

Proposed District Plan Change 56

**Enabling Intensification in Residential and
Commercial Areas**

**Summary of Decisions Requested
(Volume 3 of 3 – Submissions 201 to 277)**

Publicly Notified:

10 November 2022

Further Submissions Close:

24 November 2022



Public Notice

Public Notification of the Summary of Decisions Requested for Proposed District Plan Change 56 to the City of Lower Hutt District Plan

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

Proposed District Plan Change 56: Enabling Intensification in Residential and Commercial Areas

Hutt City Council has prepared the summary of decisions requested for Proposed District Plan Change 56.

The purpose of the proposed plan change is to meet the Council's obligations under the Resource Management Act 1991 to implement Policies 3 and 4 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards.

The proposed plan change was notified for submissions on 18 August 2022. The submission period closed on 20 September 2022. Council received 275 submissions.

The summary of decisions requested, and a full set of the submissions, can be viewed:

- On Council's website: <https://hutt.city/pc56>
- At the Customer Services Counter, Council Administration Building, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt

The following persons can make a further submission in support of, or in opposition to, the submissions already made:

- Persons who are representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; and
- Persons who have an interest in the proposed plan change that is greater than the interest of the general public.

A further submission must be limited to a matter in support of or in opposition to the relevant submission.

Further submissions may be lodged in any of the following ways:

- By email (preferably): submissions@huttcity.govt.nz
- Post: Policy Plan Team, Hutt City Council, Private Bag 31912, Lower Hutt 5040
- In Person: Council Administration Building, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt

Further Submissions close on 24 November 2022.

Further submissions must be written in accordance with Form 6 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees and Procedure) Regulations 2003 and must state whether or not you wish to be heard in support of your submission.

Copies of Form 6 are available:

- On Council's website: <https://hutt.city/pc56>
- At the Customer Services Counter, Council Administration Building, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt
- By contacting Hutt City Council on district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz or 04 570 6666

If you make a further submission, please state clearly the reference number of the submission to which your further submission relates.

In addition to serving a copy of the further submission on Hutt City Council, a copy of the further submission must also be served on the person(s) whose submission(s) you are supporting or opposing within five working days of sending your further submission to Hutt City Council.

Jo Miller

Chief Executive

10 November 2022



Submissions Received

DPC56/201	Bridget Hawkins	7
DPC56/202	Ken Hand	7
DPC56/203	Angus Gibbs.....	11
DPC56/204	Ryman Healthcare Ltd	11
DPC56/205	Silverstream Park Christian Centre.....	12
DPC56/206	Kāinga Ora	13
DPC56/207	Summerset Group Holdings Ltd.....	109
DPC56/208	Kerri Plancque.....	111
DPC56/209	Teramo Developments Ltd.....	112
DPC56/210	York Bay Residents' Association	113
DPC56/211	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated.....	115
DPC56/212	Neil McGrath	161
DPC56/213	Tom McLeod	162
DPC56/214	Michelle Lardelli-Ruthven.....	162
DPC56/215	Felicity Rashbrooke	162
DPC56/216	Major Gardens Ltd	164
DPC56/217	Sam Williams	165
DPC56/218	Richard Perry	166
DPC56/219	Survey and Spatial New Zealand.....	167
DPC56/220	Dave Robinson.....	172
DPC56/221	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd.....	173
DPC56/222	Ministry of Education.....	176
DPC56/223	East Harbour Environmental Association	177
DPC56/224	Richmond Atkinson	179
DPC56/225	Simon and Vanessa Edmonds.....	180
DPC56/226	Troy Baisden	180
DPC56/227	Living Street Aotearoa	181
DPC56/228	Steven Beech.....	183
DPC56/229	Pam Crisp	184
DPC56/230	Margaret Sissons	185
DPC56/231	Kristen Whittington	186
DPC56/232	Laurence Tyler	186
DPC56/233	Penny Walsh	187
DPC56/234	Julie Francis	188
DPC56/235	Elayna Chhiba.....	189
DPC56/236	John Roseveare	189
DPC56/237	Trevor Farrer	190
DPC56/238	RLW Holdings Ltd	191

DPC56/239	Glenys Wong.....	193
DPC56/240	Logan McLennan	193
DPC56/241	Central Apartments Ltd	194
DPC56/242	Ian Shields	195
DPC56/243	Martha Craig	196
DPC56/244	Rex Torstonson.....	197
DPC56/245	Elizabeth Beattie	199
DPC56/246	Brett Nicholls	199
DPC56/247	Geraldine Blackman.....	201
DPC56/248	Andrew Hendry	201
DPC56/249	Keith Carman	202
DPC56/250	Margaret Luping	202
DPC56/251	Arcus Marge.....	203
DPC56/252	Nick Ursin.....	203
DPC56/253	Colin Wilson	204
DPC56/254	Douglas Sheppard	205
DPC56/255	Mary Taylor	206
DPC56/256	George Mackay	206
DPC56/257	Dorothy Gallagher	207
DPC56/258	Investore Property Ltd.....	207
DPC56/259	Stan Augustowicz.....	209
DPC56/260	Steven Meadows.....	209
DPC56/261	Deborah Sweeney	210
DPC56/262	Adrienne Holmes.....	210
DPC56/263	Poneke Architects Ltd	211
DPC56/264	Mike Wong	212
DPC56/265	CEM Johnston.....	212
DPC56/266 to DPC56/268	Ashley Roper.....	213
DPC56/269	Mandy Stewart	214
DPC56/270	Sudheer Ambiti.....	214
DPC56/271	Geoffrey Shepherd.....	214
DPC56/272	Alexandra Ward	215
DPC56/273	Sarah Nation	215
DPC56/275	Stride Investment Management Limited	224
DPC56/276	Christopher Fry	226
DPC56/277	Glen Andrews.....	226

Summary of Decisions Requested

Any additions requested by a submitter is underlined in blue. Any deletions requested by a submitter is ~~struck through in blue~~.

Any underlined or ~~struck through~~ text in red is from the proposed plan change, as notified on 18 August 2022.

DPC56/201 Bridget Hawkins				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
201.1	Density	Oppose	Reject the high density residential areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding views, access to sunlight, privacy Impacts on on-street carparking. Infrastructure will not be able to cope with increased density. Impacts on Lower Hutt landscape. Reduced house prices. Earthquake hazard risk.

DPC56/202 Ken Hand				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
202.1	Density	Amend	Designate most of Lower Hutt city as Medium Density Activity Area, with High Density Activity Areas restricted to the central business district and Petone centres.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning to High Density Residential Activity Area will have significant adverse impacts. HCC should amend its interpretations of the NPS, so that much of Lower Hutt can be more appropriately designated as Medium Density Residential ('walkable catchment', 'within and adjacent to neighbour centres' as examples). The impacts on existing Lower Hutt homeowners is out of proportion compared to the impact of density provisions

				<p>proposed for Wellington and Porirua. In these areas High Density has been limited to reasonable pockets and most residential areas have been zoned Medium Density.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough protection for existing homeowners. Impacts include sunlight, daylight, privacy, property values, and noise. The proposed changes favour developers and give HCC discretion while failing to protect existing homeowners.
202.2	Density	Oppose	Delete proposals 1.10.1A, Policy 1, parts b(iv), b(v), and (c) that allow building heights of at least 6 stories within and adjacent to the suburban centres of Avalon, and building heights of at least 4 stories adjacent to the suburban centres of Eastbourne, Stokes Valley, and Wainuiomata.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals are not in keeping with the existing nature and character of the residential area. • The proposal unfairly targets a small area of Avalon (6 storeys in areas adjacent to centres but only 4 storeys in the remainder of the urban environment). • The proposed provisions are not required by the NPS-UD and reflect only HCC's interpretation of the national direction.
202.3	HDRAA	Amend	Include a new clear policy statement in Section 4G that resource consent is required for buildings more than 3 stories and up to 6 stories.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current wording in PC56 is not clear enough.
202.4	HDRAA	Amend	Include a new Objective in 4G 2 that ensures adjoining residential properties are not adversely impacted by development (sunlight, daylight, privacy, increased noise, market value).	
202.5	HDRAA	Amend	Include a new Policy in 4G 3 that ensures adjoining residential properties are not adversely impacted by development (sunlight, daylight, privacy, increased noise, market value).	

202.6	Amendment 125 Policy 4G 3.10	Amend	Amend Policy 4G 3.10 to replace 'Encouraging' with 'Requiring'.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies and standards use terminology such as 'encouraging' rather than 'requiring', giving developers too much leeway and HCC too much discretion. • 'Encouraging' provides no guarantees or protections for existing property owners and is inconsistent with Policy 4G 3.9 and 4G 3.11 which 'Requires' privacy and sunlight access for adjoining sites.
202.7	Amendment 124 Policy 4G 3.9	Amend	Amend Policy 4G 3.9 to ensure there is a good level of privacy and sunlight access for adjoining sites (not less than they currently enjoy).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current policy wording is too weak and vaguely defined.
202.8	Amendment 125 Policy 4G 3.10	Amend	Amend Policy 4G 3.10(iii) to require the orientation of windows to face towards the street, rather than the sides and rear of the site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rear of sites often overlook other residential properties and impact privacy.
202.9	Amendment 126 Policy 4G 3.11	Amend	Amend Policy 4G 3.11 to 'over three stories' rather than 'over six stories.'	
202.10	Amendment 131 Policy 4G 3.16	Oppose	Delete Policy 4G 3.16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 4G 3.16 adversely impacts the existing residential property owners and is not required under the NPS-UD.
202.11	Amendment 135 Rule 4G 4.1.2 Home Occupation	Oppose	Delete Rule 4G 4.1.2. In particular, delete Rule 4.1.2(a)(iii).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule 4G 4.1.2 permits commercial activities that will adversely affect neighbours and neighbouring properties in terms of noise, does not keep with the general principle of the zone being residential, and does not comply with the health and safety standards and legislation.
202.12	Notification	Amend	Include a new objective, policy and rule requiring neighbouring property owners to be notified in advance of any proposal for buildings to be constructed that are more than three stories in height.	

202.13	Amendment 146 Rule 4G 4.2.1 Number of Dwellings per Site	Amend	Include in proposed Rule 4G 4.2.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effects on the amenity of adjoining sites; • The effects of shading on adjoining sites; and • The effects on the privacy of adjoining sites. 	
202.14	Amendment 147 Rule 4G 4.2.2 Building Coverage	Amend	Include in proposed Rule 4G 4.2.2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effects on the amenity of adjoining sites; • The effects of shading on adjoining sites; and • The effects on the privacy of adjoining sites. 	
202.15	Amendment 148 Rule 4G 4.2.3 Building Height	Oppose	Delete Rule 4G 4.2.3(a)(i) and (ii).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would allow, as a permitted activity, buildings up to 6 stories or 22m in height in the Avalon suburban residential areas (and more widely). These developments can also be located 1.5m from the front boundary and 1m from the side and rear boundaries of other properties. • This has not taken into consideration the effects on the amenity of adjoining sites, including the effects of shading and privacy.
202.16	Amendment 150 Rule 4G 4.2.5 Setbacks	Amend	Amend Rule 4G 4.2.5 (Setbacks) to require buildings to have setbacks of 3m front, side, and rear.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed setbacks of 1.5m from front boundary and 1m from side and rear boundary are inappropriate and unacceptable.

DPC56/203 Angus Gibbs				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
203.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	No specific decision requested, but opposes the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Hazards and Climate Change risk • Loss of sunlight, privacy and amenity • Potential noise from neighbours • High ground water table • Lowered properties values • Loss of carparking and impact on the street

DPC56/204 Ryman Healthcare Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
204.1	Entire plan change	Amend	Ryman seeks the relief sought by the RVA in its submission on PC56.	<p>The submitter seeks/adopts the relief sought in the Retirement Village Associations submission (submission 211). They support the RVA's submission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC56 will have a significant impact on the provision of housing and care for Lower Hutt City's growing ageing population. There is a real risk that the proposed changes will delay necessary retirement and aged care accommodation in the region. • Operational requirements result in a density and layout that differs from a typical residential development for retirement villages.

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
205.1	MDRAA	Amend	Rezone entire property at 320 Eastern Hutt Road, Stokes Valley, to Medium Density Residential Activity Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the purposes of incorporating the MDRS, the Hill Residential Zone meets the definition of a 'relevant residential zone' as defined by Part 1 of the RMA as it does not meet any of the exclusions as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is not a Large Lot Residential Zone. The Large Lot Residential Zone best matches the Rural Residential Zoning of the operative District Plan, and therefore is not excluded on the basis that it is Large Lot Residential. ○ It is predominately urban in character. ○ It is not an offshore island and is not a settlement zone. • It is appropriate to rezone this entire block of land to MDRAA, as enabled by the section 77G(4) of the RMA to give effect to policy 2 of the NPS-UD. • Rezoning larger sites allows for cohesive medium density development in which greater yields are possible as less constraints are applicable such as existing dwellings, small sites and access etc. • The site meets the definition of being infrastructure ready as it is connected to network infrastructure and supported by transportation infrastructure. • It is feasible and reasonably expected to be realised. • There are no qualifying matters.

DPC56/206 Kāinga Ora				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
206.1	Centres Hierarchy	Support in part	Review the Centres hierarchy and commercial provisions in the Commercial and Mixed-Use zones to improve national and regional consistency to enable and support increased intensification across the district.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with national direction • Regional consistency
206.2	Extent of Centres Zone	Support in part	Expand Centre Zoning to reflect an increase in intensification anticipated in and around centres and rapid transit stops	
206.3	Residential Intensification Standards in Centres	Support in part	Expand residential intensification standards to reflect an increase in intensification anticipated in and around centres and rapid transit stops.	
206.4	Consequential Amendments	Support in part	Undertake any consequential changes necessary across the District Plan to address the matters raised above (regarding the Centres Hierarchy, extent of Centre zoning, and residential intensification standards)	
206.5	District Plan Wide Standards	Support in part	Amend standards across the plan to be proportionate to the building height changes sought in this submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficient and effective implementation of NPS-UD and RMA-EHS • Notes other consequential changes may be required as building heights may be affected by other factors such as wind and daylight standards • Transition issues between zones • Providing for increased levels of intensification
206.6	District Plan Wide Standards	Support in part	Undertake any consequential changes necessary across the District Plan to address the matters raised above (regarding building height changes)	

206.7	District Plan Wide Qualifying Matters – method	Oppose	All qualifying matters and supporting overlay provisions be relocated to chapter(s) contained within District-Wide section of the District Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests qualifying matters be controlled by overlays rather than precincts as overlays is the more appropriate tool • Concerns about plan structure
206.8	Qualifying Matters – Heritage	Support	Retain as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports heritage value being a qualifying matter • Notes status quo will be retained until a future plan review occurs to introduce further controls to protect heritage values
206.9	District Plan wide Reference to Design Guides and design guidelines	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora seeks the Design Guides and design guidelines are removed from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan.</p> <p>A note should be added where reference is made to such guidelines:</p> <p><u>Note:</u></p> <p>1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council’s Design Guidelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about plan structure • Appropriateness of plan provisions that are not expressed as a rule, matter of discretion, or assessment criterion being treated as a “de facto rule” • Design guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool that sits outside the plan as guidance for best practice design outcomes • If design guidelines remain in the plan, they should be relocated to a specific rule, matter of discretion, or assessment criteria
206.10	District Plan wide Reference to Design Guides and design guidelines	Oppose	Delete all references to the Design Guides and design guidelines.	
206.11	District Plan wide Reference to Design Guides and design guidelines	Oppose	Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment.	
206.12	District Plan wide Reference to Design Guides and design guidelines	Oppose	If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the Design Guides and design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified and written in a manner	

			that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. Otherwise, there is no flexibility and scope to create a design that fits with specific site characteristics and desired built form development. Kāinga Ora seeks the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.	
206.13	Chapter 1 – 1.10.1A Urban Environment Objective	Support	Retain as notified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives effect to Objective 1 of NPS-UD and clause 6 of Schedule 3 of the Act
206.14	Chapter 1 – 1.10.1A Urban Environment Policy 1	Support in part	<p>Amendments sought:</p> <p><u>Policy 1</u></p> <p><u>Provide for building height and density of urban form that enables:</u></p> <p>a) <u>as much development capacity as possible within the Central Commercial Activity Area and Petone Commercial Activity Area - 2,</u></p> <p>b) <u>building heights of at least 6 storeys, with greater intensification enabled in identified Height Variation Control areas:</u></p> <p>i. <u>within the Petone Commercial Activity Area - 1,</u></p> <p>ii. <u>within a walkable catchment of the Central Commercial and Petone Commercial Activity Areas,</u></p> <p>iii. <u>within a walkable catchment of rapid transit stops,</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives effect to Policy 3 of NPS-UD • Consequential to other decisions requested

			<p>iv. <u>within the suburban centres of Avalon, Eastbourne, Moera, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata, and</u></p> <p>v. <u>Within a walkable catchment adjacent to the suburban centres of Naenae, Waterloo, Avalon and Moera.</u></p> <p>c) <u>building heights of at least 4-5 storeys adjacent to within a walkable catchment of the identified suburban centres, including of Eastbourne, Stokes Valley, and Wainuiomata, and</u></p> <p>d) <u>building heights of at least 3 storeys in the remainder of the urban environment, excluding Hill Residential and Landscape Protection Residential Activity Areas.</u></p>	
206.15	Chapter 1 – 1.10.1A Urban Environment Policy 2	Support	Retain as notified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives effect to Policy 4 of NPS-UD and the 77I of the Act
206.16	Chapter 1 – 1.10.1A Urban Environment Policy 3	Support	Retain as notified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives effect to clause 6 of Schedule 3 of the Act
206.17	Chapter 1 – 1.10.1A Urban Environment Policy 4	Support	Retain as notified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives effect to clause 6 of Schedule 3 of the Act
206.18	Chapter 1 – 1.10.1A Urban Environment	Support	Retain as notified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supports the guidance text

	Explanations and Reasons			
206.19	Chapter 1 - 1.10.2 Amenity Values Objective 1	Support	Retain as notified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives effect to the NPS-UD
206.20	Chapter 1 - 1.10.2 Amenity Values Objective 2	Support	Retain as notified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not given
206.21	Chapter 1 - 1.10.2 Amenity Values Policy	Support in part	<p>Amendments sought:</p> <p>To identify within all activity areas the general character and amenity values <u>of the planned built form for</u> that activity area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify
206.22	Chapter 1 - 1.10.3 Residential Activity Policy 1	Support in part	<p>Amendments sought</p> <p><u>Policy 1</u></p> <p><u>Except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant:</u></p> <p>a) <u>Apply the Medium Density Residential Standards across the Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential Activity Area.</u></p> <p>b) <u>For the areas of Eastbourne, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata in the High Medium Density Residential Activity Area, enable buildings of at least four/five storeys.</u></p> <p>c) <u>In all other areas in the High Density Residential Activity Area, enable buildings of at least six storeys and between eight to twelve storeys in identified Height Variation Control areas.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives effect to Policy 3 of NPS-UD and the Policy 2, Schedule 3A of the Act • Consequential to other decisions requested

206.23	Chapter 1 -1.10.3 Residential Activity Policy 2	Support	Retain as notified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supportive considering the policy seeks to manage the rate of urbanisation at rural/urban interface
206.24	Chapter 1 -1.10.3 Residential Activity Explanation	Support	Retain as notified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally supportive
206.25	Chapter 1 -1.10.4 Commercial Activity Policy and explanation	Support in part	<p>Amendments sought:</p> <p>(c) Recognise the Suburban Mixed Use, Suburban commercial and Special commercial centres as the secondary areas in the hierarchy, being smaller scale with a limited number of activities servicing local area needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gives effect to national direction Believes current plan change is an opportunity to review the centres hierarchy Recognise that Suburban Mixed Use centres vary in scale and are not necessarily small
206.26	Chapter 1 - 1.10.10 Heritage Policy (c)	Support in part	Retain as notified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports policy as it only applies the qualifying matter to areas with significant historic heritage value Notes that support does not include the policy applying to some land included in Residential Heritage Precinct HA-09 (see Attachment 2 of submission)
206.27	Chapter 1 – 1.10.11 Lessening Natural Hazards Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Remove natural hazard flooding overlay(s) from the District Plan statutory maps, and instead hold this information in non-statutory GIS maps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes flood hazard mapping being included in District Plans Ignores dynamic nature of flood hazards Creates additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and land developers
206.28	Chapter 1 – 1.10.11 Lessening Natural Hazards Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Create of new definitions to identify flood hazards in the Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes no formal requirement to include flood hazard maps in District Plans Considers flood management provisions should be included in the rules, but considers they should not be linked to static

206.29	Chapter 1 – 1.10.11 Lessening Natural Hazards Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Amend rule framework to enable rules to be linked to newly defined terms of Flood Hazards.	<p>maps in the District Plan and should instead be linked to defined terms for hazards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes example of the Auckland Unitary Plan • Ability to update flood hazard information without using RMA Schedule 1 processes • Notes no formal requirement to include flood hazard maps in District Plans including national planning standards • Recommends addition of five definitions to give effect to the approach suggested above. Suggested wording offered, but ultimately seeks introduction of suitable definition(s) to achieve this purpose.
206.30	Chapter 1 – 1.10.11 Lessening Natural Hazards Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Revise reference throughout plan from “flood hazard overlays” to “flood hazard areas”.	
206.31	Chapter 1 – 1.10.11 Lessening Natural Hazards Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Consequential changes to give effect to this submission (regarding the flood hazard submission points above), including addition of definitions below,	
206.32	Chapter 3 – Definitions Flood hazard – Stream corridor	New term	<p>Add new definition for “Flood hazard – Stream corridor”</p> <p><u>Corridor consisting of a buffer of five metres either side of the centre of the stream, where in a 1% AEP flood event (assuming 15% increase in rainfall under climate change) the water depth exceeds 1m and the water velocity is greater than 2m per second.</u></p> <p><u>Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property specific information.</u></p>	
206.33	Chapter 3 – Definitions Flood hazard – Overland flow path	New term	<p>Add new definition for “Flood hazard – Overland flowpath”</p> <p><u>Area of land that conveys stormwater when the pipe or stream network capacity is exceeded or</u></p>	

			<p><u>blocked in a 1% AEP flood event (assuming 15% increase in rainfall under climate change).</u> <i>Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property specific information.</i></p>
206.34	<p>Chapter 3 – Definitions</p> <p>Flood hazard - Inundation</p>	New term	<p>Add new definition for “Flood hazard – Inundation”</p> <p><u>Area of ponding that is greater than 50mm in depth in 1% AEP flood event (assuming 15% increase in rainfall under climate change) and which has low velocity flows.</u> <i>Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property specific information.</i></p>
206.35	<p>Chapter 3 – Definitions</p> <p>High hazard area</p>	New term	<p>Add new definition for “High hazard area”</p> <p><u>Land within any of the following Natural and Coastal Hazard Areas:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a) Tsunami Hazard – 1:100 year scenario inundation extent; or</u> <u>b) Coastal Hazard – existing coastal inundation extent with a 1:100 year storm;</u> <u>c) Flood Hazard - Stream Corridor (1:100 year inundation event + 1m sea level rise); or</u> <u>d) Wellington Fault Rupture (within 20m of known fault)</u> <p><i>Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property specific information.</i></p>

206.36	Chapter 3 – Definitions 1% Annual exceedance probability flood	New term	Add new definition for “1% Annual exceedance probability flood”	
206.37	Chapter 1 – 1.10.11 Lessening Natural Hazards Objective	Support in part	<p>Replace:</p> <p>To avoid or mitigate the vulnerability and risk of people and development to natural hazards. reduce the risk to people, property and infrastructure from natural and coastal hazards.</p> <p>With:</p> <p><u>Subdivision, use and development within identified natural hazard areas reduce or do not increase the risk from natural and coastal hazards to people, property and infrastructure.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adheres to risk-based hazard planning framework • Recognises importance of people, property, and infrastructure in hazard planning • Regional consistency • Clarify outcomes sought by objective • Amend to reflect that the District Plan seeks reduce risk
206.38	Chapter 1 – 1.10.11 Lessening Natural Hazards Policy	Support in part	<p><i>Amendments sought</i></p> <p>(a) To manage the siting of buildings and structures within the Wellington Fault Special Study Area.</p> <p>(aa) To manage subdivision, use and development that results in buildings 20m either side of the Wellington Fault.</p> <p>(b) To limit the scale and intensity of development in areas susceptible to the landslide hazard.</p> <p>(c) To limit the scale and density of development in areas where the risk of flooding is medium to high.</p> <p>(ca) To avoid subdivision, development and use in high flood hazard areas, unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p><u>i. The activity or subdivision has an operational and functional need to locate within the stream corridor and locating</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adheres to risk based hazard planning framework • Seeks that a qualifying statement is applied to the avoidance direction of strand (ca) of the policy.

