

# **Proposed District Plan Change 14**

**CENTRAL COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY AREA**

## **Summary of Submissions**

**Publicly Notified:**

**20 APRIL 2010**

**Further Submissions Close:**

**7 MAY 2010 at 5.00pm**



# PUBLIC NOTICE

## Availability of Summary of Submissions on Proposed District Plan Change 14 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 14 – Amendments to the Central Commercial Activity Area Provisions**

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 Service 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/publications-forms/District-Plan/Plan-Changes>

Copies can also be requested by contacting the Council:

- Phone: (04) 570 6666 or
- Email: [ppc14@huttcity.govt.nz](mailto:ppc14@huttcity.govt.nz)

If you have any questions please contact Council's consultant Hamish Wesney (Boffa Miskell consultants) on phone: 04 803 2787 or email: [hamish.wesney@boffamiskell.co.nz](mailto:hamish.wesney@boffamiskell.co.nz)

## Further Submissions close on Friday 07 May 2009 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
- Deliver: Council Administration Building, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt
- Fax: (04) 570 6799
- Email: [ppc14@huttcity.govt.nz](mailto:ppc14@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 submission must be on RMA Form 6 and must state whether or not you wish to be heard on your submission.

Copies of this form are available from the above locations and the Council website:

- <http://www.huttcity.govt.nz/Documents/district-plan/plan-changes/form6.pdf>

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

**Tony Stallinger**  
Chief Executive  
20 April 2010



## SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

<b><i>Sub. No</i></b>	<b><i>Name/Organisation</i></b>	<b><i>Page No.</i></b>
DPC14/01	Rodger & Elaine Marvelly	7
DPC14/02	Sherry Phipps	7-8
DPC14/03	Beverley Tyler	8
DPC14/04	David Mann (Rutherford Holdings Ltd)	9
DPC14/05	Foodstuffs Co-operative Society Limited	9-11
DPC14/06	Stephen Shadwell	11-12
DPC14/07	Costas Nicolaou, Gary Edridge, Steve Shadwell, Bruce Sedcole	12
DPC14/08	Making Places Reference Group	13
DPC14/09	New Zealand Transport Agency	13-16
DPC14/10	Retail Holdings Limited & Lower Hutt Properties Limited	17-22
DPC14/11	Louise Ferrari	22-23
DPC14/12	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited	23
DPC14/13	Harvey Norman Stores Pty (New Zealand Limited)	23-26
DPC14/14	Petone Planning Action Group	26-28
DPC14/15	Greater Wellington Regional Council	28-30
DPC14/16	Hutt Valley Chamber of Commerce	31
DPC14/17	McDonald's Restaurants (New Zealand) Limited	32-34
DPC14/17A	McDonald's Restaurants (New Zealand) Limited	34-35
DPC14/18	Kiwi Property Holdings Limited	35



## SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 14

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

Submission Number: DPC14/01					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
R & E Marvelly	1.1	General	Support	The Plan Change provides firm guidelines for future development of the city.	Adopt Plan Change 14
	1.2	<b>Amendment 74</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 1] Precincts	Support	The treatment of the CBD with the defining of precincts, especially the Residential Transition Precinct is a very welcome departure from the former “one site fits all” concept.	
	1.3	<b>Amendment 38</b> [5A 2.1.1] – Maximum Height <b>Amendment 75</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 2] - Maximum Height	Support	The restoration of a 12m height limit for the Residential Transition Precinct and its defined future character will bring comfort and security to the nearby residents and to those who should move into the area.	

Submission Number: DPC14/02					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reason	Decision/Relief Sought
Sherry Phipps	2.1	General - parking	Not stated	I do not find Council’s intentions clear. It looks as though Council’s intentions are to provide the minimum of carparking. Residential buildings must have parking provision built into the structure.	Not stated
	2.2	General - wind	Not stated	Council makes reference to sun and wind, but does not say this marries in with height restrictions. Conditions need to be laid down.	Not stated
	2.3	General – water conservation	Not stated	Council says nothing about water conservation in the construction of new buildings.	Not stated
	2.4	General – signs	Oppose	The large in-your-face ads in High Street are disgusting. Five metres square seems too large.	Not stated

	2.5	General – gross floor area	Oppose	Council proposes smaller scale shops in the southern core and large scale shops in the northern precinct. Why? The less rules and regulations the better.	Not stated
	2.6	General – noise	Not stated	Insulation, double-glazing and appropriate noise control measures should be mandatory.	Not stated
	2.7	General – central library	Not stated	The central library needs more carparks.	Not stated
	2.8	General - river	Not stated	The river is not seen from the CBD.	Not stated
	2.9	General – energy efficiency	Support	All energy efficient standards for buildings, street lights, etc, are supported. Wider pavements are preferred.	Not stated
	2.10	General - vehicle crossings	Not stated	Crossing the road and driveways is more convenient when everything is on a level.	Not stated
	2.11	General - bridges	Not stated	The more crossings the better.	Not stated

<b>Submission Number: DPC14/03</b>					
<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
Beverley Tyler	3.1	<b>Amendment 83</b> [14A(iii)1.1.1] – Adequate Carparking Issue	Oppose	The central business district already has a shortage of parking. New high density residential apartment developments in the Inner Central Area would increase the need by at least one car park per residential unit.	Provision of additional car parking in the Inner Central Area Parking District using specific performance standards regarding location, design and appearance. As acknowledged in the Hutt News article of 9 March 2010 the District Plan needs to be changed to allow for parking buildings.
	3.2	<b>Amendment 84</b> [14A(iii) 1.1.1] - Adequate Car Parking Provision in the Central Commercial Area	Oppose	The central business district already has a shortage of parking. New high density residential apartment developments in the Inner Central Area would increase the need by at least one car park per residential unit.	Provision of additional car parking in the Inner Central Area Parking District using specific performance standards regarding location, design and appearance. As acknowledged in the Hutt News article of 9 March 2010 the District Plan needs to be changed to allow for parking buildings.
	3.3	<b>Amendment 85</b> [14A(iii)2.1] Special Parking Area	Oppose	The central business district already has a shortage of parking. New high density residential apartment developments in the Inner Central Area would increase the need by at least one car park per residential unit.	New rules, similar to those for the Outer Central Area, requiring new developments in the Inner Parking Area to provide onsite parking using specific performance standards e.g. one car park space per residential unit for high rise apartment developments, preferably by providing basement carparks.

Submission Number: DPC14/04					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
D Mann (Rutherford Holdings Ltd)	4.1	<b>Amendment 65</b> [5A2.3(e)] Service Stations	Oppose	We do not agree to the proposal to move repair and servicing to a discretionary activity. The repair and servicing of motor vehicles does not have high and continuous traffic movement as there is a limit to the number of cars that can be serviced in a day.	Amend definition of 'service station' to exclude 'repair and servicing of motor vehicles' so that vehicle mechanic outlets remain a permitted activity.
	4.2	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] – Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Oppose	Site of 33 Rutherford Street currently has an isolation strip to Melling Link Road which prohibits vehicular crossings, limiting access to only Rutherford Street. Therefore, impossible to meet the restrictions of the proposed design guidelines.	Remove isolation strip from Melling Link Road to allow access onto Melling Link Road.
	4.3	<b>Amendment 76</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 3] – Verandahs, Building Frontages & Display Windows	Oppose	The geographical area required to provide a continuous verandah reaches too far north. The area around 33 Rutherford Street is predominantly (new) bulk retail. This type of retail is a vehicle destination point. People drive and park in the on-site car parking. They are not walking store to store as happens further south in the smaller retail store area.	Remove the requirement to provide verandas from 33 Rutherford Street and properties to the north.

