

Proposed District Plan Change 37

HUGH SINCLAIR PARK, WAINUIOMATA
REZONING OF PART OF THE SITE AS GENERAL RESIDENTIAL
ACTIVITY AREA WITH PROVISION FOR A RETIREMENT VILLAGE

Full Set of Submissions Received

Proposed Plan Change 37 - Submissions Received

DPC35/1	Dave Williamson – United Video
DPC35/2	Bernard Kenny
DPC35/3	Angela Pahl
DPC35/4	Kenneth Ernest Malley
DPC35/5	Caroline Ammundsen – Greater Wellington Regional Council
DPC35/6	Margaret Benge

From: United Video Wainui <uvwainuiomata@xtra.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, 18 May 2015 2:16 p.m.
To: District Plan
Subject: District Plan Change 37- Hugh Sinclair Park Wainuiomata

Dear Sir/Madam

I am more than happy to support the proposed plan change as above.

Yours Faithfully

Dave Williamson
United Video
10 The Strand
Wainuiomata

From: Corinna Tessendorf
Sent: Thursday, 21 May 2015 11:31 a.m.
To: District Plan
Subject: FW: Plan change 37.

From: Bernie [<mailto:bjkenny@xtra.co.nz>]
Sent: Thursday, 21 May 2015 11:29 a.m.
To: Corinna Tessendorf
Subject: Plan change 37.

Re change of plan 37 to a Retirement village.

If the plan is make a retirement village similar to the one at Woodland Mews this would be good, as it would enable older people to downsize.

With all the older people I speak to they would rather have a Rest Home establishment with medical and hospital care if required.

If this second statement is the one proposed by council, I would like to give this proposal my 100% support. May this be sooner rather than later.

I remain
Bernard Kenny



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

From: Angela Pahl <angepahl@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, 6 June 2015 8:10 a.m.
To: District Plan
Subject: Plan 37 Submission
Attachments: Plan 37 Submission.jpg

Hi

Please find attached

Thanks

Angela Pahl
48 Nelson Cres
Wainuiomata 5014
Lower Hutt
021 115 9716

Submission on publicly notified Proposed District Plan Change

Clause 6 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991



To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council

1. This is a submission from:

Full name	Last PAHL	First ANGELA
Company/organisation		
Contact if different		
Address	Number 48 Street NELSON CRES	
	Suburb	
	City WAINUIOMATA	Postcode
Address for Service if different	Postal Address	Courier Address
Phone	Day	Evening
Fax		Mobile 021 115 9716
Email	angepahl@hotmail.com	

2. This is a **submission** on the following proposed change to the City of Lower Hutt District Plan:

Proposed District Plan Change No:

37

Title of Proposed District Plan Change:

Hugh Sinclair Park - Wainui

3. The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

Please give details:

Rezoning

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

4. My submission is:

Include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended; and reasons for your views:

In support

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

5. I seek the following decision from Hutt City Council:

Give precise details:

Rezone for Retirement Village

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

6. I ☐ **wish** ☒ **do not wish** to be heard in support of my submission.

(please tick one)

7. If others make a similar submission,

I ☒ **will** ☐ **will not** consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

(please tick one)

Signature of submitter:

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Angela Pahl

Date

2/6/15

Personal information provided by you in your submission will be used to enable Hutt City Council to administer the submission process and will be made public. You have the right under the Privacy Act 1993 to obtain access to and to request correction of any personal information held by the Council concerning you.

Submission number
OFFICE USE ONLY

Submission on publicly notified Proposed District Plan Change

Clause 6 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991



To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council

1. This is a submission from:

Full name	Last Malley First Kenneth Ernest	
Company/organisation		
Contact if different		
Address	Number 135a Street Moohan St.	
	Suburb Wainuiomata	
	City Lower Hutt	Postcode 5014
Address for Service if different	Postal Address	Courier Address
Phone	Day 049707035	Evening 04 9707035
Fax		Mobile
Email	ken-jean@paradise.net.nz	

2. This is a submission on the following proposed change to the City of Lower Hutt District Plan:

Proposed District Plan Change No:

37

Title of Proposed District Plan Change:

Hugh Sinclair Park Wainuiomata rezoning part as general residential for Retirement Village

3. The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

Please give details: I wish to retain part of the land for future improvements to the playground. In particular to retain all of the trees and shrubbery that protects the play area from the southerly which is the coldest and the prevailing wind. a pailing fence will not shelter the ground.