			<p><u>outside of the stream corridor is not a practicable option;</u></p> <p><u>ii. Mitigation measures are incorporated that reduce or avoid an increase in risk to people and property from the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability Flood;</u></p> <p><u>iii. People can safely evacuate the property during a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood; and</u></p> <p><u>iv. The conveyancing of flood waters through the stream corridor is still able to occur unimpeded and is not diverted onto adjacent properties.</u></p> <p><u>(cb) To manage subdivision, development and use in medium flood hazard areas</u></p> <p><u>(cc) To require mitigation for new development in low flood hazard areas.</u></p> <p><u>(h) To manage areas susceptible to coastal hazards such as coastal erosion and sea level rise.</u></p> <p><u>(da) To manage subdivision, development and use in medium and high coastal hazard areas.</u></p> <p><u>(db) To limit the density of development in medium and high coastal hazard areas.</u></p>	
206.39	Chapter 1 – 1.10.11 Lessening Natural Hazards Explanation and Reasons – Flood Hazard	Support in part	<p>Amendments Sought</p> <p>Flood Hazard</p> <p>The Hutt River, Wainuiomata River and local streams have the potential to overflow their banks during long continuous periods of rainfall. Three flood hazards overlays have been identified to inform areas at risk to flooding. These are Stream Corridor, Overland Flowpath and Inundation Areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Inundation Area Overlay identifies is the modelled extent of inundation expected in a 1:100 year flood event. In these areas it may be necessary to mitigate the impacts of flooding. 	Generally supports the explanation, but seeks consequential changes to give effect to the above submission points regarding flood hazard maps being outside of the District Plan.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Overland Flowpath Overlay identifies is the modelled path followed by rainwater during a 1:100 year storm event. In these areas it is necessary to manage development to ensure overland flowpaths are not impeded. • The Stream Corridor Overlay identifies is the modelled extent of rivers and streams during a 1:100 year storm event. It is necessary to avoid development in these areas due to the risks associated with the velocity and volume of water flow during the storm event. <p>The overlays applied <u>identified flood hazard areas</u> incorporate the anticipated effects of climate change such as sea level rise and increased rainfall intensity.</p> <p><u>Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property specific information.</u></p> <p>In areas where the risk of flooding is medium to high the scale of density and development is limited, being set aside as rural and open space.</p>	
206.40	Chapter 3 - Definitions Construction	Support in part	<p><i>Amend as follows:</i></p> <p>Includes construction and conversion, and additions and alterations to an existing building.</p> <p><u>means undertaking or carrying out any of the following building works:</u></p> <p><u>a) erection of new buildings and structures;</u></p> <p><u>b) additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures (including conversion);</u></p> <p><u>c) total or partial demolition or removal of an existing building or structure;</u></p>	Generally supports the intent of the definition, but notes that the definition includes the defined term within its explanation.

			d) relocation of a building.	
206.41	Chapter 3 - Definitions Net Site Area	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the amendments bringing the definition into alignment with the National Planning Standards
206.42	Chapter 3 - Definitions Rapid Transit Stop	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the proposed definition.
206.43	Chapter 3 - Definitions Rapid Transit Stop	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the proposed definition.
206.44	Chapter 4 - Residential Mapping	Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to the planning maps to reflect the amendments sought to the commercial centres, centres hierarchy, and increased intensification of the HDRAA and MDRAA to better achieve well functioning urban environments and national and regional consistency.	Supports the intent of PC56 to provide intensification within walkable catchments but seeks that these are extended to better align with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD and achieve a consistent approach to the residential zone framework throughout the region.
206.45	Chapter 4 - Residential Mapping	Support in part	The key changes sought are outlined in Appendix 2 of the submission.	Indicative mapping changes are outlined in Appendix 2 based on walkable catchment analysis taking into consideration amenities and connectivity. Mapping changes are required to better achieve well-functioning urban environments and national and regional consistency.
206.46	Chapter 4 - Residential Mapping	Support in part	Seeks expansion of the HDRAA to apply to areas that are generally: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Within a 15min/1200m walkable catchment from the edge of the city centre; ii. Increase the maximum height to 43m (12 storeys) within a 400m/5-10min walkable catchment from the city centre, demonstrated with a Height Variation Control overlay; iii. Increase the maximum height to 29m (eight storeys) within a 800m/10min walkable catchment from the city centre, 	Changes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning residential areas around the centres of Eastbourne, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata from HDRAA to MDRAA to better reflect the scale of anticipated urban built form in these locations, while also making explicit provision for increased height/intensification (via a height variation tool or similar) to enable heights of 18m (4-5 storeys) within a 5min/400m catchment of the centres. Kāinga Ora

			<p>demonstrated with a Height Variation Control overlay;</p> <p>iv. Seek for the expansion of the HDRAA in 10min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of Petone Mixed Commercial Activity Areas;</p> <p>v. Increase the maximum heights to 36m (10 storeys) within a 400m/5-10min walkable catchment of the Petone commercial centre, demonstrated with a Height Variation Control overlay;</p> <p>vi. Seek for the expansion of the HDRAA in 10min/800m walkable catchment from rapid transit stops;</p> <p>vii. Seek for the expansion of the HDRAA in 10min/800m walkable catchment around the Suburban Mixed Use Activity Areas in Waterloo and Naenae; and</p> <p>viii. Increase the maximum heights to 29m (eight storeys) within a 400m/5-10min walkable catchment of the Waterloo and Naenae commercial areas, demonstrated with a Height Variation Control.</p>	<p>supports the use of HDRAA zone when heights of at least 6 storeys (22m) are enabled.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applying a height variation control elsewhere in the MDRAA within a 400m catchment of centres (the equivalent of Local Centres) to enable heights of 18m where the HDRAA applied in accordance with Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD doesn't extend. Enabling greater intensification through a height variation control overlay in the HDRAA within 800m of the city centre, 400m of Petone, Naenae and Waterloo. Increasing the spatial extent of HDRAA around the centre of Naenae, which Kāinga Ora considers to be the equivalent of a Town Centre Zone.
206.47	Chapter 4 - Residential Mapping	Support in part	Rezone the residential areas surrounding the centres of Eastbourne, Stokes Valley, and Wainuiomata to MDRAA.	
206.48	Chapter 4 - Residential Mapping	Support in part	Apply a Height Variation Control of 18m height limit over the residential areas within a 5-10min/400m walkable catchment of these centres – Eastbourne, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata.	
206.49	Chapter 4 - Residential Mapping	Support in part	Apply the introduced Height Variation Control over residential areas within 400m of other identified centres – in Appendix 2. These are centres on Elizabeth Street, Burnside & Lockett streets, and Stelin & High streets.	

206.50	Chapter 4 - Residential Mapping	Support in part	Accept all changes sought from Kāinga Ora to the planning maps as shown in Appendix 2 of the submission.	
206.51	Chapter 4 - Residential Mapping	Support in part	Other than the changes sought in this submission and in Appendix 2 of the submission, retain the zoning as notified.	
206.52	Chapter 4 - Residential Mapping	Support in part	Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the changes sought and this submission.	
206.53	Chapter 4 - Residential Opening paragraphs	Support in part	<p><u>Existing</u> Dwelling densities range from high to low, within the context of this City. Higher dwelling densities can be found in Petone between the Esplanade and Jackson Street, which are a reflection of historical subdivision patterns.</p> <p>Medium densities are found in most parts of the City, whereas low dwelling densities are present in the steeper hillside areas of the Western Hills, Stokes Valley, Wainuiomata, and Eastbourne, and also in parts of Woburn, Military Road and Lowry Bay.</p> <p>(f) Medium Density Residential Activity Area</p> <p>This area provides opportunity for a variety of medium residential developments such as detached dwellings, terraced housing and low-rise apartments. It is mostly located around selected suburban centres and close to transport hubs and acts as a transitional area between higher density mixed-use areas and low to medium density residential activity areas.</p> <p><u>The Medium Density Residential Activity Area covers a significant portion of Lower Hutt's residential areas, including areas in the Hutt Valley floor, Western Hills, Stokes Valley, Wainuiomata and Eastern Bays. The Medium Density Residential Activity Area typically covers areas that have a lower level of access to</u></p>	<p>Supports the introductory text and residential zoning framework. Some amendments are sought to reflect changes sought in the overall submission.</p> <p>Supports the application of the high density zone framework in residential locations where heights of at least 6 storeys are enabled. Where heights between 3-5 storeys are enabled, seeks that the underlying zoning framework to be a medium density zone, with a height variation control to enable additional height in identified areas. Seeks a nationally consistent approach to zoning frameworks in this regard. A consequential change of this approach requires explicit provision to be made for increased height/intensification (via a height variation tool or similar) beyond three storeys in residential areas around identified centres (including around Eastbourne, Stokes Valley, and Wainuiomata, which were proposed to be located in the HDRAA chapter in PC56). Seeking additional height beyond 6 storeys (22m) around the city centre and Petone, Naenae, and Waterloo.</p> <p>Changes are therefore sought to the introductory statement relevant to the new High Density Residential Area to describe the outcomes of the zone more appropriately. Amendments are sought to introductory paragraph to clarify that the description of density is based on existing residential development and not the planned built urban form.</p>

		<p><u>commercial centres, community facilities and rapid transit services than areas in the High Density Residential Activity Area. However, building heights and densities are expected to change over time. A mix of low to medium density residential development is permitted in the Medium Density Residential Activity Area. This includes stand-alone, and multi-unit developments (such as semidetached, and terraced housing, and low-rise apartments) of three storeys. Some areas within the Medium Density Residential Activity Area have also been identified as being suitable to accommodate a higher density of residential development, subject to scale and design. These areas are within a walkable catchment of a local centre and are supported by a well-functioning urban environment. Resource consent is required for higher density development that does not meet the development standards for the zone.</u></p> <p><u>(g) High Density Residential Activity Area</u></p> <p><u>The High Density Residential Activity Area covers residential areas with good access to a range of commercial activities, community facilities and public transport. This includes areas surrounding train stations, the Lower Hutt city centre, Petone metropolitan centre and some suburban centres.</u></p> <p><u>Opportunities for a variety of medium and high density residential developments such as detached dwellings, terraced housing and low-rise apartments are provided for in this Activity Area. Higher density development is enabled in the High Density Residential Activity Area by permitting multi-unit developments of up to three-storey buildings and enabling taller buildings through a resource consent process. The High Density Residential Activity Area anticipates a built urban environment of at least six storeys, with greater intensification enabled in identified areas</u></p>	
--	--	--	--

			surrounding the Lower Hutt city centre and Petone, Naenae and Waterloo.	
206.54	Chapter 4A – General Residential Activity Area Entire chapter	Support	Delete as proposed	Supports the deletion of this chapter.
206.55	Chapter 4B – Special Residential Activity Area Entire chapter	Support	Delete as proposed	Supports the deletion of this chapter.
206.56	Chapter 4C – Historic Residential Activity Area Entire chapter	Support	Delete as proposed	Supports the deletion of this chapter.
206.57	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area 4F 1 Introduction/ Zone Statement	Support in part	<p>Built development is provided for in the Medium Density Residential Activity Area through a range of permitted activities and development standards that permit three residential units per site and buildings of up to three storeys. Development standards also address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the impacts of built development on adjoining sites and the streetscape, ii. stormwater management, and iii. provision of open space for residents <p>Development of four or more residential units are also encouraged through the policy framework and provided for through a resource consenting process in order to: If a proposed development does not meet the development standards, resource consent is required in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. achieve a high quality built environment; 	<p>Supports the intent of this introduction statement but seeks some changes to simplify, while also clearly noting that further intensification is encouraged in the policy framework and enabled around key centres and areas that are well serviced by transport and amenities.</p> <p>Seeks that these areas are identified on the Planning Maps as height variation areas in the MDRAA. These areas are sought around a 5min/400m catchment of identified centres, including within Eastbourne, Stokes Valley, and Wainuiomata. Acknowledges these areas are currently proposed to be HDRAA in the notified plan change with a proposed height restriction control limiting height to 14m. Kāinga Ora seeks national and regional consistency in locating built form of this scale within a Medium Density Residential zone, with a height variation control to enable heights of 4-5 storeys (18m) within these areas.</p> <p>Consistent with its submission of other District Plan reviews and changes in the Wellington region, seeks the same principle to be applied to a 400m catchment around centres that are the equivalent of a Local Centre. In the case of Hutt City, this is</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. <u>manage the effects of development on neighbouring sites;</u> iii. <u>achieve high quality onsite living environments; and</u> iv. <u>achieve attractive and safe streets and public space.</u> <p>...</p> <p><u>The Medium Density Residential Activity Area covers a significant portion of Lower Hutt's residential areas, including areas in the Hutt Valley floor, Western Hills, Stokes Valley, Wainuiomata and Eastern Bays. The Medium Density Residential Activity Area typically covers areas that have a lower level of access to commercial centres, community facilities and rapid transit services than the High Density Residential Activity Area. While areas in the Medium Density Residential Activity Area are predominantly residential in nature, non-residential activities are provided for where they are compatible with the residential character of the area and serve the local community. The planned urban built character for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area is a mix of low to medium density development, including detached dwellings, terraced housing and low-rise apartments. It is expected that the urban built character of an area will arise from the flexibility provided for by the Plan for individual development to take any low to medium density form. This supports increasing the capacity and choice of housing within neighbourhoods. It is anticipated that the appearance of neighbourhoods in the Activity Area will change over time as the number of medium density residential developments increases, including through increased opportunities for terraced housing and low-rise apartments.</u> Within this</p>	<p>relevant to catchments within 400m of the centre where the HDRAA doesn't otherwise apply through the implementation of Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD.</p>
--	--	---	--

			context, the zone also recognises that additional height is appropriate in identified areas surrounding centres that are served by frequent public transport, a range of community services, schools, and other day-to-day services that will support growth intensification. These areas are around the centres, including Eastbourne, Stokes Valley, and Wainuiomata, and are identified by height variation controls on the planning maps.	
206.58	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area 4F 1 Introduction/ Zone Statement	Support in part	Move design guides outside the plan to be non-statutory documents.	Supports design guides sitting outside of the Plan, as a non-statutory tool to assist in assessing quality design outcomes.
206.59	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4F 2.1AA	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the objective.
206.60	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4F 2.3	Support in part	The Medium Density Residential Activity Area provides for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to: i. Housing needs and demand, and ii. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including three storey buildings, and additional height and density in areas of high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity, and community services.	Supports the objective but seeks amendments to provide for further intensification in areas in the MRZ with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity, and community services.
206.61	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4F 2.3A	Support in part	Recognise that the neighbourhood's planned urban built character is defined through the flexibility of individual developments to take any low to reflecting a medium density form of up to three storeys.	Supports the objective but seeks some amendments to articulate the anticipated outcome more clearly.

206.62	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4F 2.3AA	New objective	A greater intensity of built form (4-5 storeys) is provided for around identified centres that are supported by a well-functioning urban environment.	Seeks a new objective to recognise that additional height (4-5 storeys) is provided in identified areas that are well supported by a well-functioning urban environment in the Medium Density Residential Activity Area. These areas are sought around the centres of Eastbourne, Stokes Valley, and Wainuiomata. Acknowledges these areas are currently proposed to be HDRAA in the notified plan change with a proposed a height restriction control limiting height to 14m. Seeks national/regional consistency in locating built form of this scale within a Medium Density Zone, with a height variation control to enable heights of 4-5 storeys (18m) within these areas.
206.63	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4F 2.5	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the objective.
206.64	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4F 2.8	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the objective.
206.65	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.2	Support in part	Enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities within the Medium Density Residential Activity Area, including three storey attached and detached dwellings and low-rise apartments, and additional height and density in areas of high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services.	Supports this policy as required by schedule 3A of the Act. Seeks an addition to the policy to recognise the need for additional height and density in areas of high accessibility.
206.66	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.2A	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy as required by schedule 3A of the Act.
206.67	Chapter 4F – Medium Density	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy as required by schedule 3A of the Act.

	Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.2B			
206.68	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.2C	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the policy.
206.69	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.2D	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the policy.
206.70	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.2E	New policy	<p>Provide for residential intensification of a site where it can be demonstrated that the development contributes positive design outcomes and living environments, taking into consideration the following design objectives as relevant to the specific site, development type, and the planned urban built environment of the zone:</p> <p><i>Built form:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Optimise the quality of the built outcome with an integrated, comprehensive design approach. 2. Achieve a positive frontage to the street. 3. Achieve visual interest and avoid visual monotony while also achieving aesthetic coherence and integration. 4. Achieve driveways, manoeuvring and parking areas that are safe, convenient and attractive. <p><i>Amenity and well-being</i></p>	Seeks the addition of a new policy that provides specific policy guidance for residential intensification and the design outcomes anticipated in such developments. This policy is later referred to as a matter of discretion within the relevant rule.

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Integrate building form and open space design to achieve high internal amenity and form well-located and usable private open spaces. 6. Achieve reasonable sunlight, daylight and outlook. 7. Provide reasonable internal visual privacy for all units within a development. 8. Ensure outdoor living areas are well-located, functional for the intended use, and high quality. 9. Achieve visual amenity, safety and functionality with planting. 10. Achieve high quality, legible and efficient circulation. 11. Provide for servicing that is suitably generous, convenient 	
206.71	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.2E	New policy	Insert design guidance directly into matters of discretion for the rule.	An alternative relief would be providing this guidance directly into the matters of discretion within the rule.
206.72	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.3	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the policy.
206.73	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.4	Support	Delete as proposed	Supports the deletion of these policies

	Policy 4F 3.5			
206.74	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.6	Oppose	Require built development to maintain a reasonable level <u>make adequate provision for</u> privacy and sunlight access for to adjoining sites, <u>having regard to the planned urban built environment for the zone.</u>	Kāinga Ora notes that changes are not proposed to this policy in the Plan Change. However, Kāinga Ora seeks amendment to recognise the changing built form will not always result in the maintenance of privacy and sunlight. Policy 6 of the NPS-UD is clear that amenity levels will change through a changing urban built form.
206.75	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.7	Support	Delete as proposed	Supports the deletion of this policy
206.76	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.8	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy as required by schedule 3A of the Act.
206.77	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.10	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
206.78	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4F 3.13	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
206.79	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Rules 4F 4.1.1 to 4F 4.1.10	Support	Retain as notified	Notes no significant changes are proposed and supports these rules

206.80	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Rule 4F 4.11 Vegetation Removal	Oppose	Delete entire proposed rule. Replace with: a) The removal of vegetation (whether indigenous or exotic) is a permitted activity.	Opposes the proposed changes to this rule and seeks the retention of the existing rule. Considers the proposed rule is too broad and may constrain the supply of housing. Notes that the District Plan already requires minimum onsite landscaping in this zone, and Notable Trees are protected elsewhere in the Plan. Acknowledges that Council must give effect to higher order planning documents in the identification and protection of indigenous biodiversity but considers the rule, as proposed, is inappropriate.
206.81	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area 4F 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4F 4.2.1AA Number of Residential Units per Site	Support in part	Rule 4F 4.2.1AA - Number of Residential Units per Site 1. No more than three residential units occupy the site; and 2. Compliance with the following standards is achieved: i. 4F 4.2.1 - building coverage ii. 4F 4.2.2 – building height; iii. 4F 4.2.3 – HIRTB; iv. 4F 4.2.4 –only in relation to the rear/side yard boundary setback v. 4F 4.2.11 – outlook space Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with 4F 4.2.1AA(1). Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood; 2. The development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape; 3. The extent and effects on the three waters infrastructure, achieved by demonstrating that at the point of connection the infrastructure has the capacity to service the development; and	Supports the rule but seeks changes to clarify that the rule applies to construction of new residential units, as well as amendments to the matters of discretion.

		<p><u>4. The degree to which the development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale.</u></p> <p><u>Activity status: Restricted discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> a. <u>Compliance is not achieved with 4F 4.2.1AA(2).</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> 1. <u>The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard.</u></p> <p><u>Notification:</u></p> <p>1. <u>An application for resource consent which complies with 4.2.1AA(1) but does not comply with 4.2.1AA(2) is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p>2. <u>An application for resource consent made which does not comply with 4.2.1AA(1) but complies with 4.2.1AA(2) is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u></p> <p>3. <u>An application for resource consent made which does not comply with 4.2.1AA(1) and 4.2.1AA(2) but complies 4F 4.2.2 – building height and 4F 4.2.1 – building coverage is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u> <u>(a) Up to three residential units per site are a permitted activity.</u> <u>(b) Four or more residential units per site are a restricted discretionary activity.</u> <u>Discretion is restricted to:</u> <u>(i) The planned urban built character for the Medium</u> <u>(ii) The matters in Policies 4F 3.2B and 4F 3.8.</u> <u>(iii) The on-site amenity for future occupants of the development.</u></p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p><u>(iv) The capacity of the network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, stormwater and land transport to service the proposed development.</u></p> <p><u>(v) Any positive effects, including positive effects of increasing housing capacity and variety.</u></p> <p><u>(vi) The following design elements:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Building height</u> <u>2. Recession planes and setbacks</u> <u>3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces</u> <u>4. Open space and boundary treatments</u> <u>5. Entrances, carparking and garages</u> <u>6. Onsite stormwater management</u> <u>7. End / side wall treatment</u> <u>8. Building materials</u> <u>9. Bike parking, storage and service areas</u> <u>10. Privacy and safety</u> <u>11. Landscaping</u> <p><u>When considering the Council will be guided by its Medium Density Design Guide.</u></p>	
206.82	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area 4F 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4F 4.2.1AA Number of Residential Units per Site	Support in part	Retain non-notification clauses.	Supports the non-notification clauses, as it is consistent with the prescribed MDRS.
206.83	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules)	Support in part	<p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p><u>(iaa) The planned urban built character for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area.</u></p> <p>(i) The effects on the privacy of adjoining sites.</p>	Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status of this rule where the permitted standard is not complied with.

	Rule 4F 4.2.1 Building Coverage		(ii) The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area, the streetscape and adjoining public space.	
206.84			Note: When addressing or assessing potential effects in relation to matters (i) and (ii) above, applicants and the Council can be informed by the relevant outcomes identified in the Medium Density Design Guide.	Seeks removal of the note, which advises that the (non-statutory) design guide will be used as a tool to assess the effects of a proposal that exceeds this density standard. Assessment of site coverage breaches are at the lower end of consenting complexity and do not require a qualitative assessment against a design guide.
206.85			Retain preclusion for public notification.	Supports the preclusion of public notification for any breach to this rule.
206.86	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area Rule 4F 4.2.2 Building height	Support in part	(a) Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if: (i) The building does not exceed a maximum height of 40m 11m except that 50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed this height by 1m where the entire roof slopes 15 degrees or more. <u>(ii) 18m on sites subject to the Height Variation Control shown on the planning maps</u> ...	Supports the maximum permitted height standard aligning with the MDRS across much of the MDRAA. However, Kāinga Ora seeks an amended rule framework that provides for additional height allowance in identified areas around centres and in areas well serviced by public transport and community. Seeks that these areas are identified on the planning maps. The areas where additional height is being sought are within a 400m catchment of the centres of Eastbourne, Stokes Valley, and Wainuiomata, and in areas within the MDRAA surrounding local centres that are not otherwise zoned HDRAA through the course of implementing Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD.
206.87			(b) Construction or alteration of a building that does not comply with Rule 4F 4.2.2(a) is a restricted discretionary activity.	Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status of this rule where the permitted standard is not complied with.
206.88			Discretion is restricted to: <u>(iaa) The planned urban built character for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area.</u> (i) The effects on the privacy of adjoining sites. (ii) The effects on shading of adjoining sites <u>including the impacts of shading on their primary internal and external living areas throughout the year.</u> (iii) The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area and adjoining streetscape.	Seeks simplification of the prescribed matters of discretion, and therefore seeks the deletion of the strand relating to the listed “design elements”. These matters are adequately addressed either within the remaining matters of discretion, and/or by other density standards.

			<p>(iiia) The effects of shading and additional building bulk on any public open space or recreational grounds and their ability to provide outdoor amenity to users.</p> <p>(iiib) Any design features or articulation to reduce the bulk of the building when viewed from neighbouring properties.</p> <p>(iv) The following mixed-use and medium density residential development design elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building height 2. Recession planes and setbacks 3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces 4. Open space and boundary treatments 5. Entrances, carparking and garages 6. Onsite stormwater management 7. End / side wall treatment 8. Building materials 9. Bike parking, storage and service areas 10. Privacy and safety 11. Landscaping 	
206.89			<p>When considering the matters in (iv), the Council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide.</p>	Seeks removal of the note, which advises that the (non-statutory) design guide will be used as a tool to assess the effects of a proposal that exceeds this density standard.
206.90			Retain preclusion for public notification.	Supports the preclusion of public notification for any breach to this rule.
206.91	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) Rule 4F 4.2.3 Height in relation to boundary	Support in part	<p>a) Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if the following recession plane height in relation to boundary requirements are being met:</p> <p>(i) 3.5m +45° 4m +60° from all side and rear boundaries; or</p> <p>(ii) Within areas subject to a height variation control to enable 18m only:</p> <p>a. 60° recession plane measured from a point 6 metres vertically above ground level along the first 22 metres of the side boundary as measured from the road frontage; and</p>	Supports the height in relation to boundary (HIRB) standard, which reflects the MDRS. Seeks an amended rule framework that provides for a more flexible HIRB in identified areas around centres to enable the additional height sought in these locations. Seeks that these areas are identified on the planning maps.

		<p>b. 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level at:</p> <p>i. Any boundary further than 22 metres from the road frontage; and</p> <p>ii. The common boundary of any site outside of the height variation control</p> <p>...</p> <p>Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way, the height in relation to boundary applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way. This standard does not apply to:</p> <p>(a) A boundary with a road,</p> <p>(b) Existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site, and</p> <p>(c) Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between two buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed.</p>	
206.92		<p>(b) Construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the recession plane height in relation to boundary requirements Rule 4F 4.2.3(a) is a restricted discretionary activity.</p>	Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status of this rule where the permitted standard is not complied with.
206.93		<p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>(iaa) The planned urban built character for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area.</p> <p>(i) The effects on the privacy of adjoining sites.</p> <p>(ii) The effects on shading of adjoining sites, including the impacts of shading on their primary internal and external living areas.</p> <p>(iii) The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area and adjoining streetscape.</p> <p>(iv) The impacts of shading and additional building bulk on any public open space or recreational grounds and their ability to provide outdoor amenity to users.</p> <p>(v) The following design elements:</p> <p>1. Building height</p>	Seeks simplification of the prescribed matters of discretion, and therefore seeks the deletion of the strand relating to the listed “design elements”. These matters are adequately addressed either within the remaining matters of discretion, and/or by other density standards.

