), and includes ancillary activities as defined below.</i>” • Provide a new definition for ancillary activities for the following activities: administrative, car parking, child care, health, and retail. This definition needs to clearly link the ancillary activity to tertiary education activities; specify an allowable floor area; and have separate parking provisions and provide for the further

			<p>facilities is appropriate as they have very different effects and Council is requested to revisit this issue and undertake a more detailed assessment.</p> <p>The submitter notes that student accommodation may not be appropriate and should be either considered a non-complying activity or excluded from the precinct.</p>	<p>matters identified in the submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted that Amendment 10 will also require amendment and additional criteria for ancillary activities that meet permitted criteria will need to be developed. • Consider deleting reference to student accommodation, recreational, cultural, and social activities and facilities from the definition.
153.15	Amendment 2 [Chapter 4A 1.1.4 General Residential Activity Area (Non-Residential Activities – Issue)]	Oppose	<p>The emphasis of the plan change is considered unbalanced. PPC 25 should recognise the contribution of tertiary education activities to the City while recognising that the current development has adverse environmental effects beyond the boundary of the site and also recognising the benefits that the residential area provides.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to ensure that any future development maintains and enhances the residential character and amenity, and the reliance on on-street parking is reduced over time (for example a sunset clause over 10 years).</p>	<p>That Issue 4A1.1.4 be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>Non-residential activities in residential areas can support residential activities and provide social and economic benefits to the community. Such activities can also have significant adverse effects upon surrounding residential properties, including adverse environmental effects (such as visual, loss of residential uses, traffic and parking and noise) beyond the boundary of the site. These adverse effects need to be avoided, remedied or mitigated to ensure that residential amenity values and character are maintained and enhanced. Any new non-residential development on existing sites will need to ensure any existing adverse environmental effects on the residential character and amenity are addressed, any reliance on on-street parking is reduced, and an improvement in residential character and amenity is achieved.</i></p>
153.16	Amendment 3 [4A 1.1.4 General Residential Activity Area (Non-Residential Activities – Policies)]	Support in part	<p>Policy 4A1.1.4 (d) is supported subject to minor amendments. The word ‘recognise’ tends to lead to provisions that reinforce the existing situation and such reference should be deleted. The policy needs to be amended to reference character and amenity to residential values. The submitter notes that the current buildings within the precinct (in particular in Kensington Avenue) are of poor quality and poor design.</p>	<p>That the intent of Policy 4A 1.1.4 (d) be retained as written with minor amendments or similar:</p> <p><i>(d) To recognise and provide for where appropriate tertiary education activities in Petone within a defined Precinct, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating the</i></p>

				<u>adverse effect on the environment, and ensuring any new tertiary education activities address any existing or potential adverse effects, particularly on the residential character and amenity values of the neighbourhood.</u>
153.17	Amendment 4 [4A 1.1.4 General Residential Activity Area (Non-Residential Activities – Explanation and Reasons)]	Oppose	<p>The reference to WelTec as a public entity is not relevant and should be deleted.</p> <p>The need to ‘recognise’ the WelTec facility is not appropriate and should be replaced with ‘provide for where appropriate’.</p> <p>The purpose of the Precinct is to ensure that the site is properly managed and developed for tertiary education to a suitable level and in a way that avoids any adverse effects on the surrounding residential environment and current effects are addressed.</p> <p>There is a need to identify what the future tertiary education needs might be, and any new development needs to be in the context of what the site is suitable for – need to introduce a cap on number of students.</p> <p>The plan change could result in large bulky buildings and this adverse effect cannot be effectively managed/mitigated. The proposed standards are insufficient to ensure a successful scale relationship between new buildings in the Precinct and adjacent residential and recreational/open space areas. The issues of building design quality and appearance are not addressed.</p> <p>The effects on residential amenity and character need to be addressed and any new development needs to improve residential character and amenity through the implementation of an Urban Design Guide for the Precinct.</p> <p>Either a sunset clause or stepped requirements to provide on-site car parking or a reduction on the reliance on on-street car parking needs to be included.</p> <p>The existing environment needs to be better defined, especially low density residential character and amenity of surrounding residential environment.</p> <p>Bracken Street and sites leased but not owned by WelTec need to be deleted from the Precinct.</p> <p>Elizabeth Street, Udy/Britannia Street and western Kensington Avenue sites should only be included in the precinct if the use of these sites is restricted to activities which are compatible with their location. Any development should be subject to a design guide.</p>	That Section 4A 1.1.4 Explanation and Reasons to the General Residential Activity Area be significantly re-written to incorporate the matters raised in the submission.

			<p>Where the precinct abuts a residential site further controls need to be introduced to address effects such as visual, privacy, noise, amenity, traffic safety and parking.</p> <p>Udy Street should be referred to as Udy and Britannia Streets throughout the document.</p>	
153.18	Amendment 5 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Policies)]	Oppose	<p>Policy 4A 1.2.1 (k) is opposed in its current form as it intends to recognise the existing scale and intensity of the current campus and sets the tone for more intensified development within the Precinct in the future. As currently drafted the rules allow development on the scale of the tower block throughout the whole precinct. This would potentially affect not only abutting but also nearby sites which needs to be reflected.</p> <p>The focus should be on avoiding and remedying effects on residential properties abutting the Precinct (as well as minimising them) and the reference should be to residential character and amenity.</p> <p>Any policies regarding building height, scale, intensity and location should be developed within an Urban Design Guide.</p> <p>If the use of an Urban Design Guide is rejected, the amendments proposed in amendments 5-11 are opposed on the basis that they would generate unacceptable adverse effects.</p>	<p>That 4A 1.2.1(k) be amended to read as follows or similar:</p> <p><i><u>'(k) To establish specific maximum height, maximum site coverage, minimum set back and recession plane standards within specific areas of the Tertiary Education Precinct to recognise ensure any future development is at a existing scale and intensity that is in keeping with the surrounding environment and suitability of the site to accommodate further development of the built development in the Precinct – and to avoid any minimise adverse effects on the character and amenity values of abutting or nearby residential properties through the adoption of an Urban Design Guide for the Precinct.'</u></i></p>
153.19	Amendment 6 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Explanation and Reasons (b) Site Coverage)]	Oppose	<p>The Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 (b) is opposed as is provides for the nature and scale of the existing campus and as currently drafted does not look to promote better outcomes in the future.</p> <p>The provision is likely to result in adverse scale and bulk, with no light or view shafts or building variation. Site coverage issues should be developed through an Urban Design approach.</p>	<p>That the Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 relating to site coverage be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate site coverage for individual sites based on agreed Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will minimise effects and result in better development.</p>
153.20	Amendment 7 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location –	Oppose	<p>The Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 (c) is opposed as it is likely to result in unacceptable adverse effects on the surrounding environment, however, no information as to the likely impact has been provided. There is a need for an Urban Design guide to address matters to do with recession planes and setbacks.</p>	<p>That the Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 relating to recession planes be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate site coverage for individual sites based on agreed</p>

	Explanation and Reasons (c) Recession Planes)]			Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will minimise effects and result in a better development.
153.21	Amendment 8 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Explanation and Reasons (d) Yards)]	Oppose	The Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 (d) is opposed as the provision is likely to result in unacceptable effects. There is a need to have an Urban Design Guide to address matters to do with yards.	That the Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 relating to yards be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate yards for individual sites based on agreed Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will minimise effects and result in a better development.
153.22	Amendment 9 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Explanation and Reasons (e) Height)]	Oppose	The Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 (e) is opposed. There is a need to have an Urban Design Guide to address matters to do with heights in conjunction with a 8m maximum height which should apply to the Udy Street and Britannia Street, Elizabeth Street and Kensington Avenue to ensure any new development is in keeping with the surrounding residential area.	That the Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 relating to height be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate height for individual sites based on agreed Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will minimise effects and result in better development. It is requested that the maximum height be reduced from 12m to 8m.
153.23	Amendment 10 [4A 2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Rules – Permitted Activities)]	Oppose	The definition of Tertiary Education Activities needs to be modified in respect of the submitter’s comments on Amendment 1.	That the Tertiary Education Activities definition be modified in respect of submitter’s comments on Amendment 1.
153.24	Amendment 11 [4A 2.1.1 General Residential Activity Area (Rules – Permitted Activities – Conditions)]	Oppose	The permitted activity standards are opposed. By increasing the maximum building height and site coverage the plan change could result in large bulky buildings with a dominating streetscape effect and this adverse effect cannot be effectively managed/mitigated by building rules and standards alone. The proposed standards are insufficient to ensure a successful scale relationship between new buildings in the Precinct and the adjacent residential and recreational/open space areas. Neither do the standards address issues of building design quality and appearance. A maximum building height of 8 m is requested and Udy Street should be referred to as Udy and Britannia Streets. ‘Scale’ and ‘design quality/appearance’ issues are highly relevant for a successful outcome. Reducing the impact of bulk and achieving the desired level of integration between new and existing can most effectively achieved through	That the Permitted Activity Standards 4A 2.1.1 be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate Permitted Activity Standards for individual sites based on agreed Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will result in a better development. A maximum height limit of 8m is also sought.