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

4. My submission is:

Include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended; and reasons for your views:

I oppose the extent of the area for the village, and require more land retained for the playground.
Additional pages attached.

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

5. I seek the following decision from Hutt City Council:

Give precise details:

To reduce the area rezoned at the playground end, to retain more for the playground as it is the best for a playground as no other park is protected well enough.

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

6. I ☒ **wish** ☐ **do not wish** to be heard in support of my submission.

(please tick one)

7. If others make a similar submission,

I ☒ **will** ☐ **will not** consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

(please tick one)

Signature of submitter:

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

K E Malley

Date **9 June 2015**

Personal information provided by you in your submission will be used to enable Hutt City Council to administer the submission process and will be made public. You have the right under the Privacy Act 1993 to obtain access to and to request correction of any personal information held by the Council concerning you.

Submission number
OFFICE USE ONLY

Ken Malley
 135a Moohan St.
 Lower Hutt,
 5014,
 9th June 2015,
 ph. 9707035
ken-jean@paradise.net.nz

Submission on:

Proposed District Plan Change 37 Hugh Sinclair Park, Wainuiomata.

It is the Mayor's pet project and he would have got a lot of backing from the Grey Power, but I doubt if many considered the future of the playground for the children, or their grandchildren.

The area is a prime piece of land, sheltered by trees, has toilets and play facilities, conveniently close to the shops, and can be easily expanded as the population expands. (The Council is going to open land in the northern part of the suburb for housing at a later date). None of the other parks nearby are sheltered, they have no toilets, or are not used for general recreation or playing. Usually only used for sport matches or team training, you don't see other children playing there, only team type groups, and only the rugby teams seem to have practice there.

Hugh Sinclair Park is the only one that is suitable for children to play in little random groups that come or go by incidental meeting. As it is also the main thoroughfare for children walking to and from some schools, or to the shops, it is a good socialising area protected by trees from the cold southerly.

The corner near the Medical Center has swings etc for small children and is sheltered by trees from the southerly, which is usually cold. The loss of the trees by the Medical Center would be a disaster for that area making it unsuitable for small children, except in unusually good conditions.

The trees make the area of the park that will be left seem more friendly and natural. If a fence, probably a 6ft. paling fence, is along the proposed border that will make it feel like a small play area in somebody's backyard, and spoil the rural feeling of the ground, probably decreasing its attractiveness to children. It cannot be replaced by other more distant unsuitable parks, such as Frederick Wise Park or Bryan Heath Park, both of which are out of the way for most children, and would need to be organised to meet with friends.

I often go through Bryan Heath Park, but hardly ever see anyone playing there, perhaps only a few times a year. Seldom, if ever, are they practicing for some sport. This and Frederick Wise Park are open and unsuitable for all but organised team sports.

I consider that they want far too much of our park, and will block any further development of facilities, for someone else's profit. While it may be a small financial benefit to the community, and convenient for a retirement village, and possibly some employment of locals, that is not the purpose the park was given, it is for pleasure and recreation of the community. It is our Park!

The sales pitch was that it would be good for work and for local businesses, but probably the higher paid staff will come from the Hutt, and only a few low paid jobs will be filled from Wainuiomata. The provisions will come from Wellington or the Hutt, so there is little gain for local shops.

The part I want to keep is shown on Location Map 1 as area A, and the suggested exchange area is shown at the top, as B. This would require a bridge over a fairly small stream that most High School boys can jump over, and allowances for floods is easily achieved. It crosses over to a seldom used corner of Frederick Wise Park, which is about the same height as the corner area of the proposed Village. This could be left to a later time as a proposal, and extended much further to the west on land that is not used at all if the Village needs to grow much larger.

As an absolute minimum we need area C to grow a shelter belt for the existing playground, as growing trees in the playground would reduce the play area, and, after all was donated for a playground/ recreational area for the children, so they are entitled to keep as much as they need for future expansion.