Submission Number: DPC14/05					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
Foodstuffs Co-Op Society Ltd	5.1	<b>Amendment 74</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 1] Precincts	Oppose	The strategy behind have a "core" precinct is supported but not over such a large area. Reducing the area of the core precinct will encourage consolidation and a greater intensity of activity with enhanced vibrancy and vitality.	Amend Appendix Central Commercial 1 to exclude the New World site from the Core Precinct and include it in the Commercial Precinct and/or add policies and explanation to 5A 1.1.3 that recognise the need to enable the sustainable management of existing single larger retail activities within the Core Precinct with associated car parking.
	5.2	<b>Amendment 19</b> [5A 1.1.6] - Vehicle Oriented Activities	Oppose	The retail objectives, policies and explanation do not provide an appropriate framework for the sustainable management of the existing New World supermarket.	Amend to recognise the positive effects associated with enabling larger single retail activities such as supermarkets within the Commercial Area and in particular on the fringe or outer areas of the core precinct.
	5.3	<b>Amendment 76</b> [5A Appendix	Oppose	The street frontages where verandahs, building frontages and displays windows are required are too extensive.	Amend to exclude the Waterloo Road and Kings Crescent frontages of the New World site and the Bloomfield

	Central Commercial 3] – Verandahs, Building Frontages, & Display Windows		Combined with an over-extensive “core” precinct, there will be an overall dilution of the necessary focus or concentration that is desirable to clearly signal the “heart” or “core” of the Central Commercial Activity Area.	Terrace frontage between Waterloo Road and Kings Crescent.
5.4	<b>Amendment 50</b> [5A2.2] Restricted Discretionary Activity – Retail GFA	Oppose	It is unreasonable for a proposal that does not comply with an activity condition/standard to default to Unrestricted Discretionary Activity.	Amend 5A 2.2(a) by deleting the word "Core".
5.5	<b>Amendment 50</b> [5A2.2] Restricted Discretionary Activity – Retail GFA	Oppose	It is unreasonable for a proposal that does not comply with an activity condition/standard to default to Unrestricted Discretionary Activity.	Delete 5A 2.2(b).
5.6	<b>Amendment 57</b> [SA 2.2.1] - Restricted Discretionary Activities	Oppose	It is unreasonable for a proposal that does not comply with an activity condition/standard to default to Unrestricted Discretionary Activity.	Amend 5A 2.2.1 (d) by deleting (ii) in its entirety.
5.7	<b>Amendment 62</b> [5A2.3] Discretionary Activities – Matters of Discretion	Oppose	It is unreasonable for a proposal that does not comply with an activity condition/standard to default to Unrestricted Discretionary Activity.	Amend 5A 2.3(b) by deleting the word "Core".
5.8	<b>Amendment 52</b> [5A2.2] Non-notification service	Oppose	The exclusion of non-notification does not provide an appropriate framework for the sustainable management of the existing New World supermarket.	Amend 5A 2.2 by providing for non-notification/service for all activities under this rule.
5.9	<b>Amendment 49</b> [5A 2.1.1] (j)(ii) Parking, Loading, Access	Oppose	It is unreasonable for a proposal that does not comply with an activity condition/standard to default to Unrestricted Discretionary Activity.	Amend 5A 2.1.1(j) by deleting the phrase "and in the Commercial Precinct identified in Appendix Central Commercial 1 - Precincts" and replacing the word "lesser" with "greater".
5.10	<b>Amendment 62</b> [5A2.3] Discretionary Activities –	Oppose	It is unreasonable for a proposal that does not comply with an activity condition/standard to default to Unrestricted Discretionary Activity.	Amend DPC 14 so that the activity status of any permitted or restricted discretionary activity which fails to comply with any relevant activity condition/standard/term is a Restricted Discretionary Activity.

		Matters of Discretion			
	5.11	General	Oppose	-	Any further necessary and consequential changes to give effect to this submission and (a) to (i) above.

Submission Number: DPC14/06					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
Stephen Shadwell	6.1	General	Support in part	We support the plan change containing measures to protect the pedestrian public from adverse wind effects.	For Council to proceed with Plan Change 14 but with the following to be reconsidered:
	6.2	<b>Amendment 38</b> [5A 2.1.1] – Maximum Height <b>Amendment 75</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial Activity Area 2]	Oppose in part	The height threshold should not be lowered. Buildings in commercial and residential transition areas should not need to comply with 5A 2.2.2(c) as these are not high pedestrian traffic areas. We question whether 12 metres is too low a threshold.	The 12 metre threshold needs reviewing with consideration given to raising it. It should not be based on experience in another city where conditions are different.
	6.3	<b>Amendment 38</b> [5A 2.1.1] – Maximum Height, <b>Amendment 75</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial Activity Area 2] <b>Amendment 76</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 3] – Verandahs, Building Frontages, & Display Windows	Oppose in part	The height threshold should not be lowered. Buildings in commercial and residential transition areas should not need to comply with 5A 2.2.2(c) as these are not high pedestrian traffic areas. We question whether 12 metres is too low a threshold.	Consideration should be given to having a higher threshold for buildings with verandas.
	6.4	<b>Amendment 61</b> [5A2.2.2] Wind Standard	Oppose in part	The way 5A 2.3(c) is worded it seems any addition to an existing building, that already exceeds the threshold, will trigger a wind report. This may mean that adding a small balcony to the top of a 20 metre building would require a wind report.	Consideration should be given to not requiring compliance with 5A 2.2.2(c) for insignificant additions to existing buildings.

	6.5	<b>Amendment 61</b> [5A2.2.2] Wind Standard	Oppose in part	Verandahs often provide the best protection from wind effects caused by buildings.	Consideration should be given to not requiring compliance with 5A 2.2.2(c) for medium scale additions to buildings where there is an existing veranda or a new veranda is proposed.
	6.6	<b>Amendment 61</b> [5A2.2.2] Wind Standard	Oppose in part	Verandahs often provide the best protection from wind effects caused by buildings.	There needs to be more clarity around when the wind report requirement is triggered for additions to an existing building.

<b>Submission Number: DPC14/07</b>					
<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
Costas Nicolaou, Gary Edridge, Steve Shadwell, Bruce Sedcole	7.1	General	Support	First and foremost we support mandatory resource consent for all new buildings and major additions and alterations to existing buildings.	For Council to proceed with Plan Change No. 14 for the Central Commercial Activity Area.
	7.2	<b>Amendment 35</b> [5A2.1(c)] – Permitted Activity - Building Additions <b>Amendment 50</b> [5A2.2] Restricted Discretionary Activity – Construction, alteration and additions to buildings and structures	Support in part	First and foremost we support mandatory resource consent for all new buildings and major additions and alterations to existing buildings.  Amendment 35 requires clarification in terms of the meaning of “size”. Does “size” mean the horizontal and/or vertical dimension of the building? Does it mean volume? Does it mean gross floor area as per the Introduction?	Retain Rule 5A 2.2(d).  Amend Rule 5A 2.1(c) to clarify the measure/dimension that the 5% relates to.
	7.3	General	Support in part	The Vision CBD 2030 and the Making Places document to become, in some shape or form part of the City of Lower Hutt District Plan.	Add some sort of ‘official weight’ in the District Plan to Vision CBD 2030 and Making Places documents.
	7.4	General	Support in part	The formation of a Design Panel made up of a number of suitably qualified independent design professionals whom Council can call upon as consultants for selected resource consent applications.	Ensure Resource Consents are managed and processed efficiently.

Submission Number: DPC14/08					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
Making Places Reference Group (MPRG)	8.1	General	Support	MPRG believes DPC14 is a very positive response to public consultation undertaken throughout 2008 and 2009.	Not stated
	8.2	<b>Amendment 74</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 1] Precincts	Support	The introduction of four distinct precincts: core, riverfront, commercial and residential transition.	Not stated
	8.3	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Support	The future character of each precinct is endorsed. MPRG supports the inclusion of statutory and non-statutory guidelines. The introduction of design guides to improve the quality of buildings and open spaces is critical to the ongoing development of the city.	Not stated
	8.4	<b>Amendment 37</b> [5A2.1.1] Permitted Activity - Conditions	Support	Replacement of floor area ratios and bonus rules with a maximum graduated height limits.	Not stated
	8.5	<b>Amendment 38</b> [5A 2.1.1] – Maximum Height	Support	Replacement of floor area ratios and bonus rules with a maximum graduated height limits.	Not stated
	8.6	<b>Amendment 50</b> [5A2.2] Restricted Discretionary Activity – Retail GFA <b>Amendment 57</b> [5A 2.2.1] – Restricted Discretionary Activities	Support	The requirement for resource consents for all new buildings and major additions/alterations to existing buildings as a means to improve the quality of developments (and open space). The introduction of design guides to improve the quality of buildings and open spaces is critical to the ongoing development of the city.	Not stated

Submission Number: DPC14/09					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
New Zealand Transport	9.1	General	Support in part	Subject to the amendments sought below, the NZTA supports the overall intent and direction of PC14.	That PC14 be approved subject to the following amendments (or amendments to the same effect)