			<p>design provisions of some kind.</p> <p>Design provisions will also address some other issues not covered by the plan change such as connectivity, CPTED issues, landscape treatment of large carparking areas and the use of landscaping to improve interfaces.</p>	
153.25	Amendment 12 [4A 2.3 General Residential Activity Area (Restricted Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	<p>The proposed Restricted Discretionary Activity status for activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity standards is opposed. As a precinct has been established that provides for a greater range of activities and concessions than would normally be allowed in a general activity area, any activities that fail to meet the standards should go through a higher test of approval.</p> <p>Without an urban design Guide it is not possible to determine whether the permitted activity standards are appropriate. Non-complying Activity status for activities that do not comply with Permitted Activity standards of a Precinct is considered appropriate and necessary.</p> <p>The note precluding public notification is also opposed, with full notification required for a Non-complying Activity.</p>	That the plan change be amended so that activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity standards 4A 2.1.1 for tertiary education activities are a Non-complying Activity with full public notification.
153.26	Amendment 13 [4A 2.3.1 General Residential Activity Area (Matters in which Council has restricted its Discretion and Standards and Terms)]	Oppose	<p>As a consequential amendment with the change of activity status sought under Amendment 12, the matters to be addressed in 4A 2.3.1 (k) need to be shifted to matters to be addressed when considering a Non-complying activity. The matters to consider need to be broadened to include the Urban Design Guide criteria not met, traffic effects, parking effects, hours of operation and light and noise.</p> <p>The amenity values in (k) (i) also require amendment to specifically relate to residential character and amenity, the need to comply with the Urban Design Guide for scale and intensity, the need to demonstrate that any adverse effects are managed, and that any future development will maintain or enhance the values to be better than they are now.</p>	That the matters included in 4A 2.3.1 (k) be moved to matters to be addressed when considering Non-complying activities and amended to address the matters outlined in the submission.
153.27	Amendment 14 [4A 2.4 General Residential Activity Area (Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	Discretionary status for activities that do not comply with the permitted activity conditions is opposed. It is considered appropriate that these activities are Non-complying Activities.	That 4A 2.4 (n) be amended to provide for tertiary education activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity standards to be Non-complying activities.
153.28	Amendment 15 [4A General Residential Activity Area (Appendices)]	Oppose	Udy Street should only remain in the Precinct if it has its own Urban Design Guide and other relief sought by the submitter is adopted.	The submitter only supports the inclusion of Udy Street site in the precinct if an Urban Design Guide is developed and the other relief sought by the submitter is adopted.

153.29	Amendment 16 [Chapter 6 Business (Introduction)]	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodated' in the introduction to Chapter 6 is opposed. To be consistent with other amendments sought in the submission, the term should be replaced by the term 'provided for where appropriate'.	That the Introduction (a) General Business Activity Area be amended by replacing the term ' <i>accommodated</i> ' with the term ' <i>provided for where appropriate</i> '.
153.30	Amendment 17 [6A 1.1.1 General Business Activity Area (Accommodation of a Mix of Activities – Policies)]	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodated' is opposed, and should be replaced by the term 'provided for where appropriate'.	That policy 6A 1.1.1 be amended by replacing the term ' <i>accommodated</i> ' with the term ' <i>provided for where appropriate</i> '.
153.31	Amendment 18 [6A 1.1.1 General Business Activity Area (Accommodation of a Mix of Activities – Explanation and Reasons)]	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodate' in paragraph 1 is opposed. Paragraph 2 essentially repeats paragraph 1 and includes phrases that reinforce the existing facility, and the last sentence suggests there are no adverse effects on amenity and the environment. The amendments are opposed. The submitter's submission on this provision is also subject to its opposition to the inclusion of leased sites within the precinct.	That the Explanation and Reasons for 6A 1.1.1 General Business Activity Area is amended as follows or similar: <i>The range of non-industrial activities accommodated also includes training facilities, conference centres, places of assembly and places of worship. Tertiary education activities are accommodated provided for where appropriate within the tertiary Education Precinct, of which, that part on Cuba Street is located in the General Business Activity Area.</i> <i>WelTec and its predecessors have historically provided tertiary education activities within the area in Cuba Street and the activity is an established use on the site providing important tertiary education including vocational education and applied research. These non-industrial activities are only to be provided for where the actual and potential adverse generated effects can be managed and the character and do not have an adverse effect on the amenity values of the area, including the adjoining Residential Activity Area, are maintained or enhanced and the environment.</i>
153.32	Amendment 19 [6A 1.1.3 General Business	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodate' is opposed and should be replaced with	That Issue 6A 1.1.3 be amended to replace the term ' <i>accommodated</i> ' with the term

	Activity Area (Environmental Effects – Issue)]		'provided for where appropriate'.	<i>'provided for where appropriate'.</i>
153.33	Amendment 20 [6A 1.2.1 General Business Activity Area (Effects of the Amenity Values of the Area – Issue)]	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodate' is opposed and should be replaced with 'provided for where appropriate'.	That Issue 6A 1.2.1 be amended to replace the term ' <i>accommodated</i> ' with the term ' <i>provided for where appropriate</i> '.
153.34	Amendment 21 [6A 2.2 General Business Activity Area (Controlled Activities)]	Oppose	The exception included in rules 6A 2.2 (b) and 6A 2.2.1 (b) is opposed as it is considered contrary to the objectives and policies of the General Residential Activity Area that intend to protect residential character and amenity values. Non-complying activity status is sought for activities that do not meet the permitted activity standards to ensure consistency throughout the precinct regardless of the underlying zoning. Precluding public and limited notification is opposed as this is not appropriate, is contrary to the principle of public participation and any adjoining residential activity area should have an opportunity for input.	That the exception in Rules 6A 2.2 (b) and 6A 2.2.1 (b) be deleted and any tertiary education activity that does not comply with a General Business Activity Area permitted activity standard, or is on a site abutting or on the opposite side of the road from a residential activity area, is a Non-complying Activity with full notification required.
153.35	Amendment 22 [6A 2.3 General Business Activity Area (Restricted Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	Tertiary education activities that do not comply with the General Business Activity Area permitted activity standards should be a Non-complying Activities, subject to notification.	That 6A 2.3 (i) be deleted and any tertiary education activity that does not comply with a Permitted Activity standard, or is on a site abutting or on the opposite side of the road from a residential activity area, is a Non-complying Activity with full notification required.
153.36	Amendment 23 [6A 2.3.1 General Business Activity Area (Matters in which Council has restricted its Discretion and Standards and Terms)]	Oppose	The matters included in 6A 2.3.1 (i) should become assessment criteria for Non-complying Activities. The same comments made in relation to the Amenity Values criteria in Amendment 13 apply.	That matters included in 6A 2.3.1 (i) become assessment criteria for Non-complying Activities, and the same amendments to Amenity Values sought for Amendment 13 be made to 6A 2.3.
153.37	Amendment 25 [Chapter 7 General Recreation and Open Space (introduction)]	Oppose	The inclusion of Bracken Street in the precinct is opposed as it is Conservation Land leased to HCC. It is understood the lease lapses in 3-5 years and there is no agreement or right for the land to be included in the Tertiary Education Precinct. All amendments to Chapter 7 are therefore opposed. If HCC decide it is permissible to include this land in the Precinct all references to the Bracken Street site are opposed on the basis that activities provided for in the precinct are unacceptable activities to occur in a conservation area. The	That the amendment to Introduction (a) General Recreation Activity Area be deleted as this is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.

			legal basis for WelTec’s current or past use of the site is questionable and the area should be used for recreation and open space. The location of the Bracken Street site makes inclusion into the precinct undesirable from a traffic and planning perspective.	
153.38	Amendment 26 [7A 1.1.4 General Recreation and Open Space (Non-Recreational Activities)]	Oppose	Same comments as for Amendment 25 apply.	That the amendment to Policy (b) be deleted as this area is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.
153.39	Amendment 27 [7A 2.1 General Recreation Activity Area (Permitted Activities)]	Oppose	Same comments as for Amendment 25 apply.	That the amendment to Rule 7A 2.1 (f) be deleted as this area is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.
153.40	Amendment 28 [7A 2.1.1 General Recreation Activity Area (Permitted Activities – Conditions)]	Oppose	Same comments as for Amendment 25 apply.	That the amendment to the permitted activity standard Rule 7A 2.1.1 (d) be deleted as this area is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.
153.41	Amendment 29 [7A General Recreation Activity Area (Appendices)]	Oppose	Same comments as for Amendment 25 apply.	That the amendment to Appendix Map “Appendix General Recreation 1” to Chapter 7A be deleted as the area is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.
153.42	Amendment 30 [Chapter 14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 1.2.1 – On-site Parking Provision for Activities – Policy)]	Oppose	<p>A campus wide on-site parking approach is considered appropriate as long as the relationship between the car parks and the activities is logical and functional.</p> <p>Bracken St should be removed from the campus wide on-site parking approach as it is too far from the majority of the campus. Udy St is also a significant distance from the main campus activities.</p> <p>The current Tertiary Education Institution does not currently provide adequate off-street (on-site) parking to meet its parking demand and this needs to be addressed.</p> <p>It is not appropriate that the plan change be used to confirm and recognise the existing nature, level and extent of car parking in and around the Precinct as this is resulting in unreasonable adverse effects on the surrounding area. The extent</p>	<p>That Policy 14A (iii) 1.2.1 (b) be re-worded in a manner consistent with the submission, including (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of the Bracken Street site from any campus wide approach to providing on-site car parking for the Precinct. • Deletion of “<i>Recognising the existing nature, level and extent of car parking in and around the precinct...</i>” • Development of a sunset clause requiring the on street effects to be reduced over time and to those spaces available directly outside the precinct property boundaries