By keeping this area of the park it could be planted with trees and shrubs with seating, and be a valuable sunny, resting and social, away from the housing, for people from the Retirement Home to get away from the housing which will probably only have some small gardens, and be more relaxing than sitting amongst the houses.

I notice that on the PC 37 - Part 4 - Appendix 4 - Concept Plan it shows what appears to be a road access onto The Strand. This has not been mentioned in any of the information beforehand. It would destroy the children's playground corner near the Health Center, as it would seem to cut across it, and would also need some trees to be removed, the ones that protect the playground.

To this I most strongly object. Legally if you are going to change the plan to that extent it must have a new round of public submissions.

Financial Considerations:

Referring to HUTT CITY Policy Committee Report No. PC2013/3/186 (2) on page 7 an estimate is give of the land value \$600,000 at (\$15 per square metre) and on page 12, another estimate (21) an initial valuation estimate of \$800,000 at \$20sqm. At that price, we should not sell the land, as it is much more valuable than that. That is sufficient reason to scrap the whole idea.

In July 2013 I inquired about the price of land in Wainuiomata and Professionals gave me two sale notices both for flat grassy land further from the shops, but otherwise very similar ground quality to Sinclair park.

One is in Ashburn Road up Wise St: 1402 Sqm for \$130,000 which is \$92.7 per sqm, compare that with \$15 sqm in the estimates above.

The other is a short distance up Wellington Rd. Back section own drive 598 sqm for \$79,000 equals \$132 sqm. The Sept 07 valuation for this was \$103,000 which would be \$172 sqm, that is nearly 12 times the price we are giving away our better, centrally located children's heritage playground for.


At those prices, our playground would become \$3,680,000 at the \$92sqm or at the \$132sqm price it would be \$5,280,000. There is a great deal at stake and the council should be getting the best it can for Wainuiomata, not subsidising someone else's business venture, to the tune of nearly \$5 Million.

You probably are not concerned with the price, but this is the "divide and conquer" that by piecemeal, overrides the public's wishes. How do we get to prevent land being sold at ridiculously cheap rates? At the moment, only by stopping the whole thing. An honest price for the land could sink the whole deal.

As for the soft nature of the land it is much the same as the surrounding houses have been built on and if drained requires little else for housing. The so called swampiness only affects the surface in times of rain due to poor runoff, as no drainage provision has been made. I think the claims of the proposed purchaser about the ground should be taken with much scepticism.

As a back section, it will have very low rates. Has this been taken into account, as this should increase the price, because of the permanent running cost advantage of the Village.

Yours sincerely,



Ken Malley.



From: Caroline Ammundsen <Caroline.Ammundsen@gw.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 15 June 2015 4:16 p.m.
To: District Plan
Subject: Submission on proposed Plan Change 37 from GWRC
Attachments: WGN_DOCS-#1491329-v1-SUBMISSION_Plan_Change_37
_ _Hugh_Sinclair_Park_Wainuiomata.DOC

Good afternoon

Please accept this submission on behalf of Greater Wellington Regional Council.

Please acknowledge receipt of this submission.

Thanks
Caroline

Caroline Ammundsen | Policy Advisor, Environmental Policy
GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL
Te Pane Matua Taiao

Shed 39, 2 Fryatt Quay, Pipitea, Wellington 6011

T: 04 830-4034 |

www.gw.govt.nz www.facebook.com/greaterwellington

 **Think green: read on the screen.**

ATTENTION: This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author, and do not represent those of the organisation.

ATTENTION: This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author, and do not represent those of the organisation.

15 June 2015

File Ref: X/26/03/165

Environmental Policy Division
Hutt City Council
Private Bag 31912
Lower Hutt 5040

Shed 39, Harbour Quays
PO Box 11646
Manners Street
Wellington 6142
T 04 384 5708
F 04 385 6960
www.gw.govt.nz

Dear Corinna

**Submission on Proposed District Plan Change 37 – Hugh Sinclair Park,
Wainuiomata – Rezoning of Part of the Site as General Residential
Activity Area with Provision for a Retirement Village**

Please find enclosed the Greater Wellington Regional Council's submission on proposed Plan Change 37.