Agency (NZTA)	9.2	<b>Amendment 13</b> [5A 1.1.2] - Activities	Oppose in part	The additional provisions will ensure that the potential effects from any new activities within the Central Commercial Activity Area do not adversely affect the road network.	Insert additional words into <i>Policy 5A 1.1.2(b)</i> as below: <i>(b) Ensure that activities are managed to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects in the Central Commercial Activity Area, <u>including the road network</u> or on properties in nearby residential areas.</i>
	9.3	<b>Amendment 17</b> [5A 1.1.4] - Incompatibility Between Different Activities	Oppose in part	Additional text will recognise that acoustically insulating residential activities from traffic noise is an option that should be considered.	Insert additional words into the second paragraph of the <i>Explanation and Reasons</i> of 5A 1.1.4, as below: <i>However, residential activities may be incompatible with some other activities in the Central Commercial Activity Area, in particular, they may be sensitive to noise from other activities, <u>such as traffic noise</u>. Rather than overly restricting other activities, it is appropriate that the residential activities mitigate this sensitivity by providing for external noise insulation.</i>
	9.4	<b>Amendment 19</b> [5A 1.1.6] - Vehicle Oriented Activities	Oppose in part	Additional policy will recognise the need for travel management techniques to mitigate any potential for added congestion with the Central Commercial Activity Area. Additional explanation will explain the relevance of traffic management techniques in ensuring a safe, efficient and convenient road network within the Central Commercial Activity Area.	Insert the following new policy into 5A.1.1.6. as below: <i><u>(c) Use travel management techniques to minimise the potential for increased congestion in the Central Commercial Activity Area.</u></i> Amend the <i>Explanation and Reasons</i> of 5A 1.1.6, as below: <i>Explanation and Reasons</i> <i>Some types of activities have a heavy dependence on private motor vehicles for access, such as supermarkets, takeaway outlets and service stations. Managing these types of activities ensures the effects on the transport network can be effectively assessed. This approach also relates to retail activity precincts for the Central Commercial Activity Area, where vehicle-oriented activities are typically larger in scale. This integrated approach ensures that vehicle oriented activities are managed in terms of their effects on the amenity values of the central area.</i> <i><u>The good use of travel management techniques will minimise the adverse effects of road traffic in the Central Commercial Activity Area by providing a safe, efficient and convenient road network.</u></i>
	9.5	<b>Amendment 29</b> [5A1.2.5] Carparking	Oppose in part	Additional text will recognise the potential adverse effects carparking can have on other transport modes. Additional explanation text should explain how increased	Insert additional words into the <i>Issue</i> of 5A 1.2.5, as below: <i>Issue</i> <i>Providing for carparking within the Central Commercial</i>

				carparking can reduce use the use of other transport modes such as public transport.	<p><i>Activity Area in a way that does not dominate streetscapes, or break up continuous built frontages, which can detract from the area's amenity values. <u>Provide for carparking in a way that reduces the reliance on private vehicles and encourages the use of sustainable transport modes.</u></i></p> <p>Insert additional words into the <i>Explanation and Reasons</i> of 5A 1.2.5, as below:  <i>Explanation and Reasons</i>  <i>Activities within the Central Commercial Activity Area require good access provision both for pedestrians and vehicle based users. The integration of the transport network with development and activities is essential for the effective functioning of the central area. The provision of carparking needs to ensure that supply is both adequate and well located, while not compromising other forms of transport or degrading the amenity values of the central area. <u>Controlling the growth of private vehicle commuter traffic, by limiting carparking can influence commuters to use other transport modes. This in turn will seek to avoid, remedy or mitigate congestion and to improve the Central Area environment.</u></i></p> <p><i>The provision of suitable on-site carparking, servicing and access for all sites in the Central Commercial Activity Area is essential for the efficient functioning of the city. However, it is not necessary for each individual site to be self-sufficient, with the ability for shared facilities or reliance on public facilities, such as public carparks and service lanes, <u>or public transport.</u> If on-site carparking, servicing and access is to be provided on-site, it should reflect the anticipated existing or future needs of the activities...</i></p>
9.6	<b>Amendment 31</b> [5A 1.2.6] - Energy Efficient and Low Impact Urban Development	Oppose in part		New policy will promote provision of cycle parks to encourage cycling as an alternative sustainable transport mode for commuters.	<p>Insert a policy into 5A. 1.2.6. as below:  <u>(e) Promote cycle parking provisions in new buildings.</u></p>
9.7	<b>Amendments 54</b> [5A 2.2.1] & <b>57</b> [5A	Oppose in part		Additional text will ensure that the potential adverse effects of activities that generate high numbers of traffic	Insert the following matter in which Council has Restricted its Discretion for (a) (ii), (b) (ii) and (d) (ii) of 5A 2.2.1, as:

	2.2.1] - Restricted Discretionary Activities		movements are given consideration.	<i>(ii) Traffic effects, including the suitability of site access, <del>and</del> site servicing arrangements, <u>number of traffic movements and potential for congestion, and use of other transport modes.</u></i>
9.8	<b>Amendment 83</b> [14A(iii)1.1.1] – Adequate Carparking Issue	Oppose in part	Additional text will recognise the potential adverse effects carparking can have on the use of other modes of transport.	Insert additional words into the <i>Issue</i> of 14A (iii) 1.1.1, as: <i>Issue</i> <i>The increased ownership of private vehicles and increased activity in the Central Commercial Activity Area in recent years has contributed to a high demand for long and short stay parking. Each activity should provide sufficient parking on site, however, the inner area sites are generally small which makes it difficult to provide on site parking. It is also desirable to maintain a continuous pedestrian frontage for shoppers. <u>The potential growth of private vehicle commuter traffic from increased parking can also have adverse effects on the Central Commercial 6 Activity Area environment, which needs to be considered to avoid, remedy or mitigate potential congestion.</u></i> <i>Policies for the Central Commercial Activity Area have maintained the approach that sites within the inner area are not required to provide on site parking, as sufficient on and off street parking will be provided in the immediate vicinity. Sites in the outer area will be required to provide on site parking to meet the high demand for long and short stay parking, <u>unless suitable alternatives such as good public transport uptake are available.</u> The provision of safe and, adequate and well located parking contributes to the maintenance of amenity values, and the vitality and viability of the Central Commercial Activity Area.</i>
9.9	<b>Amendment 84</b> [14A(iii) 1.1.1] - Adequate Car Parking Provision in the Central Commercial Area	Oppose in part	Additional text will recognise the need to consider travel demand in relation to carparking to protect the Central Commercial Activity Area environment’s amenity from increased congestion.	Insert an additional paragraph after the fourth paragraph of the <i>Explanation and Reasons</i> of 14A(iii) 1.1.1, as below: <i><u>Parking must be considered in relation to traffic demand to manage potential adverse effects to the Central Commercial Activity Area. Such potential adverse effects include increased congestion from increased commuters, which in turn will decrease the amenity and pleasantness of the Central Commercial Activity Area.</u></i>

**Submission Number: DPC14/10**

Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
Retail Holdings Ltd & Lower Hutt Properties Ltd	10.1	General	Oppose	Does not promote the sustainable management of resources and is otherwise contrary to the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991.	That the relief set out in the reasons given in the text below be allowed as follows:
	10.2	<b>Amendment 15</b> [5A1.1.3] – Retail	Oppose in part	The explanation and reasons fails to have adequate regard to the fact that large format/anchor type retail stores can be and often are appropriately established in the central commercial activity area.	Amend Rule 5A1.1.3 Explanation and Reasons to read: <i>"Retail activities are continually changing in response to market pressures. As the central focus and main concentration of existing retail activity in Lower Hutt City, the Central Commercial Activity Area needs to be adaptive to these changes, while ensuring these changes do not degrade or undermine the vitality and vibrancy of this area and its amenities. The retail activities in the central area are a mix of <u>larger format/anchor</u>, specialty and comparative shops. They vary in size throughout the central area, with a general pattern of small-scale specialty shops at the southern end and larger-scale shops at the northern end."</i>
	10.3	<b>Amendment 23</b> [5A1.2.2] Relationship of Buildings to Streets and Open Spaces	Oppose in part	Requiring buildings to maintain a continual frontage is unduly restrictive, and a continual frontage may not be appropriate in all cases.	Amend clause 5A1.2.2 Policy (b) to read: <i>"(b). <u>Require Encourage</u> buildings to maintain an active, transparent and continual frontage, as well as shelter along identified streets, to provide a pedestrian focused central core to the Central Commercial Activity Area."</i> Amend the Explanation and Reasons for clause 5A1.2.2 as follows: <i>"Explanation and Reasons Maintaining and enhancing ... and the streetscape. <del>Requiring Encouraging</del> display windows and buildings to be located on the front boundary of identified key roads maintains and enhances the quality of the streetscape for pedestrians. In addition, <del>requiring encouraging</del> shelter for pedestrians along the identified key roads provides protection from adverse climatic conditions and provides a more comfortable environment."</i>
	10.4	<b>Amendment 29</b> [5A1.2.5] Carparking - Issue	Oppose in part	Carparking that breaks up continuous built frontages may be appropriate on some sites.	Amend the Issue in clause 5A1.2.5 to read: <i>"Providing for car parking within the Central Commercial Activity Area in a way that does not dominate</i>