			<p>of reliance of on-street parking by an institution of this nature is entirely unprecedented and inappropriate and should be reduced.</p> <p>The reference to “...recognising the existing nature, level and extend of Carparking in and around the precinct.” is opposed and should be deleted as it would allow for the current on street sprawl of car parks to continue. A sunset clause is needed requiring the on street effects be reduced over time to those spaces available directly outside the precinct property boundaries to reduce the adverse effects. This will require further provision of off-street parking, better utilisation of existing off-street car parks and better management of traffic generated as a result of Tertiary Education activities.</p> <p>The amenity values and character of the area need to be established particularly in the context of how on-street parking may detract from that amenity value and character.</p> <p>It is noted that while some existing use rights may exist in respect of buildings and site, off-site ancillary activities such as car parking are not usually recognised as having existing use rights.</p> <p>It is considered questionable whether it is permissible to include a provision which relies on on-street parking provided in an area outside the precinct.</p>	<p>to reduce the adverse effects; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defining the residential character and amenity values to be protected and determining the effects of on-street parking on these values.
153.43	Amendment 31 [14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 1.2.1 – On-site Parking Provision for Activities – Explanation and Reasons)]	Oppose	<p>There are aspects of the first paragraph that are acceptable in principle. The reference to recognising the existing nature, level and extent of car parking in and around the precinct in the second paragraph is challenged as it implies that the existing situation is acceptable and should be maintained. The District Plan requires parking to be a maximum of 100m from the site and this non-compliance needs to be addressed.</p> <p>In the second paragraph there is a reference to “...the improved management of the on-street parking resources so it is more available for residents...”. This management is outside of the Tertiary Education providers control and requires HCC to implement. It is not known if any on street changes will occur and appears to be outside the scope of the Precinct.</p> <p>It is considered that ‘adequate supply of car parking’ within the precinct should be linked to staff numbers and the total number of students enrolled in courses.</p>	That the second paragraph of the Explanation and Reasons 14A (iii) 1.2.1 be amended to address the concerns raised in the submission.
153.44	Amendment 32 [14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 2.1 – Permitted Activity	Support in part	<p>A campus wide on-site parking approach is considered appropriate as long as the relationship between the car parks and activities are logical and functional.</p> <p>The provision of off-street parking outside the Precinct causes ‘creep’ and</p>	That Rule 14A (iii) 2.1 (b) be amended by changing the word ‘ <u>may</u> be located on any site...’ to ‘ <u>must</u> be located on any site...’.

	Conditions (b) Location of Parking Spaces]]		impacts on the residential area and is not appropriate. It is considered necessary for the word ' <i>may be located on any site</i> ' to be changed to ' <i>must be located on any site</i> '.	
153.45	Amendment 33 [14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 2.2 Discretionary Activities(b))]	Oppose	<p>Where parking associated with a tertiary education activity cannot comply with the permitted activity status, it should be Non-complying and require notification.</p> <p>Providing off-street parking outside of the Precinct is unacceptable and encourages 'creep' and derogation of the residential area.</p> <p>A Discretionary Activity rule should be developed that adopts one of the mechanisms discussed (sunset clause, stepped approach, or car parking requirements based on staff and student numbers) to reduce the reliance of the Tertiary Education Activity operations on on-street parking.</p>	That the activity provided by the amendment to Rule 14A (iii) 2.2 (b) be a Non-complying activity with full notification, with the Discretionary Activity Rules to reduce the reliance of the tertiary education activities on on-street parking be included.
153.46	Amendment 34 [14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 2.2.1 Assessment Matters for Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	<p>The proposed Assessment Matters in 14A (iii) 2.2.1 are opposed. The wording does not provide enough certainty to the requirement for the tertiary precinct to work towards reducing their reliance on on-street parking and their adverse effects within the vicinity of their property boundaries. The phrase 'is likely to maintain' should be replaced with 'will maintain'. The reference to reducing reliance on on-street parking should be retained.</p> <p>The matter included as amendment to this rule should not be a Discretionary Activity and should instead become a matter of consideration for a Non-complying Activity.</p>	That the matters included in Assessment Matters in 14A (iii) 2.2.1 be included as a Non-complying Activity assessment matter.
153.47	Amendment 35 [14A Appendix Transport 3 – Minimum Parking Standards]	Oppose	<p>The standard proposed in Appendix Transport 3 is opposed. Without an indication of what the future development in the Precinct might look like, it is not possible to tell if the formula is the "<i>...the most effective and efficient for activities and development within the proposed Tertiary Education Precinct area</i>". In keeping with the relief sought in respect of Amendment 1 the parking requirements for ancillary activities that do not come within the definition of 'Tertiary Education Activities' should not be assessed on this basis (e.g. retail, childcare and health). These will require different minimum parking requirements.</p> <p>The definition of the unit is inadequate and continued reliance on on-street parking is in contradiction to the intent of the wording in Amendment 34. The proposed supply calculation makes no attempt to reduce the reliance on on-street parking.</p> <p>The definition of 'Student' is unknown and it is not known if this refers to the</p>	That the formula included in Appendix 3 be deleted, a tighter definition of the terms 'student' and 'staff' and that the equation be replaced with an equation that uses FTE students and enrolled staff, and reduction of the on street parking provision from 300 to 63 (the number of car parks available on the adjoining road frontages on the Education Precinct). A separate further equation is required for the car parking requirements for ancillary activities.

			<p>total number of students enrolled or the number on site at any time. The staff number is also unknown and there is no reference to whether it relates just to teaching staff or all other staff working on the site (i.e. cleaners, grounds men or tutors). Both these definitions need to be more clearly defined.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to modify the parking requirement to an equation that uses FTE staff and enrolled students and reduce the on street parking provision from 300 to 63.</p>	
153.48	Amendment 36 [Chapter 14B 2.1.1 (c) Signs]	Oppose	<p>There appears to be no justification for allowing the maximum face area of a sign in the Precinct to be 3m², and Permitted Activity status is opposed. There is no control over the purpose, location or content of the sign and such controls are required to ensure the residential character and amenity of adjoining areas is maintained or enhanced. Signs should only be linked to Tertiary Education activities provided within the Precinct.</p>	<p>That the amendment to Rule 14B 2.1.1 (c) be deleted, with additional controls developed on the purpose, location and content of the signs, and any adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the surrounding residential area. If these standards cannot be met, a Non-complying activity should be required, with notification.</p>
153.49	Amendment 37 [14B 2.2 Signs (Controlled Activities)]	Oppose	<p>The comments on Amendment 36 apply.</p>	<p>That the amendment to Rule 14B 2.2 (a) be deleted, with additional controls sought on the purpose, location and content of the signs, and any adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the surrounding residential area (which may be a matter for a urban design guide). If these standards cannot be met, a Non-complying activity should be required, with notification.</p>
153.50	Amendment 38 [14B 2.2 Signs (Controlled Activities)]	Oppose	<p>Refer to comments under Amendments 36 & 37.</p>	<p>That the amendment to Rule 14B 2.2 (e) be deleted, with additional controls sought on the purpose, location and content of the signs, and any adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the surrounding residential area. If these standards cannot be met, a Non-complying activity should be required, with notification.</p>
153.51	Amendment 39 [14B 2.3 Signs (Restricted Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	<p>Refer to comments under Amendments 36 & 37.</p>	<p>That the amendment to Rule 14B 2.3 (e) be deleted, with additional controls sought on the purpose, location and content of the signs, and any adverse effects on the</p>

				character and amenity values of the surrounding residential area. If these standards cannot be met, a Non-complying activity should be required, with notification.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC25/154 Nelson Street Trust				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
154.1	General – Legal Matters: Consultation	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that there has been very little consultation with the community and that which occurred was vastly inadequate. It has not been within the context of the precinct and occurred during other plan change processes where the community were unaware of a proposed precinct and were unable to make an informed comment.</p> <p>Council has failed in its duties in respected of an adopted plan change under Schedule 1 part 1 of the RMA to undertake consultation on the plan change in a manner consistent with the principles of consultation in s.82 of the LGA 2002.</p> <p>The submitter notes that while a Council is not required to consult on an adopted plan change prior to notification where a local authority does opt to undertake consultation in conjunction with the applicant this must be done in accordance with the LGA 2002.</p>	
154.2	General – Legal Matters: Assessment of Environmental Effects	Oppose	The submitter states that the AEE provided for the Proposed Plan Change is inadequate and provides very little (if any) assessment as to the adverse effects that may occur in the event it is adopted. The AEE provides no assessment on shading, bulk, privacy, height, noise, heritage or other impacts on the amenity of the surrounding residential and recreational areas.	
154.3	General – Legal Matters: Section 32 analysis	Oppose	The submitter challenges the Section 32 report for PPC25, under Section 32A, stating that it is flawed in that it fails to demonstrate that the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, the policies and rules are efficient and effective and most appropriate to achieve the objectives, and the benefits and costs of the policies and rules are warranted.	
154.4	General – Legal Matters: Resource Management Act 1991	Oppose	The submitter states that in its current form, PPC 25 does not promote the sustainable management of natural or physical resources required by the RMA. PPC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational	

			areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.	
154.5	General – Legal Matters: Consistency with other plan provisions	Oppose	The submitter comments that the plan change is not consistent with other plan provisions such as the provisions introduced by Plan Change 12, Heritage (i.e.: the Old Court House) and matters protected and identified in the General Residential Area and Petone Recreation Area chapters.	
154.6	General – Legal Matters: Existing use rights	Oppose	The submitter states that it is unlikely existing use rights for the precinct areas and for the current activities (e.g.: on-street car parking) can be established. The submitter states that the plan change is contrary to good resource management practice in that it seeks to confirm and reinforce the existing level of non-compliance, including non-compliance with existing resource consent conditions via the plan change; the submitter says this is inconsistent with the Councils’ duties to act in accordance with its own plans.	That existing use rights are properly determined and established before using them in the proposed provisions.
154.7	General – Legal Matters: ‘Precinct concept’	Oppose	The submitter questions whether PPC25 creates a precinct, as opposed to creating preferential ‘spot zoning’. The submitter states that many of the amendments currently proposed have the potential to undermine the precinct.	That the Council amend PPC25 in accordance with the submitter’s submission, which seeks to strengthen and enhance the precinct approach. Re-write the introduction to the Precinct plan change to better reflect the precinct as a planning mechanism and to recognise the existing conflict between the nature and scale of existing Tertiary Education Activities and residents and other community and recreational activities.
154.8	General – Legal Matters: Changes to the general residential area zone desirable	Oppose	The submitter notes that several parts of PPC25 relate to matters which are outside the precinct area, and appear to be outside the scope of the plan change.	That consideration be given to amending the General Residential Area provisions of the plan. Amending the plan to make “tertiary Education Activities” outside the precinct in the General Residential Activity Area a non-complying activity would assist in preserving the residential character of the area and effectively maintain the integrity of the precinct.
154.9	General – Legal Matters: Independent commissioner	Oppose	The submitter considers that given that Council have adopted the proposed plan change (an action which implies support), the Council should not decide the matter itself.	That an independent commissioner be appointed.