			<p>2. Recession Planes</p> <p>3. End / side wall treatment</p> <p>4. Privacy and safety</p>	
206.94			<p>Note: When addressing or assessing potential effects in relation to matters (i) to (vi) above, applicants and the Council can be informed by the relevant outcomes identified in the Medium Density Design Guide.</p>	<p>Seeks removal of the note, which advises that the (non-statutory) design guide will be used as a tool to assess the effects of a proposal that exceeds this density standard. Considers a breach of this nature does not warrant a qualitative assessment against a design guide.</p>
206.95			<p>Retain preclusion for public notification.</p>	<p>Supports the preclusion of public notification for any breach to this rule.</p>
206.96	<p>Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) Rule 4F 4.2.4 Setbacks</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>(a) Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if:</p> <p>...</p> <p>(i) Buildings are set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed below:</p> <p>Front yard: 1.5m</p> <p>Side yard: 1m</p> <p>Rear yard: 1m (excluded on corner sites)</p> <p>This standard does not apply to site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed.</p> <p>Eaves may encroach into any yard by up to 0.6m.</p> <p>(b) Construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the yard setback requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</p>	<p>Supports the setbacks standard, which reflects the MDRS. However, adjustments are sought, to make the rule more effective.</p>
206.97			<p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>(iaa) The planned urban built character for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area.</p> <p>(i) The effects on the privacy of adjoining sites.</p> <p>(ii) The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area, the streetscape and adjoining public space.</p>	<p>Seeks simplification of the prescribed matters of discretion, and therefore seeks the deletion of the strand relating to the listed “design elements”. These matters are adequately addressed either within the remaining matters of discretion, and/or by other density standards.</p>

			<p><u>(iii) The effect from any building bulk and its proximity to the main internal and external living areas of adjoining residential properties.</u></p> <p>(iv) The following design elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building height 2. Recession Planes 3. End / side wall treatment 4. Privacy and safety 	
206.98			<p>Note: When addressing or assessing potential effects in relation to matters (iaa) to (iv) above, applicants and the Council can be informed by the relevant outcomes identified in the Medium Density Design Guide.</p>	Seeks removal of the note, which advises that the (non-statutory) design guide will be used as a tool to assess the effects of a proposal that exceeds this density standard. Assessment setbacks are at the lower end of consenting complexity and do not require a qualitative assessment against a design guide.
206.99			Retain preclusion for public notification.	Supports the preclusion of public notification for any breach to this rule.
206.100	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) Rule 4F 4.2.4A Height in Relation to Boundary and Setbacks for Sites Abutting Marae in the Community Iwi Activity Area	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule framework, noting that the more restrictive HIRB and setbacks are only applicable to sites directly abutting a marae in the Community Iwi Activity Area.
206.101	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules)	Support in part	<p>a. Construction or alteration of a building, or new impermeable surfaces, is a permitted activity, if:</p> <p>(i) A minimum of 30% of the site area is a permeable surface.</p>	Supports the requirement to maintain a minimum permeable surface across 30% of the site area. However, seeks the removal of 4f 4.2.5 (b)(iv) (list of design elements) in its entirety along with the removal of the note referencing assessment being made against the design guide for this rule.

	Rule 4F 4.2.5 Permeable Surface		<p>b. Construction or alteration of a building, or new impermeable surfaces, that do not meet the above permitted permeable surface requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>i. The effects on the stormwater system.</p> <p>ii. The potential for increased surface ponding and flooding.</p> <p>iii. The mitigation of additional stormwater runoff through means such as onsite stormwater retention.</p> <p>(iv) The following mixed-use and medium density residential development design elements:</p> <p>1. Building height</p> <p>2. Recession planes and setbacks</p> <p>3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces</p> <p>4. Open space and boundary treatments</p> <p>5. Entrances, carparking and garages</p> <p>6. Onsite stormwater management</p> <p>7. End / side wall treatment</p> <p>8. Building materials</p> <p>9. Bike parking, storage and service areas</p> <p>10. Privacy and safety</p> <p>11. Landscaping</p> <p>When considering the matters in (v), the Council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide.</p>	
206.102			Introduce preclusion clause for limited notification	Seeks the preclusion of public and limited notification for any breach to this rule.
206.103	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) Rule 4F 4.2.6	Support in part	<p>Delete:</p> <p>1. 4F 4.2.6(b)(iii) (list of design elements)</p> <p>2. Reference to assessment being made against the design guide</p>	Supports the outdoor living space standard, which is consistent with the MDRS. However, seeks the removal of 4F 4.2.6 (b)(iii) (list of design elements) in its entirety along with the removal of the note referencing assessment being made against the design guide for this rule.

206.104	Outdoor Living Space		Introduce preclusion clause for limited notification	Seeks the preclusion of limited notification for any breach to this rule.
206.105	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) Rule 4F 4.2.7 Accessory Building	Support in part	Introduce preclusion clause for public notification.	Supports the proposed administrative changes to this rule. Seeks the introduction of a notification preclusion for public notification.
206.106	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) Rule 4F 4.2.8 Screening and storage	Support in part	Delete: 1. 4F 4.2.8(b)(iii) (list of design elements) 2. Reference to assessment being made against the design guide	Notes this is an existing standard and only administrative changes are proposed. Seeks these amendments go further resulting in the removal of 4F 4.2.8(b)(iii) (list of design elements) in its entirety along with the removal of the note referencing assessment being made against the design guide for this rule.
206.107	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) Rule 4F 4.2.11	Support in part	Delete: 1. 4F 4.2.8(b)(iii) (list of design elements) 2. Reference to assessment being made against the design guide	Seeks the removal of the note referencing assessment being made against the design guide for a breach to this rule.
206.108	Outlook Space (per unit)		Introduce preclusion clause for limited notification	Supports this rule, but also seeks the preclusion of limited notification for any breach of this rule.
206.109	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) Rule 4F 4.2.12	Support in part	Delete: 1. 4F 4.2.12(b)(iii) (list of design elements) 2. Reference to assessment being made against the design guide	Supports the windows to street standard, which is consistent with the MDRS. Seeks the removal of 4F 4.2.12 (b)(iii) (list of design elements) in its entirety along with the removal of the note referencing assessment being made against the design guide for this rule.
206.110	Windows to Street		Introduce preclusion clause for limited notification	Seeks the preclusion of limited notification for any breach to this rule.

206.111	Chapter 4F – Medium Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) Rule 4F 4.2.13 Landscaped Area	Support in part	Delete: 1. 4F 4.2.13(b)(ix) (list of design elements) 2. Reference to assessment being made against the design guide	Supports the landscaped area standard, which is consistent with the MDRS. Seeks the removal of 4F 4.2.13 (b)(ix) (list of design elements) in its entirety along with the removal of the note referencing assessment being made against the design guide for this rule.
206.112			Introduce preclusion clause for limited notification.	Seeks the preclusion of limited notification for any breach to this rule.
206.113	Chapter 4F 5 – Precincts and Schedules Sites 4F 5.1 Residential Heritage Precinct	Oppose in part	1. Change to the boundary of the proposed heritage area HA-09 to exclude landholdings / buildings that (a) retain little heritage value due to modifications and (b) are considered not to contribute to the proposed housing area (consistent with the attached at Appendix 2).	Opposes (in part) of Council proposed heritage areas. Kāinga Ora has commissioned a heritage assessment, which has concluded that there are a number of proposed landholdings/buildings that have little heritage value, largely due to modifications that have significantly altered heritage and architectural values. Seeks the following amendments to the proposed Petone State Flats Heritage Area.
206.114	Chapter 4F 5 – Precincts and Schedules Sites 4F 5.1 Residential Heritage Precinct	Oppose in part	Change the title of heritage area HA-09 to: Petone State Flats Housing Area	1. Change title of the heritage area to: “Petone State Housing Area” 2. Change to the boundary of the proposed heritage area to exclude landholdings/buildings that
206.115	Chapter 4F 5 – Precincts and Schedules Sites 4F 5.1 Residential Heritage Precinct	Oppose in part	Change to an overlay, not as a precinct.	(a) retain little heritage value due to modifications and (b) are considered not to contribute to the proposed housing area. Considers that qualifying matters should be identified as overlays and addressed as district-wide provisions, rather than precincts within zone-based chapters. On this basis, Kāinga Ora requests that identified areas with recognised significant heritage values are managed and addressed with appropriate provisions and rules within a Heritage Chapter, in accordance with the National Planning Standards.
206.116	Chapter 4F 5 – Precincts and Schedules Sites 4F 5.1 Residential Heritage Precinct	Oppose in part	Relocate provisions and rules to the District-wide chapter, rather than being located within the residential chapters	Queries the presence of a permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings, as this would result in the potential loss of heritage buildings within the interim period that Council

206.117	Chapter 4F 5 – Precincts and Schedules Sites 4F 5.1 Residential Heritage Precinct	Oppose in part	Change the activity status of demolition of buildings from permitted to discretionary.	undertakes a plan change to review and strengthen the heritage provisions.
206.118	Chapter 4F 5 – Precincts and Schedules Sites 4F 5.1 Residential Heritage Precinct	Oppose in part	Make any consequential amendments to give effect to this submission and the relief/s sought.	
206.119	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Mapping	Support in part	Seeks amendments to the planning maps to reflect the amendments sought to the commercial centres, centres hierarchy, and increased intensification of the HDRAA and MDRAA to better achieve well-functioning urban environments and national and regional consistency.	<p>Supports the introduction and application of a High Density Residential Zone. Opportunities for further high density housing are sought to support the role and function of a wider range of Centres in order to achieve well-functioning urban environments in accordance with the NPS-UD. Consequential changes to maps and provisions are sought to give effect to these changes.</p> <p>Additional height is sought around the city centre and Petone Commercial Activity Area, and around the Naenae and Waterloo centre (the latter in recognition of the role and function this centre plays). Rather than restrict height in the HDRAA below six storeys around the commercial centres of Eastbourne, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata.</p>
206.120	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Mapping	Support in part	The key changes sought are outlined in Appendix 2 .	
206.121	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Mapping	Support in part	<p>Seek for the expansion of the HDRAA to apply to areas that are generally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Seek for the expansion of the HDRAA in 15min/1200m walkable catchment from the edge of the city centre; ii. Increase the maximum height to 43m (12 storeys) within a 400m/5- 10min walkable catchment from the city centre, demonstrated with a Height Variation Control overlay; iii. Increase the maximum height to 29m (eight storeys) within a 800m/10min walkable catchment from the city centre, demonstrated with a Height Variation Control overlay; 	
				<p>Seeks that these surrounding residential areas instead be zoned as MDRAA and subject to a height variation control to enable heights of 4-5 storeys (18m).</p> <p>Consequential changes are sought in the MDRAA to give effect to this.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Seek for the expansion of the HDRAA in 10min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of Petone Mixed Commercial Activity Areas; v. Increase the maximum heights to 36m (10 storeys) within a 400m/5-10min walkable catchment of the Petone commercial centre; demonstrated with a Height Variation Control overlay; vi. Seek for the expansion of the HDRAA in 10min/800m walkable catchment from rapid transit stops; vii. Seek for the expansion of the HDRAA in 10min/800m walkable catchment around the Suburban Mixed Use Activity Areas in Waterloo and Naenae; and viii. Increase the maximum heights to 29m (eight storeys) within a 400m/5-10min walkable catchment of the Waterloo and Naenae commercial areas, demonstrated with a Height Variation Control. 	
206.122	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Mapping	Support in part	Rezone the residential areas surrounding the centres of Eastbourne, Stokes Valley, and Wainuiomata to MDRAA.	
206.123	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Mapping	Support in part	Apply a Height Variation Control of 18m height limit over the residential areas within a 5-10min/400m walkable catchment of these centres – Eastbourne, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata.	
206.124	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Mapping	Support in part	Apply the introduced Height Variation Control over residential areas within 400m of other identified centres – in Appendix 2. These are centres on Elizabeth Street, Burnside & Lockett streets, and Stellin & High streets.	
206.125	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area	Support in part	Accept all changes sought from Kāinga Ora to the planning maps as shown in Appendix 2 .	

	Mapping			
206.126	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Mapping	Support in part	Other than the changes sought in this submission and in Appendix 2 , retain the zoning as notified	
206.127	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Mapping	Support in part	Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the changes sought and this submission.	
206.128	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area 4F 1 Introduction/ Zone Statement	Support in part	<p><u>The High Density Residential Activity Area covers residential areas with a higher level of access to commercial activities and community facilities. This includes areas surrounding train stations, the Lower Hutt city centre and Petone metropolitan centre as well as some suburban centres.</u></p> <p><u>While areas in the High Density Residential Activity Area are predominantly residential in nature, non-residential activities are provided for within the Activity Area where they are compatible with residential activities.</u></p> <p>The planned urban built character for the High Density Residential Activity Area is high density residential development, including detached dwellings, terraced housing and apartments. The planned urban built character of the High Density Residential Activity Area includes buildings of at least six storeys in most of the Activity Area. The urban built character of an area will arise from the flexibility provided for by the Plan for individual development to take any low to high density form. This supports increasing the capacity and choice of housing within neighbourhoods. It is anticipated that the</p>	<p>Supports the intent of this introduction statement but seeks some changes to frame the anticipated outcome of the zone and enable greater levels of intensification around key centres and areas that are well serviced by transport and amenities more effectively. Seeks that these areas are identified on the Planning Maps as height variation areas.</p> <p>Notes support for design guides sitting outside of the Plan, as a non-statutory tool to assist in assessing quality design outcomes.</p>

		<p>appearance of neighbourhoods in the High Density Residential Activity Area It is expected that the <u>urban built form of an area will change over time</u> as the number of high density residential developments increases including through increased opportunities for terraced housing and apartments.</p> <p><u>Built development is provided for in the High Density Residential Activity Area through a range of permitted activities and development standards that permit three six dwellings per site and buildings of up to six storeys in most of the Activity Area and four storeys for areas in Eastbourne, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata.</u> Some areas have been identified as being suited to a more intensive built form through increased building heights than the standard zone height. These areas are located within a walkable catchment of the City Centre and Petone Commercial Activity Area, Naenae and Waterloo. They are identified on the planning maps as Height Variation Controls.</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>If a proposed development does not meet the development standards, resource consent is required in order to:</u> <u>Development of seven or more residential units is also encouraged through the policy framework and provided for through a resource consenting process in order to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>i. achieve a high quality built environment;</u> <u>ii. manage the effects of development on neighbouring sites;</u> <u>iii. achieve high quality living environments; and</u> <u>iv. achieve attractive and safe streets and public spaces.</u> <p><u>Residential development that infringes 1 or</u></p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>more standards is also provided for through a resource consenting process. The resource consent process enables the design and layout, as well as potential or actual effects on the environment, of development to be assessed, recognising that quality design is increasingly important as the scale and density of development increases. Council provides design guidance for residential developments through design guides that sit outside the plan.</p> <p>The planned urban built character of the High Density Residential Activity Area includes buildings of at least six storeys in most of the Activity Area and at least four storeys in Eastbourne, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata. As buildings of this scale are likely to breach one or more development standard, resource consent is likely to be required. However, buildings of at least six storeys must be enabled within the walkable catchments of Lower Hutt city centre, Petone metropolitan centre and the city's train stations.</p>	
206.129	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4G 2.1	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the objective.
206.130	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4G 2.2	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the objective.
206.131	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4G 2.3	Support in part	<p>The High Density Residential Activity Area provides for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to:</p> <p>i. Housing needs and demand, and</p>	Supports the objective but seeks some amendments to more clearly articulate the anticipated outcome sought through the broader submission by Kāinga Ora.

			<u>ii. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including six-storey buildings and between eight to twelve storeys in identified locations.</u>	
206.132	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4G 2.4	Support in part	<u>Recognise that the neighbourhood's planned urban built character is defined through the flexibility of individual developments to take:</u> <u>i. Any low to medium density form of up to three storeys, or</u> <u>ii. A form of up to six storeys that achieves, for that development, the best practicable amenity outcomes for adjoining sites, or</u> <u>iii. A taller form if compatible with the amenity levels associated with high density residential development of six storeys.</u>	Supports this objective, which recognises the differing scales of development that could occur in the High Density Residential Activity Area. Seeks amendments to articulate the change more clearly in character that is anticipated in the planned urban built environment of the High Density Residential Activity Area.
206.133	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4G 2.5	Support in part	<u>Built development is of high quality and provides:</u> <u>i. appropriate on-site amenity for residents,</u> <u>ii. appropriate residential amenity for adjoining sites, and</u> <u>iii. a high level of amenity for the street.</u> <u>i. healthy, safe and accessible living environments</u> <u>ii. attractive and safe streets.</u>	Supports the intent of this objective, but seeks alternative wording to more clearly articulate the overall outcome sought.
206.134	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4G 2.6	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the objective.
206.135	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Objective 4G 2.7	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the objective.
206.136	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area	Oppose	<u>Modify the general approach of the Activity Area in Eastbourne, Stokes Valley, and Wainuiomata to have a planned urban built character of:</u>	Does not support a reduced 4-storey height limit applying in areas adjacent to the centres of Eastbourne, Stokes Valley, and Wainuiomata. Seeks a secondary height limit of 18m be

	Objective 4G 2.8		i. Any low to medium density form of up to three storeys, or ii. A form of up to four storeys that achieves, for that development, the best practicable amenity outcomes for adjoining sites, or iii. A taller form if compatible with the amenity levels associated with high density residential development of four storeys.	introduced within the Medium Density Residential Activity Area within a 400 walkable catchment from the local commercial centre. This Objective is sought to be deleted from the HDRAA.
206.137	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.1	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy.
206.138	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.2	Oppose	Enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities within the High Density Residential Activity Area, including three-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments.	Acknowledges that this policy is a modified version of the mandatory provision under the MDRS, but notes this policy is more appropriately located in the Medium Density Residential Activity Area.
206.139	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.3	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the policy.
206.140	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.4	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the inclusion of this MDRS provision.
206.141	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.5	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the inclusion of this MDRS provision.
206.142	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.6	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the policy.

206.143	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.7	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the policy.
206.144	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.8	Support in part	<p>Amendments sought Manage the effects of built development on adjoining sites and the street by controlling height, bulk and form of built development.</p> <p>Manage the effects of built form that does not meet the permitted activity standards for height in relation to boundary, building set back, site coverage or height standards, by ensuring adequate provision of privacy and access to sunlight is made to neighbouring residential properties internal and external living areas, and the impact of building bulk and dominance is mitigated or remedied through design responses.</p>	Supports the intent of this policy, but seeks amended wording to articulate the issue more clearly being managed and the outcomes sought. Replacement text is provided.
206.145	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.9	Oppose	<p>Require the design of built development of up to three storeys to maintain a reasonable level of privacy and sunlight access for adjoining sites.</p>	<p>Opposes this policy, as it is inconsistent with anticipated change relating to the urban built form and amenity levels in the High Density Activity Area.</p> <p>Does not support the use of the term “maintain” in the context of provision of privacy and sunlight access. Policy 6 of the NPSUD is clear that amenity levels will change through a changing urban built form.</p> <p>Seeks deletion of this policy, noting that the broad range of alternative policies within Chapter 4G make adequate provision for amenity.</p>
206.146	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.10	Support in part	<p><u>Encourage high density residential development that contributes positive design outcomes and living environments</u> Manage the design of built development of more than three storeys and up to six storeys to achieve the best practicable outcomes for privacy, sunlight, and appearance including by:</p>	Supports the amenity and design outcomes being specifically referenced in the policy. Changes are sought to frame the issue being managed, which is ensuring positive design and living environments are provided as intensification increases.

			<p><u>i. Encouraging buildings on front sites to be located close to the street.</u></p> <p>ii. Encouraging buildings to be planned to be compatible with possible future developments on neighbouring sites, including through the position of walls likely to be future common walls, accessways, communal open space and parking areas,</p> <p><u>iii. Encouraging the orientation of key windows and outdoor living spaces in units to face toward the street and rear of the site, rather than the sides,</u></p> <p><u>iv. Encouraging windows to be designed to minimise overlooking or looking into windows or outdoor living spaces of other close residential units,</u></p> <p><u>v. Encouraging outdoor living spaces to achieve a good level of privacy by being screened from windows or outdoor living spaces of other close residential units,</u></p> <p><u>vi. Encouraging outdoor living spaces to be located to achieve a good level of privacy and access to sunlight while minimising impacts on privacy and access to sunlight of other close residential units, and</u></p> <p><u>vii. Encouraging the appearance of end wall and boundary treatments to take into account their proposed context, and the possible future context given the flexible options available on adjoining sites.</u></p>	
206.147	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.10	Support in part	<p>ii. Encouraging buildings to be planned to be compatible with possible future developments on neighbouring sites, including through the position of walls likely to be future common walls, accessways, communal open space and parking areas,</p>	Amendments sought to delete the policy strand that seeks to encourage buildings to be planned to be compatible with possible future developments on neighbouring sites, as it creates ambiguity in consenting when possible future developments cannot be reasonably understood as part of the resource consenting process. This is also inconsistent with the height in relation boundary and setback standards.
206.148	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential	Oppose	<p>Require the design of built development of over six storeys to achieve outcomes for</p>	Seeks the deletion of this policy, as the matters it seeks to

	Activity Area Policy 4G 3.11		privacy, sunlight, and appearance consistent with that of the best practicable outcomes for a development of six storeys.	address and provide for are adequately covered by the Policies 44G 3.8 and 4G3.10 (as amended by Kāinga Ora)
206.149	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.12	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy, which is required by schedule 3A of the Act.
206.150	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.13	Support in part	Require rainwater tanks and design solutions and an appropriate provision minimum area of permeable surface in order to assist with the management of stormwater runoff created by development.	Supports the intent of this policy but seeks amendments to provide more flexibility through the resource consenting process.
206.151	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.14	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy.
206.152	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.15	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy.
206.153	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Policy 4G 3.16	Oppose	Modify the general approach of the Activity Area in Eastbourne, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata to enable buildings of up to four storeys, rather than six storeys, and achieve corresponding outcomes for amenity values including privacy, sunlight, and appearance.	Opposes a restrictive height limit of 4 storeys applying in the HDRAA around Eastbourne, Stokes Valley and Wainuiomata. Seeks deletion of this policy.
206.154	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Rules 4G 4.1.1	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this activity-based rule.
206.155	Chapter 4G – High	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this activity-based rule.

	Density Residential Activity Area Rules 4G 4.1.2			
206.156	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Rules 4G 4.1.3	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this activity-based rule.
206.157	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Rules 4G 4.1.4	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this activity-based rule.
206.158	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Rules 4G 4.1.5	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this activity-based rule.
206.159	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Rules 4G 4.1.6	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this activity-based rule.
206.160	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Rules 4G 4.1.7	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this activity-based rule.
206.161	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area New Rule 4G 4.1.X	New rule	<u>Community Garden</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u> Consequential changes, such as the introduction of a new definition, are also requested to give effect to this change.	Seeks the introduction of a new rule to enable Community Gardens to operate as a permitted activity. Kāinga Ora notes that the creation of a new definition may be required as a consequential change.
206.162	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area New Rule 4G 4.1.XX	New rule	<u>Commercial Activity</u> <u>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The commercial activity is limited to the ground floor tenancy of an apartment building;</u>	Seeks a new rule to enable commercial activities on ground floor to be specifically enabled via a Restricted Discretionary Activity consent pathway, subject to meeting standards. This recognises that some service-related activities, such as convenience stores, hairdressers, and cafes have a role to play in enabling a well-functioning urban environment and enhancing vibrancy in walkable neighbourhoods. An example rule framework is

			<p><u>b. The total gross floor area of commercial activity does not exceed 200m²;</u></p> <p><u>c. The commercial activity does not include the repair, alteration, restoration or maintenance of motor vehicles.</u></p> <p><u>d. The hours of operation are between:</u></p> <p><u>i. 7.00am and 9.00pm Monday to Friday; and</u></p> <p><u>ii. 8.00am and 7.00pm Saturday, Sunday and public holidays.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>1. The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area.</u></p> <p><u>2. The effects on pedestrian safety and the safe and efficient movement of vehicles.</u></p> <p><u>3. The activity contributes positively to the urban environment and achieves attractive and safe streets.</u></p> <p><u>2. Activity status: Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance is not achieved with 4G 4.1XX-1.a - 4G 4.1XX -1.d.</u></p>	<p>provided. This rule framework is adequately provided for through Obj 4G 2.2 and Policy 4G 3.1.</p>
206.163	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Rules 4G 4.1.8 to 4G 4.1.10	Support	Retain as notified	Supports these rules.
206.164	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area Rule 4G 4.11 Vegetation Removal	Oppose	<p>Replace with:</p> <p><u>The removal of vegetation (whether indigenous or exotic) is a permitted activity.</u></p>	<p>Opposes the proposed changes to this rule and seeks the retention of the existing rule. Kāinga Ora considers the proposed rule to be too broad sweeping and may constrain the supply of housing. The District Plan already requires minimum onsite landscaping in this zone, and Notable Trees are protected elsewhere in the Plan.</p> <p>Acknowledges that the Council must give effect to higher order planning documents in the identification and protection of</p>

				indigenous biodiversity but considers the rule, as proposed, is inappropriate.
206.165	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4G 4.2.1 Number of Residential Units per Site	Support in part	<p><u>Rule 4G 4.2.1 - Number of Residential Units Dwellings per Site</u></p> <p><u>1. No more than six residential units occupy the site; and</u></p> <p><u>2. Compliance with the following standards is achieved:</u></p> <p><u>i. 4G 4.2.2 - building coverage</u></p> <p><u>ii. 4G 4.2.3 – building height;</u></p> <p><u>iii. 4G 4.2.4 – HIRTB;</u></p> <p><u>iv. 4G 4.2.5 –only in relation to the rear/side yard boundary setback</u></p> <p><u>v. 4G 4.2.13 – outlook space</u></p> <p><u>Activity status: Restricted discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance is not achieved with 4G 4.2.1(1)</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>1. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u></p> <p><u>2. The development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape;</u></p> <p><u>3. The extent and effects on the three waters infrastructure, achieved by demonstrating that at the point of connection the infrastructure has the capacity to service the development; and</u></p> <p><u>4. The degree to which the development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale.</u></p> <p><u>Activity status: Restricted discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>b. Compliance is not achieved with 4G 4.2.1(2).</u></p>	Supports this rule but seeks changes to the maximum number of permitted units from 3 to 6, recognising that the HDRAA is an area that is explicitly enabling more intensive development.