					<i>streetscapes, or unduly break up continuous built frontages, which can detract from the area's amenity values."</i>
10.5	<b>Amendment 29</b> [5A1.2.5] Carparking – Explanation & reason	Support		Provision of suitable on-site car parking, servicing and access for all sites in the central commercial activity area is essential for the efficient function of the city, but that it is not necessary for each individual site to be self sufficient.	Retain the second paragraph of the Explanation and Reasons in clause 5A1.2.5 in its notified form.
10.6	<b>Amendment 29</b> [5A1.2.5] Carparking – Explanation & reason	Oppose in part		On-site carparking can be designed in a way that enhances the streetscape and character of the Central Commercial Activity Area.	Amend the third paragraph of the Explanation and Reasons in clause 5A1.2.5 as follows: <i>"On-site car parking <del>can also degrade</del> can be designed in a way to enhance the streetscape and character of the Central Commercial Activity Area. Therefore, performance standards and design guidance is provided to ensure on-site car parking is provided in a manner which recognises and reflects the streetscape and character of the different precincts in the Central Commercial Activity Area. These standards and guidelines include managing ground level car parking and car parking structures."</i>
10.7	<b>Amendment 41</b> [5A2.1.1] Permitted Activity Conditions – Building Frontages & Display Windows	Oppose in part		This provision is confusing when read with new Clause 5A 1.2.5 'Car parking' as it is unclear whether buildings on the submitters' site will have to occupy the whole street frontage or whether it will be possible to develop larger style anchor retail stores with at grade carparking along part of the street frontage.	Amend Condition 5A 2.1.1 (d) to read; <i>"(d) Building frontages and display windows: Any part of a building fronting a street, pedestrian mall, pedestrian walkway or other public space identified in Appendix Central Commercial 3 - Verandahs, Building Frontages and Display Windows, shall be that is built to the front boundary shall have display windows along the frontage. The display windows shall meet the following requirement: (i) Within the Core, Commercial and Riverfront precincts identified in Appendix Central Commercial 1 - Precincts, at least 60% of the ground floor façade surface that fronts a street, pedestrian mall, pedestrian walkway or, or other public space, shall be transparent glass display windows."</i>
10.8	<b>Amendment 42</b> [5A2.1.1] Permitted Activity Conditions – Verandahs	Oppose in part		No objection to the requirements for a verandah, but are concerned that the condition could require a verandah across the frontage of an 'at grade' car park fronting a street, pedestrian mall, pedestrian walkway, or other public space identified in Appendix Central Commercial 3.	Amend clause 5A 2.1.1(e) to read: <i>"(e) Verandahs: Where Any part of a building, but not its associated at grade parking, fronts a street, pedestrian mall, pedestrian walkway or other public space identified in Appendix</i>

					<p><i>Central Commercial 3 - Verandahs, Building Frontages and Display Windows, it shall have a verandah The verandah shall meet the following requirements:</i></p> <p><i>(i) ...</i></p> <p><i>(v) provide continuous shelter with any adjoining verandah or pedestrian shelter <u>unless interrupted by an at grade car park.</u></i></p>
10.9	<b>Amendment 49</b> [5A 2.1.1] (j)(ii) Parking, Loading, Access	Oppose in part		Maximum width of 18 metres along the site frontage would be a more appropriate figure to include in the condition as this would enable two rows of car parks of 5 metres in depth with an 8 metre wide aisle for circulation.	Amend clause 5A 2.1.1 (j)(ii) to read: <i>"For front road boundaries not identified in Appendix Central Commercial 3 - Verandahs, Building Frontages and Display Windows and in the Commercial Precinct identified in Appendix Central Commercial 1 - Precincts, any surface or ground level parking area shall not exceed a maximum width of <del>15</del> 18m along the site frontage or 40% of the site frontage whichever is the <del>lesser</del> greatest."</i>
10.10	<b>Amendment 50</b> [5A2.2] Restricted Discretionary Activity – Retail GFA	Oppose in part		Large format retails in the 500m <sup>2</sup> to 3,000m <sup>2</sup> are commonly found in the Core and should be permitted activities if they meet the permitted activity conditions.	Amend clause 5A 2.2(a) to read: <i>"(a) Any single retail activity with a gross floor area exceeding 3,000m<sup>2</sup> in the Core Precinct identified in Appendix Central Commercial 1 Precincts and any single retail activity with a gross floor area exceeding 500m<sup>2</sup> up to 3,000m<sup>2</sup> in the Riverfront and Residential Transition Precincts identified in Appendix Central Commercial 1 Precincts. "</i>
10.11	<b>Amendment 52</b> [5A2.2] Non-notification service	Oppose in part		There are no relevant effects of developing retail activities in the Core or in the Commercial Precinct that would require notification or service on affected persons.	Amend clause 5A 2.2 Non-notification Service to read: <i>"Non-notification/service In respect of Rules 5A 2.2.1(a)(d) and (e), applications do not need to be publicly notified and do not need to be served on affected persons. "</i>
10.12	<b>Amendment 54</b> [5A 2.2.1] Restricted Discretionary Activities	Oppose in part		Restricting discretion in respect of 'traffic effects' should be limited to the 'traffic effects of site access and site servicing' only and not the wider 'off-site traffic effects'.	Amend the description of 5A2.2.1 (a) and criteria (ii) of clause 5A2.2.1 (a) to read: <i>"(a) Any single retail activity with a gross floor area exceeding 3,000m<sup>2</sup> in the Core Precinct identified in Appendix Central Commercial 1 - Precincts and any single retail activity with a gross floor area exceeding 500m<sup>2</sup> up to 3,000m<sup>2</sup> in the Riverfront and Residential Transition</i>

					<p><i>Precincts identified in Appendix Central Commercial 1 Precincts.</i></p> <p><i>(i) ...</i></p> <p><i>(ii) Traffic effects, including but limited to the suitability of site access and site servicing arrangements”...</i></p>
10.13	<b>Amendment 54</b> [5A 2.2.1] Restricted Discretionary Activities	Oppose part	in	Restricting discretion in respect of ‘traffic effects’ should be limited to the ‘traffic effects of site access and site servicing’ only and not the wider ‘off-site traffic effects’.	Amend criteria (ii) of clause 5A 2.2.1 (b) to read: <i>“(ii) Traffic effects, including but limited to the suitability of site access and site servicing arrangements.”</i>
10.14	<b>Amendment 57</b> [5A 2.2.1] – Restricted Discretionary Activities	Oppose part	in	The traffic effects in relation to this discretion should be limited to those relating to the suitability of the site access and site servicing arrangements.	Amend criteria (ii) of clause 5A 2.2.1(d) to read: <i>“(ii) Traffic effects, including but limited to the suitability of site access and site servicing arrangements.”</i>
10.15	<b>Amendment 84</b> [14A(iii) 1.1.1] - Adequate Car Parking Provision in the Central Commercial Area	Support		-	Retain the following wording as notified in the Explanation and Reasons of clause 14A(iii)1.1.1: <i>...Sites in this area shall not be required to provide on-site parking, as these sites are generally small, and it would degrade the overall quality of the central area, such as breaking up to the continuous pedestrian shopping frontage”</i>
10.16	<b>Amendment 84</b> [14A(iii) 1.1.1] - Adequate Car Parking Provision in the Central Commercial Area	Support part	in	-	Retain the following words in the Explanation and Reasons in clause 14A(iii)1.1.1 if the changes sought by the submitters to the standards for 'at grade' car parks are allowed: <i>“However, large surface areas of car parking can detract from the streetscape and amenity values in the Central Commercial Activity Area. Therefore, standards are used to manage the location, extent and design of car parking areas to ensure they maintain and enhance the streetscape and amenity values.</i> If the changes sought by the submitters for 'at grade' carparks are not allowed, then delete the last two sentences in the Explanation and Reasons of clause 14A(iii)1.1.1 noted above.
10.17	<b>Amendment 85</b> [14A(iii)2.1]	Support		-	Retain in its notified form 'Permitted Activities - Conditions' in 14A (iii) 2.1 in respect of (c) 'Special Parking