154.10	General – Plan Change documentation: What is Proposed Plan Change 25?	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that the Proposed Plan Change as notified does not meet its purpose of <i>‘providing for ongoing use and development of the campus to meet future tertiary education needs whilst also providing greater certainty for the community’</i>. The submitter questions the purpose of PPC25 as whole.</p> <p>The submitter questions how the plan change will protect the amenity values of each surrounding area if the residential amenity values have not been properly defined in the plan change. The submitter states that amendments are required to the objectives and policies to better define residential amenity and introduce mechanisms (e.g. an urban design framework) to ensure amenity values are recognised and protected.</p> <p>The submitter supports in general the plan change’s intent to provide for the activities of the Tertiary Education provider in an appropriate way by applying rules differently throughout the campus but comments that they have addressed the matter in detail further in their submission.</p> <p>The submitter comments that there is no future development plan included as part of PPC25 and that there is no way of measuring whether the effects on the surrounding areas are being managed. The submitter feels that this lack of development plan makes it difficult to determine what the future requirements for the Tertiary Education Facility are. The submitter notes that the current approach has been to free up any planning controls to allow for flexibility in what can be built on the site in the future, as quickly as possible, presumably to respond to future tertiary education needs as they arise. The submitter considers that this approach does not represent sound resource management planning practice.</p> <p>The submitter questions the proposed changes relating to car and cycle parking and signage as well as the concurrent HCC review of on-street carparking in Petone. The submitter states that where multiple sites are involved the proximity of the sites to each other plays an important part in the optimal management of the car parks and the overall effects of the parking overspill.</p> <p>The submitter states that it has been established that the current operation of the existing tertiary education activity Petone has significant adverse effects in terms of parking and traffic and that PPC25 appears to endorse this, seeking to maintain or potentially worsen them rather than mitigating them.</p> <p>The submitter highlights two significant issues that they feel need to be addressed for this plan change to be effective:</p>	
--------	---	--------	--	--

			<p>1. The provision of sufficient car parks to meet the needs of the tertiary education activity. This involves the provision of both off street and on street car parks.</p> <p>(a) an appropriate total number of spaces relative to the number of people using the site and the activities being undertaken on the site; and</p> <p>(b) an appropriate split between off and on street spaces to minimise the adverse effects.</p> <p>2. The management of the off street car parks to maximise their use and the management of on street car parks to minimise their effect on other residents.</p> <p>The submitter states that the plan change also fails to deal with what may occur in the event that the site is no longer needed for Tertiary Education Activities.</p>	
154.11	General – Plan Change documentation: Scope of PC25	Oppose	<p>It is not clear by what ‘generally’ means in the first paragraph of the text under the Scope of Proposed Plan Change 25 heading.</p> <p>The submitter states that the land at 26 and 26A Bracken Street (K Block) is owned by the Minister of Conservation as a conservation area and is subject to the Conservation Act 1987. The Section 32 report wrongly identifies this as land owned by HCC. The submitter considers this is entirely inappropriate for this land to be included in PPC25 as part of the Precinct and should be deleted.</p> <p>The submitter comments that while the ownership of land is not generally an RMA issue, given the relaxation of height, bulk provisions it may not be appropriate for land that is leased and not owned by the Tertiary Education institution to be included in the precinct. Including lease sites within the precinct is problematic because</p> <p>1. if a leased site is included in the precinct, and developed in accordance with the precinct provisions including reliance on the off street parking provisions and campus wide parking approach, then conceivably a leased site could be developed that relies on car parking on another part of the campus or the leased property could provide car parking for another part of the precinct; and</p> <p>2. in the event that the lease comes to an end and is no longer used for Tertiary Education Activities the precinct may lose off-street car parks provided on the leased site or the leased site may be left with insufficient off-street car parking because that property has been developed in reliance</p>	<p>That the following wording (or similar) be inserted by way of explanation to the introduction of PPC25 which records:</p> <p><u><i>“in past years the tertiary education institution has had some conflict with local residents because of moves to expand into the surrounding residential areas. For this reason Council generally requires the Precincts to develop within their existing boundaries to protect nearby residential neighbourhoods from the encroachment of non-residential development. Future expansion of the precinct is not prohibited, but Council seeks to ensure that any of Tertiary educational institution boundaries is properly evaluated. Expansion proposals will be dealt with under the plan change process to enable a full assessment of environmental effects”</i></u></p> <p>That the precinct plan records that considerable scope for expansion of Tertiary Education Activities is possible at the institution’s other campuses, e.g.: the new</p>

			<p>of the campus wide car parking approach, using the proposed formula, rather than those of the General Business Area. The building owners who would benefit from the relaxed precinct rules will also obtain a benefit as they have been able to develop their properties to a level over and above what is permitted for the underlying zone.</p> <p>The submitter states that PPC25 is more like a spot zoning approach rather than a precinct.</p>	<p>hospitality school and Wakefield Street site in Wellington, the Petone Memorial College site and the Jackson Street site in Petone and the close management relationship that WelTec has with Whitirea all of which have space available for further development and have more preferable zoning. This recognises that the Precinct Area is a finite area that is currently subject to relatively intense development. As a result of the nature of the site, limited new development opportunities are restricted.</p>
154.12	General – Plan Change documentation: Summary of Proposed Plan Change 25	Oppose	<p>The submitter states it is inappropriate for PC25 to say it specifically provides for WelTec’s activities. The proposed definition does not reference WelTec, and PPC25 should not provide for the activities of a specific organisation. All references to WelTec should be deleted.</p> <p>The submitter states that permitted activities as currently proposed are likely to result in unacceptable adverse effects on the neighbouring residential and recreational areas. The submitter states that PPC25 shouldn’t be a mechanism to add individual activities which are not existing activities on site (e.g. student accommodation) or provide for current activities with no limitation on scale. The submitter questions the intent of the permitted activity provisions to protect the amenity of the surrounding residential areas, particularly as the residential amenity to be protected is not well defined and effects of the proposed provisions not properly understood. The permitted activity conditions need to be more tightly defined, with no discretion, and address a wider range of issues.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that the current provisions as currently drafted legitimise and confirm WelTec’s current level of non-compliance with the operative District Plan requirements; this is not considered appropriate or acceptable to the submitter.</p> <p>The submitter states that provisions should be included in PPC25 (such as a sunset clause, stepped requirements to provide on-site parks or a reduction on reliance on on-street car parking as student enrolment numbers increase) to address the reliance of using on-street parking.</p> <p>The submitter points out that there is a contradiction on Page 6 of the</p>	

		<p>Introduction of the plan change document where the heading for General Business Activity has been used twice.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed parking provisions, the submitter states that no information has been provided as to the basis of the student numbers to provide clarity as to whether they are enrolment or attendance figures. The submitter states that no information has been provided with respect to whether the staff is employment numbers or full time equivalents, is limited to academic staff of the Tertiary Education Institution or is all people who might be working in the Precinct. The submitter states that the Section 32 document does not adequately assess the various options available for parking & traffic. The submitter states that there is also no ability provided within the equation to reduce the reliance on on-street parking over time, as alluded to in Amendment 34 of the Plan Change.</p> <p>The submitter states that multi-modal mechanisms to reduce reliance on on-street parking should be part of PPC25 as there is currently nothing proposed regarding this matter. The submitter suggests buses from the rail way station and mini bus provision from the Udy Street carpark etc. should be provided for and encouraged in PPC25 and be in a manner that requires the tertiary education provider to consider and adopt them.</p> <p>The submitter debates the ability of the precinct to comply with the proposed rules. A review of the area shows a difference in the number of carparks for the sole use of the tertiary education activity. The submitter gives details regarding car park numbers which are WelTec has sole use of and which are for the community. The submitter considers that the security of use of the leased parking is questionable for long term provision and that there is also confusion regarding whether all the existing leased and HCC carparks, considered to be the sole use of WelTec are within the proposed precinct, as they appear not to be in the proposed precinct, there is already non-compliance with the proposed rules.</p> <p>The submitter states that no details have been provided in PPC25 with respect to how the tertiary education activity is going to manage their off street parking to improve its utilisation or encourage use of sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>The submitter states that the character and amenity of the local area been defined, and there is no effects based assessment provided.</p> <p>The submitter states there are no provisions relating to controlling the subject matter on the signs, location, and necessity.</p>	
--	--	---	--

