

Proposed District Plan Change 21

**54 OAKLEIGH STREET, MAUNGARAKI
REZONING OF PART OF THE SITE AS GENERAL
RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY AREA**

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PUBLIC NOTICE

Public Notification of the Summary of Submissions on Proposed District Plan Change 21 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 21 – 54 Oakleigh Street, Maungaraki Rezoning of Part of the Site as General Residential Activity Area

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

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

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

- <http://www.huttcity.govt.nz/Your-Council/Plans-and-publications/District-Plan/District-Plan-changes/District-Plan-change-21/>

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 Tuesday 21 June 2011 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) 566 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**

07 June 2011

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

| <i>Sub. No</i> | <i>Name/Organisation</i> | <i>Page No.</i> |
|-----------------------|---|------------------------|
| DPP12-5-21-001 | Anna and Jeremy Norman | 3 |
| DPP12-5-21-002 | Prathiba Gupta | 3 |
| DPP12-5-21-003 | Souradeep Gupta | 4 |
| DPP12-5-21-004 | Ekta Jhala | 4 |
| DPP12-5-21-005 | Parakramsingh Rana | 5 |
| DPP12-5-21-006 | Chris Rae | 5 |
| DPP12-5-21-007 | Rosemarie and Stephen Thomas | 6 |
| DPP12-5-21-008 | Sharyn Mitchell | 6 |
| DPP12-5-21-009 | Ruth Kerr | 7 |
| DPP12-5-21-010 | Angela Todd | 7 |
| DPP12-5-21-011 | Greater Wellington Regional Council, Attn. Caroline Ammundsen | 8 |
| DPP12-5-21-012 | Margaret Wilson | 8 |
| DPP12-5-21-013 | Christopher Fahey | 9 |
| DPP12-5-21-014 | David Austin | 9 |
| DPP12-5-21-015 | Friends of Belmont Regional Park, Attn. Peter Matcham | 11 |

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS - PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 21

| Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-001 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
| Anna and Jeremy Norman | 1.1 | General | Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though concerned about increased traffic, the development is supported as it will help making the remaining recreational space more usable. | - |
| | 1.2 | Section Size | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed section sizes are considered too small and should be 500m² at the very minimum. | Increase minimum lot size to 500m ² |
| | 1.3 | Remaining Recreation Area | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remaining recreation area should be left open to dogs off-leash as it is the only space open for dogs in Maungaraki. | - |
| | 1.4 | Remaining Recreation Area | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wish for play equipment either on the remaining site or at the Belmont Park entrance area. | - |

| Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-002 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|---|------------------------|
| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
| Prahiba Gupta | 2.1 | General | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual Amenity: New development will directly affect visual amenity by being in line with views Overcrowding: Proposed Changes will make area overcrowded and will directly impact lifestyle of people in the neighbourhood. Lack of other recreational ground: Plan change site is the only flat ground besides Maungaraki School and planned development would directly impact on family life. Water Pressure: Low water pressure could be further reduced by new development. Narrow Road: Overcrowding without broadening of roads will | Maintain status quo |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>cause issues in accessibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise Level: More development in an already overcrowded area will cause issues overall lifestyle. | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-003

| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
|-----------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|---|------------------------|
| Souradeep Gupta | 3.1 | General | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual Amenity: New development will directly affect visual amenity by being in line with views • Overcrowding: Proposed Changes will make area overcrowded and will directly impact lifestyle of people in the neighbourhood. • Lack of other recreational ground: Plan change site is the only flat ground besides Maungaraki School and planned development would directly impact on family life. • Water Pressure: Low water pressure could be further reduced by new development. • Narrow Road: Overcrowding without broadening of roads will cause issues in accessibility. • Noise Level: More development in an already overcrowded area will cause issues overall lifestyle. | Maintain status quo |

Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-004

| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
|------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Ekta Jhala | 4.1 | General | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of visual amenity: Loss of ocean views will have impact on lifestyle and on value of property. • Road leading to Otonga Heights is very narrow, further addition will lead to over-crowding and increase in traffic issues. • Further residential sites will have major impact on water supply and already low water pressure. | <p>Maintain General Recreation Activity Area.</p> <p>No proceeding with residential development.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is only available recreational activity and dog exercise area in suburb. • Increase number of houses will lead to over-crowding and affect quality of life. • Prolonged construction work will cause noise, dust and general disturbance, affecting the health of residents. | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-005

| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
|---------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Parakringsingh Rana | 5.1 | General | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of visual amenity: Loss of ocean views will have impact on lifestyle and on value of property. • Road leading to Otonga Heights is very narrow, further addition will lead to over-crowding and increase in traffic issues. • Further residential sites will have major impact on water supply and already low water pressure. • Site is only available recreational activity and dog exercise area in suburb. • Increase number of houses will lead to over-crowding and affect quality of life. • Prolonged construction work will cause noise, dust and general disturbance, affecting the health of residents. | <p>Maintain General Recreation Activity Area.</p> <p>No proceeding with residential development.</p> |

Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-006

| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
|-----------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Chris Rae | 6.1 | General | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrow access road entry from Oakleigh Street. | Better access before rezoning commences. |
| | 6.2 | General | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impact on Otonga Heights residents. | Assessment of visual impact for Otonga Heights residents. |



| Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-007 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|---|------------------------|
| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
| Rosemarie and Stephen Thomas | 7.1 | General | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overcrowding of small road. | Maintain status quo. |

| Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-008 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
| Sharyn Mitchell | 8.1 | General | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sports field is used by numerous people for a wide range of activities such as dog walking/exercising, cricket, football, running and family picnics • Concerns over additional traffic entering and exiting the area • Sports field is of sufficient size for a full size rugby/football field, drainage work should be completed and area used as a sports field e.g. for lower grade or children's rugby • Subdivision and Selling of land would be a waste of a valuable resource. | Not proceed with proposed plan change |
| | 8.2 | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If part of the land need to be sold Council should sell the eastern half instead of the northern half • The remaining land would be more usable and could be accesses via the Regional Park car park. • The land to be developed would provide more/better options for development. | |

| Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-009 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
| Ruth Kerr | 9.1 | General | Support | <p>Traffic flow and the recreational area are primary points of concern.</p> <p>Access roads should be in Council ownership</p> <p>Traffic Flow/ Signage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient signage causes incidents and risk of accidents • Signage and maintenance issues regarding private street that is public access to reserve at the same time • Preference for two-way access from Maungaraki Road <p>Recreational Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues regarding type of recreation, access and signage <p>Residential:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections appear to be of relatively small size. <p>Ecological Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve vegetation for bird habitat • Council should incorporate this into their work on recreational area. <p>Geotechnical Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geotechnical assessment describes part of the area as “uneconomic to create building platforms”, therefore Council is welcome to improve field drainage to improve utilisation of this area. | Proceed with Option 3 with some amendments (easy access and use, Council ownership of access road, clear and encouraging signage) |

| Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-010 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
| Angela Todd | 10.1 | General | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional residential will have visual amenity impact and lead to overcrowding. | Maintain status quo, leave the site as currently zoned |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of existing recreation area which is used by local residents. • Additional dwellings will lead to increase in noise and traffic in the area • Construction work will cause increase in noise, dust and general disturbance, earthworks could increase climate change and carbon emission. • Development would result in loss of privacy, sense of open space and lowering of property values • Possible environmental and ecological impacts on Belmont Regional Park and further loss of green areas. | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-011 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|--|------------------------|
| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
| Greater Wellington | 11.1 | General | Neutral | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan Change is regarded as being consistent with regional policy direction. <p><i>NB: Submission received from Greater Wellington Regional Council relates to Proposed Plan Changes 17 to 21, however the main issues addressed in the submission relate to Proposed Plan Change 20.</i></p> | |

| Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-012 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
| Margaret Wilson | 12.1 | General | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan Change breaches former agreement from 2008 to retain playing field area for recreational purposes with landscaping provided by HCC • Part that is now proposed to be retained as recreational area | Uphold 2008 decision to use the site for recreational purpose only and do landscaping as promised |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>could be used for houses later.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan Change contradicts Council's and Percy Dowse's vision of green spaces in the suburbs • Submissions in 2008 land review process stated residents need for flat land for recreational purposes. • Green spaces could be an asset for promoting the area and the well-being of its residents. | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-013 | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
|-------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Christopher Fahey | 13.1 | Traffic Assessment | Oppose in parts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The traffic assessment attached as Appendix 7 identifies a "one-way road" option which implies some non-compliance issues • The right of way between 52 and 56 Oakleigh Street is now at its maximum allowable capacity and will not be an option for access to the proposed new subdivision. | Acknowledgment that the right of way between 52 and 56 Oakleigh Street is at its maximum allowable traffic capacity and will not be an option for access to the proposed new subdivision. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-014 | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
|--------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| David Austin | 14.1 | General | Oppose | <p>Maintenance, good faith and current use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor site maintenance by Council: reserve surface was not fully restored following drainage investigations and construction of Otonga Heights subdivision. • Council has not acted in good faith following submissions on land review process in 2008, no support for residents wanting to use the site for recreation (access, damage, mowing) • However use has grown | Not proceed with recommended option but vest the total current site as Recreational Reserve as intended by original subdivision (amended Option 1) |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>Reserve size and future use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size of recommended option reduces future recreational possibilities at the site. • Layout of recommended option would make site access difficult for organised sport. • Proposed shape would eliminate many recreational activities. <p>Purpose of Land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement that original purpose of the site was housing is misleading as every subdivision needs broad recreation facilities. • Rezoning would contradict original intention of subdivision and vision of Percy Dowse. <p>Access to reserves and PAOS conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Banksia Grove playground is too far away and not suitable for ball sports. • Maungaraki grounds is not a suitable alternative for organised sport. The addition of fencing and the increased use by school is likely to cause conflicts between public and school use. <p>Value of flat land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over the last 10 years many flat easy access sections have been developed for residential use in the Western Hills while there is no other option to develop flat recreational land. • Bush clad Regional Park can't be compared to a flat recreational site. <p>Certainty of budget for remedial work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sale of land will return money to a large budget therefore there is no certainty that money from sale will be used on remaining reserve land | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| Submission Number: DPP12-5-21-015 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Submitter | Sub. Ref. | Amendment/ Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary/Reasons | Decision/Relief Sought |
| Friends of Belmont Regional Park | 15.1 | General | Oppose in part | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned at the impact the plan change will have on Oakleigh Street entrance to Belmont Regional Park. While not questioning the decision to sell part of the site it is considered that the area defined in the plan change does not allow for the optimum integration of the development with existing and potential use of the remaining land. It is considered that the inclusion of the Western slope is neither necessary nor appropriate. Concerned that insufficient thought has been given to the impact the creation of a second exit road down the slope and additional traffic will have on the park entrance | Proceed with amendments as outlined below. |
| | 15.2 | Visual aspect | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development will impact on visual aspect from the Park and of the perception of the Park's environment. Creation of a vegetative buffer strip could achieve better result. It is unnecessary to include Western slope in plan change and then protect it by way of a covenant, Western bank should therefore be excluded from plan change. It is understood that it was agreed earlier that a buffer between proposed and existing residential developments to provide a visual break. It is suggested to move the area to be re-zoned to the south by 10m to create this strip. | Exclude the bush clad slope from the playing field to the park entrance level from the plan change. Move area to be re-zoned to the South to allow a vegetative visual barrier to be developed between the new development and the existing development on the Otonga School site. |
| | 15.3 | Traffic movements | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns for impact that increased traffic may have on entrance and potential conflict between vehicular traffic from development and public using the Park entrance area. Option with the least impact on Oakleigh Street entrance needs to be determined with no possibility for any developer to deviate from this option | Investigate alternative access/egress options to negate the necessity of a second road being constructed into the Park entrance. |
| | 15.4 | Cost to | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Much of the vegetation along the Western edge of the site | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------|--|--|--|
| | | community | | was planted and tended by members of Friends of Belmont Regional Park. If land would be rezoned HCC should recompense for the cost of replacement trees and for the lost work. | |
|--|--|-----------|--|--|--|

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE – PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 21

| Submission No. | Name/Organisation | Address | Wish to be heard | Consider joint case |
|----------------|--|-------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| DPP12-5-21-001 | Anna and Jeremy Norman | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | Not stated | Not stated |
| DPP12-5-21-002 | Prathiba Gupta | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | Yes | Yes |
| DPP12-5-21-003 | Souradeep Gupta | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | Yes | Yes |
| DPP12-5-21-004 | Ekta Jhala | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | No | Yes |
| DPP12-5-21-005 | Parakram Singh Rana | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | Yes | Yes |
| DPP12-5-21-006 | Chris Rae | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | No | Yes |
| DPP12-5-21-007 | Rosemarie and Stephen Thomas | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | No | Yes |
| DPP12-5-21-008 | Sharyn Mitchell | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | Yes | Yes |
| DPP12-5-21-009 | Ruth Kerr | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | Yes | Yes |
| DPP12-5-21-010 | Angela Todd | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | No | Yes |
| DPP12-5-21-011 | Greater Wellington Regional Council, Attn. Caroline Ammundsen | PO Box 11646, WELLINGTON 6142 | Yes | Not stated |
| DPP12-5-21-012 | Margaret Wilson | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | No | No |
| DPP12-5-21-013 | Christopher Fahey | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | No | Not stated |
| DPP12-5-21-014 | David Austin | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | Yes | no |
| DPP12-5-21-015 | Friends of Belmont Regional Park, Attn. Peter Matcham | ■■■■■■■■■■ LOWER HUTT 5010 | Yes | Not stated |