	Special Parking Area			Area', which provides in (i) 'Central Commercial Activity Area' that: "There shall be no on-site parking requirements within the Inner Central Area Parking District".												
10.18	<b>Amendment 88</b> [14A(iv)2.1] Permitted Activity Conditions for loading requirements	Oppose in part	This requirement should be qualified as being only required for supermarkets or other retail development where articulated trucks are reasonably required. Most retail activities with a gross floor area in the range 2,000m <sup>2</sup> to 4,000m <sup>2</sup> do not require servicing by an articulated truck.	Amend Table 7 of clause 14A(iv)2.1 to read: <b>Table 7 - Loading Area Requirements</b> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>GFA (m<sup>2</sup>)</th> <th>No of spaces</th> <th>Minimum Design Vehicle</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>&lt;2000</td> <td>1</td> <td>Maximum rigid truck</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000-4000</td> <td>1</td> <td><u>For supermarkets and retail activities serviced by articulated truck – Maximum articulated truck Plus 1 Maximum rigid truck:</u> <u>For all other retail and industrial activities 1 Maximum rigid truck</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>&gt;4000</td> <td>1</td> <td><u>For supermarkets and other retail activities serviced by articulated truck – 1 Maximum articulated truck Plus 2 Maximum rigid truck:</u> <u>For all other retail and industrial activities 2 Maximum rigid truck</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	GFA (m <sup>2</sup> )	No of spaces	Minimum Design Vehicle	<2000	1	Maximum rigid truck	2000-4000	1	<u>For supermarkets and retail activities serviced by articulated truck – Maximum articulated truck Plus 1 Maximum rigid truck:</u> <u>For all other retail and industrial activities 1 Maximum rigid truck</u>	>4000	1	<u>For supermarkets and other retail activities serviced by articulated truck – 1 Maximum articulated truck Plus 2 Maximum rigid truck:</u> <u>For all other retail and industrial activities 2 Maximum rigid truck</u>
GFA (m <sup>2</sup> )	No of spaces	Minimum Design Vehicle														
<2000	1	Maximum rigid truck														
2000-4000	1	<u>For supermarkets and retail activities serviced by articulated truck – Maximum articulated truck Plus 1 Maximum rigid truck:</u> <u>For all other retail and industrial activities 1 Maximum rigid truck</u>														
>4000	1	<u>For supermarkets and other retail activities serviced by articulated truck – 1 Maximum articulated truck Plus 2 Maximum rigid truck:</u> <u>For all other retail and industrial activities 2 Maximum rigid truck</u>														
10.19	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Oppose in part	It will not always be appropriate to have buildings being continuous from side boundary to side boundary in the Core as in some cases larger retail activities are appropriate in the Core, particular as anchor stores, and require at grade parking on their site.	Amend the Statutory Guidelines 2.1 Making a Good Street Frontage point 1 page 23 to read: <i>1. Unless at grade car parking is being provided, buildings in the Core and Riverfront precincts should be continuous from side boundary to side boundary, except that floors above the fourth storey may be set back;"</i>												
10.20	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] – Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Oppose in part	This requirement is unduly restrictive when developing a building which provides first floor level carparking as it would be inappropriate to provide transparent windows on a car parking floor level which could be on the first floor.	Amend the Statutory Guidelines 2.1 Making a Good Street Frontage 'Frontage Type Table' page 25 line 4 row 3 to read as follows: <i>"30% minimum (except if the first floor level contains car parking in which case no transparent glass windows are required."</i>												
10.21	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] – Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Oppose in part	Maximum width of 18 metres along the site frontage would be a more appropriate figure to include in the condition as this would enable two rows of car parks of 5 metres in depth with an 8 metre wide aisle for circulation.	Amend the Statutory Guidelines 2.3 Providing for Car Parking 'Addressing Surface Car Parking' point 2 page 31 to read: <i>"In the Commercial Precinct surface parking fronting the street should not exceed more than 40% of the total lot</i>												

					<i>frontage or <del>15</del> 18 metres, whichever is the <del>shortest</del> greatest."</i>
10.22	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] – Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Oppose		Identifying a new laneway in the Design Guidelines, albeit in the non-statutory section, could be seen as a certainty that a lane be provided in this location. This would provide an unreasonable restriction on redevelopment options for the submitters' land.	Amend the map diagram in 3.7 Private or Public Lane Access Design on page 35 of the non-statutory Guidelines to delete the new laneway identified on the submitters' land.
10.23	<b>Amendment 92</b> [14B2.1.5] Signage – Permitted Activity Conditions	Oppose		This is an unduly restrictive area of signage as many retail businesses rely on signage to assist customers in identifying their premises and for marketing their products.	Delete the changes to clause 14B2.1.5 relating to Signage (c) Maximum Face Area (iv).
10.24	General	Oppose		Does not promote the sustainable management of resources and is otherwise contrary to the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Such further consequential or other relief as is appropriately made to PC#14 and the plan to take account of the concerns expressed in this submission.

Submission Number: DPC14/11					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
Louise Ferrari	11.1	<b>Amendment 75</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 2] – Maximum Height	Support in part	Changes to building height, from the existing rules are no improvement. However, they need to ensure that the amenity of the CBD and interconnectedness with building stock is improved. Rules should possibly not place the highest buildings near the river corridor – or the buildings should ensure they account for the residual flood risk.	Not stated
	11.2	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Support in part	So that significant trees are provided for, link to the existing heritage schedule in the Design Guide.	Include a link to the existing heritage schedule in the Design Guide so that larger trees on new and existing sites can be protected in the same way through District Plan.
	11.3	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Support	The existing Section 3.4 does not have enough emphasis on maintaining/protecting trees in the CBD.	Amend Section 3.4 Greening the Central Area in the Design Guide with emphasis on maintaining/protecting existing trees in the CBD.
	11.4	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] Commercial	Support	An example of an inappropriate sign is that which is large and dominating, such as "Raine and Horne" sign on the corner of Laings Road and Queens Drive.	Retain Section 3.2 Managing Signage as outlined on page 49.

		Central Activity Area Design Guide			
--	--	------------------------------------	--	--	--

Submission Number: DPC14/12					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
Westfield (NZ) Ltd	12.1	General	Support in part	Westfield supports the intent of the Plan Change, and, subject to ensuring appropriate flexibility and resolving specific matters as noted below, Westfield supports the Plan Change as most appropriate for achieving sustainable management.	Westfield seeks that the Plan Change be adopted, to the extent it achieves appropriate centres based development, but opposes it to the extent it does not provide for the issues identified in its submission.
	12.2	General	Oppose	Opposes it to the extent it does not provide for the issues listed below (12.2 - 12.8)	
	12.3	General – carparking	Oppose	Restricting the number and location of carparks attached to retail centres.	
	12.4	General – vehicle oriented activity	Oppose	Whether it is a “vehicle oriented activity” (undefined) and/or the considerations of traffic effects a mall has on the network	
	12.5	General – signage	Oppose	Imposing restrictions for on-building and free-standing signage	
	12.6	General – reverse sensitivity issues	Oppose	Reverse sensitivity issues for any additions or renovations it may make near the Residential Transition Precinct	
	12.7	General – ground floor retail activities	Oppose	Requirements to integrate active frontage elements for ground floor retailing without reference to the type of retail involved	
	12.8	General – design guidelines	Oppose	Design Guidelines are not unduly restrictive nor assessed against subjective criteria.	
	12.9	General	Support in part	Westfield is generally supportive of the Council’s goal of good urban design	Westfield also seeks such further or consequential amendments necessary to give effect to this submission

Submission Number: DPC14/13					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
Harvey Norman Stores Pty NZ Ltd	13.1	<b>Amendment 33</b> [5A 2.1] - Permitted Activities	Support	-	Retain office and warehouse uses as permitted activities.

13.2	<b>Amendment 38</b> [5A 2.1.1] – Maximum Height	Support	-	Retain maximum height of 18 metres for buildings and structures in the Riverfront Precinct.
13.3	<b>Amendment 85</b> [14A(iii)2.1(c)] Special Parking Area	Support	-	Supports deletion of the top-tier for on-site car parking requirements in this rule.
13.4	<b>Amendment 74</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 1] Precincts	Oppose in part	Proposed precincts are too simplified and do not accurately reflect the varied character of the central area. Specifically, the proposed Riverfront Precinct is too generalised. Dividing the Riverfront Precinct into the Riverfront (Core) Precinct and Riverfront (Commercial) Precinct will enable the District Plan to provide for a mix of uses and building types that will better compliment adjoining core or commercial activities, while protecting the character of the adjacent river reserve.	Amend 5A Appendix Central Commercial 1 Precinct Map to divide the proposed Riverfront Precinct into the Riverfront (Core) Precinct and the Riverfront (Commercial) Precinct
13.5	<b>Amendment 76</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 3] – Verandahs, Buildings Frontages and Display Windows	Oppose	Proposed rule would be ineffective for the section of the Hutt River adjoining the Riverfront (Commercial) Precinct.	Delete the verandah and display window controls relating to the Hutt River frontages for the area identified as Riverfront (Commercial) Precinct in the submission from Appendix Central Commercial 3.
13.6	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] – Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Oppose in part	This proposed amendment is required to give effect to the submitter’s proposed recommendations above.	Amend the Central Commercial Activity Area Design Guide to divide the Riverfront (Core) and Riverfront (Commercial) Precincts
13.7	<b>Amendment 50</b> [5A2.2] Restricted Discretionary Activity – Retail GFA	Oppose in part	Large format retail (over 500m <sup>2</sup> ) is not considered an appropriate in-centre use. This is because the large floor plates required to store and display items can impact on the amenity of centres. Proposed amendment will provide a more sophisticated approach to spatial planning, which recognises that land use is influenced by both the natural environment (e.g. the riverfront) and the surrounding built environment (e.g. core/commercial retail activities).	Amend Rule 5A2.2 as follows: <i>a) Any single retail activity with a gross floor area exceeding 500m<sup>2</sup> up to 3,000m<sup>2</sup> in the <u>Core</u>, Riverfront <u>Core</u> and Residential Transition Precincts identified in Appendix Central Commercial 1 - Precincts.</i> <i>b) Any single retail activity with a gross floor area exceeding 3,000m<sup>2</sup> in the Commercial <u>and</u> Riverfront <u>(Commercial)</u> Precincts identified in Appendix Central Commercial 1 Precincts...</i>