154.13	General – Section 32 Report	Oppose	<p>The submitter notes that the assessment of matters contained has been undertaken from WelTec (as the requester’s) perspective rather than by the HCC and that their perspective may differ to those of the HCC or the community. E.g.: The S32 has stated that a Design Guide is undesirable yet HCC uses multiple design guides already and they are valid and effective planning tools, especially for precincts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter puts forward 3 points in support of the use of design guides • While a design guide can create a level of uncertainty for the applicant, it can also provide a better understanding of the nature and quality of the final outcome. This provides the Council and the community with a higher level of certainty and ensure a more balanced approach to managing building form; • By outlining clear objectives regarding the quality of expected design outcomes, a design guide will provide a common reference point for both the applicant and the Council in assessing the applicant’s design proposals; and • A design guide can successfully work in tandem with the amended rules/standards by providing a set of ‘qualitative’ criteria to complement the ‘measurable’ provisions of setbacks, site coverage and building height, which alone cannot mitigate the potential impact of bulk and/or address building design quality. 	
154.14	Amendment 1 [Chapter 3 – Definitions]	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that the first part of the tertiary education activities definition seems appropriate and is considered to be consistent with the definition of institution in the Education Act. However, defining the ancillary activities should be directly linked to the core business of the institution, and the current definition is too vague.</p> <p>It is appropriate for ancillary activities such as car parking and administration to be recognised as ancillary activities, but the extent needs to be limited to being for tertiary education purposes only, not open to the public and restricted to the precinct area.</p> <p>Other ancillary activities such as childcare, health and retail may be appropriate but need to be subject to rules limiting the extent and specific parking provisions.</p> <p>Further consideration needs to be given as to whether the inclusion of other activities such as student accommodation, recreational, cultural and social facilities is appropriate as they have very different effects and Council is</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current definition of Tertiary Education Activities be amended as follows or similar: • Amend the second part of the definition by removing the reference to specifically ancillary activities, and to read “... <i>(the Education Act 1989), and includes ancillary activities as defined below.</i>” • Provide a new definition for ancillary activities for the following activities: administrative, car parking, child care, health, and retail. This definition needs to clearly link the ancillary activity to tertiary education activities; specify an allowable floor area; and have separate parking provisions and provide for the further matters identified in the submission.

			<p>requested to revisit this issue and undertake a more detailed assessment.</p> <p>The submitter notes that student accommodation may not be appropriate and should be either considered a non-complying activity or excluded from the precinct.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted that Amendment 10 will also require amendment and additional criteria for ancillary activities that meet permitted criteria will need to be developed. • Consider deleting reference to student accommodation, recreational, cultural, and social activities and facilities from the definition.
154.15	Amendment 2 [Chapter 4A 1.1.4 General Residential Activity Area (Non-Residential Activities – Issue)]	Oppose	<p>The emphasis of the plan change is considered unbalanced. PPC 25 should recognise the contribution of tertiary education activities to the City while recognising that the current development has adverse environmental effects beyond the boundary of the site and also recognising the benefits that the residential area provides.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to ensure that any future development maintains and enhances the residential character and amenity, and the reliance on on-street parking is reduced over time (for example a sunset clause over 10 years).</p>	<p>That Issue 4A1.1.4 be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>Non-residential activities in residential areas can support residential activities <u>and provide social and economic benefits to the community.</u> Such activities can <u>also</u> have significant adverse effects upon surrounding residential properties, <u>including adverse environmental effects (such as visual, loss of residential uses, traffic and parking and noise) beyond the boundary of the site.</u> These adverse effects need to be avoided, remedied or mitigated to ensure that residential amenity values and character are maintained and enhanced. <u>Any new non-residential development on existing sites will need to ensure any existing adverse environmental effects on the residential character and amenity are addressed, any reliance on on-street parking is reduced, and an improvement in residential character and amenity is achieved.</u></i></p>
154.16	Amendment 3 [4A 1.1.4 General Residential Activity Area (Non-Residential Activities – Policies)]	Support in part	<p>Policy 4A1.1.4 (d) is supported subject to minor amendments. The word ‘recognise’ tends to lead to provisions that reinforce the existing situation and such reference should be deleted. The policy needs to be amended to reference character and amenity to residential values. The submitter notes that the current buildings within the precinct (in particular in Kensington Avenue) are of poor quality and poor design.</p>	<p>That the intent of Policy 4A 1.1.4 (d) be retained as written with minor amendments or similar:</p> <p><i><u>(d) To recognise and provide for where appropriate tertiary education activities in Petone within a defined Precinct, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effect on the environment, and</u></i></p>

				<u><i>ensuring any new tertiary education activities address any existing or potential adverse effects, particularly on the residential character and amenity values of the neighbourhood.</i></u>
154.17	Amendment 4 [4A 1.1.4 General Residential Activity Area (Non-Residential Activities – Explanation and Reasons)]	Oppose	<p>The reference to WelTec as a public entity is not relevant and should be deleted.</p> <p>The need to ‘recognise’ the WelTec facility is not appropriate and should be replaced with ‘provide for where appropriate’.</p> <p>The purpose of the Precinct is to ensure that the site is properly managed and developed for tertiary education to a suitable level and in a way that avoids any adverse effects on the surrounding residential environment and current effects are addressed.</p> <p>There is a need to identify what the future tertiary education needs might be, and any new development needs to be in the context of what the site is suitable for – need to introduce a cap on number of students.</p> <p>The plan change could result in large bulky buildings and this adverse effect cannot be effectively managed/mitigated. The proposed standards are insufficient to ensure a successful scale relationship between new buildings in the Precinct and adjacent residential and recreational/open space areas. The issues of building design quality and appearance are not addressed.</p> <p>The effects on residential amenity and character need to be addressed and any new development needs to improve residential character and amenity through the implementation of an Urban Design Guide for the Precinct.</p> <p>Either a sunset clause or stepped requirements to provide on-site car parking or a reduction on the reliance on on-street car parking needs to be included.</p> <p>The existing environment needs to be better defined, especially low density residential character and amenity of surrounding residential environment.</p> <p>Bracken Street and sites leased but not owned by WelTec need to be deleted from the Precinct.</p> <p>Elizabeth Street, Udy/Britannia Street and western Kensington Avenue sites should only be included in the precinct if the use of these sites is restricted to activities which are compatible with their location. Any development should be subject to a design guide.</p> <p>Where the precinct abuts a residential site further controls need to be</p>	That Section 4A 1.1.4 Explanation and Reasons to the General Residential Activity Area be significantly re-written to incorporate the matters raised in the submission.

			<p>introduced to address effects such as visual, privacy, noise, amenity, traffic safety and parking.</p> <p>Udy Street should be referred to as Udy and Britannia Streets throughout the document.</p>	
154.18	<p>Amendment 5 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Policies)]</p>	Oppose	<p>Policy 4A 1.2.1 (k) is opposed in its current form as it intends to recognise the existing scale and intensity of the current campus and sets the tone for more intensified development within the Precinct in the future. As currently drafted the rules allow development on the scale of the tower block throughout the whole precinct. This would potentially affect not only abutting but also nearby sites which needs to be reflected.</p> <p>The focus should be on avoiding and remedying effects on residential properties abutting the Precinct (as well as minimising them) and the reference should be to residential character and amenity.</p> <p>Any policies regarding building height, scale, intensity and location should be developed within an Urban Design Guide.</p> <p>If the use of an Urban Design Guide is rejected, the amendments proposed in amendments 5-11 are opposed on the basis that they would generate unacceptable adverse effects.</p>	<p>That 4A 1.2.1(k) be amended to read as follows or similar:</p> <p><u><i>'(k) To establish specific maximum height, maximum site coverage, minimum set back and recession plane standards within specific areas of the Tertiary Education Precinct to recognise ensure any future development is at a existing scale and intensity that is in keeping with the surrounding environment and suitability of the site to accommodate further development Of the built development in the Precinct – and to avoid any minimise adverse effects on the character and amenity values of abutting or nearby residential properties through the adoption of an Urban Design Guide for the Precinct.'</i></u></p>
154.19	<p>Amendment 6 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Explanation and Reasons (b) Site Coverage)]</p>	Oppose	<p>The Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 (b) is opposed as is provides for the nature and scale of the existing campus and as currently drafted does not look to promote better outcomes in the future.</p> <p>The provision is likely to result in adverse scale and bulk, with no light or view shafts or building variation. Site coverage issues should be developed through an Urban Design approach.</p>	<p>That the Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 relating to site coverage be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate site coverage for individual sites based on agreed Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will minimise effects and result in better development.</p>
154.20	<p>Amendment 7 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Explanation and Reasons (c))]</p>	Oppose	<p>The Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 (c) is opposed as it is likely to result in unacceptable adverse effects on the surrounding environment, however, no information as to the likely impact has been provided. There is a need for an Urban Design guide to address matters to do with recession planes and setbacks.</p>	<p>That the Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 relating to recession planes be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate site coverage for individual sites based on agreed Urban Design principles and future outcomes</p>