Please feel free to contact me on 04 830 4034 or caroline.ammundsen@gw.govt.nz if you have any questions or concerns.

Yours sincerely

Caroline Ammundsen
Policy Advisor, Environmental Policy

Encl: Submission



Greater Wellington Regional Council: Submission

To:	Hutt City Council
Submission on:	Proposed Plan Change 37

1. Reason for submission

- 1.1 The Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) wishes to make a submission on proposed Plan Change 37 pursuant to Schedule 1 Section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).
- 1.2 GWRC supports proposed Plan Change 37.

2. Policy framework

- 2.1 GWRC is interested in how proposed Plan Change 37 will support and contribute to achieving the sustainable management of natural and physical resources in the Wellington region. The proposal has been assessed for its consistency with the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region 2013 (RPS).

Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region

- 2.2 The RPS integrates the sustainable management of natural and physical resources in the Wellington region. The first group of RPS policies are directive to local authorities and require provisions to be included in district or regional plans. The second set of RPS policies need to be given particular regard to when assessing and determining a resource consent, notices of requirements, or when changing, varying or replacing city, district or regional plans. Many of these regulatory policies will cease to have effect once the directive policies are given effect to through district or regional plans.

3. Comments

Public transport

- 3.1 The area proposed to be rezoned currently has excellent public transport access, which is consistent with Policy 57 of the RPS. Policy 57 seeks that land uses and transport are well integrated. For example, the site is located within 500m or ~5 minutes walk of a number of bus stops, made up of 3 pairs of stops on Wainuiomata Road (served by the Route 170); 2 pairs of stops on Fitzherbert Road (the Route 160); and 1 pair of stops on Parkway (the Route 160).
- 3.2 Bus route 160 and 170 run at 30 minute intervals during the day and hourly in the evenings and on weekends. Bus routes 160 and 170 both operate from early morning until midnight, and provide good connections to community facilities in Wainuiomata and Lower Hutt city. In Lower Hutt CDB it is also possible to transfer to other bus services to give easy access to Hutt Hospital and the surrounding area. These bus routes both give excellent access to timed

connections for rail services at Waterloo Railway Station, where train services travel south to Wellington city and north to Upper Hutt.

- 3.3 GWRC considers that pedestrian links to enable safe and easy access to these current bus routes should be included in the detailed designs for the Retirement Village on this rezoned site. This will give the residents excellent access to the community facilities mentioned above. GWRC notes the inclusion of “traffic generation effects” in the plan change application, which ensures “the safe and efficient movement of all vehicle and pedestrian traffic” (Chapter 4A2.3.1(x)(iii)). It is important that additional traffic to the site does not cause congestion on these bus corridors which creates travelling time issues for the buses.

Parks

- 3.4 GWRC do not generally support the loss of public open space and recreation reserve, however, in this proposal the site for the retirement village is well serviced with public open space. This development could deliver significant community benefits through development contributions which could include potential enhancement of recreation facilities in the remaining reserve.

Flood Protection

- 3.5 The site is affected by flooding, with a 1:100 year flood level of 86.92 above MSL for flooding from Parkway Drain.
- 3.6 Key issues for development of the site relate to:
1. Building floor levels above the 100 year return period flood level for habitable buildings (villas) and for the proposed 52 bed health care facility
 2. Achieving safe access to the all buildings
 3. Safety in an over-design flood i.e. a larger flood than the 1:100 year flood
 4. Flood modelling including an allowance for climate change.

Building floor levels above the 100 year return period flood level for habitable buildings and achieving safe access to and from buildings

- 3.7 Parkway Drain is maintained by Hutt City Council, which is also responsible for identifying the flood hazard and flood hazard maps for the watercourse. In the flood hazard maps included with the application in Appendix 6, the flood hazard is generally confined to the northern and north-eastern portions of the site.
- 3.8 The Proposed Plan Change 37 application identifies that the floor level of any habitable space is to be raised above the 1:100 year return period flood level for Parkway Drain (page 4). The raising of floor levels appears to be generally achieved by raising the ground levels across the site. GWRC supports the

raising of the building floor levels for the villas above the 1:100 year flood level as an appropriate minimum standard, as the villas are intended for people who may have restricted mobility. To enable safe evacuation of the villas should it be necessary, GWRC considers that the access to villas should also be raised above the 1:100 year flood level.