13.8	<b>Amendment 62</b> [5A2.3] Discretionary Activities – Matters of Discretion	Oppose	Large format retail (over 500m <sup>2</sup> ) is not considered an appropriate in-centre use. This is because the large floor plates required to store and display items can impact on the amenity of centres. Proposed amendment will provide a more sophisticated approach to spatial planning, which recognises that land use is influenced by both the natural environment (e.g. the riverfront) and the surrounding built environment (e.g. core/commercial retail activities).	Amend Rule 5A2.3(b) as follows: <i>b) Any single retail activity with a gross floor area exceeding 3,000m<sup>2</sup> in the Core, Riverfront (Core) and Residential Transition Precincts identified in Appendix Central Area Commercial 1 - Precincts.</i>
13.9	<b>Amendment 44</b> [5A2.1.1] Permitted Activity Conditions – Sites abutting Residential or Recreation Activity Areas	Oppose	This rule should exclude sites abutting the Hutt River Recreation Area. The Hutt River Recreation Zone, which abuts the Harvey Norman site, is not considered sensitive to building setbacks.	Exclude sites abutting the Hutt River Recreation area by amending as follows: Where a site abuts a Residential or Recreation Activity Area the following shall apply: <i>i. ...</i> <i>ii. Side and rear yards - minimum of 7 metres from the side and rear boundaries of any site in the Residential or Recreation Activity Area, <u>but excluding the Hutt River Recreation Area</u></i> <i>iii...</i> <i>iv. Servicing of activities shall not occur between the hours of 10.00pm and 7.00am, <u>where a site immediately abuts a Residential Activity Area.</u></i>
13.10	<b>Amendment 86</b> [14A(iii)2.2] Discretionary Activity – 90+ parking spaces	Oppose	It is considered that the only potential effects associated with this rule relate to traffic, therefore, should be restricted discretionary activity.	Amend Rule 14A(iii)2.2 from a Discretionary Activity status to Restricted Discretionary Activity status.
13.11	<b>Amendment 86</b> [14A(iii)2.2] Discretionary Activity – 90+ parking spaces	Oppose	-	The submitter requests further clarification on the reference to a maximum width for car parking on street frontages.
13.12	<b>Amendment 92</b> [14B2.1.5] Signage – Permitted Activity Conditions	Oppose	Amending the proposed rule would provide commercial activities in the adjoining Commercial and Riverfront (Commercial) Precinct with the same permitted signage development rights. Signs can be an accepted feature of industrial and commercial environments.	Amend rule 14B2.1.5 to read: <i>(i)...</i> <i>(ii)...</i> <i>(iii)...</i> <i>(iv) Where a sign is erected within the Core, Riverfront</i>

					<p><i>(Core) or Residential Transition Precincts of the Central Commercial Activity Area identified in Appendix Central Commercial 1 - Precincts, the maximum face area of all signs shall not exceed 5m<sup>2</sup>.</i></p> <p><i>(v) Where a sign is erected within the Commercial or Riverfront (Commercial) Precincts of the Central Commercial Activity Area identified in Appendix Central Commercial 1 - Precincts, the maximum face area of all signs shall not exceed 20m<sup>2</sup>.</i></p>
	13.13	All other amendments	Support	-	Accept all other amendments

Submission Number: DPC14/14					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
Petone Planning Action Group	14.1	<b>Amendment 3</b> [1.10.4]	Oppose in part	-	Request a rider that any references to the Petone area will be likely to need amending when the Petone review happens
	14.2	<b>Amendment 17</b> [5A 1.1.4] - Incompatibility Between Different Activities	Support	We support the adoption of on-site measures by residential activities within the Central Commercial Activity Area.	Not stated
	14.3	<b>Amendment 23</b> [5A1.2.2] Relationship of Buildings to Streets and Open Spaces	Support	We support the reinstatement of what look like workable wind rules.	Not stated
	14.4	<b>Amendment 39</b> [5A2.1.1(a)] Permitted Activity Conditions – Yards	Support	We support the minimum yard requirements.	Not stated
	14.5	<b>Amendment 43</b> [5A2.1.1] Permitted Activity Conditions – Screening	Support	We agree that all areas of outdoor storage should be screened.	Not stated

14.6	<b>Amendment 44</b> [5A2.1.1] Permitted Activity Conditions – Sites abutting Residential or Recreation Activity Areas	Support in part	We agree that buildings and structures should comply with the recession plane requirements of any adjacent or adjoining Residential or Recreation Activity Areas, but not to abutting areas, as a High Court Decision interpreted abutting to mean touching. We want this clause changed.	Amend Rule 5A 2.1.1(g)(i) to replace the term “abutting” with either “adjacent” and “adjoining”.
14.7	<b>Amendment 51</b> [5A2.2] Restricted Discretionary Activity	Not stated	What does this mean for buildings under 12 metres in height?	Not stated
14.8	<b>Amendment 52</b> [5A2.2] Non-notification service	Support in part	-	Seek reassurance this refers back to Amendments 34 and 35 only.
14.9	<b>Amendment 60</b> [5A2.2.2] Noise Insulation & Ventilation	Oppose in part	Concerned that mechanical ventilation units create noise outside and ugliness on and around buildings.	Not stated
14.10	<b>Amendment 83</b> [14A(iii)1.1.1] Adequate Carparking Issue <b>Amendment 85</b> [14A(iii) 2.1] Special Parking Area	Oppose	Disagree with approach not to require on-site car parking, as CBD already has a shortage of parking.	Amend Rule 14A(iii)2.1 to require at least one car park per future residential unit or retail or business development in the Central Commercial Activity Area.
14.11	<b>Amendment 84</b> [14A(iii) 1.1.1] - Adequate Car Parking Provision in the Central Commercial Area	Oppose	Ask how the well located parking will be achieved without parking space requirements in any new developments.	Unclear – seek clarification over wording of 14A(iii) 1.1.2 as statement is not true
14.12	<b>Amendment 85</b> 14A(iii)2.1] Special Parking Area	Oppose	Disagree, as effects of this seen in Petone.	Amend Rule 14A(iii)2.1 to remove the requirement for nil parking for retail activities and licenses premises of less than 500m <sup>2</sup> GFA.
14.13	<b>Amendments 87</b> [14A(iv)1.1.1] Safe	Oppose in part	Petone is mentioned.	That references to the Petone area will be likely to need amending when the Petone review happens

		& Adequate Provision for Servicing <b>Amendment 88</b> [14A(iv)2.1] Loading Unloading Requirements			
	14.14	<b>Amendments 87</b> [14A(iv)1.1.1] <b>Amendment 88</b> [14A(iv)2.1] Loading Unloading Requirements	Oppose in part	All larger scale residential developments need loading spaces.	Amend Rule 14A(iv)2.1 to require residential developments to provide lading spaces.
	14.15	<b>Amendment 93</b> [14C2.1.2] Noise standards	Support	Support the lowering of noise levels to 60dBA from 10pm to 7pm from the current 65dBA.	Retain Rule 14C2.1.2(b)
	14.16	General	Oppose	Heritage inventory needs to be publicly shared before any of this Plan Change can be endorsed or implemented.	The heritage part of the District Plan needs to be updated
	14.17	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] – Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Support	Support the introduction and use of Design Guide.	Retain Central Commercial Activity Area Design Guide

Submission Number: DPC14/15					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
Greater Wellington Regional Council	15.1	General	Support in part	-	That Hutt City Council make changes to Proposed District Council Plan Change 14 in regard to natural hazards and transportation in accordance with the matters listed below to promote the sustainable management objectives of the RMA.
	15.2	<b>Amendment 18</b> [5A1.1.5] Hutt River Corridor – Objective	Support	Supports the objective to recognise and enhance the significant amenity, natural and recreational values of the Hutt River and its relationship to activities in the Central Commercial Activity Area.	Not stated