	Recession Planes)]			that will minimise effects and result in a better development.
154.21	Amendment 8 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Explanation and Reasons (d) Yards)]	Oppose	The Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 (d) is opposed as the provision is likely to result in unacceptable effects. There is a need to have an Urban Design Guide to address matters to do with yards.	That the Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 relating to yards be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate yards for individual sites based on agreed Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will minimise effects and result in a better development.
154.22	Amendment 9 [4A 1.2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Building Height, Scale, Intensity and Location – Explanation and Reasons (e) Height)]	Oppose	The Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 (e) is opposed. There is a need to have an Urban Design Guide to address matters to do with heights in conjunction with a 8m maximum height which should apply to the Udy Street and Britannia Street, Elizabeth Street and Kensington Avenue to ensure any new development is in keeping with the surrounding residential area.	That the Explanation and Reasons 4A 1.2.1 relating to height be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate height for individual sites based on agreed Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will minimise effects and result in better development. It is requested that the maximum height be reduced from 12m to 8m.
154.23	Amendment 10 [4A 2.1 General Residential Activity Area (Rules – Permitted Activities)]	Oppose	The definition of Tertiary Education Activities needs to be modified in respect of the submitter’s comments on Amendment 1.	That the Tertiary Education Activities definition be modified in respect of submitter’s comments on Amendment 1.
154.24	Amendment 11 [4A 2.1.1 General Residential Activity Area (Rules – Permitted Activities – Conditions)]	Oppose	The permitted activity standards are opposed. By increasing the maximum building height and site coverage the plan change could result in large bulky buildings with a dominating streetscape effect and this adverse effect cannot be effectively managed/mitigated by building rules and standards alone. The proposed standards are insufficient to ensure a successful scale relationship between new buildings in the Precinct and the adjacent residential and recreational/open space areas. Neither do the standards address issues of building design quality and appearance. A maximum building height of 8 m is requested and Udy Street should be referred to as Udy and Britannia Streets. ‘Scale’ and ‘design quality/appearance’ issues are highly relevant for a successful outcome. Reducing the impact of bulk and achieving the desired level of integration between new and existing can most effectively achieved through design provisions of some kind.	That the Permitted Activity Standards 4A 2.1.1 be amended to provide for the development of an Urban Design Guide to provide for appropriate Permitted Activity Standards for individual sites based on agreed Urban Design principles and future outcomes that will result in a better development. A maximum height limit of 8m is also sought.

			Design provisions will also address some other issues not covered by the plan change such as connectivity, CPTED issues, landscape treatment of large carparking areas and the use of landscaping to improve interfaces.	
154.25	Amendment 12 [4A 2.3 General Residential Activity Area (Restricted Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	<p>The proposed Restricted Discretionary Activity status for activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity standards is opposed. As a precinct has been established that provides for a greater range of activities and concessions than would normally be allowed in a general activity area, any activities that fail to meet the standards should go through a higher test of approval.</p> <p>Without an urban design Guide it is not possible to determine whether the permitted activity standards are appropriate. Non-complying Activity status for activities that do not comply with Permitted Activity standards of a Precinct is considered appropriate and necessary.</p> <p>The note precluding public notification is also opposed, with full notification required for a Non-complying Activity.</p>	That the plan change be amended so that activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity standards 4A 2.1.1 for tertiary education activities are a Non-complying Activity with full public notification.
154.26	Amendment 13 [4A 2.3.1 General Residential Activity Area (Matters in which Council has restricted its Discretion and Standards and Terms)]	Oppose	<p>As a consequential amendment with the change of activity status sought under Amendment 12, the matters to be addressed in 4A 2.3.1 (k) need to be shifted to matters to be addressed when considering a Non-complying activity. The matters to consider need to be broadened to include the Urban Design Guide criteria not met, traffic effects, parking effects, hours of operation and light and noise.</p> <p>The amenity values in (k) (i) also require amendment to specifically relate to residential character and amenity, the need to comply with the Urban Design Guide for scale and intensity, the need to demonstrate that any adverse effects are managed, and that any future development will maintain or enhance the values to be better than they are now.</p>	That the matters included in 4A 2.3.1 (k) be moved to matters to be addressed when considering Non-complying activities and amended to address the matters outlined in the submission.
154.27	Amendment 14 [4A 2.4 General Residential Activity Area (Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	Discretionary status for activities that do not comply with the permitted activity conditions is opposed. It is considered appropriate that these activities are Non-complying Activities.	That 4A 2.4 (n) be amended to provide for tertiary education activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity standards to be Non-complying activities.
154.28	Amendment 15 [4A General Residential Activity Area (Appendices)]	Oppose	Udy Street should only remain in the Precinct if it has its own Urban Design Guide and other relief sought by the submitter is adopted.	The submitter only supports the inclusion of Udy Street site in the precinct if an Urban Design Guide is developed and the other relief sought by the submitter is adopted.
154.29	Amendment 16 [Chapter 6 Business	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodated' in the introduction to Chapter 6 is opposed. To be consistent with other amendments sought in the submission,	That the Introduction (a) General Business Activity Area be amended by replacing the

	(Introduction)]		the term should be replaced by the term 'provided for where appropriate'.	term 'accommodated' with the term 'provided for where appropriate'.
154.30	Amendment 17 [6A 1.1.1 General Business Activity Area (Accommodation of a Mix of Activities – Policies)]	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodated' is opposed, and should be replaced by the term 'provided for where appropriate'.	That policy 6A 1.1.1 be amended by replacing the term 'accommodated' with the term 'provided for where appropriate'.
154.31	Amendment 18 [6A 1.1.1 General Business Activity Area (Accommodation of a Mix of Activities – Explanation and Reasons)]	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodate' in paragraph 1 is opposed. Paragraph 2 essentially repeats paragraph 1 and includes phrases that reinforce the existing facility, and the last sentence suggests there are no adverse effects on amenity and the environment. The amendments are opposed. The submitter's submission on this provision is also subject to its opposition to the inclusion of leased sites within the precinct.	That the Explanation and Reasons for 6A 1.1.1 General Business Activity Area is amended as follows or similar: <i>The range of non-industrial activities accommodated also includes training facilities, conference centres, places of assembly and places of worship. Tertiary education activities are accommodated provided for where appropriate within the tertiary Education Precinct, of which, that part on Cuba Street is located in the General Business Activity Area.</i> <i>WelTec and its predecessors have historically provided tertiary education activities within the area in Cuba Street and the activity is an established use on the site providing important tertiary education including vocational education and applied research. These non-industrial activities are only to be provided for where the actual and potential adverse generated effects can be managed and the character and do not have an adverse effect on the amenity values of the area, including the adjoining Residential Activity Area, are maintained or enhanced and the environment.</i>
154.32	Amendment 19 [6A 1.1.3 General Business Activity Area (Environmental Effects –	Oppose	The use of the term 'accommodate' is opposed and should be replaced with 'provided for where appropriate'.	That Issue 6A 1.1.3 be amended to replace the term 'accommodated' with the term 'provided for where appropriate'.

	Issue)]			
154.33	Amendment 20 [6A 1.2.1 General Business Activity Area (Effects of the Amenity Values of the Area – Issue)]	Oppose	The use of the term ‘accommodate’ is opposed and should be replaced with ‘provided for where appropriate’.	That Issue 6A 1.2.1 be amended to replace the term ‘ <i>accommodated</i> ’ with the term ‘ <i>provided for where appropriate</i> ’.
154.34	Amendment 21 [6A 2.2 General Business Activity Area (Controlled Activities)]	Oppose	The exception included in rules 6A 2.2 (b) and 6A 2.2.1 (b) is opposed as it is considered contrary to the objectives and policies of the General Residential Activity Area that intend to protect residential character and amenity values. Non-complying activity status is sought for activities that do not meet the permitted activity standards to ensure consistency throughout the precinct regardless of the underlying zoning. Precluding public and limited notification is opposed as this is not appropriate, is contrary to the principle of public participation and any adjoining residential activity area should have an opportunity for input.	That the exception in Rules 6A 2.2 (b) and 6A 2.2.1 (b) be deleted and any tertiary education activity that does not comply with a General Business Activity Area permitted activity standard, or is on a site abutting or on the opposite side of the road from a residential activity area, is a Non-complying Activity with full notification required.
154.35	Amendment 22 [6A 2.3 General Business Activity Area (Restricted Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	Tertiary education activities that do not comply with the General Business Activity Area permitted activity standards should be a Non-complying Activities, subject to notification.	That 6A 2.3 (i) be deleted and any tertiary education activity that does not comply with a Permitted Activity standard, or is on a site abutting or on the opposite side of the road from a residential activity area, is a Non-complying Activity with full notification required.
154.36	Amendment 23 [6A 2.3.1 General Business Activity Area (Matters in which Council has restricted its Discretion and Standards and Terms)]	Oppose	The matters included in 6A 2.3.1 (i) should become assessment criteria for Non-complying Activities. The same comments made in relation to the Amenity Values criteria in Amendment 13 apply.	That matters included in 6A 2.3.1 (i) become assessment criteria for Non-complying Activities, and the same amendments to Amenity Values sought for Amendment 13 be made to 6A 2.3.
154.37	Amendment 25 [Chapter 7 General Recreation and Open Space (introduction)]	Oppose	The inclusion of Bracken Street in the precinct is opposed as it is Conservation Land leased to HCC. It is understood the lease lapses in 3-5 years and there is no agreement or right for the land to be included in the Tertiary Education Precinct. All amendments to Chapter 7 are therefore opposed. If HCC decide it is permissible to include this land in the Precinct all references to the Bracken Street site are opposed on the basis that activities provided for in the precinct are unacceptable activities to occur in a conservation area. The legal basis for WelTec’s current or past use of the site is questionable and the area should be used for recreation and open space. The location of the Bracken	That the amendment to Introduction (a) General Recreation Activity Area be deleted as this is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.