206.166		<p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard.</u></p> <p><u>Notification:</u></p> <p><u>1. An application for resource consent which complies with 4G 4.2.1(1) but does not comply with 4G 4.2.1(2) is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>2. An application for resource consent made which does not comply with 4G 4.2.1(1) but complies with 4G 4.2.1(2) is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u></p> <p><u>3. An application for resource consent made which does not comply with 4G 4.2.1(1) and 4G 4.2.1(2) but complies 4G 4.2.3 – building height and 4G 4.2.1 - building coverage is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u></p> <p><u>(a) Up to three residential units per site are a permitted activity.</u></p> <p><u>(b) Four or more residential units per site are a restricted discretionary activity. Discretion is restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>(i) The planned urban built character for the High Density Residential Activity Area.</u></p> <p><u>(ii) The matters in Policies 4G 3.5, and 4G.12.</u></p> <p><u>(iii) The matters in Policies 4G 3.10 and 4G 3.11, if the development is four or more storeys.</u></p> <p><u>(iv) The on-site amenity for future occupants of the development.</u></p> <p><u>(v) The capacity of the network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, stormwater and land transport to service the proposed development.</u></p> <p><u>(vi) Any positive effects, including positive effects of increasing housing capacity and variety.</u></p> <p><u>(vi) The following design elements:</u></p> <p><u>1. Building height</u></p> <p><u>2. Recession planes and setbacks</u></p>	Seeks revisions to the matters of discretion.
---------	--	---	---

			<p>3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces 4. Open space and boundary treatments 5. Entrances, carparking and garages 6. Onsite stormwater management 7. End / side wall treatment</p> <p>8. Building materials 9. Bike parking, storage and service areas 10. Privacy and safety 11. Landscaping</p> <p>When considering the matters in (vii), the Council will be principally guided by its <i>Medium Density Design Guide</i>. Public and limited notification is precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4G 4.2.1 (b).</p>	
206.167	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2	Support in part	<p>Discretion is restricted to: (i) The planned urban built character for the High Density Residential Activity Area including the requirements to enable buildings of at least six storeys within the High Density Residential Activity Area. (ii) The effects on the privacy of adjoining sites. (iii) The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area, the streetscape and adjoining public space.</p>	Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status of this rule where the permitted standard is not complied with.
206.168	Development Standards Rule 4G 4.2.2 Building Coverage		<p>Note: When addressing or assessing potential effects in relation to matters (i) and (ii) above, applicants and the Council can be informed by the relevant outcomes identified in the <i>Medium Density Design Guide</i>.</p>	Seeks removal of the note, which advises that the (non-statutory) design guide will be used as a tool to assess the effects of a proposal that exceeds this density standard. Assessment of site coverage breaches are at the lower end of consenting complexity and do not require a qualitative assessment against a design guide.
206.169			Retain public notification preclusion.	Supports the preclusion of public notification for any breach to this rule.
206.170	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules)	Support in part	<p>(a) Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if: a. The building is within a specific height control overlay shown on the District Plan map and does</p>	Supports the maximum permitted height standard. As noted elsewhere in the submission, Kāinga Ora opposes the four-storey height limit proposed around the centres of Wainuiomata, Eastbourne and Stokes Valley and instead seeks that the

	4G 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4G 4.2.3 Building height		<u>not exceed the maximum height shown for that overlay, or</u> <u>b. In any other case, the building does not exceed a maximum height of 22m.</u>	residential areas surrounding these centres are zoned MDRAA and subject to a height control overlay within that zone.
206.171			Increase maximum height for Petone, Naenae, and Waterloo Commercial Activity Areas to 29m	Seeks additional height (around the city centre and Petone Commercial Activity Area, Naenae and Waterloo). The proposed rule framework in the plan change is supported in part on the basis that it provides for the application of such an approach. It is on this basis that Kāinga Ora supports clause 4F 4.2.2(a)(i).
206.172			<u>(b) Construction or alteration of a building that does not comply with Rule 4G 4.2.3(a) is a restricted discretionary activity.</u>	Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status of this rule where the permitted standard is not complied with.
206.173			Discretion is restricted to: <u>(i) The planned urban built character for the High Density Residential Activity Area including the requirements to enable buildings of at least six storeys within the High Density Residential Activity Area.</u> <u>(ii) The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area and adjoining streetscape.</u> <u>(iii) The effects on the privacy of adjoining sites.</u> <u>(iv) The effects on shading of adjoining sites including the impacts of shading on their primary internal and external living areas throughout the year.</u> <u>(v) The effects of shading and additional building bulk on any public open space or recreational grounds and their ability to provide outdoor amenity to users.</u> <u>(vi) Any design features or articulation to reduce the bulk of the building when viewed from neighbouring properties.</u> (vii) The following design elements: 1. Building height 2. End / side wall treatment 3. Building materials 4. Privacy and safety 5. Landscaping	Seeks simplification of the prescribed matters of discretion, and therefore seeks the deletion of the strand relating to the listed “design elements”. These matters are adequately addressed either within the remaining matters of discretion, and/or by other density standards.

			<u>When considering the design outcomes of the development matters in (vii), the Council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide.</u>	
206.174			Retain public notification preclusion.	Supports the preclusion of public notification for any breach to this rule.
206.175	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4G 4.2.4 Height in relation to boundary	Oppose	<u>(a) Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if the following maximum height in relation to boundary requirements are being met:</u> <u>a. 4m 19m + 60° along the first 22m of the side boundary as measured from the road frontage</u> <u>b. 8m + 60° from all other side and rear boundaries</u> <u>c. Except no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level along any boundary that adjoins a site in the Medium Density Residential Activity Area.</u>	Seeks an amended standard that provides for a more flexible HIRB in the HDRAA. Kāinga Ora notes that the 4m + 60° is a medium density standard, which does not enable the more intensive built form anticipated in a high density context.
206.176	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4G 4.2.4 Height in relation to boundary	Oppose	<u>Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way, the height in relation to boundary applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way. This standard does not apply to:</u> <u>(a) A boundary with a road,</u> <u>(b) Existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site, and</u> <u>(c) Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between two buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed.</u> <u>(d) Boundaries adjoining the City Centre Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone, [all relevant commercial zones];</u> <u>(e) Chimney structures not exceeding 1.1m in width on any elevation and provided these do not</u>	Supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status of this rule where the permitted standard is not complied with. Additional exclusions are sought from which the HIRB applies.

			<p><u>exceed the height in relation to boundary by more than 1m;</u> <u>(f) Antennas, aerials, satellite dishes (less than 1m in diameter), flues, and architectural features (e.g., finials, spires) provided these do not exceed the height in relation to boundary by more than 3m measured vertically</u> <u>(b) Construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the maximum height in relation to boundary requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</u></p>	
206.177			<p>Discretion is restricted to: <u>a. The planned urban built character for the High Density Residential Activity Area, including the requirements to enable buildings of at least six storeys within the High Density Residential Activity Area.</u> <u>b. The effects on the privacy of adjoining sites.</u> <u>c. The effects on shading of adjoining sites, including the impacts of shading on their primary internal and external living areas.</u> <u>d. The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area and adjoining streetscape.</u> <u>e. The level of additional building bulk and the impact on the amenity of the adjoining residential properties.</u> <u>f. The following design elements:</u> <u>1. Building height</u> <u>2. Recession Planes</u> <u>3. End / side wall treatment</u> <u>4. Privacy and safety</u></p>	<p>Seeks simplification of the prescribed matters of discretion, and therefore seeks the deletion of the strand relating to the listed “design elements”. These matters are adequately addressed either within the remaining matters of discretion, and/or by other density standards or relevant policies.</p>
206.178			<p>Note: When addressing or assessing potential effects in relation to matters (i) and (vi) above, applicants and the Council can be informed by the relevant outcomes identified in the Medium Density Design Guide.</p>	<p>Seeks removal of the note, which advises that the (non-statutory) design guide will be used as a tool to assess the effects of a proposal that exceeds this density standard. A breach of this nature does not warrant a qualitative assessment against a design guide.</p>
206.179			<p>Retain public notification preclusion.</p>	<p>Supports the preclusion of public notification for any breach to this rule</p>

206.180			<p><u>(a) Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if:</u> <u>(i) Buildings are set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed below:</u> <u>Front yard: 1.5m</u> <u>Side yard: 1m</u> <u>Rear yard: 1m (excluded on corner sites)</u> <u>This standard does not apply to site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed.</u> <u>Eaves may encroach into any yard by up to 0.6m.</u> <u>(b) Construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the setback requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</u></p>	<p>Supports the setbacks standard as they relate to side and rear yards. However, seeks removal of the front yard setback given a high density zone has a more urbanised character of a high density zone. Other adjustments are sought, to make the rule more effective.</p>
206.181	<p>Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4G 4.2.5 Setbacks</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p><u>Discretion is restricted to:</u> <u>(i) The planned urban built character for the High Density Residential Activity Area, including the requirements to enable buildings of at least six storeys within the High Density Residential Activity Area.</u> <u>(ii) The effects on the privacy of adjoining sites.</u> <u>(iii) The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area, the streetscape and adjoining public space.</u> <u>(iv) The effect from any building bulk and its proximity to the main internal and external living areas of adjoining residential properties</u> <u>(v) The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area, the streetscape and adjoining public space.</u> <u>(vi) The following design elements:</u> 1. Building height 2. Recession planes 3. End / side wall treatment 4. Privacy and safety</p>	<p>Seeks simplification of the prescribed matters of discretion, and therefore seeks the deletion of the strand relating to the listed “design elements”. These matters are adequately addressed either within the remaining matters of discretion, and/or by other density standards.</p>
206.182			<p><u>Note: When addressing or assessing potential effects in relation to matters (i) and (vi) above,</u></p>	<p>Seeks removal of the note, which advises that the (non-statutory) design guide will be used as a tool to assess the effects of a</p>

			applicants and the Council can be informed by the relevant outcomes identified in the Medium Density Design Guide.	proposal that exceeds this density standard. Assessment setbacks are at the lower end of consenting complexity and do not require a qualitative assessment against a design guide.
206.183			Public and limited notification is precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4G 4.2.5(b).	Supports the preclusion of public notification for any breach to this rule. If the front yard setback is not removed, Kāinga Ora seeks a preclusion to limited notification to apply to this aspect of a breach.
206.184	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4G 4.2.6 Height in Relation to Boundary and Setbacks for Sites Abutting Marae in the Community Iwi Activity Area	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule framework, noting that the more restrictive HIRB and setbacks are only applicable to sites directly abutting a marae in the Community Iwi Activity Area.
206.185	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4G 4.2.7 Permeable Surface	Oppose	Delete the rule in its entirety.	Opposes the introduction of permeable surfaces within the HDRAA and considers that the Landscaped Areas rule provides adequate control.
206.186	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules)	Oppose	Replace standard with alternative better suited to high density development Replacement standard	Seeks amendments to enable flexibility to provision of open space within the more intensive high density zone. Changes sought are provided.

	<p>4G 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4G 4.2.8 Outdoor Living Space</p>		<p><u>1. Each residential unit must be provided with either a private outdoor living space or access to a communal outdoor living space;</u> <u>2. Where private outdoor living space is provided it must be:</u> <u>a. For the exclusive use of residents;</u> <u>b. Directly accessible from a habitable room;</u> <u>c. A single contiguous space; and</u> <u>d. Of a minimum area and dimension as follows</u> <u>i. Studio/1 bdrm - 5m² and 1.8m</u> <u>ii. 2+ bdrm – 8m² and 1.8m</u> <u>3. Where communal outdoor living space is provided it does not need to be in a single continuous space, but it must be:</u> <u>a. Accessible from the residential units it serves;</u> <u>b. A minimum area of 10m² for every 5 units that it serves and a minimum dimension of 8m; and</u> <u>c. Free of buildings, parking spaces, and servicing and manoeuvring areas.</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to:</u> <u>The extent to which:</u> <u>1. Any proposed outdoor living space provides a good standard of amenity relative to the number of occupants the space is designed for;</u> <u>2. Other on-site factors compensate for a reduction in the size or dimension of the outdoor living space; and</u> <u>3. The availability of public open space in proximity to the site.</u></p>	
206.187			Remove reference to assessment being made against the design guide	Seeks the removal of the note referencing assessment being made against the design guide for this rule.
206.188			Expand notification preclusion clause to also apply to limited notification.	Seeks the preclusion of limited notification for any breach to this rule.

206.189	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4G 4.2.9 Accessory Building	Support in part	Introduce: 1. Preclusion clause for public notification.	Supports this rule. Seeks the introduction of a notification preclusion for public notification.
206.190	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4G 4.2.10 Screening and storage	Support in part	Delete: 1. 4G 4.2.10(b)(v) (list of design elements) 2. Reference to assessment being made against the design guide	Seeks the removal of 4G 4.2.10(b)(v) (list of design elements) in its entirety along with the removal of the note referencing assessment being made against the design guide for this rule.
206.191	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4G 4.2.11 Demolition	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the permitted activity status for demolition of buildings.
206.192	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4G 4.2.12	Support	Retain as notified	Supports measures to implement onsite hydraulic neutrality.

	Stormwater Retention			
206.193	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2 Development Standards (Rules) Rule 4G 4.2.13 Outlook Space (per unit)	Support in part	Delete reference to assessment being made against the design guide	Seeks the removal of the note referencing assessment being made against the design guide for a breach to this rule.
206.194			Introduce preclusion clause for limited notification.	Supports this rule, but also seeks the preclusion of limited notification for any breach of this rule
206.195	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2 Development Standards (Rules)	Support in part	Delete: 1. 4G 4.2.14(b)(iii) (list of design elements) 2. Reference to assessment being made against the design guide	Supports the windows to street standard, which is consistent with the MDRS. Seeks the removal of 4G 4.2.14 (b)(iii) (list of design elements) in its entirety along with the removal of the note referencing assessment being made against the design guide for this rule.
206.196			Rule 4G 4.2.14 Windows to Street	Introduce preclusion clause for limited notification.
206.197	Chapter 4G – High Density Residential Activity Area (Rules) 4G 4.2 Development Standards Rule 4F 4.2.13 Landscaped Area	Support in part	Delete: 1. 4G 4.2.15(b)(viii) (list of design elements) 2. Reference to assessment being made against the design guide	Supports the landscaped area standard, which is consistent with the MDRS. Seeks the removal of 4G 4.2.15 (b)(viii) (list of design elements) in its entirety along with the removal of the note referencing assessment being made against the design guide for this rule.
206.198				Introduce preclusion clause for limited notification.
206.199	Chapter 4G 5 – Precincts and Schedules Sites 4G 5.2	Opposes in part	Relocate provisions and rules to a District wide chapter, rather than being located within the residential chapters, with all relevant consequential changes.	Opposes (in part) of Council proposed heritage areas. Kāinga Ora has commissioned a heritage assessment which has concluded that there are a number of proposed landholdings/buildings that have little heritage value, largely due to modifications that have

	Residential Heritage Precinct		Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to this submission and relief/s sought	significantly altered heritage and architectural values. Seeks the following amendments to the proposed Petone State Flats Heritage Area. Queries the presence of a permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings, as this would result in the potential loss of heritage buildings within the interim period that Council undertakes a plan change to review and strengthen the heritage provisions.
206.200	Chapter 4G 5 – Precincts and Schedules Sites 4G 5.2 Residential Heritage Precinct	Opposes in part	Change the provisions to an overlay instead of a precinct in the Plan.	Considers that qualifying matters should be identified as overlays and addressed as district-wide provisions, rather than precincts within zone based chapters. On this basis, requests that identified areas with recognised significant heritage values are managed and addressed with appropriate provisions and rules within a Heritage Chapter, in accordance with the National Planning Standards.
206.201	Chapter 4G 5 – Precincts and Schedules Sites 4G 5.2 Residential Heritage Precinct	Opposes in part	Change to the boundary of the proposed heritage area HA-09 to exclude landholdings/buildings that (a) retain little heritage value due to modifications and (b) are considered not to contribute to the proposed housing area (consistent with the amendments shown on the map attached at Appendix 2).	Change to the boundary of the proposed heritage area to exclude landholdings/buildings that (a) retain little heritage value due to modifications and (b) are considered not to contribute to the proposed housing area
206.202	Chapter 4G 5 – Precincts and Schedules Sites 4G 5.2 Residential Heritage Precinct	Opposes in part	Change the title of heritage area HA-09 to: Petone State Flats Housing Area	Change title of the heritage area to: “Petone State Housing Area”
206.203	Chapter 4G 5 – Precincts and Schedules Sites 4G 5.2 Residential Heritage Precinct	Opposes in part	Kāinga Ora seeks the exclusion of 2-6 East St. and 82 Adelaide St.	Kāinga Ora seeks the exclusion of 2-6 East St. and 82 Adelaide St., largely due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lost contextual value due to the demolition of 2 of the 4 original blocks, grouped around open space • Modifications to the multi-unit flats has affected the heritage values;

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both multi-unit buildings are not considered to be the best representation of the modernist style multi-unit flats (as compared to 28 Scholefield St, and 1-20 Scholefield St)
206.204	Chapter 4G 5 – Precincts and Schedules Sites 4G 5.2 Residential Heritage Precinct	Opposes in part	Seeks the exclusion of the star-flats at 80 Adelaide St.	<p>Kāinga Ora seeks the exclusion of the star-flats at 80 Adelaide St., largely due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensively remodelled, original distinctive architectural forms have been lost Unsympathetic modifications, particularly to the roof form, significantly affect the architectural and heritage values Most distinctive feature of the star-flat typology is the original butterfly roof
206.205	Chapter 4G 5 – Precincts and Schedules Sites 4G 5.2 Residential Heritage Precinct	Opposes in part	Seeks the exclusion of 81-89 Adelaide St.	<p>Kāinga Ora seeks the exclusion of 81-89 Adelaide St, largely due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modifications have resulted in the dwellings having little heritage value, specifically: Changes to the roof form Additions to the primary facades, including awnings Lack of Modernist influences that shaped other similar dwelling along Jackson St.
206.206	Commercial Centres hierarchy	Oppose	Review the Centres hierarchy and commercial and residential intensification provisions in the Commercial (Centres) and Mixed-Use zones to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board.	<p>Supports the approach to implement the NPS-UD and Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act by incorporating intensification provisions into PC56. However, notes that a review of the centres hierarchy and accompanying zone framework has not been undertaken to support this at a strategic level.</p> <p>The Kāinga Ora submission as a whole seeks improvements to better align with national direction and achieve regional consistency with this direction. Consequently, a review of the centres hierarchy and accompanying framework to support intensification is considered necessary.</p> <p>Notes through a review of the s32 reporting, that Council intends to comprehensively review and replace the commercial chapters in the ongoing full District Plan review. In the event that this is not the intention, seeks a comprehensive review of the centres</p>
206.207	Commercial Centres hierarchy	Oppose	Expand Centre Zoning and residential intensification standards to reflect an increase in intensification anticipated in and around centres and rapid transit stops, and where necessary introduce new chapters.	
206.208	Commercial Centres hierarchy	Oppose	The revised centres hierarchy would then translate into an updated centres zoning framework, with clear objectives in each zone stating the intended role and purpose and	

			articulating the planned built urban environment for each zone.	hierarchy to better align with national direction and achieve regional consistency.
206.209	Commercial Centres hierarchy	Oppose	Undertake any consequential changes necessary across Plan Change 56 to address the matters raised above.	<p>Considers in such a review of the centre's hierarchy, that the following centres should be considered for implementation across Hutt City, consistent with the wider region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Centre • Metropolitan Centre • Town Centre • Local Centre • Neighbourhood Centre • Mixed Use • General Industrial
206.210	Chapter 5 Commercial Introduction	Support in part	(e) Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area The Mixed Use Activity Area provides for the local convenience needs of surrounding residents such as community activities , local retail, commercial services and offices. It also provides for residential use above ground floor. The area provides for moderate intensification and greater development capacity for the types of housing likely to be demanded in the future.	Supports the amendments made to the introduction of the overarching Commercial Chapter, and the rationalisation of centres from five to three, recognising the scope of the plan change and in the absence of a centre's hierarchy review being undertaken.
206.211	Chapter 5 Commercial Introduction	Support in part	...The area provides for moderate intensification and greater development capacity for the types of housing likely to be demanded in the future.	Seeks minor amendments to the description of the Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area to more clearly describe the intensification that is enabled in this zone.
206.212	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Policy of 5A 1.1.1 Capacity of the Central Commercial Activity Area	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the revisions to the policy to enable a greater intensity of development more explicitly.

206.213	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Explanation and Reasons of section 5A 1.1.1 Capacity of the Central Commercial Activity Area	Support in part	The Central Commercial Design Guide identifies five subareas or precincts which have specific issues and values. These precincts are entitled Core, Commercial, Riverfront (Core), Riverfront (Commercial) and Residential Transition, and have different design principles and assessment guidelines applying to the respective precincts.	Supports the revisions to the explanation and reasons section, but opposes design guides being located within the District Plan, and therefore seeks deletion of the statement referencing the Central Commercial Design Guide. This is consistent with the notified Residential Chapters, where Design Guides sit outside of the District Plan. Notes that rules and standards relevant to the precincts have been removed as part of the Plan Change, which provides further reason to delete this statement.
206.214	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Explanation and Reasons of section 5A.1.1.4 Incompatibility between Different Activities	Support in part	However, residential activities may be incompatible sensitive to effects generated by other with some other activities in the Central Commercial Activity Area, in particular, they may be sensitive to noise from other activities.	Supports the revisions to the policy to enable a greater intensity of residential development more explicitly within the city centre.
206.215	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Explanation and Reasons of section 5A.1.1.4 Incompatibility between Different Activities	Support in part	... Rather than overly restricting other activities, it is appropriate that the residential activities mitigate this sensitivity by providing for external appropriate noise insulation.	Seeks amendments to final paragraph of the statement that refers to the incompatibility of residential activities with other activities.
206.216	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Policies of section 5A 1.2.1	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the revisions to the policy to enable a greater intensity of development more explicitly within the city centre.

	Quality of Buildings and Open Spaces			
206.217	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Explanation and Reasons of section 5A 1.2.1 Quality of Buildings and Open Spaces	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the revisions to the policy to enable a greater intensity of development more explicitly within the city centre.
206.218	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Objective of section 5A.1.2.3 Adjoining Residential Areas	Oppose in part	<i>Amendments sought.</i> Built development is consistent with the amenity values expected in the planned urban environment of adjoining residential areas. <u>Built development adjoining residential areas minimises adverse effects on the amenity values of adjacent sites in Residential Zones, taking into account the planned urban built environment of the central commercial activity area.</u>	Accepts the intent of managing zone interface effects but opposes the objective in its proposed form. Intensive development within the city centre is explicitly encouraged; however, the objective as proposed could require any development in the city centre to be consistent with the amenity values of surrounding residential areas. This places an undue constraint on the ability to intensify the city centre. Considers that the height in relation to boundary standards are appropriate to manage amenity values of adjacent residential neighbourhoods, but the rest of the planning framework should seek to maximise the benefits of intensification. Amendments sought.
206.219	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Policy of section 5A.1.2.3 Adjoining Residential Areas	Oppose in part	a) Manage the effects of buildings and development in the Central Commercial Activity Area to ensure any adverse effects on the amenity values of the nearby residential areas are avoided, remedied or mitigated. <u>Minimise the adverse effects from development and activities directly adjoining sites within adjoining residential areas by ensuring that:</u> <u>1. Buildings are located and designed to achieve a transition at the zone interface;</u> <u>2. Buildings are located and designed to minimise shading and privacy effects;</u>	Supports the intent to simplify the policy, but opposes the proposed wording and seeks a replacement policy that more clearly articulates the intended management of zone interface effects.

			<p>3. Activities at the zone interface are compatible with adjacent residential use; and</p> <p>4. Screening and landscaping minimise adverse visual effects</p>	
206.220	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Explanation and Reasons of section 5A 1.2.3	Support in part	<p>The Central Commercial Activity Area shares an extensive interface with adjacent Residential Activity Areas. This interface is a particularly sensitive one as the effects associated with commercial activities and the scale of development have the ability to adversely impact on the use and enjoyment of neighbouring residential areas.</p> <p>Given the extent of this interface, and the relatively unrestricted range of activities permitted within the Central Commercial Activity Area, and the planned built form of the area, the District Plan seeks to ensure that adequate safeguards mitigating controls are put in place to protect provide for residential amenity at the zone interface. These safeguards include measures to include controlling the effects of new buildings and development and larger additions to existing buildings, on adjacent residential areas, such as building height and location in relation to the boundary, and location, building bulk, appearance, character, landscaping and screening, access, servicing, signage and lighting.</p>	Supports the intent of this statement. Changes are sought to remove reference to “safeguard” and “protect” in the context of providing for residential amenity, as amenity will change as the planned urban built form is established. Revisions are sought to articulate more clearly that zone interface effects are to be appropriately managed to provide for residential amenity, which is primarily achieved through the HIRB control and existing activity based controls at the zone interface.
206.221	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area 5A 2.1.1(a)	Support	Retain as notified and delete as proposed	Supports the proposed changes to the rules.

206.222	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area 5A 2.1.1(b)	Support	Retain as notified and delete as proposed	Supports the proposed changes to the rules.
206.223	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area 5A 2.1.1(g)	Support	Retain as notified and delete as proposed	Supports the proposed changes to the rules.
206.224	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area 5A 2.1.1(h)	Support	Retain as notified and delete as proposed	Supports the proposed changes to the rules.
206.225	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area 5A 2.1.1(k)	Support	Retain as notified and delete as proposed	Supports the proposed changes to the rules.
206.226	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Chapter 5A Central	Support	Retain as notified and delete as proposed	Supports the proposed changes to the rules.

	Commercial Activity Area 5A 2.2(b)			
206.227	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area 5A 2.2.1(b)	Support	Retain as notified and delete as proposed	Supports the proposed changes to the rules.
206.228	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area 5A 2.3(b)	Support	Retain as notified and delete as proposed	Supports the proposed changes to the rules.
206.229	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area 5A 2.3(c)	Support	Retain as notified and delete as proposed	Supports the proposed changes to the rules.
206.230	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area 5A 2.3(e)	Support	Retain as notified and delete as proposed	Supports the proposed changes to the rules.
206.231	Chapter 5A	Support	Retain as notified and delete as proposed	Supports the proposed changes to the rules.

	Central Commercial Activity Area Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area 5A 2.3(j)			
206.232	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Appendices Central Commercial 1 Precincts	Support	Delete as proposed	Supports the proposed deletion of the appendices
206.233	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Appendices Central Commercial 2 Maximum Height	Support	Delete as proposed	Supports the proposed deletion of the appendices
206.234	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Appendices Central Commercial 5 Wind Protection	Support	Delete as proposed	Supports the proposed deletion of the appendices
206.235	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Appendices	Support	Delete as proposed	Supports the proposed deletion of the appendices

	Central Commercial 6 - Wind Report			
206.236	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Entire chapter and Appendix 8 - Central Commercial Design Guide	Oppose	1. Kāinga Ora seeks the Design Guidelines are removed from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. A note should be added where reference is made to such guidelines: <u>Note:</u> <u>Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u>	Opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Opposes any policy or rule that requires development proposals to be consistent with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Alternatively seeks and supports design guidelines sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.
206.237	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Entire chapter and Appendix 8 – Central Commercial Design Guide	Oppose	Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.	Seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.
206.238	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Entire chapter and Appendix 8 - Central Commercial Design Guide	Oppose	Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment.	
206.239	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area Entire chapter and	Oppose	If the Council does not provide the relief sought above in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the	If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.