15.3	<b>Amendment 18</b> [5A1.1.5] Hutt River Corridor – policy a)	Support		Any development or activity along the river frontage could increase the risk of flood or erosion or be affected by flood and erosion events or affect the ability to undertake protection works or maintenance.	Amend Policy 5A1.1.5 a) to read <del>Encourage</del> <i>Explore the opportunities for the development of a river side promenade by managing activities and development along the river frontage, in conjunction with flood protection works.</i>
15.4	<b>Amendment 18</b> [5A1.1.5] Hutt River Corridor – Explanation & Reasons			-	Amend 5A1.1.5 Explanation and Reasons to better reflect the overall responsibilities and management of the Hutt River Corridor and Greater Wellington Regional Council's role. Also requests clarification on who would pay for any development in the Hutt River Corridor.
15.5	<b>Amendment 27</b> [5A 1.2.4] – Hutt River Corridor – objective & Policy a)	Support in part		Any development or activity along the river frontage could increase the risk of flood or erosion or be affected by flood and erosion events or affect the ability to undertake protection works or maintenance.	Amend Policy 5A1.2.4a) to read: <i>(a) Encourage—Explore the opportunities for the development of a river side promenade by managing activities and development along the river frontage, in conjunction with flood protection works.</i>
15.6	<b>Amendment 27</b> [5A 1.2.4] – Hutt River Corridor – Explanation & Reasons	Support in part		-	Amend explanation and reasons to reflect the overall responsibilities and management of the Hutt River Corridor
15.7	<b>Amendment 74</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 1] Precincts and <b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] Central Commercial Activity Area Design Guide	Oppose in part		-	Exclude the Hutt River Corridor and therefore should exclude Daly Street. Also, the small triangular section on the northern side of the Melling Bridge area be excluded from the 'Riverfront Precinct', as a result of extending the Harvey Norman boundary.
15.8	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Support in part		Residual flood risk from flooding arising from a flood exceeding the design standard of flood protection measures, or the failure of those measures such as would occur with a stop-bank breach.	Amend Section 1.7 Character and Context Description (page 14) to include an acknowledgement that this area is subject to flood hazard.
15.9	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8]	Support in part		Essential that any activity or planting within the Hutt River Corridor including the stop banks does not	Amend Section 2.7 Designing to Address the River (page 40), first paragraph, replacing the 'riverfront parkland',

	Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide		compromise the integrity of the flood protection works, access for maintenance and any requirements for upgrades or increases the potential for flood risk or erosion.	with 'river corridor'. Amend diagram to show the Hutt River Corridor extends to the outside toe of the stop-bank. Amend the second paragraph on page 41 of the guide for both statements be amended to read: " <u>in the order of 1 metre</u> ".
15.10	<b>Amendment 86</b> [14A(iii)2.2] Discretionary Activity – 90+ parking spaces	Support	Consistency with Regional Travel Demand Management Plan.	Retain Rule 14A(iii)2.2(c)
15.11	<b>Amendment 85</b> [14A(iii)2.1] Special Parking Area	Support in part	Consistency with Regional Travel Demand Management Plan.	Add a maximum parking standard for Outer Parking Area to limit over-supply within new developments (e.g. 1.5 car parks per dwelling)
15.12	<b>Amendment 33</b> [5A2.1] Permitted Activities	Support	Consistent with sustainable land use/transport integration principles by providing opportunities for increased walking and a safer environment for pedestrians after hours.	Retain Rule 5A2.1
15.13	<b>Amendment 41</b> [5A2.1.1(d)] Permitted Activity Conditions, <b>Amendment 42</b> [5A2.1.1(e)] Permitted Activity Conditions & <b>Amendment 76</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 3]	Support	Providing active frontages and sheltered footpaths create a more pleasant and safe pedestrian environment, thereby encouraging more walking trips.	Retain Rules 5A2.1.1(d), 5A2.1.1(e) and 5A Appendix Central Commercial 3.
15.14	General	Support in part		Add the following to Chapter 1.5 Relationship of this plan to documents of other organisations: <i>Hutt River Floodplain Management Plan</i> .

Submission Number: DPC14/16					
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
Hutt Valley Chamber of Commerce	16.1	General	Support in part	Generally support proposed changes, except those relating to car parking.	Not stated
	16.2	<b>Amendment 74</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 1] Precincts	Support	Support the proposal to define four different areas – Core, Commercial, Riverfront and Residential Transition	Not stated
	16.3	<b>Amendment 33</b> [5A2.1] Permitted Activities	Support	Support widening the range of permitted activities to include residential use.	Not stated
	16.4	<b>Amendment 50</b> [5A2.2] Restricted Discretionary Activity – Retail GFA	Support	Support the concept of allowing smaller shops in the core precinct and encouraging larger shop, including “big box” retailing in the northern commercial precinct.	Not stated
	16.5	<b>Amendments 50 &amp; 51</b> [5A2.2] Restricted Discretionary Activities	Support	Support restricting activities to those which are appropriate for an area (e.g. entertainment should be permitted activity in the core precinct by service stations should not).	Not stated
	16.6	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Support	Support the introduction of a design code for the CBD.	Not stated
	16.7	<b>Amendment 85</b> [14A(iii)2.1] – Carparking	Oppose	Do not support any reductions to the on-site parking requirements in the CBD. All residential developments in the CBD should be required to provide carparking, regardless of which precinct they are in.	Not stated
	16.8	<b>Amendment 86</b> [14A(iii)2.2] Discretionary Activity – 90+ parking spaces	Oppose	Do not support the rule restricting the maximum number of carparks on any one site to 90.	Not stated

**Submission Number: DPC14/17A**

Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Ltd	17.1	<p><b>Amendment 74</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 1] Precincts,</p> <p><b>Amendment 75</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 2] - Maximum Height,</p> <p><b>Amendment 76</b> [5A Appendix Central Commercial 3] – Verandahs, Building Frontages &amp; Display Windows</p>	Oppose	McDonald’s restaurant and drive through has been established for more than 20 years and is to remain for the foreseeable future. Core Precinct is pedestrian-focused activity, while existing and future uses on this site are vehicle-oriented activity. McDonald’s site fits more comfortably within the Commercial Precinct rather than Core Precinct.	<p>Amend 5A Appendix Central Commercial 1 - Precincts, 5A Appendix Central Commercial 2 - Maximum Height &amp; 5A Appendix Central Commercial 3 - Verandahs, Building Frontages &amp; Display Windows, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i The block bounded by Raroa Road, High Street and Kings Crescent, and in particular the McDonald's site at the corner of High Street and Raroa Road (and also fronting Kings Crescent) be removed from the Core Precinct and 18m Maximum Height area, and included in the Commercial Precinct and 12m Maximum Height area instead.</li> <li>ii That the block bounded by Raroa Road, High Street and Kings Crescent, and in particular the McDonald's site at the corner of High Street and Raroa Road (and also fronting Kings Crescent) be removed from Appendix Central Commercial 3 - Street Frontages requiring verandahs, building frontages and display windows.</li> <li>iii Such other relief as may give effect to the submission including any consequential amendments.</li> </ul>
	17.2	<p><b>Amendment 19</b> [5A 1.1.6] - Vehicle Oriented Activities</p>	Oppose	Need to acknowledge the important role played by smaller vehicle oriented retail activities in adding to the diversity of the city centre.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i Add to 5A 1.1.6 as follows: <i>"Some types of activities have a heavy dependence on private motor vehicles for access, such as supermarkets, takeaway outlets and service stations. However, the Council acknowledges the important role played by vehicle oriented retail activities in adding to the diversity of the City Centre. Whilst growth and intensification is intended to result in a change to the form and function of the Central Commercial Activity Area, it is recognised that this is a gradual process. During such time, vehicle oriented activities will continue to have a role particularly where they form part of a vehicle oriented node or are on the fringe of the centre. Managing these types of activities..."</i></li> <li>ii Such other relief as may give effect to the submission including any consequential amendments.</li> </ul>