			Street site makes inclusion into the precinct undesirable from a traffic and planning perspective.	
154.38	Amendment 26 [7A 1.1.4 General Recreation and Open Space (Non-Recreational Activities)]	Oppose	Same comments as for Amendment 25 apply.	That the amendment to Policy (b) be deleted as this area is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.
154.39	Amendment 27 [7A 2.1 General Recreation Activity Area (Permitted Activities)]	Oppose	Same comments as for Amendment 25 apply.	That the amendment to Rule 7A 2.1 (f) be deleted as this area is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.
154.40	Amendment 28 [7A 2.1.1 General Recreation Activity Area (Permitted Activities – Conditions)]	Oppose	Same comments as for Amendment 25 apply.	That the amendment to the permitted activity standard Rule 7A 2.1.1 (d) be deleted as this area is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.
154.41	Amendment 29 [7A General Recreation Activity Area (Appendices)]	Oppose	Same comments as for Amendment 25 apply.	That the amendment to Appendix Map “Appendix General Recreation 1” to Chapter 7A be deleted as the area is Conservation Land and cannot be incorporated into the Tertiary Education Precinct.
154.42	Amendment 30 [Chapter 14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 1.2.1 – On-site Parking Provision for Activities – Policy)]	Oppose	<p>A campus wide on-site parking approach is considered appropriate as long as the relationship between the car parks and the activities is logical and functional.</p> <p>Bracken St should be removed from the campus wide on-site parking approach as it is too far from the majority of the campus. Udy St is also a significant distance from the main campus activities.</p> <p>The current Tertiary Education Institution does not currently provide adequate off-street (on-site) parking to meet its parking demand and this needs to be addressed.</p> <p>It is not appropriate that the plan change be used to confirm and recognise the existing nature, level and extent of car parking in and around the Precinct as this is resulting in unreasonable adverse effects on the surrounding area. The extent of reliance of on-street parking by an institution of this nature is entirely unprecedented and inappropriate and should be reduced.</p>	<p>That Policy 14A (iii) 1.2.1 (b) be re-worded in a manner consistent with the submission, including (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of the Bracken Street site from any campus wide approach to providing on-site car parking for the Precinct. • Deletion of “<i>Recognising the existing nature, level and extent of car parking in and around the precinct...</i>” • Development of a sunset clause requiring the on street effects to be reduced over time and to those spaces available directly outside the precinct property boundaries to reduce the adverse effects; and • Defining the residential character and

			<p>The reference to “...recognising the existing nature, level and extend of Carparking in and around the precinct.” is opposed and should be deleted as it would allow for the current on street sprawl of car parks to continue. A sunset clause is needed requiring the on street effects be reduced over time to those spaces available directly outside the precinct property boundaries to reduce the adverse effects. This will require further provision of off-street parking, better utilisation of existing off-street car parks and better management of traffic generated as a result of Tertiary Education activities.</p> <p>The amenity values and character of the area need to be established particularly in the context of how on-street parking may detract from that amenity value and character.</p> <p>It is noted that while some existing use rights may exist in respect of buildings and site, off-site ancillary activities such as car parking are not usually recognised as having existing use rights.</p> <p>It is considered questionable whether it is permissible to include a provision which relies on on-street parking provided in an area outside the precinct.</p>	<p>amenity values to be protected and determining the effects of on-street parking on these values.</p>
154.43	<p>Amendment 31 [14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 1.2.1 – On-site Parking Provision for Activities – Explanation and Reasons)]</p>	Oppose	<p>There are aspects of the first paragraph that are acceptable in principle. The reference to recognising the existing nature, level and extent of car parking in and around the precinct in the second paragraph is challenged as it implies that the existing situation is acceptable and should be maintained. The District Plan requires parking to be a maximum of 100m from the site and this non-compliance needs to be addressed.</p> <p>In the second paragraph there is a reference to “...the improved management of the on-street parking resources so it is more available for residents...”. This management is outside of the Tertiary Education providers control and requires HCC to implement. It is not known if any on street changes will occur and appears to be outside the scope of the Precinct.</p> <p>It is considered that ‘adequate supply of car parking’ within the precinct should be linked to staff numbers and the total number of students enrolled in courses.</p>	<p>That the second paragraph of the Explanation and Reasons 14A (iii) 1.2.1 be amended to address the concerns raised in the submission.</p>
154.44	<p>Amendment 32 [14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 2.1 – Permitted Activity Conditions (b) Location of Parking Spaces)]</p>	Support in part	<p>A campus wide on-site parking approach is considered appropriate as long as the relationship between the car parks and activities are logical and functional.</p> <p>The provision of off-street parking outside the Precinct causes ‘creep’ and impacts on the residential area and is not appropriate. It is considered necessary for the word ‘<u>may be located on any site</u>’ to be changed to ‘<u>must be located on</u></p>	<p>That Rule 14A (iii) 2.1 (b) be amended by changing the word ‘<u>may be located on any site...</u>’ to ‘<u>must be located on any site...</u>’.</p>

			<i>any site’.</i>	
154.45	Amendment 33 [14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 2.2 Discretionary Activities(b))]	Oppose	<p>Where parking associated with a tertiary education activity cannot comply with the permitted activity status, it should be Non-complying and require notification.</p> <p>Providing off-street parking outside of the Precinct is unacceptable and encourages ‘creep’ and derogation of the residential area.</p> <p>A Discretionary Activity rule should be developed that adopts one of the mechanisms discussed (sunset clause, stepped approach, or car parking requirements based on staff and student numbers) to reduce the reliance of the Tertiary Education Activity operations on on-street parking.</p>	That the activity provided by the amendment to Rule 14A (iii) 2.2 (b) be a Non-complying activity with full notification, with the Discretionary Activity Rules to reduce the reliance of the tertiary education activities on on-street parking be included.
154.46	Amendment 34 [14A (iii) Car and Cycle Parking (14A (iii) 2.2.1 Assessment Matters for Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	<p>The proposed Assessment Matters in 14A (iii) 2.2.1 are opposed. The wording does not provide enough certainty to the requirement for the tertiary precinct to work towards reducing their reliance on on-street parking and their adverse effects within the vicinity of their property boundaries. The phrase ‘is likely to maintain’ should be replaced with ‘will maintain’. The reference to reducing reliance on on-street parking should be retained.</p> <p>The matter included as amendment to this rule should not be a Discretionary Activity and should instead become a matter of consideration for a Non-complying Activity.</p>	That the matters included in Assessment Matters in 14A (iii) 2.2.1 be included as a Non-complying Activity assessment matter.
154.47	Amendment 35 [14A Appendix Transport 3 – Minimum Parking Standards]	Oppose	<p>The standard proposed in Appendix Transport 3 is opposed. Without an indication of what the future development in the Precinct might look like, it is not possible to tell if the formula is the “...<i>the most effective and efficient for activities and development within the proposed Tertiary Education Precinct area</i>”. In keeping with the relief sought in respect of Amendment 1 the parking requirements for ancillary activities that do not come within the definition of ‘Tertiary Education Activities’ should not be assessed on this basis (e.g. retail, childcare and health). These will require different minimum parking requirements.</p> <p>The definition of the unit is inadequate and continued reliance on on-street parking is in contradiction to the intent of the wording in Amendment 34. The proposed supply calculation makes no attempt to reduce the reliance on on-street parking.</p> <p>The definition of ‘Student’ is unknown and it is not known if this refers to the total number of students enrolled or the number on site at any time. The staff number is also unknown and there is no reference to whether it relates just to</p>	That the formula included in Appendix 3 be deleted, a tighter definition of the terms ‘student’ and ‘staff’ and that the equation be replaced with an equation that uses FTE students and enrolled staff, and reduction of the on street parking provision from 300 to 63 (the number of car parks available on the adjoining road frontages on the Education Precinct). A separate further equation is required for the car parking requirements for ancillary activities.

			<p>teaching staff or all other staff working on the site (i.e. cleaners, grounds men or tutors). Both these definitions need to be more clearly defined.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to modify the parking requirement to an equation that uses FTE staff and enrolled students and reduce the on street parking provision from 300 to 63.</p>	
154.48	Amendment 36 [Chapter 14B 2.1.1 (c) Signs]	Oppose	<p>There appears to be no justification for allowing the maximum face area of a sign in the Precinct to be 3m², and Permitted Activity status is opposed. There is no control over the purpose, location or content of the sign and such controls are required to ensure the residential character and amenity of adjoining areas is maintained or enhanced. Signs should only be linked to Tertiary Education activities provided within the Precinct.</p>	<p>That the amendment to Rule 14B 2.1.1 (c) be deleted, with additional controls developed on the purpose, location and content of the signs, and any adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the surrounding residential area. If these standards cannot be met, a Non-complying activity should be required, with notification.</p>
154.49	Amendment 37 [14B 2.2 Signs (Controlled Activities)]	Oppose	<p>The comments on Amendment 36 apply.</p>	<p>That the amendment to Rule 14B 2.2 (a) be deleted, with additional controls sought on the purpose, location and content of the signs, and any adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the surrounding residential area (which may be a matter for a urban design guide). If these standards cannot be met, a Non-complying activity should be required, with notification.</p>
154.50	Amendment 38 [14B 2.2 Signs (Controlled Activities)]	Oppose	<p>Refer to comments under Amendments 36 & 37.</p>	<p>That the amendment to Rule 14B 2.2 (e) be deleted, with additional controls sought on the purpose, location and content of the signs, and any adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the surrounding residential area. If these standards cannot be met, a Non-complying activity should be required, with notification.</p>
154.51	Amendment 39 [14B 2.3 Signs (Restricted Discretionary Activities)]	Oppose	<p>Refer to comments under Amendments 36 & 37.</p>	<p>That the amendment to Rule 14B 2.3 (e) be deleted, with additional controls sought on the purpose, location and content of the signs, and any adverse effects on the character and amenity values of the surrounding residential area. If these</p>

				standards cannot be met, a Non-complying activity should be required, with notification.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC25/155 Scott Sonneman				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
155.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/156 Helen Kneebone				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
156.1	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form. As currently worded it would result in inappropriate effects on (but not limited to) residential, recreational and community amenity, residential and recreational character, historic character, community and social, traffic and safety of the surrounding areas.	That the Hutt City Council adopt the amendments, additions, and deletions sought by the Residents of High Street in its submission.