- 3.9 GWRC considers that healthcare facilities should have a higher standard of flood risk mitigation than the general habitable buildings (villas) due to the vulnerability of patients and the difficulty in evacuating sick and/or immobile patients during a flood event. This is also consistent with the approach taken in the Hutt River Floodplain Management Plan to which HCC is a signatory. GWRC considers that the building floor level for the proposed 52 bed health care facility should be set at the 500 year return period flood, as a minimum (which is a similar level to that in the Hutt River Floodplain Management Plan of the risk-based 2300cumec flood standard with equates roughly to an averaged 1:440 year flood level).
- 3.10 GWRC considers that flood-free access to the proposed 52 bed health care facility should also be achieved, and as the proposed health-care facility is likely to be the emergency evacuation centre for evacuated villa residents, access to the health care facility should be at considered at a 1:500 year flood level as a minimum.

Safety in an over-design flood i.e. a larger flood than the 1:100year flood

- 3.11 Although it is intended to raise the site and have building floor levels for the villas above the 1:100 flood level, more severe flooding than this could occur. If more severe flooding occurs, flooding of at least some of the proposed villas could be expected. GWRC considers that plans to manage the residual flood risk should be put in place. These plans could include evacuation plans (with initial evacuation to the health care facility), flood-proofing buildings, provision for emergency power generation (with generators above the ground floor level) and emergency water supply. Emergency response management plans should be coordinated with Hutt City Council CDEM. These measures are particularly important given the vulnerable nature of rest home residents.

Flood modelling including an allowance for climate change

- 3.12 Although it is not stated in the plan change documentation, GWRC presumes that climate change is appropriately included in the flood modelling for determining building floor levels.

4. Biodiversity

- 4.1 The proposed plan change will require the rezoning of 3.9 hectares of Hugh Sinclair Park from 'General Recreation Activity Area' to 'General Residential Activity Area – Medium Density' under the City of Lower Hutt District Plan. As such, it represents a form of residential intensification in Wainuiomata. In principle, GWRC supports this change because the provision of well-designed higher-density housing in this area will reduce the potential incursion of development into surrounding rural or open space land that is valued for its

productive, ecological, aesthetic or recreational qualities. Provision of higher density housing aligns with policies 54 and 55 of the RPS which encourages a compact and well-designed regional form.

- 4.2 Policy 54 requires that, when considering an application for a district plan change, particular regard shall be given to achieving the region's seven urban design principles, which include the principle of 'custodianship' (see RPS appendix 2). GWRC provides comment on some of these aspects below.

Recognition of ecological values

- 4.3 An assessment of the potential ecological effects of the proposed plan change was limited by the absence of an Ecological Impact Assessment. Consequently, our knowledge of the biodiversity on site and its ecological importance was limited to the brief description in the Section 32 Evaluation¹. According to that description, the site is mostly grassland with scattered clusters of amenity trees covering approximately 20% of the site. The maturity and species composition of these tree clusters was not described.
- 4.4 While the dominance of grassland and presence of only scattered trees indicate lower indigenous biodiversity values of the site, the general ecological values of grassland based landscapes are well recognised². These include prevention of soil erosion, regulation of local microclimates, and provision of habitat for protected species. Taken together, these services contribute to safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems under section 2 (b) of the Resource Management Act (1991) (the RMA). To ensure that the ecological values of the site are accurately captured GWRC suggests that a scoping assessment of the site is undertaken as per the EIANZ Ecological Impact Assessment guidelines³ which are in line with Schedule 4 (Assessment of effects on the environment) of the RMA.
- 4.5 According to the New Zealand Threatened Environment Classification⁴, the site is also located in an 'acutely threatened' environment. This is because of past losses of indigenous vegetation in lowland environments and the low level of legal protection for what remains. This classification elevates the significance of any indigenous vegetation on site. Any indigenous vegetation on site, whether planted or otherwise, contributes to what little remains of once contiguous tracts of forest across the Wainuiomata valley. As such, it is important to the wildlife corridors that link the surrounding parks and reserves including the East Harbour Regional Park, Parkway Bush and Wainuiomata Scenic Reserve.