17.3	<b>Amendment 17</b> [5A 1.1.4] - Incompatibility Between Different Activities	Support	Potential for reverse sensitivity effects in relation to established business activities and it is necessary to ensure that such effects are avoided in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Retain Policy 5A1.1.4(a) as proposed and associated rules.
17.4	<b>Amendment 34</b> [5A2.1(b)] Permitted Activity – Buildings	Support	Many existing buildings will have a long economic life and it is appropriate the Plan permits their redevelopment, repair, maintenance and general enhancement without the need for resource consent.	Retain Rule 5A2.1(b) without amendment
17.5	<b>Amendment 35</b> [5A2.1(c)] – Permitted Activity - Building Additions	Support	Appropriate the Plan permits small additions and alterations to existing buildings without the need for resource consent.	Retain Rule 5A2.1(c) without amendment
17.6	<b>Amendment 49</b> [5A 2.1.1] (j)(ii)] Parking, Loading, Access	Oppose	McDonald’s restaurant and drive through has been established for more than 20 years and is to remain for the foreseeable future. Any future changes to the existing site layout would require resource consent. This rule creates uncertainty over the future outcome of any such proposal, as well as significant additional costs and delays associated with a resource consent application. McDonald’s site fits more comfortably within the Commercial Precinct rather than Core Precinct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i Delete Rule 5A 2.1.1 (j)(i)(ii), or in the alternative:</li> <li>ii Amend Rule 5A 2.1.1 (j)(i)(ii) to by adding the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>this rule does not apply to existing activities where additions or alterations to buildings do not exceed 10% of existing GFA</u></li> <li>- <u>sites with frontage to more than one street may provide parking at ground level at the front of the street with the lower traffic volume</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>iii Or alternatively, inclusion of the McDonald's site within the Commercial Precinct instead of the Core Precinct</li> <li>iv Such other relief as may give effect to the submission including any consequential amendments.</li> </ul>
17.7	<b>Amendment 50</b> [5A2.2] Restricted Discretionary Activity – Retail GFA	Oppose	McDonald’s restaurant and drive through has been established for more than 20 years and is to remain for the foreseeable future. Intention of the rule is to enable discretion over a wide range of matters. This process is considered inappropriate and onerous for an existing activity which is essentially on the fringe of the city centre.	<p>Amend Rule 5A 2.2 (a) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <i>“Precincts identified in Appendix Central Commercial 1 – Precincts.</i> <i>For the purpose of this rule, Gross Floor Area does not include covered refuse enclosures, children's covered playland areas”...xx</i></li> <li>ii Or alternatively, inclusion of the McDonald's site within the Commercial Precinct instead of the Core Precinct.</li> <li>iii Such other relief as may give effect to the submission including any consequential amendments.</li> </ul>
17.8	<b>Amendment 91</b> [5A Appendix	Oppose	McDonald’s restaurant and drive through has been established for more than 20 years and is to remain for	<p>Amend Appendix Transport 2 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i The block bounded by Raroa Road, High Street and</li> </ul>

		Transport 2] inner and Outer Central Parking Districts		the foreseeable future. Core Precinct is pedestrian-focused activity, while existing and future uses on this site are vehicle-oriented activity. McDonald's site fits more comfortably within the Outer Parking District than in the Inner Parking District.	<p>Kings Crescent, and in particular the McDonald's site at the corner of High Street and Raroa Road (and also fronting Kings Crescent) be removed from the Inner Parking District and included in the Outer Parking District instead</p> <p>ii Such other relief as may give effect to the submission including any consequential amendments.</p>
17.9		<b>Amendment 92</b> [14B2.1.5] Signage – Permitted Activity Conditions	Oppose	Rule is too restrictive for businesses that rely on signage visible to the motoring public, and which has a traffic directional as well as site identification function.	<p>i Amend Rule 14B 2.1.5 (c)(iv) to exclude its application to the Core Precinct.</p> <p>ii Such other relief as may give effect to the submission including any consequential amendments.</p>

Submission Number: DPC14/17A						
Submitter	Sub. Ref.	Amendment & Provision	Support / Oppose		Reasons	Decision/Relief Sought
McDonalds Restaurants NZ Ltd	17A.1	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Oppose in part		Design Guide does not acknowledge the ongoing role that vehicle orientated business activities have in the Central Commercial Activity Area.	Amend the Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide by introducing the specific additional matters relating to Drive Through Restaurants (refer to the appendix of the submission for the specific additional matters).
	17A.2	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Oppose in part		McDonald's restaurant and drive through has been established for more than 20 years and is to remain for the foreseeable future. Core Precinct is pedestrian-focused activity, while existing and future uses on this site are vehicle-oriented activity. McDonald's site fits more comfortably within the Commercial Precinct rather than Core Precinct.	Amend the Precinct Map (page 11) by excluding the block bounded by Raroa Road, High Street and Kings Crescent, and in particular the McDonald's site at the corner of High Street and Raroa Road (and also fronting Kings Crescent) from the Core Precinct, and included in the Commercial precinct instead.
	17A.3	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Oppose in part		Design Guide does not acknowledge the ongoing role that vehicle orientated business activities have in the Central Commercial Activity Area.	Amend the Frontage Type Plan on page 24 by deleting the Type 2 - secondary frontage notation from Raroa Road and Kings Crescent, and replace with Type 3 Commercial Precinct Frontage.
	17A.4	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Oppose in part		Design Guide does not acknowledge the ongoing role that vehicle orientated business activities have in the Central Commercial Activity Area.	Amend the provision for parking in Section 2.3.8 page 31 by adding the following text: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>this rule does not apply to existing activities where additions or alterations to buildings do not exceed 10% of existing GFA</i></li> <li>- <i>sites with frontage to more than one street may</i></li> </ul>

					<i>provide parking at ground level at the front of the street with the lower traffic volume"</i>
	17A.5	<b>Amendment 81</b> [5A Appendix 8] Commercial Central Activity Area Design Guide	Oppose in part	Design Guide does not acknowledge the ongoing role that vehicle orientated business activities have in the Central Commercial Activity Area.	Such other relief as may give effect to the submission including any consequential amendments.

<b>Submission Number: DPC14/18</b>					
<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Sub. Ref.</b>	<b>Amendment &amp; Provision</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision/Relief Sought</b>
Kiwi Property Holdings Ltd	18.1	General	Support in part	Generally supportive of the Plan Change in principle and the introduction of a more refined approach to managing retail in the Central Commercial Activity Area. However, further refinement of the retail provisions is required to ensure consistency with the overall objectives of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement.  The Plan Change provisions as they currently stand have the potential to undermine the wider aspirations of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement. There is no distinction between single shops and larger integrated retail developments which contain single shops.	The Plan Change being amended to address the concerns outlined in the submission being further refinement of the retail provisions. For example no distinction between single shops and larger integrated retail developments which contain single shops. Similarly, a large format integrated retail development could establish as a permitted activity in the Commercial Precinct.  In the event that the relief sought is not met, they oppose the Plan Change.



## ADDRESS FOR SERVICE – PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 14

Submission No.	Name/Organisation	Address	Address
DPC14/01	Rodger & Elaine Marvelly	[REDACTED]	LOWER HUTT 5010
DPC14/02	Sherry Phipps	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	LOWER HUTT
DPC14/03	Beverley Tyler	[REDACTED]	LOWER HUTT 5010
DPC14/04	Rutherford Holdings Ltd Attn: David Mann	PO Box 830	WELLINGTON
DPC14/05	Foodstuffs Co-operative Society Limited C/- Urban Perspectives Ltd Attn: Peter Coop	PO Box 9042	WELLINGTON
DPC14/06	Stephen Shadwell	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	LOWER HUTT 5046
DPC14/07	Costas Nicolaou, Gary Edridge, Steve Shadwell, Bruce Sedcole	[REDACTED]	LOWER HUTT 5040
DPC14/08	Making Places Reference Group C/- Ian Pike	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	LOWER HUTT
DPC14/09	New Zealand Transport Agency Attn: Cole O'Keefe	PO Box 5084 Lambton Quay	WELLINGTON
DPC14/10	Retail Holdings Limited & Lower Hutt Properties Limited C/- Offices of Ellis Gould Attn: Julie Goodyer	PO Box 1509	AUCKLAND
DPC14/11	Louise Ferrari	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	LOWER HUTT
DPC14/12	Westfield (New Zealand) Limited C/- James Gardner-Hopkins/Liz Hardacre Russell McVeagh	PO Box 10 214	WELLINGTON

DPC14/13	Harvey Norman Stores Pty (New Zealand Limited) C/- Haines Planning Consultants Ltd	PO Box 90 842 Victoria Street West	AUCKLAND 1142
DPC14/14	Petone Planning Action Group	PO Box 33 326	PETONE 5046
DPC14/15	Greater Wellington Regional Council Attn: Scott Ihaka	PO Box 41	MASTERTON
DPC14/16	Hutt Valley Chamber of Commerce	PO Box 30 653	LOWER HUTT
DPC14/17 & DPC14/17A	McDonald's Restaurants (New Zealand) Limited C/- Jenny Hudson	██████████ ██████	NORTH SHORE CITY
DPC14/18	Kiwi Property Holdings Limited C/- Barker & Associates Attn: Nick Roberts	PO Box 37 806 Parnell	AUCKLAND 1151