	Appendix 8 - Central Commercial Design Guide		guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. Otherwise, there is no flexibility and scope to create a design that fits with specific site characteristics and desired built form development.	
206.240	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Entire chapter and zoning framework	Support in part	Review the Centres hierarchy and commercial and residential intensification provisions in the Commercial (Centres) and Mixed-Use zones to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board.	Reaffirms that a comprehensive review of the Centres hierarchy is required. The Petone Commercial Activity Area comprises the Petone Commercial Activity Area – Area 1 (traditional retail and Jackson Street area), and Petone Commercial Activity Area – Area 2 (mixed use and offering larger format retail services). The existing zone framework does not align with the National Planning Standards. Notwithstanding this, Kāinga Ora has approached the submission on the basis that this area would be classified as a Metropolitan Centre Zone (MCZ) under a revised zoning framework, and has accordingly applied principles as to the scale of intensification that would be anticipated in a MCZ and surrounding catchment, to the extent that is possible within the limited scope provided by Plan Change 56.
206.241	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Entire chapter and zoning framework	Support in part	The revised centres hierarchy would then translate into an updated centres zoning framework, with clear objectives in each zone stating the intended role and purpose and articulating the planned built urban environment for each zone.	
206.242	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Entire chapter and zoning framework	Support in part	Seeks that the Petone commercial activity areas to be treated and recognised as a metropolitan centre to seek regional consistency.	
206.243	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Entire chapter and zoning framework	Support in part	Undertake any consequential changes necessary across Plan Change 56 to address the matters raised above.	
206.244	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area	Opposes in part	Policy a. External alterations, repairs, or modifications to existing buildings and structures plus <u>and</u> the construction of new buildings and structures in the	
				Recognises and supports the protection and sensitive reuse and adaption of heritage buildings and sites in areas with identified significant heritage values. However, the proposed wording of Policy B places restrictions on development outside of the

	Policies in section 5B 1.2.1 - Area 1 Distinctive Character and Built Form of the Area on Jackson Street generally between Victoria and Cuba Streets		<p>area bounded by Victoria and Cuba Streets must Jackson Street Heritage Precinct comply with the specified design performance standards.</p> <p>b. External alterations, repairs, or modifications to existing buildings and structures and the construction of new buildings and structures in Area 1 outside the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct respect the significant historic heritage values, style, and character of the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.</p>	identified heritage area, which Kāinga Ora does not support. Seeks the deletion of this proposed policy.
206.245	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Objective within 5B 1.2.3 - Area 2 - Character and Building Form and Quality within Area 2 Petone Mixed Use	Support in part	<p>To ensure that The form and quality of buildings, structures, open space and development overall within the Petone Mixed Use Area is <u>designed to result in a quality interface with the public realm and, where appropriate, minimise adverse effects on surrounding sensitive interfaces, taking into account the planned urban built environment of the area. maintain and enhance the character, amenity values and quality of the environment, whilst recognising and protecting the values and features of adjoining areas</u></p>	Seeks amendment of this objective to recognise that enabling intensification within this area in accordance with the planned urban built environment will alter existing amenity values beyond the activity area. Kāinga Ora seeks amendment to recognise that values may not be “maintained or enhanced” in every case, nor will values be “protected” in this changing environment. Kāinga Ora seeks changes to the objective to account for the changing urban form and amenity values.
206.246	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Policies in section 5B 1.2.3 - Area 2 - Character and Building Form and Quality within Area 2 Petone Mixed Use	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the unlimited height limit proposed within Area 2 (noting that Kāinga Ora seeks an increased height limit in Area 1 to 53m, consistent with the anticipated built form that Kāinga Ora is seeking in other MCZ elsewhere in the region and nationwide). Kāinga Ora therefore supports the changes to these policies as proposed, recognising that by enabling additional height there is a need to amend the accompanying policy direction so the management of effects is appropriately calibrated.

206.247	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Area 1 Permitted Activity Condition 5B 2.1.1.1(b) Maximum Height of Buildings and Structures	Support in part	(b) Maximum Height of Buildings and Structures: i. 10m within the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct ii. 22m 53m where not within the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct Maximum Height of Buildings and Structures: 40.0m.	Seeks an increase in the height limit applicable to Petone Commercial Activity Area – Area 1 outside of the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct, from 22m to 53m. The Council’s section 32 analysis notes that the Petone Commercial Activity Area is comparable to a Metropolitan Centre Zone under the National Planning Standards. This change is consistent with height limits Kāinga Ora is seeking in Metropolitan Centres throughout the region.
206.248	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Area 1 Permitted Activity Condition 5B 2.1.1.1(d) Sites abutting residential activity areas	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the proposed changes to this rule, noting that the adjoining residential area is proposed to be High Density Residential Area, which anticipates an intensive built form. The proposed changes strike an appropriate balance between enabling intensification in the Commercial Area, while managing zone interface effects.
206.249	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Area 1 Restricted Discretionary Activity Rule 5B 2.1.2(a)	Support in part	Amend rule, if required, to clarify that the rule is only intended to enable works under the new Permitted Activity Rules 5B 2.1.1 (f) and 5B 2.1.1 (g).	Considers this rule automatically requires resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity for construction related works that are not listed as a Permitted Activity as it is currently worded.
206.250			Introduce non-notification clause to Rule 5B 2.1.2 precluding public and limited notification where compliance is achieved with 5B 2.1.1.1 (b) Maximum Height and 5B 2.1.1.1 (d) Sites abutting residential activity areas. Where compliance is achieved with 5B 2.1.1.1(b) and 5B 2.1.1.1(d), an application under this rule is precluded from being publicly and limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.	Residential units above ground floor are listed as Permitted Activities under rule 5B 2.1.1(c). It is unclear whether the intent of this rule is to exclude construction of apartment buildings where residential units are located above the ground floor (or any construction works related to any of the other permitted activities listed at 5B 2.1.1), or whether the rule is only intended to enable works under the new Permitted Activity Rules 5B 2.1.1 (f) and 5B 2.1.1 (g)? If the latter, seeks amendments to make reference to these permitted activity rules. Seeks a non-notification clause for Rule 5B 2.1.2, for both public and limited notification, in instances where development complies with amended 5B 2.1.1.1 (b) <i>Maximum Height</i> and 5B 2.1.1.1

206.251			<p>Introduce new restricted discretionary rule for works that do not comply with 5B 2.1.1.1 Permitted Activity Conditions</p> <p>Rule 5B 2.1.2A – Restricted Discretionary Activity</p> <p>(a) Except where stated in the General Rules, any Permitted Activity which fails to comply with any of the Permitted Activity Conditions.</p> <p>(b) Residential activity on the ground floor of buildings.</p> <p><u>Matters of Discretion</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The location, design and appearance of the building; 2. Loss of sunlight to adjacent public space; 3. Shading to surrounding buildings; 4. Shading and loss of privacy for any adjacent residential activity; 5. Wind effects on the safety and amenity of the adjacent public space; 6. The planned urban built environment; 7. Whether the location of the residential units promote an active frontage, community safety and visual interest at the pedestrian level; and 8. Whether the use of the ground floor for residential activity could facilitate conversion to commercial use so as not to foreclose future options 	<p>(d) <i>Sites abutting residential activity areas</i> - beyond this, seeks the introduction of a Restricted Discretionary Activity rule for construction work that does not comply with Permitted Activity Conditions (currently automatically escalates to Discretionary Activity), with consequential changes to Rule 5B 2.1.3 to delete these matters from within.</p>
206.252			<p>Consequential changes to give effect to these changes</p>	<p>Seeks any consequential changes to the wider rule framework under 5B 2.1.1, 5B 2.1.2, and 5B 2.1.3 to enable these changes to occur.</p>
206.253	<p>Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Area 2 Permitted Activity Condition 5B 2.2.1.1(a)</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Retain as notified</p>	<p>Supports the proposed amendments, resulting in deletion of the standards and replacement with alternative text specifying that there is no height limit, except where stated on the maximum height overlay that applies. Kāinga Ora notes that there is no maximum height limit proposed in this area, and more generally, Kāinga Ora is seeking a 53m height limit where there is an applicable height control overlay. The proposed rule provides for this.</p>

	Maximum height and recession plane of buildings and structures			
206.254	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Area 2 Permitted Activity Condition 5B 2.2.1.1(b) Minimum yard and setback requirements	Support	Delete as proposed	Supports the deletion of these minimum yard and setbacks.
206.255	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Area 2 Permitted Activity Condition 5B 2.2.1.1(d) Landscaping and screening	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the changes made to this standard.
206.256	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Area 2 Permitted Activity Condition 5B 2.2.1.1(e) Sites abutting Residential Activity Areas	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the changes made to this standard.

206.257	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area 2 Permitted Activity Condition 5B 2.2.1.1(i) Outdoor Living Areas for Residential Activities	Support in part	<p>(l) Outdoor Living Areas for Residential Activities:</p> <p>A minimum area of 20m² per residential unit shall be provided as either private or shared outdoor amenity space. Of this area, a minimum of 2.5m² shall be private outdoor space which is contiguous with the main living area of the unit.</p> <p><u>Alternatively, for residential units located entirely above ground floor level the outdoor living space requirement can be satisfied by providing a balcony or roof terrace with a minimum area of 5m² with a minimum dimension of 1.8m.</u></p> <p><u>Except, up to 40% of above ground units on a site can be provided with a Juliet balcony instead of a balcony or roof terrace.</u></p> <p><u>An application where compliance is not achieved with this standard is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</u></p>	<p>Supports the additional flexibility enabled in this Permitted Activity condition. Seeks further flexibility to enable a proportion of above ground units to have Juliet balconies. This flexibility offers an alternative to requiring balconies for every apartment in a new apartment building in recognition of the more intensive nature of development enabled in this zone. This is appropriate in the equivalent of a MCZ also noting the proximity to services and amenities.</p> <p>Also seeks the introduction of a non-notification clause precluding both public and limited notification, as a breach to this standard requires an assessment of the quality of internal amenity. It is not a matter that would require consideration of affected parties. Kāinga seeks consequential changes to be made to reflect this within the relevant rule.</p>
206.258	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Area 2 Rule 5B 2.2.2	Support in part	<p>(a) The construction, alteration of, addition to buildings and structures, except for those works permitted under Rule 5B 2.2.1 (l) and (m).</p> <p>(b) The construction, alteration of, addition to buildings and structures over 12 metres in height, except:</p> <p>i. The alteration of, addition to buildings and structures where the gross floor area of the additions is less than 5% of the gross floor area of the existing building; or</p> <p>ii. The alteration of, addition of buildings and structures which does not change the external building form (floor area and height) of the existing building.</p>	<p>Supports the deletion of arm (b) of the restricted discretionary rule, and notes that any new building will require resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity under this revised rule.</p>

206.259			<p>(b) Residential facilities</p> <p>(c) Any Permitted Activity which fails to comply with any of the relevant Permitted Activity Conditions, or relevant requirements of Chapter 14 – General Rules...</p>	<p>Seeks some further changes to the rule to enable residential facilities to be considered under the RDA activity status, rather than escalating to Discretionary. Notes that residential facilities provide an alternative form of residential housing and should be appropriately enabled within the Petone Commercial Activity Area.</p>
206.260	<p>Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Area 2 Rule 5B 2.2.2.1(a) Matters in which the Council has Restricted its Discretion</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>a. The construction, alteration of, addition to buildings and structures, except for those works permitted under Rule 5B 2.2.1 (l) and (m)</p> <p>i. Design, external appearance and siting of the building or structures</p> <p>ii. Matters in the Petone Mixed Use Area Design Guide</p> <p>• A Design Statement will be required which demonstrates how the proposed development responds to the design guidelines of the Petone Mixed Use Area Design Guide.</p> <p>ii. Alignment with urban design outcomes:</p> <p>• Provides an effective public private interface</p> <p>• Provides a well-functioning site</p> <p>• Provides high quality buildings</p> <p>iii. Amenity Values</p> <p>• Effects upon the amenity values both within the site concerned and upon the planned amenity values for surrounding areas from buildings, structures and use of outdoor areas, recognising the planned urban built form of the area.</p> <p>iv. Landscaping</p> <p>• The extent to which landscaping is incorporated to achieve high quality urban design which maintains or enhances the image and visual appearance of the mixed use area.</p> <p>• A landscape plan will be required. This plan should include landscaping of any outdoor onsite parking areas.</p> <p>...</p> <p>vi. Capacity of Infrastructure</p>	<p>Seek amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The capacity of the City's infrastructure to service additional development on the site. <p>vii. Impact on Historic Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expected or potential impacts on the historic heritage values of any adjacent Historic Area, Historic Building or Significant Cultural or Archaeological Resource and any measures to be adopted to protect these values. <p><u>viii. Cultural significance of Te Puni Urupā</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Where adjacent, impacts on the cultural and historic values of the Te Puni Urupā.</u> 	
206.261			<p>v. Natural Hazards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The outcomes of the geotechnical investigation on seismic hazards, including fault rupture, subsidence, tsunami and liquefaction. • Whether the potential risk to the health and safety of people and property from fault rupture, subsidence, tsunami, liquefaction and sea level rise (taking into account changes to these levels arising from climate change), can be avoided or mitigated. • The design and layout of the development, including buildings, to avoid or mitigate the effects from fault rupture, subsidence, tsunami, liquefaction and sea level rise (taking into account changes to these levels arising from climate change). 	Seeks removal of reference to natural hazards – noting a new chapter is proposed within PC56 to manage hazard related effects.
206.262	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Area 2 Rule 5B 2.2.2.1(b) Matters in which the Council has Restricted its Discretion	Support	Delete as proposed	Supports the deletion of the matter of discretion relating to wind effects from buildings in excess of 12m in height.

206.263	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area 2 Rule 5B 2.2.2.2(b)	Support	Delete as proposed	Supports the deletion of the condition requiring compliance with wind standards for buildings in excess of 12m, noting that a new chapter has been proposed within PC56 to manage wind effects.
206.264	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Appendices Appendix 8 Petone Commercial 8 (maximum heights for Petone Commercial Activity Area 2)	Support	Delete as proposed	Supports the deletion of this appendix, which is consistent with the removal of a maximum height limit in this area.
206.265	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Appendices Design guides	Oppose	Seeks the Design Guidelines are removed from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. A note should be added where reference is made to such guidelines: <u>Note: Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u>	Opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Opposes any policy or rule that requires development proposals to be consistent with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.
206.266	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Appendices Design guides	Oppose	Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.	
206.267	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Appendices Design guides	Oppose	Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment.	

206.268	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area Appendices Design guides	Oppose	If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. Otherwise, there is no flexibility and scope to create a design that fits with specific site characteristics and desired built form development.	Alternatively, seeks and supports design guidelines sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.
206.269	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Entire chapter and zoning framework	Support in part	Review the Centres hierarchy and commercial and residential intensification provisions in the Commercial (Centres) and Mixed-Use zones to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board.	Reaffirms that a comprehensive review of the Centres hierarchy is required. Notes the Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area comprises a range of centres that could be classified as Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, or Neighbourhood Centre Zone and considers zone framework within PC56 does not align with the National Planning Standards.
206.270	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Entire chapter and zoning framework	Support in part	Kāinga Ora seeks the expansion of the Suburban Mixed Use Area Zone to cover the most of the Naenae commercial area. This change emphasises the role and function of the Naenae commercial centre in the district and wider urban environment.	Kāinga Ora has approached the submission on the basis that these areas would be classified primarily as Local Centres, and in the case of Naenae and Waterloo, a Town Centre under a revised zoning framework that aligned with the National Planning Standards. This has informed the principles Kāinga Ora has applied to enable appropriate levels of intensification both within the centre, and the surrounding residential environment, to the extent that is possible within the limited scope provided by Plan Change 56.
206.271	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Entire chapter and zoning framework	Support in part	Expand the spatial extent of Naenae Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area to encompass adjacent General Business Activity Area and increase the height limits to 36m.	Kāinga Ora recognises that the Naenae and Waterloo commercial areas are prominent commercial areas in the district and should be identified for greater height and development. Considers Naenae and Waterloo to be town centres in the context of the Hutt City district and greater Wellington region.
206.272	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Entire chapter and zoning framework	Support in part	Increase the height limit in the Suburban Mixed Use Areas of Naenae and Waterloo to 36m	

206.273	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Entire chapter and zoning framework	Support in part	Support height limit of 22m where proposed in PC56, and seek application of a broader 22m height limit across all other centres (other than identified in this submission across the Hutt City. Considers that there are a number of commercial centres in Hutt City that are considered local centres.	
206.274	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Entire chapter and zoning framework	Support in part	Rezone the properties at 304-306 Waiwhetū Road, 3, 5, 5A & 5B Rungay St from HDRAA to Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area.	
206.275	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area 5E1 Introduction/Zone Statement	Support in part	<p>The Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area applies to selected suburban centres generally located in areas of good public transport, local commercial areas that complement the city centre and Petone metropolitan centre. The Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area provides These areas primarily provide for the local convenience needs of surrounding residential areas including local retail, commercial services and offices as well as residential use above ground floor. It addresses expectations of residents of higher density housing types to have easy access to wide range of facilities and services, particularly residents of higher density housing types.</p> <p>The Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area enables intensification and provides for medium to high density development.</p> <p>The highest levels of building height and density are provided for in centres that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are located within a walkable catchment of the city centre, or the Petone metropolitan centre, and the Naenae and Waterloo town centres, • are located within a walkable catchment of rapid transit stops, • have a high level of commercial activity or a wide range of community services. 	Supports the revisions to the introduction, but seeks an amendment to recognise that additional intensification is to be enabled in Naenae and Waterloo, which is considered to be the equivalent of a Town Centre.

			<p><u>Other centres provide for more moderate height to reflect the surrounding residential context.</u></p> <p>New development is expected to be designed to high standards and enhance the quality of the streets and public open space in these centres. The Medium Density Design Guide assists in the development of high quality buildings and environments and provides guidance where permitted activity development standards are not met.</p>	
206.276	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Objective 5E 2.2	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the revised objective as it recognises that they will be a change in the anticipated urban built form to one that includes high density built outcomes.
206.277	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Objective 5E 2.3	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the revised objective as it recognises that they will be a change in the anticipated urban built form to one that includes high density built outcomes.
206.278	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Objective 5E 2.4	Support in part	<p>Built development shall maintain is consistent with the amenity values expected in the planned urban environment of adjoining residential areas.</p> <p><u>Built development adjoining residential areas minimises adverse effects on the amenity values of adjacent sites in Residential Zones, taking into account the planned urban built environment of the Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area and surrounding residential environment.</u></p>	Supports managing zone interface effects but opposes the objective in its proposed form. Intensive development within the commercial centre is explicitly encouraged; however, the objective as proposed could require any development in the centre to be consistent with the amenity values of surrounding residential areas. This places an undue constraint on the ability to intensify the centres. Kāinga Ora considers that the height in relation to boundary standards are appropriate to manage amenity values of adjacent residential neighbourhoods, but the rest of the planning framework should seek to maximise the benefits of intensification. Amendments sought.
206.279	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Objective 5E 2.6	Support	Delete as notified	Supports the deletion of this objective, noting a separate chapter relevant to natural hazards is proposed to manage such effects.

206.280	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Policy 5E 3.5	Support in part	Enable the efficient use of land through medium <u>to high</u> density built development while managing any adverse effects on the environment, including effects on infrastructure and residential amenity, <u>having regard to the planned urban built environment of the activity area.</u>	Supports the intent of the revised objective, but seeks amendments to refine the outcome sought recognising that amenity values will change relative to the planned urban built environment.
206.281	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Policy 5E 3.6	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the revisions to this policy, which recognises a more intensive urban built form is to be enabled.
206.282	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Policy 5E 3.7	Support in part	Require built development adjoining Residential Activity Areas to manage the effects on the amenity of those areas, having specific regard to visual dominance, privacy and shading. <u>Minimise the adverse effects from development and activities directly adjoining sites within adjacent residential areas by ensuring that:</u> <u>1. Buildings are located and designed to achieve a transition at the zone interface;</u> <u>2. Buildings are located and designed to minimise shading and privacy effects</u>	Supports the intent to simplify the policy, but opposes the proposed wording and seeks a replacement policy that more clearly articulates the intended management of zone interface effects.
206.283	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Policy 5E 3.10	Support	Delete as notified	Supports the deletion of this policy, noting a separate chapter relevant to natural hazards is proposed to manage such effects.
206.284	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Rule 5E 4.1.4 Residential Activities	Support in part	(a) Residential Activities are permitted activities if: i. The <u>dwelling residential unit</u> is located above the ground floor; or ii. The <u>dwelling residential unit</u> is located on the ground floor but has no frontage to public open spaces including streets except for access. (b) Residential Activities that do not meet the above permitted activity standards are restricted discretionary activities.	Notes that no changes are proposed to this rule. Notwithstanding this, Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to this rule, to focus the assessment relevant more clearly to the issue being managed.

			<p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The effects on the continuity of the design and appearance of the frontage of buildings including display windows and verandahs. ii. The effects on the amenity of the streetscape and public open space. iii. The effects on the privacy and amenity of residents of the site. iv. The following mixed use and medium density residential development design elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building height 2. Recession planes and setbacks 3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces 4. Open space and boundary Treatments 5. Entrances, carparking and garages 6. On-site stormwater management 7. End / side wall treatment 8. Building materials 9. Bike parking, storage and service areas 10. Privacy and safety 11. Landscaping <p>When considering the matters in (iv), the Council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide.</p>	
206.285			<p><u>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</u></p>	Seeks the introduction of a non-notification clause precluding both public and limited notification, as a breach to this rule requires an assessment upon the internal amenity and the streetscape/public realm. It is not a matter that would require consideration of affected parties.
206.286	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Rule 5E 4.1.5 Care Facilities, Residential Facilities, Boarding Houses,	Support in part	<p>(a) Care Facilities, Residential Facilities, Boarding Houses, Hostels and Visitor Accommodation are permitted activities if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Any h Habitable rooms are located above the ground floor; or ii. Any habitable rooms located on the ground floor have no frontage to public open spaces including streets. 	Notes that no changes are proposed to this rule. Notwithstanding, seeks amendments to this rule, to focus the assessment relevant more clearly to the issue being managed.

	Hostels and Visitor Accommodation		<p>(b) Care Facilities, Residential Facilities, Boarding Houses, Hostels and Visitor Accommodation that do not meet the above permitted activity standards are restricted discretionary activities.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>i. The effects on the continuity of the design and appearance of the frontage of buildings including display windows and verandahs.</p> <p>ii. The effects on the amenity of the streetscape and public open space.</p> <p>iii. The effects on the privacy and amenity of residents of the site.</p> <p>iv. The following mixed use and medium density residential development design elements:</p> <p>1. Building height</p> <p>2. Recession planes and setbacks</p> <p>3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces</p> <p>4. Open space and boundary treatments</p> <p>5. Entrances, carparking and garages</p> <p>6. On-site stormwater management</p> <p>7. End / side wall treatment</p> <p>8. Building materials</p> <p>9. Bike parking, storage and service areas</p> <p>10. Privacy and safety</p> <p>11. Landscaping</p> <p>When considering the matters in (iv), the Council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide.</p>	
206.287			<p><u>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</u></p>	Seeks the introduction of a non-notification clause precluding both public and limited notification, as a breach to this rule requires an assessment upon the internal amenity and the streetscape/public realm. It is not a matter that would require consideration of affected parties.
206.288	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed		<p>(a) Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if:</p>	Outside of requirements to increase height limits in accordance with Policy 3 of the NPSUD, Kāinga Ora seeks the following

	<p>Use Activity Area Rule 5E 4.2.1 Building height</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>i. The building is within a specific height control overlay shown on the District Plan map and does not exceed the maximum height shown for that overlay, or in the table below</p> <p>ii. <u>In any other case, the building</u> does not exceed a maximum height of 12m.</p> <p><u>CENTRE HEIGHT LIMIT</u></p> <p><u>Alicetown 22m</u></p> <p><u>Moera 22m</u></p> <p><u>Waiwhetū & Wainui Road 22m</u></p> <p><u>Woburn – White Lines West 22m</u></p> <p><u>Waterloo 36m</u></p> <p><u>Fairfield 22m</u></p> <p><u>Epuni – Witako St 22m</u></p> <p><u>Epuni – Oxford Tce 22m</u></p> <p><u>Boulcott -Boulcott St 22m</u></p> <p><u>Boulcott – Mitchell St 22m</u></p> <p><u>Melling - Hutt Road 22m</u></p> <p><u>Cuba St/Atiawa St 22m</u></p> <p><u>High Street – Stellin St/Park Ave/Daysh St 22m</u></p> <p><u>Avalon – High St/Tennyson Ave/Cottle St/De Menech Gr 22m</u></p> <p><u>Taitā south - High St and Burcham St 22m</u></p> <p><u>Taitā north – High St and Farmer Cres 22m</u></p> <p><u>Taitā 22m</u></p> <p><u>Stokes Valley 22m</u></p> <p><u>Wainuiomata 22m</u></p> <p><u>Eastbourne 22m</u></p>	<p>minimum height limits to be applied to centres following a revised centres hierarchy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Centres that are the equivalent to a Neighbourhood Centre Zone (except those located within 800m of a train station) – 12m Centres that are the equivalent to a Local Centres Zone and/or within 800m of a train station – 22m Naenae Centre, which is the equivalent of a Town Centre Zone – 36m Waterloo Centre and train station area, which is the equivalent of a Town Centre Zone – 36m <p>Seeks all consequential changes through provisions and within the maps</p>
--	--	------------------------	--	---

			<p>Naenae – Treadwell St/Naenae Road 22m</p> <p>Naenae Town Centre 36m</p> <p>(b) Construction or alteration of a building that exceeds the maximum height of 12m in Rule 5E 4.2.1(a) is a restricted discretionary activity.</p>	
206.289			<p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>i. The effects on the amenity of adjoining sites.</p> <p>ii. The effects on the privacy of adjoining sites.</p> <p>iii. The effects on shading of adjoining sites.</p> <p>iv. The effects on the amenity of adjoining Residential Activity Areas, the streetscape and adjoining public space.</p> <p>v. The following mixed use and medium density residential development design elements:</p> <p>1. Building height</p> <p>2. Recession planes and setbacks</p> <p>3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces</p> <p>4. Open space and boundary treatments</p> <p>5. Entrances, carparking and garages</p> <p>6. On-site stormwater management</p> <p>7. End / side wall treatment</p> <p>8. Building materials</p> <p>9. Bike parking, storage and service areas</p> <p>10. Privacy and safety</p> <p>11. Landscaping</p> <p>When considering the matters in (iv), the Council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide.</p>	Seeks amendments to this rule, to focus the assessment relevant more clearly to the issue being managed.
206.290	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Rule 5E 4.2.3	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the revised yards standards, noting they align with the MDRS

	Yards			
206.291	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area Rule 5E 4.2.4 Outdoor living space	Support in part	<p>(a) Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if:</p> <p>(i) Each dwelling has an outdoor living space that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has a minimum area of 10m². 2. Has a minimum dimension of 2m. 3. Has direct access from the dwelling to which it relates. <p>For dwellings located entirely above ground floor level the outdoor living space requirement can be satisfied by providing a balcony or roof terrace with a minimum area of 5m² with a minimum dimension of 2m 1.8m.</p> <p>Except, up to 40% of above ground units on a site can be provided with a Juliet balcony instead of a balcony or roof terrace.</p> <p>(b) Construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the outdoor living space requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</p>	Supports the additional flexibility enabled in this Permitted Activity condition. Seeks further flexibility to enable a proportion of above ground units to have Juliet balconies. This flexibility offers an alternative to requiring balconies for every apartment in a new apartment building in recognition of the more intensive nature of development enabled in this zone.
206.292			<p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The effects on the amenity for residents of the site, including access to sunlight and open space and the usability and accessibility of the outdoor living space proposed. ii. The proximity of the site to communal or public open space that has the potential to mitigate any lack of private outdoor living space. iii. The following mixed use and medium density residential development design elements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building height 2. Recession planes and setbacks 3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces 4. Open space and boundary treatments 5. Entrances, carparking and garages 6. Onsite stormwater management 7. End / side wall treatment 	Additionally seeks amendments to this rule, to focus the assessment relevant more clearly to the issue being managed.