¹ Hutt City Council. 2015. Proposed district plan change 37: Hugh Sinclair Park, Wainuiomata, <http://portal.huttcity.govt.nz/Record/ReadOnly?Tab=3&Uri=3745733>, pp. 25-26.

² Manning, A.D., Fischer, J., Lindenmayer, D.B. 2006. Scattered trees are keystone structures – implications for conservation, *Biological Conservation* 132: 311-321, http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Joern_Fischer2/publication/229096084_The_disproportionate_value_of_scattered_trees/links/0deec53b1766e6ecd4000000.pdf

³ Environment Institute of Australia and New Zealand Inc. 2015. EIANZ guidelines for use in New Zealand: terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems, <http://www.eianz.org/document/item/2827>, pp. 24-33.

⁴ Walker, S., Cieraad, E., Grove, P., Lloyd, K., Myers, S., Park, T., Porteous, T., 2007. Guide for users of the threatened environment classification, Ver 1.1, Landcare Research, https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/data/assets/pdf_file/0007/21688/TECUserGuideV1_1.pdf

Suggestions for mitigating ecological effects

- 4.6 Development of this site will increase the proportion of land covered by hard surfaces and reduce the site's provision of ecosystem services, including the provision of habitat for local wildlife. Our preference would therefore be for any development to focus on multi-story development which could reduce the area of impermeable surfaces required and provide space for wildlife corridors, among other benefits. Loss of established trees and vegetation is another common concern when considering proposals for residential intensification⁵
- 4.7 This is considered in RPS policy 41 and discussed further below. These concerns include potential losses to amenity values, indigenous habitat values, and other ecosystem services. Such effects can be mitigated, in part, through the incorporation of sensitive urban design features in the development, such as planted setbacks between adjacent properties.
- 4.8 Policy 47 of the RPS provides considerations for managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with biodiversity values, when considering an application for a district plan change. These considerations include:
- (a) maintaining connections or corridors between indigenous habitats,
 - (d) avoiding the cumulative adverse effects of the incremental loss of habitats,
 - (f) protecting the life supporting capacity of ecosystems,
 - (g) remedying or mitigating adverse effects to ecosystems, and
 - (h) requiring a precautionary approach when considering effects.
- 4.9 GWRC suggests that these considerations are integrated into the design of any development on site.
- 4.10 GWRC supports the extensive plantings put forward the concept plan for the proposed retirement village. Given that the site is currently dominated by grassland, there is even potential to increase the amount of woody vegetation at the site while also accommodating new housing and associated facilities and infrastructure. Where possible, GWRC suggests incorporating the existing woody vegetation on site into the design by avoiding the removal of established trees.
- 4.11 Where trees cannot be accommodated into the design of infrastructure, their removal could be partly mitigated by including locally-appropriate species in the development's planting plan. The Department of Conservation's Classification of New Zealand's Terrestrial Ecosystems⁶ indicates that the site would have originally been podocarp, broadleaved forest including species

⁵ Sharpin, A.B., 2006. The social and environmental effects of residential infill development in New Zealand: A literature review. Urban Development Strategy Working Paper 6, <http://wellington.govt.nz/~media/your-council/projects/files/infill-social.pdf>

⁶ Singers, N.J.D., Rogers, G.M. 2014. A classification of New Zealand's terrestrial ecosystems. Science for conservation 325, Department of Conservation, <http://www.doc.govt.nz/Documents/science-and-technical/sfc325entire.pdf>, p. 53 (Ecosystem unit code WF8).

such as kahikatea, pukatea, kiekie, supplejack, rimu, tawa and swamp maire. Not all of these species may be appropriate for planting within the confines of a retirement village. Other locally-appropriate planting suggestions for this site, including many small and herbaceous species, can be found in the Wellington Regional Native Plant Guide⁷.