DPC25/157 Raelee Jenson Manesh Kumar				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
157.1	General	Oppose	The submitters oppose the plan change in its current form. PC25 does not promote sustainable management as the RMA requires. PC25 fails to protect, maintain and enhance the residential and recreational areas and community facilities which neighbour the proposed precinct.	That the Hutt City Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject the plan change • Remove the outlying areas from the so-called precinct. • Make changes to respond to the

		<p>The precinct should only apply to the main campus area.</p> <p>As currently worded it would adversely affect existing residential, recreational and community facilities and have adverse effects on amenity values, residential and recreational character, historic character, and community and social values. These effects include potential bulk and location of buildings, effects associated with educational and associated retail and residential activities, traffic effects and associated safety in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PC25 does not manage the interface between WelTec and the surrounding area appropriately, particularly given its context in a traditional residential area.</p> <p>PC25 does not provide for the safeguards that were required in previous resource consents e.g.: the recent approval for N Block.</p> <p>There should be adequate controls over future activities, including detailed management of height, scale, massing, and design and the requirements should be more in line with those for example the Mt Cook Precinct in Wellington.</p> <p>The submitters generally support the amendments and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.</p>	<p>submitter's submission points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt the amendments, additions and deletions sought by Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated in its submission.
--	--	---	--

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE – PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 25

Submission number	Submitter name/organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC25/1	Greater Wellington Regional Council c/- Caroline Ammundsen	PO Box 11646		Wellington 6142
DPC25/2	Carolyn Wadsworth	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/3	Hilda Burgess	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/4	Janet Milne	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/5	Phyllis & Paul Anderson	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/6	Dwight Christian Poutoa	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/7	Deborah Michelle Poutoa	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/8	Stephen Charles & Jane Frazes Parson	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/9	Sarah Beth Antunovic	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/10	Tyrone Lee Phillips	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/11	Robert Roy Carr	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/12	Denise Carr	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/13	Mr Baden Atkin	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/14	Leon and Ruth Cooke	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/15	Matthew Earles	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/16	Roger Bagshaw	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/17	Lesley Dokter and Peter Wilson	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/18	Jo Raverty	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/19	Denis Lea	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/20	Khiem Trong Nguyen	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/21	Ruth Burton	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/22	Alfred Memelink	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/23	Thomas Reedy	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/24	Kathryn Mary Reedy	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/25	Department of Conservation Kapiti Wellington Area Office c/- Grant McKenna	PO Box 5086	Lambton Quay	Wellington 6145
DPC25/26	Michael Debney	██████████	██████	██████████

Submission number	Submitter name/organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC25/27	Angela Zhen Liu	[REDACTED]		
DPC25/28	Petone Community Board Gerald Davidson, Chair	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/29	William D L Cooper	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/30	Carla Richelle Cooper	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/31	Cuong Ngoc Do and Hau Thi Lai	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/32	Barry and Wendy Delwyn Rozenberg	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/33	Fish & Game Council c/- Fiona Death	PO Box 1325		Palmerston North 4440
DPC25/34	Lesley Kennedy & Menno van der Laan	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/35	Merran Bakker	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/36	Josephine & John Jones	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/37	Ken & Val Fitzmaurice	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/38	Alice Elizabeth Pollock	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/39	Dr Barnaby C H May	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/40	Kathryn Joyce Vinten	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/41	Barbara Gibbs	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/42	Mrs Mavis Anne Rayner	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/43	Tui Kent	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/44	Graeme Lyon	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/45	Peter and Nicola Prichard	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/46	Ian Hawij	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/47	Suzanne Debra Hartley	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/48	Mrs Sian Bisson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/49	Julie Dennison	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/50	Mary Horner	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/51	Tui Lewis	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/52	Rachel Badham	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/53	Sally Davina Selwood	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/54	Katherine Jane Clarke	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Submission number	Submitter name/organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC25/55	Vert Company Ltd c/- M Verkerk	Unit 1/Building C	59-61 Marsden Street	Lower Hutt 5040
DPC25/56	Jude Wachswender	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/57	Patrick & Bridget Gower	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/58	Wellington Institute of Technology Attn: R Schofield	C/- Boffa Miskell Limited	PO Box 11340	Wellington 6142
DPC25/59	Charles Avery	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/60	Rosy and Kevin Moar	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/61	Nick Miller and Jan Simmons	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/62	New Zealand Historic Places Trust, Pouhere Taonga c/- Sacha Walters	PO Box 2629		Wellington
DPC25/63	Roger Thackery	[REDACTED]		
DPC25/64	Michele [Mishi] Berecz	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/65	Roger Chandler	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/66	Geoffrey Terence Broad	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/67	James Kwing	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/68	Craig McKirdy	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/69	Simon and Wendy Rogerson	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/70	Anita Patel	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/71	Laura Newton-King	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/72	Clinton Maulder	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/73	Patricia Fraser	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/74	Dannie John Warren	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/75	Bocarda Print	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/76	Barbara Scott	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/77	Nikki Chiappini and Brian Cole	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/78	Patricia Alexandra Fraser	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/79	Dannie Warren	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/80	Iain Jenkins	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/81	Kylie & Andrew Morrell	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DPC25/82	Emani Iosefo	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Submission number	Submitter name/organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC25/83	Mr A. Powers	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/84	High Street Residents	PO Box 33 011		Petone 5046
DPC25/85	Royal New Zealand Plunket Society c/- Tina Syme	4 Market Grove		Lower Hutt
DPC25/86	Petone Planning Action Group c/- Pam Hanna, Chairperson	PO Box 33 326		Petone 5046
DPC25/87	Andrea and Warwick Bolton	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/88	Petone Corps, Salvation Army c/- Bryan Stuart Campbell	72 Cuba Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012
DPC25/89	Pat Sviatko	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/90	Frank Steven Sviatko	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/91	Anthony Joseph O'Connor	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/92	Michiko Ammon	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/93	Ranka Sanko	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/94	Judith Kathleen Exley	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/95	Lisa Michelle Wilde	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/96	David Tripp	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/97	Nikki Cherie Bennett The Salvation Army Petone Playgroup	72 Cuba Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012
DPC25/98	Joleen Hendry The Salvation Army Petone Playgroup	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/99	Jamie Dawson	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/100	Karen Ferguson	██████████ ██████	██████	██████████
DPC25/101	Sharon McKendrick	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/102	Tessa Marie McGuinness	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/103	Meagan Joan Hughes	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/104	Helen Dorothy Tripp High Street Craft Group	3 High Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012
DPC25/105	Margaret Isobel Nicholas High Street Craft Group	3 High Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012
DPC25/106	Lesley Anne Whitlock High Street Craft Group	3 High Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012

Submission number	Submitter name/organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC25/107	Sue Moran High Street Craft Group	3 High Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012
DPC25/108	Lorraine Isabel Driskel High Street Craft Group	3 High Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012
DPC25/109	Beryl Henderson High Street Craft Group	3 High Street	Petone	Lower Hutt 5012
DPC25/110	Michael McCrorie	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/111	Alan & Jenny Mumford	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/112	Albert & Geraldine Wayers	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/113	Flora Beblidakis	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/114	Rose & Humphrey Foote	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/115	Cathy & Mike Reid	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/116	Mukesh Vakharia	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/117	Victoria Sutton	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/118	Suega Boot	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/119	Rochelle Griffin	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/120	Wilma Cooke	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/121	M J Sammons	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/122	C J Cosford	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/123	Peter & Catharina Philipsen	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/124	D Gordon	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/125	Sue Howard	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/126	Faith Janet Lawson	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/127	Chris Skinn	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/128	Jonathan Mahoney	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/129	Graham Nesor	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/130	Paul McGillicuddy	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/131	Hazel Nesor	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/132	Gordon Craig	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/133	Jo St Just	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/134	Susana Lemisio	██████████	██████	██████████

Submission number	Submitter name/organisation	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3
DPC25/135	Mark & Anne Godfrey	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/136	Peter Richard Cartwright	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/137	Esme Judith Cartwright	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/138	A E Hansen	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/139	Mike Fisher	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/140	Patrick Williams	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/141	Lorraine Williams	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/142	Reg & Anne Cotter	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/143	Kathryn Josephine Delahunty	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/144	Mark Dare Phegan	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/145	Katrina Mannix	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/146	Maara Heather	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/147	Vasu Govind	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/148	David Goldsbury	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/149	Matt Goldsbury	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/150	Diane Goldsbury	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/151	Kevin Goldsbury	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/152	Petone Urban Environmental Association Incorporated c/- Pherne Tancock	Harbour Chambers	PO Box 10-242	Wellington
DPC25/153	John & Kathleen Yardley c/- Pherne Tancock	Harbour Chambers	PO Box 10-242	Wellington
DPC25/154	Nelson Street Trust c/- Pherne Tancock	Harbour Chambers	PO Box 10-242	Wellington
DPC25/155	Scott Anthony Sonneman	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/156	Helen Louise Kneebone	██████████	██████	██████████
DPC25/157	Raelee Jensen and Manesh Kumar	██████████	██████	██████████