- 4.12 Although no permanent waterways traverse this site, any development will impact on surrounding watercourses, particularly Black Creek which is a tributary of the regionally significant Wainuiomata River. RPS policies 40, 41, 42 and 43 provide a range of considerations for assessing the suitability of applications for district plan changes. These policies require applicants to consider the range of potential effects on aquatic ecosystem health and functionality, from earthworks and vegetation disturbance to stormwater contamination.
- 4.13 Policy 40 provides guidance to city councils when considering the management of impacts on aquatic ecosystem health from new developments. Considerations include:
- Limiting the extent of impervious surfaces allowed in new developments;
 - Requiring rooftop rainwater collection for gardens; and
 - Requiring roadside swales, filter strips and 'rain gardens' for stormwater runoff.

⁷ Greater Wellington Regional Council. 2010. Wellington regional native plant guide, <http://www.gw.govt.nz/assets/Be-the-Difference/Biodiversity/Wellington-Regional-Native-Plant-Guide-Revised-Edition-2010-Web.pdf>, pp. 26-27.

- 4.14 These and other design elements could be used as opportunities for retaining or even enhancing the value of habitat at this site⁸. Policy 43 provides further guidance to city councils. It suggests that particular regard should be given to maintaining or enhancing the ecological functions and amenity values of riparian margins, and reinstating riparian habitat.
- 4.15 GWRC suggests that appropriate mitigation for the loss of public space in Hugh Sinclair Park could be to undertake riparian planting in the adjacent Black Creek and the nearby park to improve its amenity and biodiversity values. The riparian planting would provide some mitigation for the likely effects of earthworks on this waterway and also enhance the amenity value of a waterway that is currently grassed, and thus also of low ecological value, throughout most of its upper reach. Improving the planting of the nearby park would, in part, mitigate the loss of established vegetation and public open space at the site. In addition, such plantings may benefit residents of the retirement village by providing them with a nearby natural location to exercise and socialise.

5. Relief sought

- 5.1 Should the Hutt City Council approve proposed Plan Change 37, GWRC requests that:

Consideration is given to the recommendations made in the submission

6. Further involvement

- 6.1 We would also welcome the opportunity to clarify and further discuss the matters raised.

GWRC wishes to be heard in support of its submission.



Jonathan Streat
Manager, Environmental Policy

Address for service:

Caroline Ammundsen
Policy Advisor, Environmental Policy
Greater Wellington Regional Council
PO Box 11646
Manners Street
Wellington 6142

T 04 8304034
F 04 385 6960

⁸ Ministry for the Environment, 2005. New Zealand urban design protocol, <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/towns-and-cities/new-zealand-urban-design-protocol>

Submission on publicly notified Proposed District Plan Change

Clause 6 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991



To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council

1. This is a submission from:

Full name	Last BENGE	First MARGARET
Company/organisation		
Contact if different		
Address	Number 13 Street WAINUIOMATA ROAD	
	Suburb WAINUIOMATA	
	City LOWER HUTT	Postcode
Address for Service if different	Postal Address	Courier Address
Phone	Day 5647030	Evening
Fax		Mobile 027 5647030
Email		

2. This is a submission on the following proposed change to the City of Lower Hutt District Plan:

Proposed District Plan Change No:

37

Title of Proposed District Plan Change:

HUGH SINCLAIR PARK

3. The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

Please give details:

making the change of the land to a Medium Density for the Building of a retirement village

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

4. My submission is:

Include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended; and reasons for your views:

I support the change, as we badly need a retirement + Hospital Complex

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

5. I seek the following decision from Hutt City Council:

Give precise details:

I feel we have enough play or Green areas in Wainuiomata near the Centre of Town

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

6. I ☐ wish ☐ do not wish to be heard in support of my submission.

(please tick one)

7. If others make a similar submission,

I ☐ will ☐ will not consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

(please tick one)

Signature of submitter:

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

M. A. Benge

17-6-2015

Date

Personal information provided by you in your submission will be used to enable Hutt City Council to administer the submission process and will be made public. You have the right under the Privacy Act 1993 to obtain access to and to request correction of any personal information held by the Council concerning you.

Submission number
OFFICE USE ONLY