			<p>8. Building materials 9. Bike parking, storage and service areas 10. Privacy and safety 11. Landscaping</p> <p>When considering the matters in (iii), the Council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide.</p>	
206.293			<p><u>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</u></p>	<p>Seeks the introduction of a non-notification clause precluding both public and limited notification, as a breach to this rule requires an assessment of the quality of internal amenity. It is not a matter that would require consideration of affected parties.</p>
206.294	Chapter 11 – Subdivision Objective (b) Section 11.1.3 Natural Hazards	Support	Retain as notified	<p>Supports the proposed new objective, which requires subdivision to not increase the risk of natural hazards, including coastal hazards.</p>
206.295	Chapter 11 – Subdivision Policies of section 11.1.3 Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p><i>Amendments sought</i> Policy Delete: (a) Subdivision of land within the Wellington Fault Special Study Area shall ensure that the allotments are of sufficient size and shape so that buildings and structures are not sited within twenty metres of a faultline. (aa) Subdivision of land within the Wellington Fault Hazard Overlay shall ensure that the allotments are of sufficient size and shape so that the building platform is at least 20m from the Wellington Faultline. (b) Subdivision of land subject to flooding is discouraged as this can lead to greater intensity of use and development and have adverse effects on the environment.</p>	<p>Seeks a simplified policy, which addresses the requirement to manage risk from natural hazards. An alternative policy is provided. Notes that the alternative policy refers to natural hazards <i>identified</i> in the District Plan. As noted elsewhere in this submission, opposes flood hazards being mapped in the Plan, and instead seeks definitions to appropriately <i>identify</i> such hazards in the plan.</p>

			<p>(ba) Subdivision shall ensure that any building platform is not located within an identified Stream Corridor.</p> <p>(bb) Subdivision where building platforms are within overland flow paths shall ensure that overland flowpaths are not impeded and mitigation measures are incorporated into the subdivision to avoid any increase in risk to people or property, including neighbouring</p> <p>(bc) Subdivision where the building platforms are within the Inundation Area shall include mitigation measures to avoid any increase in risk to people or property, including neighbouring properties.</p> <p>(bd) Subdivision where the building platforms are within the Medium and High Coastal Hazard Overlays shall include mitigation measures to avoid any increase in risk to people or property, including neighbouring properties.</p> <p>(c) Subdivision of land should be managed to ensure that within each allotment there is a suitable building platform so that buildings and associated structures will not be adversely affected by slope instability, including the deposition of debris.</p> <p>Replace with: <u>Take a risk-based approach to the management of subdivision of land affected by natural hazards and coastal hazards identified in the District Plan based on:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. The sensitivity of the activities to the impacts of natural hazards; and</u> <u>2. The hazard posed to people's lives and wellbeing, and property, by considering the likelihood and consequences of differing natural hazard events.</u> 	
206.296	Chapter 11 – Subdivision Objective 2	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the protection of identified heritage precincts from inappropriate subdivision

	Section 11.1.4 Special Areas			
206.297	Chapter 11 – Subdivision Policy b Section 11.1.4 Special Areas	Support in part	(b) Protect the historic heritage values in the Historic Residential Precinct and Patrick Street-Riddlers Crescent by managing density of development enabled by subdivision of land. b) Provide for the subdivision of land within Historic Residential Overlays and Patrick Street-Riddlers Crescent, having regard to the extent to which the subdivision and any anticipated development would detract from the identified heritage values.	Supports a new policy, but seeks alternative wording to better achieve both the outcome sought by the policy, and the underlying zone.
206.298			Consequential amendments to give effect to the above submission point.	Consequential changes are also sought as per the Residential Heritage submission points whereby seeks that all heritage provisions are an overlay and not a precinct.
206.299	Chapter 11 - Subdivision 11.2.2 Controlled Activities	Support in part	Introduce non-notification clause for Rule 11.2.2 for both public and limited notification.	Supports the changes to this rule to reflect the proposed change in zones. However, to achieve the outcome of Clause 5(3) of Schedule 3A the Act, Kāinga Ora seeks the inclusion of a non notification clause precluding both public and limited notification. Notes that while s95A(5)(b) provides for preclusion of Controlled Activity resource consents (both land use and subdivision), s95B(6)(b) does not automatically preclude notification for Controlled Activity subdivision consents.

206.300	Chapter 11 – Subdivision 11.2.2.1 Controlled Activity Standard and Terms (a) Allotment Design	Support in part	<p>Amend as follows: ...</p> <p>Resulting allotments with no residential units: Vacant allotments:</p> <p>(ii) For every allotment where there is no existing dwelling, or for which no existing land use consent for a dwelling has been granted, or is being concurrently granted (in the case of joint land use and subdivision applications): It can be demonstrated that it is practicable to construct on all allotments, as a permitted activity, a dwelling which complies with all relevant Medium Density Residential Development Standards specified in 4F 4.2. For any resulting vacant allotments with no existing residential unit:</p> <p>A. It is practicable to construct a residential unit on the allotment as a permitted activity the allotment can accommodate a rectangle with a shape factor of 8m x 15m, or</p> <p>B. Land use consent has been granted for the proposed use of the site (including built development), or</p> <p>C. The subdivision application is accompanied by a land use application for the proposed use of the site that will be determined concurrently with the subdivision application.</p> <p>Minimum frontage: 3m to ensure that there is drive on access to the allotment. For rear allotments the 3m frontage may be satisfied through a registered Right of Way outside the title (outside legal boundaries of the allotment).</p>	<p>Supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A controlled activity status • Amendment to Medium Density Residential Activity Area table to include High Density and the following matters within the table <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No minimum allotment size ○ Matters set out in (i) <p>Seeks the following changes to the Medium Density Residential Activity Area and High Density Residential Activity Area table:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alter chapeau of (ii) from “resulting allotments with no residential units” to “vacant allotments” and text within to reflect this change • Revise Point A from needing to demonstrate that a permitted dwelling can be constructed (which could require hypothetical plans to be produced at the consent stage) to instead require a minimum shape factor of 8m x 15m. • Deletion of minimum frontage standard, which is consistent with the proposed changes to 11.2.2.3(b)(i) within PC56.
206.301	Chapter 11 – Subdivision 11.2.3	Support in part	<p>11.2.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities</p> <p>a) Any subdivision that does not comply with the standards and terms for controlled activity under Rule 11.2.2.1 in respect of (a) Allotment</p>	<p>Supports the introduction of 11.2.3(e), (f), and (g) relating to natural hazards as Restricted Discretionary Activities.</p>

	Restricted Discretionary Activities		Design for Medium Density Residential Activity Area and High Density Activity Areas (b) Engineering Design, (c) Contamination and (e) Earthworks. i. Non-notification - In respect of Rule 11.2.3 (a) in relation to a breach of the standards and terms to Rule 11.2.2.1 (a), public and limited notification of applications for resource consent is precluded.	
206.302			Introduce new Restricted Discretionary rule for subdivisions that don't meet 11.2.3(a)(a) for Medium and High Density Activity areas.	Seeks a new RDA rule framework for subdivisions that do not meet the Standards and Terms of the Controlled Activity Rule (a) <i>Allotment Design</i> for Medium Density Residential Activity Area and High Density Activity Area. This is consistent with the activity status that is applied in both the WCC, and PCC proposed district plans for the same aspect of non-compliance.
206.303			Consequential changes to give effect to the above two submission points.	Seeks consequential changes to introduce new matters of discretion relevant to this new rule in 11.2.3.1.
206.304	Chapter 11 – Subdivision 11.2.3.1 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Matters of Discretion	Support in part	11.2.3.1 Matters in which Council has restricted its discretion a. Any subdivision that does not comply with the standards and terms for controlled activity under Rule 11.2.2.1 in respect of (a) allotment design , (b) Engineering Design, (c) Contamination and (e) Earthworks. ... (ia) The matters of control under Rule 11.2.2.2. (iaa) Whether the allotment design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reflects the intended pattern of development and are consistent with the purpose, character and amenity values of the zone and • is adequately sized to accommodate the intended development form for the activity area • whether the staging of the subdivision relative to building construction is efficient 	Seeks consequential changes to introduce new matters of discretion as a result of the proposed RDA rule at 11.2.3. Kāinga Ora supports the proposed changes to 11.2.3.1 with regard to introducing discretion to consider natural and coastal hazards.

			and appropriate to the scale and complexity of the overall development	
206.305			Consequential change to remove reference to Flood Hazard Overlay in 11.2.3.1(d).	Consequential changes are sought to remove reference Flood Hazard Overlay in 11.2.3.1(d).
206.306	Chapter 11 – Subdivision 11.2.4 Discretionary Activities	Support in part	Amend with consequential changes.	Supports the proposed amendments to this rule, introducing subdivision within identified historic precinct areas, and where building platforms are located in within the Wellington Fault Hazard Overlay and High Coastal Hazard Overlay as Discretionary Activities. Consequential changes are requested in terms of renaming historic heritage precincts to overlays as per the relevant Kāinga Ora submission points.
206.307	Chapter 11 – Subdivision 11.2.5 Non-Complying Activities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the proposed amendments to this rule, introducing subdivision resulting in a building platform within the stream corridor as a Non-Complying Activity.
206.308	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Remove natural hazard flooding overlay(s) from the District Plan statutory maps, and instead hold this information in non-statutory GIS maps	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard mapping as part of the District Plan. Including Flood Hazard overlays in the District Plan ignores the dynamic nature of flood hazards and will create unnecessary additional cost and uncertainty for landowners and land developers.
206.309	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Creation of new definitions to identify flood hazards in the Plan	Agrees it is appropriate to include provisions and rules to manage the risk of flood hazards but seeks that the rules are not linked to static maps contained within the District Plan. Instead, the rules can be linked to defined terms of the hazards. The Auckland Unitary Plan (“AUP”) adopts a set of non-statutory flood hazard overlay maps which operate as interactive maps on the Council’s ‘Geo Maps’ website – a separate mapping viewer to the statutory maps. The advantage of this approach is the ability to operate a separate set of interactive maps which are continually subject to improvement and updates, outside of and without a reliance on the Schedule 1 process under the RMA. Kāinga Ora notes that there is no formal requirement for flooding overlay maps to be
206.310	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Amended rule framework to enable rules to be linked to newly defined terms of Flood Hazards	
206.311	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Revise reference throughout plan to delete “flood hazard overlay”	

206.312	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Flood Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Consequential changes to give effect to this submission	<p>included within a district plan. Notes that the National Planning Standards 2016 – Mapping Standard Table 20 includes a number of specific overlay and other symbols, but none relate to flooding. To ensure the rule framework continues to be linked to identified flood hazards, Kāinga Ora suggests definitions be introduced as a consequential amendment to ensure the hazards are appropriately “identified” in the Plan. Such definitions are anticipated to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Hazard – Stream Corridor • Flood Hazard – Overland Flowpath • Flood Hazard – Inundation • High Hazard Area • 1% Annual Exceedance Probability Flood <p>Otherwise supports the mapping of other, non-flooding natural hazards to be incorporated into the District Plan maps, such as Fault Hazards (in addition to Coastal Hazards), as these hazards are less subject to change.</p>
206.313	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Introduction	Support in part	<p><u>Natural Hazard Overlay: Respective Hazard Ranking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Wellington Fault Rupture (within 20m of known fault): High</u> • <u>Stream Corridor (1:100 year inundation event + 1m sea level rise): High</u> • <u>Overland Flowpath (1:100 year inundation event + 1m sea level rise): Medium</u> • <u>Inundation Area (1:100 year inundation extent + 1m sea level rise): Low</u> 	Seeks removal of the use of “overlay” from the table identifying the Natural Hazards.
206.314			<p><u>Overlays</u></p> <p><u>Natural Hazard Overlays – Means the mapped extent within the District Plan of the following Natural Hazards:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Fault Rupture Hazards</u> • <u>Flood Hazards based on a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability Flood including effects of climate change, including:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Stream corridor</u> • <u>Overland Flow</u> • <u>Inundation Areas</u> 	Seeks removal of reference to flood hazard maps under the “Overlay” section of the introduction. It is noted that Kāinga Ora has offered elsewhere in this submission additional definitions for flood hazards to ensure these are still <i>identified</i> in the District Plan.

206.315			Amend Introduction to be more concise.	Queries the length and level of detail within the introduction. For example, Kāinga Ora questions the need to list all relevant overlays and potential mitigation methods.
206.316			Refine and reduce content of provisions by defining terms in the Definitions section	Considers that any terms relied on within provisions should be contained within definitions. Seeks consequential changes to the introduction to significantly refine and reduce the content.
206.317	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Policy 14H 1.1 Levels of Risk	Support in part	<u>Subdivision, use and development reduce or do not increase the risk to people, property and infrastructure by:</u> 1. <u>Limiting the scale of subdivision, use and development on sites within the medium and high Natural Hazard areas Overlays and the medium and high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays;</u> and 2. <u>Requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development that addresses the impacts from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure in the low hazard, medium hazard and high hazard areas within the identified Natural Hazard areas and Coastal Hazard Overlays.</u>	Supports the risk based approach to managing development and use in areas subject to natural hazards. Amendments are sought to give effect to the relief sought to remove reference to natural hazard overlays insofar as it relates to flooding.
206.318	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Policy 14H 1.3 Additions to Buildings in an identified Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay	Support in part	<u>Policy 14H 1.3 Additions to Buildings in an identified Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay</u>	Supports this policy, but seeks amendment to the policy chapeau to remove reference to the flood hazard overlay.
206.319			<u>Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property specific information.</u>	Seeks the inclusion of a note at the end of the policy, which makes reference to flood hazard maps that sit outside of the Plan to help identify, at a property level, whether the site may be subject to flooding.
206.320	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Policy 14H 1.4 Additions to Buildings within the Overland Flowpaths and	Support in part	<u>Policy 14H 1.4 Additions to Buildings within the Overland Flowpaths and Stream Corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays</u>	Supports this policy, but seeks amendment to the policy chapeau to remove reference to the flood hazard overlay.
206.321			<u>Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of</u>	Seeks the inclusion of a note at the end of the policy,

	Stream Corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays		flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property-specific information.	which makes reference to flood hazard maps that sit outside of the Plan to help identify, at a property level, whether the site may be subject to flooding.
206.322	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Policy 14H 1.5 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities within the identified Inundation Areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays	Support in part	Policy 14H 1.5 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities within the identified Inundation Areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays	Supports this policy, but seeks amendment to the policy chapeau to remove reference to the flood hazard overlay.
206.323	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Policy 14H 1.5 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities within the identified Inundation Areas of the Flood Hazard Overlays		Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property-specific information.	Seeks the inclusion of a note at the end of the policy, which makes reference to flood hazard maps that sit outside of the Plan to help identify, at a property level, whether the site may be subject to flooding.
206.324	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Policy 14H 1.6 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities within the Overland Flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays	Support in part	Policy 14H 1.6 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities within the Overland Flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays	Supports this policy, but seeks amendment to the policy chapeau to remove reference to the flood hazard overlay.
206.325	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Policy 14H 1.6 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities within the Overland Flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlays		Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property-specific information.	Seeks the inclusion of a note at the end of the policy, which makes reference to flood hazard maps that sit outside of the Plan to help identify, at a property level, whether the site may be subject to flooding.
206.326	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Policy 14H 1.7 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities within the Stream Corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays	Support in part	Policy 14H 1.7 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities within the Stream Corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays	Supports this policy, but seeks amendment to the policy chapeau to remove reference to the flood hazard overlay.
206.327	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Policy 14H 1.7 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities within the Stream Corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays		Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property-specific information.	Seeks the inclusion of a note at the end of the policy, which makes reference to flood hazard maps that sit outside of the Plan to help identify, at a property level, whether the site may be subject to flooding

206.328			Rule 14H 2.2 Additions to residential buildings in the Inundation Area, Overland Flow Path or Stream Corridor Flood Hazard Overlays	Seeks amendment to the chapeau to remove reference to the flood hazard overlay.
206.329	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards 14H 2 - Rules Rule 14H 2.2 Additions to residential buildings in the Inundation Area, Overland Flow Path or Stream Corridor Flood Hazard Overlays	Support in part	<p>1. Additions to residential buildings that are within the Inundation Area, Overland Flow Path or Stream Corridor Flood Hazard Overlays are permitted activities where:</p> <p>a. When located within an Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, The finished floor levels of the additions are located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability Level, where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab.; and</p> <p>b. The additions are not located within the Overland Flow Path Overlay; and</p> <p>c. The additions are not located within the Stream or River Corridor Overlay.</p> <p>2. Additions to residential buildings that are within the Inundation Area, Overland Flow Path or Stream Corridor Flood Hazard Overlays are restricted discretionary activities where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of 14H 2.24(1)(a) cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>1. The matters in 14H 1.3.</p> <p>3. Additions to residential buildings that are in the Inundation Area, Overland Flow Path or Stream Corridor Flood Hazard Overlays are restricted discretionary activities where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of 14H 2.4(1)(b) cannot be achieved</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>1. The matters in 14H 1.4.</p>	Supports the intent of the rule, but seeks simplification of the rule framework to reflect the risk management approach – such that additions in an Inundation Area are Permitted, subject to meeting minimum FFL, otherwise RDIS. Additions within an Overland Flowpath are automatically RDIS, and additions within a Stream Corridor are automatically NC.

			<p>4. Additions to residential buildings that are in the Inundation Area, Overland Flow Path or Stream Corridor Flood Hazard Overlays are non-complying activities where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of 14H 2.2(1)(c) cannot be achieved.</p>	
206.330			<p>2. Additions to residential buildings that are within the Inundation Area, Overland Flow Path or Stream Corridor Flood Hazard Overlays are restricted discretionary activities where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with the requirements of 14H 2.24(1)(a) cannot be achieved.</p>	Seeks correction of an incorrect rule reference at 14H 2.2.2(a).
206.331			<p><u>Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property-specific information.</u></p>	Seeks the inclusion of a note at the end of the policy, which makes reference to flood hazard maps that sit outside of the Plan to help identify, at a property level, whether the site may be subject to flooding.
206.332	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards 14H 2 - Rules Rule 14H 2.3 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay	Support in part	<p>Rule 14H 2.3 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay</p> <p>1. New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities that are within the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay are permitted activities where:</p> <p>a. When located within an Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, The finished floor levels of the building for the Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activity are located above the 1% Flood Annual Exceedance Probability Level, including an allowance for freeboard, where the finished floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or the base of the concrete floor slab.</p> <p>2. New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities that are within the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay are restricted discretionary activities where:</p>	Supports this rule framework, but seeks amendment to remove reference to the flood hazard overlay.

206.333			Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property-specific information.	Seeks the inclusion of a note at the end of the policy, which makes reference to flood hazard maps that sit outside of the Plan to help identify, at a property level, whether the site may be subject to flooding.
206.334	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards 14H 2 - Rules Rule 14H 2.4 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities that are within the Overland Flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay	Support in part	Rule 14H 2.4 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities that are within the Overland Flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay 1. New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities that are within the Overland Flowpaths of the Flood Hazard Overlay are restricted discretionary activities. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters in 14H 1.6.	Supports this rule framework, but seeks amendment to remove reference to the flood hazard overlay.
206.335			Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property-specific information.	Seeks the inclusion of a note at the end of the policy, which makes reference to flood hazard maps that sit outside of the Plan to help identify, at a property level, whether the site may be subject to flooding.
206.336	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards 14H 2 - Rules Rule 14H 2.5 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities that are within the Stream Corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay	Support in part	Rule 14H 2.5 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities that are within the Stream Corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay 1. New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities that are within the Stream Corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlay are noncomplying activities.	Supports this rule framework, but seeks amendment to remove reference to the flood hazard overlay.
206.337			Note: The Council holds publicly available information showing the modelled extent of flooding affecting specific properties in its GIS viewer. The maps are non-statutory and can be reviewed to take account of any property-specific information.	Seeks the inclusion of a note at the end of the policy, which makes reference to flood hazard maps that sit outside of the Plan to help identify, at a property level, whether the site may be subject to flooding.
206.338	14M - Wind Entire chapter	Support in Part	Amend the height limit at which point a wind assessment and/or resource consent is required to 20m.	Supports a well functioning and safe urban environment. However, Kāinga Ora seeks adjustments at the point at which wind assessments are required and/or resource consent is

				<p>necessary. Seeks an increase in this threshold to apply only to development in excess of 20m.</p> <p>Considers that an alternative method could be utilised to assess effects of wind on the safety of the pedestrian public realm, which could include assessment of wind effects as a listed matter of discretion in the zone based rules for development that is in excess of 20m.</p> <p>Seeks that any rule framework requiring the consideration of wind effects is a restricted discretionary activity, as the matters of discretion should be able to be identified for such an assessment.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/207 Summerset Group Holdings Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
207.1	Medium and High Density Residential Activity Areas	Support with amendment	Adopt the retirement village specific objectives and policies sought in the RVA submission [DPC56/211] into the Medium and High Density Residential Activity Areas.	<p>Summerset generally supports the intent of the plan change to enable more housing. They request amendments in line with those requested in the RVA submission [DPC56/211] for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summerset supports the integration of the mandatory objectives and policies of the Enabling Housing Act as they are drafted in the Enabling Housing Act in the Medium and High Density Residential Activity Areas. Summerset opposes additional objectives/policies which have been inserted that conflict with the MDRS; • The Plan Change encompasses some elements of the retirement village specific objectives and policies sought by the RVA Position Paper (e.g. recognising the required change to existing character and amenity of neighbourhoods, providing for the unique layout and amenity needs of some developments etc.), however the majority of these objectives and policies sought by the RVA Position Paper are not provided for in the plan change (e.g.
207.2	Medium and High Density Residential Activity Areas	Support with amendment	That retirement villages be an activity to be permitted.	
207.3	Medium and High Density Residential Activity Areas	Support with amendment	A retirement village specific set of matters of discretion to apply for the construction of retirement villages, such that the broad matters of discretion for infringements to the relevant development standard do not apply.	
207.4	Medium and High Density Residential Activity Areas	Support with amendment	Delete development standards that are not included in the MDRS provisions of the Enabling	

			Housing Act (in particular in the Medium and High Density Residential Activity Areas).	<p>recognising the functional and operational needs of <i>retirement villages</i>, recognising intensification opportunities provided by larger sites etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discretionary activity status in Area 2 of the Petone Commercial Area under 'housing for the elderly' is in conflict with the MDRS and the Enabling Housing Act. There is a need to include provision for retirement villages as part of the Plan Change process.
207.5	Medium Density Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes the application of matters of discretion that make reference to a Medium Density Design Guide to retirement villages.	
207.6	Notification	Support with amendment	Amend the MDRS density standards and notification requirements in line with the RVA position [DPC56/211].	
207.7	Central Commercial Activity Area and the Petone Commercial Activity Area	Amend	Seeks retirement village specific provisions for these activity areas – including the provision for retirement villages as a permitted activity (with the construction of buildings for retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity) and the provision of a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion.	
207.8	Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area	Amend	That retirement villages are provided for as a permitted activity.	
207.9	Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area	Amend	A retirement village specific set of matters of discretion to apply for the construction of retirement villages.	
207.10	Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area	Amend	Summerset seeks amendments to the MDRS density standards and notification requirements for the Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area in line with the RVA position paper.	
207.11	Financial Contributions	Amend	Amend the financial contributions chapter to prevent 'double dipping' between FC and DC regimes, and add a retirement village specific regime.	

DPC56/208 Kerri Plancque				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
208.1	Chapter 14F Heritage Buildings and Structures Heritage Areas	Oppose	Amend the plan change to include the following policy: <u>That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes listing of private residential properties under the proposed heritage areas without homeowner consent. • Council has not provided evidence that a particular property qualifies as a 'heritage' property. • Concerned about the effect of the heritage listing on property values. • Houses in the proposed heritage areas vary in their quality and type and may not meet healthy homes standards. • While respecting and preserving heritage supports the city's cultural capital, it should be balanced against what is needed for people to live and for a city to grow and change. • Council must allow for fair and reasonable development across the city for a vibrant, living city that people are able to afford. • Supports provisions that enable more housing, flexibility to build and extend for those who want it, and a city where people can live. • Imposition of heritage listings will result in costs to Hutt City from increased management, and loss of citizen goodwill. • A voluntary heritage policy is a better approach for the city and residents.

Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
209.1	Zone Maps	Support in part	Rezone the land at 76 Antrim Crescent, along with other Hill Residential-zoned land extending west to, and including 30 Pencarrow Crescent Wainuiomata, to Medium Density Residential Zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supports Proposed Plan Change 56 (PC56). • Opposes not rezoning the land at 76 Antrim Crescent, along with other Hill Residential-zoned land extending west to, and including 30 Pencarrow Crescent Wainuiomata, to Medium Density Residential Zone. • The block of land (“the block”) does not exhibit the characteristics of the Hill Residential Activity Area as it is relatively flat and contains no significant vegetation. • The Medium Density Residential Activity Area is located at the west and south of the block of land. • Rezoning the subject sites would be consistent with the resource consents already granted for 76 Antrim Crescent (RM210072 and RM210368) which together consented 20 medium density lots. • For the purposes of incorporating the MDRS, the Hill Residential Activity Area meets the definition of a ‘relevant residential zone’ as defined by the RMA, and therefore Council must give effect to the MDRS. • It is appropriate to rezone the block of land to Medium Density Residential, as enabled by the section 77G(4) of the RMA to give effect to policy 2 of the NPS-UD to meet expected demand for housing over the short and medium term. • HCC must provide sufficient development capacity that is plan-enabled. The Council’s District Plan Review and the 2012 Housing and Business Land Capacity Assessment identified small areas around Wainuiomata as potentially being suitable for greenfield development.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The block is largely already residential in nature, and rezoning this land is a logical extension of the Medium Density Residential Activity Area. • The block has a gentle to moderate slope, is readily serviced, and does not otherwise exhibit the same characteristics of other land in the Hill Residential Activity Area. • Rezoning larger sites allows for cohesive medium density development in which greater yields are possible as less constraints are applicable such as existing dwellings, small sites and access etc. • The block already meets the definition of being infrastructure-ready under clause 3.4(3) of the NPS-UD. • There are no qualifying matters.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/210 York Bay Residents' Association				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
210.1	Entire plan change	Oppose in part	Exclude Eastbourne and the Eastern Bays from PC56 until the impact of coastal hazards can be better understood and considered as part of the forthcoming review of the entire District Plan, and in light of other government reviews and actions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCC can limit the effects of housing intensification if the area is at "significant risk from natural hazards" (a qualifying matter). • Eastbourne and the Eastern Bays have been identified as at risk of inundation from the combined effect of accelerating sea level rise, land subsidence and failure to meet emission reduction targets. • Marine Drive provides the only access for this area, as well as protecting the Pencarrow sewer pipeline servicing the whole of the Hutt Valley and other water infrastructure. Notes it is already compromised by high tides and storm surges, which will become more frequent.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various reviews and plans are under way that will provide better information for HCC on which to base any decision with regard to densification in Eastbourne/Eastern Bays. These reports are due in the next two years.
210.2	Entire plan change	Oppose in part	Raise the height of the proposed Tupua Horo Nuku shared path to help mitigate the effects of sea level rise.	There is an opportunity now as construction begins to increase the height of the shared path to future-proof the path for longer. The cost of changes would be offset by reduced maintenance costs.
210.3	MDRAA	Oppose in part	Undertake a more careful analysis of individual sites when applying the MDRAA to properties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic zoning errors have been carried over into PC56. • Some properties are within tsunami zones • Some properties are affected by stream corridors • Historic heritage of 10 Taungata Road. • General natural hazards and risk concerns affect many properties in York Bay.
210.4	Entire plan change	Oppose in part	Protect the indigenous vegetation on road reserves and properties that support rare fauna.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections in York Bay often contain a wide variety of indigenous plants and trees that support native bird populations. • It is important to protect the vegetation providing food and nesting sites for these birds from clearance. • The protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna is a matter of national importance under section 6(c) of the RMA. • Vegetation is required to offset carbon emissions.
210.5	Entire plan change	Oppose in part	Adopt design guides, such as those prepared by the Wellington City Council, in the District Plan as a critical mechanism for ensuring a better built environment.	Design guides for all developments will help create a better housing environment.

210.6	Plan Change Wide / General approach	Oppose	Explore the potential to act in unison with other local authorities for outright refusal to make this change.	Consider working with the other local authorities affected by these requirements to follow Christchurch City Council in refusing to make these changes to its District Plan.
-------	-------------------------------------	--------	---	--

DPC56/211 Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
211.1	Explanation and Reasons	Oppose	Delete all explanation and reasons with relevant text to be integrated into the operative provisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the inclusion of lengthy explanation text within PC56. • The planning direction should be clearly set out in the operative provisions. • Explanation text has no clear role and increases interpretation uncertainties where it creates inconsistencies with operative provisions.
211.2	1.10.1A Urban Environment – Objective 1.10.1A	Support	Retain Objective 1.10.1A as notified.	Aligns with Objective 1 of the MDRS.
211.4	1.10.1A Urban Environment - Policy 1.10.1A.1	Support	Retain Policy 1.10.1A.1 as notified.	Reflects Policy 3 NPS-UD and the MDRS.
211.5	1.10.1A Urban Environment - Policy 1.10.1A.2	Support	Retain Policy 1.10.1A.2 as notified.	Reflects 3.32 of the NPS-UD.
211.6	1.10.1A Urban Environment - Policy 1.10.1A.3	Support	Retain Policy 1.10.1A.3 as notified.	Aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.

211.7	1.10.1A Urban Environment - Policy 1.10.1A.4	Support	Retain Policy 1.10.1A.4 as notified.	Aligns with Policy 4 of the MDRS.
211.8	1.10.2 Amenity Values – Objective 1.10.2.1	Support	Retain Objective 1.10.2.1 as notified.	Reflects Objective 4 NPS-UD.
211.9	1.10.2 Amenity Values – Objective 1.10.2.2	Oppose in part	The RVA seeks Objective 1.10.2.2 is amended to exclude Residential and Commercial zones.	The RVA supports Objective 1.10.2.2 in principle as it seeks to identify, maintain and enhance the character and amenity values of the different activity areas <i>outside</i> the urban environment <i>only</i> . However, it submits that this Objective could create interpretation issues as ‘urban environment’ is not defined in the Plan.
211.10	1.10.2 Amenity Values – Policy	Support in part	Amend 1.10.2 Policy to refer to “planned urban built form”.	The RVA supports the change in focus of this policy from existing to planned character and amenity values. It considers the wording “planned urban built form” would be more consistent with the NPSUD.
211.11	1.10.3 Residential Activity	New objective sought	Add a new objective: Ageing population Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.	The RVA considers policy support for retirement villages in the Residential Zones is required for the reasons set out in the submission above.
211.12	1.10.3 Residential Activity – Policy 1.10.3.1	Support in part	Amend Policy 1.10.3.1(a) to acknowledge the built form standards will be more enabling than the MDRS in the High Density Residential Activity Area.	The RVA supports Policy 1.10.3.1 to the extent it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS. However, in the High Density Residential Activity Area the built form standards should be more enabling than the MDRS.
211.13	1.10.3 Residential Activity – Policy 1.10.3.2	Oppose	Delete Policy 2.	The RVA opposes this Policy as it is unclear as to its meaning and does not appear to be consistent with Policy 2 NPSUD requiring “at least sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for housing and for business land” to be provided.

211.14	1.10.4 Commercial Activity	New objective sought	<p>Add a new objective:</p> <p><u>Ageing population</u></p> <p><u>Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</u></p>	The RVA considers policy support for retirement villages in the Commercial Zones is required for the reasons set out in the submission above.
211.15	Definitions – Retirement Village	Oppose	<p>The RVA seeks the definition in the District Plan be amended to comply with the National Planning Standards:</p> <p><u>Retirement village</u></p> <p><u>means a managed comprehensive residential complex or facilities used to provide residential accommodation for people who are retired and any spouses or partners of such people. It may also include any of the following for residents within the complex: recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (inclusive of hospital care) and other non-residential activities.</u></p>	The RVA opposes the definition of retirement village contained in the District Plan as it is inconsistent with the National Planning Standards.
211.16	Definitions	Support	<p>The RVA seeks to include a new definition for ‘retirement units’ as follows:</p> <p><u>Retirement Unit</u></p> <p><u>means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing, and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is not a residential unit.</u></p>	The RVA seek to include a new definition for ‘retirement units’ in the District Plan, as this term has been sought to be included in multiple provisions in the tables below. This definition is required to acknowledge the differences from typical residential activities in terms of layout and amenity needs.
211.17	Chapter 4 Residential – Introduction	Support in Part	<p>The RVA seeks to amend this section to provide specific reference to retirement villages:</p> <p>The site activity areas are:</p> <p>....</p> <p>(f) Medium Density Residential Activity Area</p> <p>...</p>	The RVA supports the recognition that building heights and densities in the zones that provide for Medium Density Residential activities are expected to change over time, and a mix of low to medium density residential development is permitted. However, the RVA considers that specific acknowledgement of retirement villages is required in the introductory text. Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS require Council to enable all people and communities to provide for their well-being and for relevant residential zones to respond to housing needs and demands. The

			<p>However, building heights and densities are expected to change over time. A mix of low to medium density residential development is permitted in the Medium Density Residential Activity Area. This includes stand-alone and multi-unit developments (such as semi-detached and terrace housing and retirement villages) of three storeys. Resource consent is required for higher density development that does not meet the development standards for the zone.</p>	<p>Residential Introduction must recognise the important role retirement villages have in accommodating aging populations in the community.</p>
211.18	Chapter 4 Residential – Introduction	Support in Part	<p>The RVA seeks to amend this section to provide specific reference to retirement villages as follows:</p> <p>The site activity areas are:</p> <p>....</p> <p>(g) High Density Residential Activity Area</p> <p>....</p> <p>Opportunities for a variety of medium and high density residential developments such as detached dwellings, terraced housing, and low-rise apartments and retirement villages are provided for in this Activity Area. Higher density development is enabled in the High Density Residential Activity Area by permitting multi-unit developments of up to six-storey buildings and enabling taller buildings of at least 6 storeys through a resource consent process.</p>	<p>The RVA supports the recognition that higher density development is enabled in the High Density Residential Activity area as a permitted activity. However, the RVA seeks to provide specific acknowledgement of retirement villages in the introductory text. Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS require Council to enable all people and communities to provide for their well-being and for relevant residential zones to respond to housing needs and demands. The Residential Introduction must recognise the important role retirement villages have in accommodating aging populations in the community.</p> <p>In accordance with Policy 3 of the NPSUD, the RVA considers the Policy must refer to enabling taller buildings of ‘at least 6 storeys’. It also considers heights greater than 3 storeys should be permitted to enable higher density development in this Area.</p>
211.19	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Introduction / Zone Statement	Support in Part	<p>The RVA seeks to amend this section to provide specific reference to retirement villages as follows:</p> <p>....</p> <p><i>The planned urban built character for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area is a mix of densities low to medium density</i></p>	<p>The RVA opposes the statements that the planned urban character for the area is a “mix of low to medium density development” as it is inconsistent with MDRS Policy 1 regarding a “mix of densities”. The planned urban character for this area is medium density overall and should acknowledge that higher densities can be provided for.</p> <p>The RVA seeks to provide specific acknowledgement of retirement villages in the introductory text given the important role</p>

			<p><i>development, including detached dwellings, terraced housing, and low-rise apartments and retirement villages. The urban built character of an area will arise from the flexibility provided for by the Plan for individual development to take any low to medium density form, as well as higher densities through a consenting process. This supports increasing the capacity and choice of housing within neighbourhoods. It is anticipated that the appearance of neighbourhoods in the Activity Area will change over time, including through increased opportunities for terraced housing, and low-rise apartments, and retirement villages.</i></p> <p>Amend the Introduction/Zone Statement to align with the MDRS:</p> <p>If a proposed development does not meet the development standards, resource consent is required in order to:</p> <p>i. achieve a high quality built environment;</p> <p>ii. manage the effects of development on neighbouring sites;</p> <p>iii. achieve high quality onsite living environments; and</p> <p>iv. achieve attractive and safe streets and public space.</p> <p>The resource consent process enables the design and layout of development to be assessed, recognising that quality design is increasingly important as the scale and density of development increases. Council provides design guidance for residential developments through design guides that sit outside the plan.</p>	<p>retirement villages have in accommodating the aging populations in the community.</p> <p>The RVA supports paragraph 4 of the Introduction/Zone Statement which states that development standards address certain matters. The RVA considers a policy is needed to address this point.</p> <p>The RVA opposes Paragraph 5 of the Introduction/Zone Statement, which is inconsistent with the MDRS as follows:</p> <p>(i) the requirement to “achieve” a high quality built environment, where the MDRS only requires high quality development to be “encouraged”;</p> <p>(iii) the requirement to “achieve high quality onsite living environments,” which is not a requirement of the MDRS. The RVA opposes a policy requirement relating to on-site amenity. The RVA’s members have significant experience of building villages and know intimately the amenity needs of its residents. The RVA’s members frequently come across issues during consenting processes where council officers attempt to influence retirement villages’ internal layouts based on their understanding of design principles which only apply to traditional housing types.</p> <p>(iv) the requirement to “achieve attractive and safe streets and public space” which is inconsistent with Policy 3 of the MDRS, which only “encourages” development to achieve attractive and safe streets and public space. These matters are also already provided for under Policy 4F 3.8.</p> <p>The RVA opposes paragraph 6 of the Statement insofar as it seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner which is inconsistent with the MDRS. It also opposes the application of design guides to retirement villages as they are not fit-for-purpose.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

211.20	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Objective 4F 2.1AA	Support	Retain Objective 4F 2.1AA as notified.	The RVA supports Objective 4F 2.1AA as it aligns with Objective 1 of the MDRS.
211.21	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Objective 4F 2.3	Support	Retain Objective 4F 2.3 as notified.	The RVA supports Objective 4F 2.3 as it aligns with Objective 2 of the MDRS
211.22	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Objective 4F 2.3A	Oppose	Amend policy to provide for a mix of densities including higher density development.	The RVA opposes this policy as it limits development in the Medium Density Residential Activity Area to a low to medium density form, with a maximum of three storeys. This is inconsistent with the NPSUD and MDRS as higher density development must be provided for (Policy 5 MDRS).
211.23	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Objective 4F 2.5	Oppose in part	<p>Add a new policy:</p> <p><u>Role of density standards</u></p> <p><u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u></p> <p>Amend (iii) to refer to “attractive and safe streets”.</p>	The RVA opposes the use of the word “appropriate” in (i) and (ii) of this policy without policy guidance to confirm “appropriate” is determined by the density standards. The RVA opposes the phrase “high level of amenity for the street” as it is inconsistent with Policy 3 MDRS.
211.24	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Objectives	Support / New Objective Sought	<p>Insert a new Objective in the Objectives for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area chapter that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</p> <p><u>RESZ-OX Ageing population</u></p> <p><u>Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</u></p>	In addition to the current objectives for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area, the RVA considers that an ageing population specific objective should be included that recognises and enables the housing and care needs of the ageing population.
211.25	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential	Support	Retain Policy 4F 3.2 as notified.	The RVA supports Policy 4F 3.2 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS.

	Activity Area – Policy 4F 3.2			
211.26	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4F 3.2A	Support	Retain Policy 4F 3.2A as notified.	The RVA supports Policy 4F 3.2A as it aligns with Policy 5 of the MDRS.
211.27	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4F 3.2B	Support	Retain Policy 4F 3.2B as notified.	The RVA supports Policy 4F 3.2B as it aligns with Policy 4 of the MDRS.
211.28	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4F 3.2C	Oppose in part	<p>Exclude retirement villages from Policy 4F 3.2C: <i>Require built development (excluding retirement villages) to provide occupants with adequate opportunities for outdoor living through having useable and accessible on-site private outdoor living space, or through access to appropriate communal or nearby public open space of comparable utility.</i></p> <p>Add a new policy (Role of density standards) as set out above.</p>	<p>The RVA supports the recognition under Policy 4F 3.2C that access to communal open space will provide adequate opportunities for outdoor living, as it provides for the unique layout and amenity needs of retirement villages (e.g. the wide range of communal spaces residents have access to in addition to their individual homes).</p> <p>However, it considers the terms “adequate opportunities” and “appropriate” are vague and will lead to interpretation difficulties. As discussed above, policy guidance is needed to clarify these terms are determined by the density standards.</p> <p>The RVA seeks that retirement villages are excluded from this policy as controls regarding on-site amenity are considered inappropriate for the reasons set out above.</p>
211.29	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4F 3.2D	Oppose in part	<p>The RVA seeks that retirement villages are excluded from Policy 4F 3.2D: <i>Policy 4F 3.2D</i></p> <p><i>Encourage development (excluding retirement villages) to contribute to an attractive setting for occupants and the surrounding area, which can be achieved through:</i></p> <p><i>i. landscaped areas that contribute to amenity,</i></p>	<p>The RVA supports Policy 4F 3.2D(iii), as it recognises that a lack of outlook area as part of a development (e.g. a retirement village) can be sufficiently mitigated by other means to ensure that development contributes to an attractive setting for occupants and the surrounding area. As set out below, the RVA considers the outlook density standard needs to be amended for retirement villages. Retirement villages provide a wide range of communal spaces and ‘living areas’ (e.g. communal sitting areas, dining rooms, libraries etc) which often provide outlook into large and attractive spaces.</p>

			<p><i>ii. adequate outlook areas from habitable rooms, and</i></p> <p><i>iii. other means that would adequately mitigate a lack of landscaping or outlook areas.</i></p> <p>Add a new policy (Role of density standards) as set out above.</p>	<p>However, it considers the term “adequate” is vague and will lead to interpretation difficulties. As discussed above, policy guidance is needed to clarify this term is determined by the density standards.</p> <p>The RVA seeks that retirement villages are excluded from this policy as controls regarding on-site amenity are considered inappropriate for the reasons set out above.</p>
211.30	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4F 3.3	Support in part	Amend policy to refer to height, height in relation to boundary, setback and building coverage standards (rather than “height, bulk and form”).	The RVA supports this policy to the extent it reflects the MDRS standards.
211.31	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4F 3.8	Support	Retain Policy 4F 3.8 as notified.	The RVA supports Policy 4F 3.8 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.
211.32	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4F 3.10	Oppose in part	Delete policy or amend to “encourage”.	The RVA opposes <i>requiring</i> hydraulic neutrality in all cases including where there is sufficient capacity in the downstream system and/or the effects of increased water flows can be managed effectively.
211.33	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Policies	Support	<p>Include a new Policy in the Policies of the Medium Density Residential Activity Area chapter, as follows:</p> <p><u>RESZ-PX Changing communities</u></p> <p><u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p>	In addition to the proposed policies for the Medium Density Residential Activity Areas, the RVA considers that a policy is required that recognises the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, and that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.
211.34	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential	Support	Include a new Policy in the Policies of the Medium Density Residential Activity Area	In addition to the current policies for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area, the RVA considers that a policy

	Activity Area – Policies		chapter that recognises the intensification opportunities provided for by larger sites: <u>RESZ-PX Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within all residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>	regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites should be included in the District Plan.
211.35	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Policies	Support	Include a new Policy in the Policies of the Medium Density Residential Activity Area chapter, as follows: <u>MDR-Px Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> 1. <u>Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in Medium Density Residential Areas, such as retirement villages.</u> 2. <u>Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> a. <u>May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> b. <u>Have a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u>	In addition to the current policies for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area, the RVA consider that a policy to provide for and acknowledge the following should be integrated into the District Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons; and • The functional and operational needs of retirement villages.
211.36	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.1.7 Retirement Villages	Oppose in Part	<u>Amend the activity status of retirement villages to be a permitted activity, with the construction of buildings for retirement villages specifically included in Rule 4F 4.1.7 as a restricted discretionary activity.</u>	The RVA supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule. However, the RVA considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (as opposed to a restricted discretionary activity as currently drafted). This recognises that retirement villages are residential activities that are appropriate in residential zone and provide substantial benefits, including

		<p><u>The RVA also seek to include the following set of matters of discretion for retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities:</u></p> <p><u>Rule 4F 4.1.7 Retirement Villages</u></p> <p><u>(a) Retirement Villages are restricted discretionary permitted activities.</u></p> <p><u>(b) The construction and alteration of buildings for a Retirement Village is a restricted discretionary activity.</u></p> <p><u>...</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>(i) The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area.</u></p> <p><u>(ii) The extent to which the site layout and any proposed landscaping helps to avoid or minimise the impacts on surrounding residential areas, the streetscape and adjoining public space.</u></p> <p><u>(iii) Whether the site is subject to any hazards, including being within any natural hazard overlay area.</u></p> <p><u>(iv) The capacity of the network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, stormwater and land transport to service the proposed development.</u></p> <p><u>(v) The following development design elements:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Building height</u> <u>2. Recession planes and setbacks</u> <u>3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces</u> <u>4. Open space and boundary treatments</u> <u>5. Entrances, carparking and garages</u> 	<p>enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), while also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p> <p>Furthermore, the RVA supports the construction or alteration of any building comprising a permitted activity when it can comply with the relevant development standards (provided in Rule 4F 4.2), and the triggering of a restricted discretionary activity standard based on non-compliance with the relevant development standards.</p> <p>However, retirement villages will likely infringe the number of residential units per site standard (Rule 4F 4.2.1AA), so the construction of retirement villages will be a restricted discretionary activity under this rule. This being the case, the RVA considers that the construction of retirement villages should have a bespoke rule and set of matters of discretion to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p> <p>When considering the specific matters of discretion for retirement villages in Rule 4F 4.1.7(a), the RVA considers most of these matters are not appropriate for retirement villages, particularly that the Council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements. The Medium Density Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, with no guidance as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs). Furthermore, the RVA consider that a number of these matters of discretion seek to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the MDRS.</p> <p>The RVA considers matters of discretion (i) and (ii) are inconsistent with the MDRS and will not enable Council to respond to housing needs and demands as required by Objective 2 of the MDRS. Matters of discretion (i) and (ii) do also not recognise Policy 6 of the NPSUD, which recognises that the planned urban built form may involve significant changes to an</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p><u>6. On-site stormwater management</u></p> <p><u>7. End / side wall treatment</u></p> <p><u>8. Building materials</u></p> <p><u>9. Bike parking, storage and service areas</u></p> <p><u>10. Privacy and safety</u></p> <p><u>11. Landscaping</u></p> <p><u>When considering the matters in (v), the Council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide.</u></p> <p><u>1. The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: Rule 4F 4.2.1, Rule 4F 4.2.2, Rule 4F 4.2.3, Rule 4F 4.2.4, Rule 4F 4.2.6, Rule 4F 4.2.11, Rule 4F 4.2.12 and Rule 4F 4.2.13;</u></p> <p><u>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>3. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></p> <p><u>4. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>5. When assessing the matters in 1 – 4, consider:</u></p> <p><u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p><u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p>	<p>area that may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people, or that changes to amenity are not, of themselves, an adverse effect.</p> <p>The RVA considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for/support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p> <p>The RVA considers that internal amenity standards applicable to retirement villages should be limited to those controls/standards necessary or appropriate for retirement villages.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status:</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with Rule 4F 4.2.1, Rule 4F 4.2.2, Rule 4F 4.2.3 and Rule 4F 4.2.4 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>	
211.37	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.2.1AA	Oppose in Part	<p>Amend Rule 4F 4.2.1AA to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard.</p> <p>Rule 4F 4.2.1AA Number of Residential Units per Site</p> <p>...</p> <p><i>b. Four or more residential units per site are a restricted discretionary activity.</i></p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <p>...</p> <p><i>When considering the matters in (vi), the Council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide.</i></p> <p><u>The matters of discretion above do not apply to retirement villages. For a retirement village that infringes this standard, the retirement village specific matters of discretion provided in Rule 4F 4.1.7 apply.</u></p>	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4F 4.2.1 as the number of residential units provided for per site reflects the MDRS standard. The RVA also supports public and limited notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4F 4.2.1AA(b).</p> <p>The RVA considers however that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4F 4.2.1AA(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements - as further explained in the response above to Rule 4F 4.1.7). The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion, with retirement village specific matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in relation to Rule 4F 4.1.7 above.</p>

			<i>Public and limited notification is precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4F 4.2.1AA(b).</i>	
211.38	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.2.1	Support in Part	Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4F 4.2.1 and the building coverage provisions as they reflect the building coverage standard of the MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4F 4.2.1(b). The RVA considers however that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4F 4.2.1(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that applicants and the council can be informed by the relevant outcomes of the Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements - as further explained in the relation above to Rule 4F 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion, and for retirement village specific matters of discretion to apply instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4F 4.1.7 above.</p>
211.39	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.2.2	Support in Part	Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4F 4.2.2 and the building height provisions which align with the building height standard of the MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4F 4.2.2(b).</p> <p>The RVA considers however that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4F 4.2.2(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements - as further explained in the response above to Rule 4F 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion, with retirement village specific matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4F 4.1.7 above.</p>

211.40	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.2.3	Support in Part	Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4F 4.2.3 and the height in relation to boundary provisions which reflect the height in relation to boundary standard of the MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4F 4.2.3(b).</p> <p>However, the RVA consider that additional exclusions should be integrated into the height in relation to boundary standard with Rule 4F 4.2.3(a)(d).</p> <p>The RVA opposes the broad list of matters of discretion, which seek to manage the scale, form and design of development in a manner which is inconsistent with the MDRS. The RVA also opposes the Note referring to the Medium Density Design Guide for the reasons outlined in response to Rule 4F 4.1.7 above.</p> <p>The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the note below matter of discretion (iv) for Rule 4F 4.2.3(b), with retirement village specific matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4F 4.1.7 above.</p>
211.41	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.2.4	Support in Part	Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4F 4.2.4 and the setback provisions which reflect the setback standards of the MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4F 4.2.4(b).</p> <p>The RVA considers however that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4F 4.2.4(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that applicants and the council can be informed by the relevant outcomes identified in the Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements - as further explained in the response above to Rule 4F 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion, with a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4F 4.1.7 above.</p>

211.42	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.2.5	Oppose	Delete Rule 4F 4.2.5.	The RVA opposes Rule 4F 4.2.5 (permeable surface standards) as the MDRS do not include this standard.
211.43	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.2.6	Support in Part	<p>Amend Rule 4F 4.2.6 to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the amenity standard.</p> <p>Rule 4F 4.2.6 Outdoor Living Space</p> <p>(a) ...</p> <p>(v) <u>For retirement units, clauses (iii) and (iv) apply with the following modifications:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</u> 2. <u>a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u> <p>(b) <i>Construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the outdoor living space requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</i></p> <p>The RVA also seeks to amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).</p>	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4F 4.2.6 and the outdoor living space provisions in principle which reflect the outdoor living space standard of the MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4F 4.2.6(b).</p> <p>However, the RVA considers that as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made to Rule 4F 4.2.6 that enable the communal areas to count towards the amenity standard.</p> <p>The RVA also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4F 4.2.6(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements - as further explained in the relation above to Rule 4F 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA seeks that retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in relation to Rule 4F 4.1.7 above.</p> <p>It is also noted that the numbering of this standard is incorrect, as under clause (a) the numbering starts at (iii) rather than (i).</p>
211.44	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential	Support in part	Amend Rule 4F 4.2.7 to delete the reference to 4F 4.2.5.	The RVA supports the permitted activity Rule 4F 4.2.7 (accessory building) except the requirement to comply with 4F 4.2.5 as the

	Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.2.7			MDRS provisions of the Enabling Housing Act do not include this standard.
211.45	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.2.8	Oppose	Delete Rule 4F 4.2.8.	The RVA opposes Rule 4F 4.2.8 (screening and storage standard) as the MDRS do not include this standard.
211.46	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.2.10	Opposes	Delete Rule 4F 4.2.10.	The RVA opposes Rule 4F 4.2.10 (stormwater retention standard) as the MDRS do not include this standard.
211.47	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.2.11	Support in Part	<p>Amend Rule 4F 4.2.11 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.</p> <p>4F 4.2.11 Outlook Space (per unit)</p> <p>a) ...</p> <p><i>ix. <u>For retirement units, clauses i – viii apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms.</u></i></p> <p><i>b. Construction or alteration of a building that does not comply with one or more of the standards listed above is a restricted discretionary activity.</i></p> <p>The RVA also seeks to amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).</p>	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4F 4.2.11 and the outlook space provisions in principle which reflect the outlook space standard of the MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4F 4.2.11(b).</p> <p>The RVA however consider that in a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents), the standard is not directly relevant. The RVA considers amendments should be made to Rule 4F 4.2.11 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.</p> <p>The RVA also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4F 4.2.11 (b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements - as further explained in the response above to Rule 4F 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA seeks that the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4F 4.1.7 above.</p>

211.48	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.2.12	Support in Part	<p>Amend Rule 4F 4.2.12 to provide for retirement units facing a public street.</p> <p>4F 4.2.12 Windows to Street</p> <p>(a) <i>Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <i>Any residential unit facing the street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors., and</i> ii. <i><u>Any retirement unit facing a public street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors.</u></i> <p>(b) <i>Construction or alteration of a building that does not comply with the above standard is a restricted discretionary activity.</i></p> <p>The RVA also seeks to amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).</p>	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4F 4.2.12 and the windows to street provisions in principle which reflect the windows to street MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4F 4.2.12(b).</p> <p>The RVA however consider that an additional clause should be added to provide for retirement units facing public streets.</p> <p>The RVA also considers that s the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4F 4.2.12(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements - as further explained in the response above to Rule 4F 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA seeks that the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4F 4.1.7 above.</p>
211.49	Chapter 4F Medium Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4F 4.2.13	Support in Part	<p>The RVA seeks to amend Rule 4F 4.2.13 to provide for retirement units.</p> <p>4F 4.2.13 Landscaped Area</p> <p>a. <i>Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if the following landscaped area standards are met:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <i>A residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> at ground floor level has a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees</i> 	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4F 4.2.13 and the landscaped area provisions in principle which reflect the landscaped area MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4F 4.2.13(b).</p> <p>The RVA also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4F 4.2.13(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements - as further explained in the response above to Rule 4F 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA seeks that the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead. These retirement village specific matters</p>

			<p><i>regardless of the ground treatment below them.</i></p> <p><i>ii. The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site and does not need to be associated with each residential unit <u>or retirement unit.</u></i></p> <p><i>b. Construction or alteration of a building that does not comply with either of the above standards listed above is a restricted discretionary activity.</i></p> <p>The RVA also seeks to amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).</p>	<p>of discretion are those provided in relation to Rule 4F 4.1.7 above.</p>
211.50	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Introduction / Zone Statement	Oppose in Part	<p>The RVA seeks to amend this section to provide specific reference to retirement villages as an example:</p> <p>....</p> <p><i>The planned urban built character for the High Density Residential Activity Area is high density residential development, including detached dwellings, terraced housing, and apartments <u>and retirement villages.</u> The urban built character of an area will arise from the flexibility provided for by the Plan for individual development to take any low to high density form. This supports increasing the capacity and choice of housing within neighbourhoods. It is anticipated that the appearance of neighbourhoods in the High Density Activity Area will change over time, including through increased opportunities for terraced housing, and apartments, <u>and retirement villages.</u></i></p>	<p>The RVA supports the recognition that the planned urban character for the area is high density residential development, including detached dwellings, terraced housing and apartments. However, the RVA also seeks to provide specific acknowledgement of retirement villages in this introductory text.</p> <p>The RVA also supports the recognition that the appearance of neighbourhoods in the High Density Residential Area will change over time.</p> <p>The RVA considers the Zone Statement is inconsistent with the direction in Policy 3 of the NPSUD, and with later paragraphs in the Zone Statement, to provide for building heights of “at least” 6 storeys in relevant locations.</p> <p>The RVA opposes paragraph 4 of the Introduction/Zone Statement which provides for built development through development standards that do not align with the MDRS.</p> <p>The RVA opposes Paragraph 5 of the Statement, which is inconsistent with the MDRS, as follows:</p>

			<p>Amend the Introduction/Zone Statement to align with the MDRS:</p> <p><i>Development standards also address:</i></p> <p><i>i. the impacts of built development on adjoining sites and the streetscape,</i></p> <p><i>ii. stormwater management, and</i></p> <p><i>iii. provision of open space for residents.</i></p> <p><i>If a proposed development does not meet the development standards, resource consent is required in order to:</i></p> <p><i>i. achieve encourage a high quality built environment;</i></p> <p><i>ii. manage the effects of development on neighbouring sites;</i></p> <p><i>iii. achieve high quality onsite living environments; and</i></p> <p><i>iv. achieve encourage attractive and safe streets and public space.</i></p> <p><i>The resource consent process enables the design and layout of development to be assessed, recognising that quality design is increasingly important as the scale and density of development increases. Council provides design guidance for residential developments through design guides that sit outside the plan.</i></p>	<p>(i) The requirement to “achieve” a high quality built environment, where the MDRS only requires high quality development to be “encouraged”;</p> <p>(iii) The requirement to “achieve high quality onsite living environments,” which is not a requirement of the MDRS. The RVA opposes a policy requirement relating to on-site amenity. The RVA’s members have significant experience of building villages and know intimately the amenity needs of its residents. The RVA’s members frequently come across issues during consenting processes where council officers attempt to influence retirement villages’ internal layouts based on their understanding of design principles which only apply to traditional housing types.</p> <p>(iv) the requirement to “achieve attractive and safe streets and public space” which is inconsistent with Policy 3 of the MDRS, which only “encourages” development to achieve attractive and safe streets and public space. These matters are also already provided for under Policy 4F 3.8.</p> <p>The RVA opposes paragraph 6 of the Statement insofar as it seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner which is inconsistent with the MDRS.</p>
211.51	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Objective 4G 2.1	Support	Retain Objective 4G 2.1 as notified.	The RVA supports Objective 4G 2.1 as it aligns with Objective 1 of the MDRS.
211.52	Chapter 4G High Density Residential	Support	Retain Objective 4G 2.2 as notified.	The RVA supports Objective 4G 2.2 as it states that residential activities are the dominant activities in the High Density Residential Activity Area.

	Activity Area – Objective 4G 2.2			
211.53	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Objective 4G 2.3	Support	Retain Objective 4G 2.3 as notified.	The RVA supports Objective 4G 2.3 as it aligns with Objective 2 of the MDRS.
211.54	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Objective 4G 2.4	Support in part	Amend Objective 4G 2.4 for consistency with the MDRS and to remove references to “best practicable amenity outcomes” and “compatible with the amenity levels”.	The RVA supports Objective 4G 2.4 in principle as it provides flexibility in the form of individual developments. However, it considers the Objective’s reference to the “best practicable amenity outcomes” and “compatible with the amenity levels” goes beyond the MDRS and are uncertain.
211.55	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Objective 4G 2.5	Oppose	Add a new policy: <u>Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u> Amend (iii) to refer to “attractive and safe streets”.	The RVA opposes the use of the word “appropriate” in (i) and (ii) of this policy without policy guidance to confirm “appropriate” is determined by the density standards. The RVA opposes the phrase “high level of amenity for the street” as it is inconsistent with Policy 3 MDRS.
211.56	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Objective 4G 2.8	Oppose	Amend Objective 4G 2.8 for consistency with the MDRS and to remove references to “best practicable amenity outcomes” and “compatible with the amenity levels”.	The RVA opposes Objective 4G 2.8 for the reasons set out under 2.4 above.
211.57	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Objectives	Support / New Objective Sought	Insert a new Objective in the Objectives for the High Density Residential Activity Area chapter that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population. <u>RESZ-OX Ageing population</u> <u>Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</u>	In addition to the current objectives for the High Density Residential Activity Area, the RVA considers that an ageing population specific objective should be integrated that recognises and enables the housing and care needs of the ageing population.

211.58	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.1	Oppose in part	Delete the text “manage any adverse effects on residential amenity”.	The RVA opposes the general reference in this policy to “manage any adverse effects on residential amenity”.
211.59	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.2	Support	Retain Policy 4G 3.2 as notified.	The RVA supports Policy 4G 3.2 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS.
211.60	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.3	Support in part	Amend Policy 4G 3.3 as follows: Policy 4G 3.3 <i>Enable buildings of up to six storeys, and buildings of more than six storeys where compatible with the amenity levels associated with high density <u>character of the Zonesix-storey residential development, recognising that significant change to amenity values is anticipated in the Zone.</u></i>	The RVA supports Policy 4G 3.3, which seeks to enable buildings up to six storeys or buildings greater than six storeys where compatible with the amenity levels associated with high density six-story residential development, but considers it must recognise the need for change to the existing character and amenity of neighbourhoods to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community as required by Policy 6 of the NPSUD.
211.61	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.4	Support	Retain Policy 4G 3.4 as notified.	The RVA supports Policy 4G 3.4 as it aligns with Policy 5 of the MDRS.
211.62	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.5	Support	Retain Policy 4G 3.5 as notified.	The RVA supports Policy 4G 3.5 as it aligns with Policy 4 of the MDRS.
211.63	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.6	Oppose in part	Exclude retirement villages from Policy 4G 3.6.	The RVA supports the recognition under Policy 4G 3.6, that access to communal open space will provide adequate opportunities for outdoor living, as it provides for the unique layout and amenity needs of retirement villages (e.g. the wide range of

211.64	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.6	Oppose in part	Add a new policy (Role of density standards) as set out above (see submission point 211.55).	<p>communal spaces residents have access to in addition to their individual homes).</p> <p>However, it considers the terms “adequate opportunities” and ‘appropriate’ is vague and will lead to interpretation difficulties. As discussed above, policy guidance is needed to clarify these terms are determined by the density standards.</p> <p>It seeks that retirement villages are excluded from this Policy as controls regarding on-site amenity are considered inappropriate for the reasons set out above.</p>
211.65	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.7	Oppose in part	Exclude retirement villages from Policy 4G 3.7.	<p>The RVA supports Policy 4G 3.7(iii), as it recognises that a lack of outlook area as part of a development (e.g. a retirement village) can be sufficiently mitigated by other means to ensure that development contributes to provide an attractive setting for occupants and the surrounding area.</p> <p>As set out below, the RVA considers the outlook density standard needs to be amended for retirement villages. Retirement villages provide a wide range of communal spaces and ‘living areas’ that retirement villages often provide (e.g. communal sitting areas, dining rooms, libraries etc) which often provide outlook into large and attractive spaces.</p>
211.66	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.7	Oppose in part	Add a new policy (Role of density standards) as set out above (see submission point 211.55).	<p>However, it considers the term “adequate” is vague and will lead to interpretation difficulties. As discussed above, policy guidance is needed to clarify this term is determined by the density standards.</p> <p>The RVA seeks that retirement villages are excluded from this policy as controls regarding on-site amenity are considered inappropriate for the reasons set out above.</p>
211.67	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.8	Support in part	Amend policy to refer to height, height in relation to boundary, setback and building coverage standards (rather than “height, bulk and form”).	The RVA supports this policy to the extent it reflects the MDRS standards.
211.68	Chapter 4G High Density Residential	Oppose	Delete Policy 4G 3.9.	The RVA opposes Policy 4G 3.9 in that it seeks to manage the design of built development that is permitted under the MDRS.

	Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.9			
211.69	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.10	Oppose in part	Delete Policy 4G 3.10.	<p>The RVA supports the use of the word “encouraging” in this policy as it is consistent with MDRS policy 5.</p> <p>However, the RVA opposes Policy 4G 3.10 in that it seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the MDRS. The “best practicable outcomes for privacy, sunlight and appearance” is unclear and does not recognise the change anticipated in the Zone.</p>
211.70	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.11	Oppose	Delete Policy 4G 3.11.	<p>The RVA opposes Policy 4G 3.11 in that it seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the MDRS, and includes a vague requirement to achieve consistency with that of the “best practicable outcomes” which is not otherwise defined in the Plan.</p>
211.71	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.12	Support	Retain Policy 4G 3.12 as notified.	<p>The RVA supports Policy 4G 3.12 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.</p>
211.72	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.13	Oppose in part	Delete policy.	<p>The RVA opposes this policy relating to rainwater tanks and permeable surface area as it is additional to the MDRS policies.</p>
211.73	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policy 4G 3.14	Oppose in part	Delete policy or amend to “encourage”.	<p>The RVA opposes <i>requiring</i> hydraulic neutrality in all cases including where there is sufficient capacity in the downstream system and/or the effects of increased water flows can be managed effectively.</p>
211.74	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policies	Support	The RVA seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the High Density Residential Activity Area chapter that recognises the diverse and changing community needs and that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time.	<p>In addition to the current policies for the High Density Residential Activity Area, the RVA considers that a policy is required that recognises the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, and that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</p>

			<p><u>RESZ-PX Changing communities</u></p> <p><i>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</i></p>	
211.75	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policies	Support	<p>Include a new Policy in the Policies of the High Density Residential Activity Area chapter that recognises the intensification opportunities provided for by larger sites.</p> <p><u>RESZ-PX Larger sites</u></p> <p><i>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within all residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</i></p>	In addition to the current policies for the High Density Residential Activity Area, the RVA considers that a policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites should be integrated into the District Plan.
211.76	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Policies	Support	<p>Include a new Policy in the Policies of the High Density Residential Activity Area chapter to acknowledge the diverse housing and care options of retirement villages, and their unique functional and operational needs:</p> <p><u>MDR-Px Provision of housing for an ageing population</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in the High Density Residential Activity Area, such as retirement villages.</i> 2. <i>Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</i> 	<p>In addition to the current policies for the High Density Residential Activity Area, the RVA consider that a policy to provide for and acknowledge the following should be integrated into the District Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons; and • The functional and operational needs of retirement villages.

			<i>b. Have a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</i>	
211.77	Chapter 4F High Density Residential Activity Area – Policies	Support	<p>Insert a new policy in the High Density Residential Activity Area that enables the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</p> <p><u>MRZ-PX Role of density standards</u></p> <p><u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u></p>	The RVA considers that it would be appropriate to enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments for the reasons set out in the submission above.
211.78	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.1.7	Oppose in Part	<p><i>Amend the activity status of retirement villages to be a permitted activity, with the construction of buildings for retirement villages specifically included in Rule 4G 4.1.7 as a restricted discretionary activity. The RVA also seek to include the following set of matters of discretion for retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities:</i></p> <p>Rule 4G 4.1.7 Retirement Villages</p> <p><i>(a) Retirement Villages are restricted discretionary permitted activities.</i></p> <p><u><i>(b) The construction and alteration of buildings for a Retirement Village is a restricted discretionary activity.</i></u></p> <p>...</p> <p><u><i>Discretion is restricted to:</i></u></p> <p><u><i>(i) The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>(ii) The extent to which the site layout and any proposed landscaping helps to avoid or minimise the impacts on surrounding residential</i></u></p>	<p>The RVA supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule. However, the RVA considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (as opposed to a restricted discretionary activity as currently drafted). This recognises that retirement villages are residential activities that are appropriate in residential zone and provide substantial benefits, including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs. It also aligns with the permitted activity rule for residential activities generally (Rule 4G 4.1.1).</p> <p>Furthermore, the RVA supports the construction or alteration of any building being a permitted activity when the relevant development standards (provided in 4G 4.2) are achieved, and the triggering of a restricted discretionary activity standard based on non-compliance with the relevant development standards.</p> <p>However, retirement villages will likely infringe the 'number of residential units per site' standard (Rule 4G 4.2.1), so the construction of retirement villages will be a restricted discretionary activity under this rule. The RVA considers that the construction of retirement villages should have specific matters of discretion to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p>

			<p>areas, the streetscape and adjoining public space.</p> <p>(iii) Whether the site is subject to any hazards, including being within any natural hazard overlay area.</p> <p>(iv) The capacity of the network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater to service the proposed development.</p> <p>(v) The following development design elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building height 2. Recession planes and setbacks 3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces 4. Open space and boundary treatments 5. Entrances, carparking and garages 6. On-site stormwater management 7. End / side wall treatment 8. Building materials 9. Bike parking, storage and service areas 10. Privacy and safety 11. Landscaping <p>When considering the matters in (v), the Council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: Rule 4G 4.2.2, Rule 4G 4.2.3, Rule 4G 4.2.4 and Rule 4G 4.2.5, Rule 4G 4.2.8, Rule 4G 4.2.13, Rule 4G 4.2.14 and Rule 4G 4.2.15;</u> <u>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> 	<p>When considering the specific matters of discretion for retirement villages in Rule 4G 4.1.7(a), the RVA considers that some of these matters are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements). The Medium Density Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, with no guidance as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with a substantially differing functional and operational needs). Furthermore, the RVA consider that a number of these matters of discretion seek to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the MDRS.</p> <p>The RVA considers matters of discretion (i) and (ii) are also inconsistent with the MDRS, and will not enable Council to respond to housing needs and demands as required by Objective 2 of the MDRS. (i) and (ii) do also not recognise Policy 6 of the NPSUD, which recognises that the planned urban built form may involve significant changes to an area that may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people, or that changes to amenity are not, of themselves, an adverse effect.</p> <p>The RVA considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for/support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p> <p>The RVA considers that internal amenity standards applicable to retirement villages should be limited to those controls/standards necessary or appropriate for retirement villages.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p><u>3. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></p> <p><u>4. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>5. When assessing the matters in 1 – 4, consider:</u></p> <p><u>The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p><u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status:</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with Rule 4G 4.2.2, Rule 4G 4.2.3, Rule 4G 4.2.4 and Rule 4G 4.2.5 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>	
211.79	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.2.1	Support in Part	Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4G 4.2.1 as the number of residential units per site reflects the MDRS standard. The RVA also supports public and limited notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4G 4.2.1(b).</p> <p>The RVA considers however that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4G 4.2.1(b) are not</p>

				<p>appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by the Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements – as further explained in the response above to Rule 4G 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 4G 4.2.1(b), with retirement village specific matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4G 4.1.7 above.</p>
211.80	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.2.2	Support in Part	Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4G 4.2.2 and the building coverage provisions which reflect the building coverage standard of the MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4G 4.2.2(b).</p> <p>The RVA considers however that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4G 4.2.2(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that applicants and the council can be informed by the relevant outcomes of the Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements - as further explained in the response above to Rule 4G 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 4G 4.2.2(b), with a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4G 4.1.7 above.</p>
211.81	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.2.3	Support in Part	Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4G 4.2.3 and the building height provisions which reflect the building coverage standard of the MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4G 4.2.3(b).</p> <p>The RVA considers however that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4G 4.2.3(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements – as further explained in the response above to Rule 4G 4.1.7).</p>

				The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 4G 4.2.3(b), with a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4G 4.1.7 above.
211.82	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.2.4	Support in Part	<p>Amend Rule 4G 4.2.4(a) to include additional exclusions from the standard.</p> <p>Rule 4G 4.2.4 Height in Relation to Boundary</p> <p>(a) ...</p> <p><i>This standard does not apply to:</i></p> <p>(a) A boundary with a road,</p> <p>(b) Existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site, and</p> <p>(c) Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between two buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed, and</p> <p><u>(d) Boundaries adjoining recreation and open space zones, rural zones and commercial, business and mixed use zones.</u></p> <p>(b) Construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the maximum height in relation to boundary requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).</p>	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4G 4.2.4 and the height in relation to boundary provisions which reflect the height in relation to boundary standard of the MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4G 4.2.4(b).</p> <p>However, the RVA consider that additional exclusions should be integrated into the height in relation to boundary standard through the provision of a new clause (Rule 4G 4.2.4(a)(d)).</p> <p>The RVA also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4G 4.2.4(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that applicants and the council can be informed by the relevant outcomes of the Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements - as further explained in the response above to Rule 4G 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 4G 4.2.4(b), with retirement village specific matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4G 4.1.7 above.</p>
211.83	Chapter 4G High Density Residential	Support in Part	Amend Rule 4G 4.2.5 to delete those matters of discretion which are inconsistent with the MDRS	The RVA supports Rule 4G 4.2.5 and the setback provisions which reflect the setback standards of the MDRS. The RVA also

	Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.2.5		<p>and to exclude retirement villages from being considered under the note below matter of discretion (vi), and to provide an additional clause stating that only the retirement village specific matters of discretion are to be considered for the construction of a building for a retirement village that does not achieve this setback standard.</p> <p>Rule 4G 4.2.5 Setbacks</p> <p>...</p> <p><i>(b) Construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the setback requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</i></p> <p>Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).</p>	<p>supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4G 4.2.5(b).</p> <p>The RVA considers however that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4G 4.2.5(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that applicants and the council can be informed by the relevant outcomes of the Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements - as further explained in the response above to Rule 4G 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 4G 4.2.5(b), with retirement village specific matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4G 4.1.7 above.</p>
211.84	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.2.7	Oppose	Delete Rule 4G 4.2.7.	The RVA opposes Rule 4G 4.2.7 (permeable surface standards) as the MDRS do not include this standard.
211.85	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.2.8	Support in Part	<p>Amend Rule 4G 4.2.8 to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the amenity standard.</p> <p>Rule 4G 4.2.8 Outdoor Living Space</p> <p>(a) ...</p> <p><u>iii. For retirement units, clauses (i) and (ii) apply with the following modifications:</u></p> <p><u>2. the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible</u></p>	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4G 4.2.8 and the outdoor living space provisions in principle which reflect the outdoor living space standard of the MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4G 4.2.8(b).</p> <p>However, the RVA consider that as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made to Rule 4G 4.2.8 that acknowledge that the communal areas contribute amenity values at villages.</p> <p>The RVA also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4G 4.2.8(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will</p>

			<p><u>location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</u></p> <p><u>3. a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u></p> <p><i>(b) Construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the outdoor living space requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</i></p> <p>Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).</p>	<p>be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements – as further explained in the response above to Rule 4G 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 4G 4.2.8(b), with a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4G 4.1.7 above.</p>
211.86	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.2.9	Support in part	Amend Rule 4F 4.2.7 to delete the reference to 4F 4.2.5.	The RVA supports the permitted activity Rule 4F 4.2.7 (accessory building) except the requirement to comply with 4F 4.2.5 as the MDRS do not include this standard.
211.87	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.2.10	Oppose	Delete Rule 4G 4.2.10.	The RVA opposes Rule 4G 4.2.10 (screening and storage standard) as the MDRS do not include this standard.
211.88	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.2.12	Opposes	Delete Rule 4G 4.2.12.	The RVA opposes Rule 4G 4.2.12 (stormwater retention standard) as the MDRS do not include this standard.
211.89	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.2.13	Support in Part	Amend Rule 4G 4.2.13 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages. 4G 4.2.13 Outlook Space (per unit)	The RVA supports Rule 4G 4.2.13 and the outlook space provisions in principle which reflect the outlook space standard of the MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being

			<p>(a) ...</p> <p><u>x. For retirement units, clauses i – ix apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms.</u></p> <p>(b) <i>Construction or alteration of a building that does not comply with one or more of the standards listed above is a restricted discretionary activity.</i></p> <p>Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).</p>	<p>precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4G 4.2.13(b).</p> <p>The RVA however consider that in a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents), the standard is not directly relevant. The RVA considers amendments should be made to Rule 4G 4.2.13 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.</p> <p>The RVA also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4G 4.2.13(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements – as further explained in the response above to Rule 4G 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 4G 4.2.13(b), with a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4G 4.1.7 above.</p>
211.90	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.2.14	Support in Part	<p>Amend Rule 4G 4.2.14 to provide for retirement units facing a public street.</p> <p>4G 4.2.14 Windows to Street</p> <p>a. <i>Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if:</i></p> <p>i. <i>Dwellings facing the street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors., and</i></p> <p><u>ii. Any retirement unit facing a public street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors.</u></p> <p>b. <i>Construction or alteration of a building that does not comply with the above standard is a restricted discretionary activity.</i></p>	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4G 4.2.14 and the windows to street provisions in principle which reflect the windows to street standard of the MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4G 4.2.14(b).</p> <p>The RVA however consider that an additional clause should be added to provide for retirement units facing public streets.</p> <p>The RVA also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4G 4.2.14(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements – as further explained in the response above to Rule 4G 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion (for Rule 4G 4.2.14(b), with a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion applying instead.</p>

			Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).	These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4G 4.1.7 above.
211.91	Chapter 4G High Density Residential Activity Area – Rule 4G 4.2.15	Support in Part	<p>Amend Rule 4G 4.2.15 to provide for retirement units. The RVA also seeks to amend Rule 4G 4.2.15 to delete those matters of discretion which are inconsistent with the MDRS and to exclude retirement villages from being considered under the note below matter of discretion (viii), and to provide an additional clause stating that the retirement village specific matters of discretion are to be considered (instead of clauses (i) to (vii)) for the construction of a retirement village building that does not achieve this landscaped area standard.</p> <p>4G 4.2.15 Landscaped Area</p> <p>(a) <i>Construction or alteration of a building is a permitted activity if the following landscaped area standards are met:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <i>A minimum of 20% of a developed site is landscaped with grass or plants. The landscaped area can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them.</i> ii. <i>The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site and does not need to be associated with each residential unit or retirement unit.</i> <p>(b) <i>Construction or alteration of a building that does not comply with either of the standards listed above is a restricted discretionary activity.</i></p>	<p>The RVA supports Rule 4G 4.2.15 and the landscaped area provisions in principle which reflect the landscaped area standard of the MDRS. The RVA also supports public notification being precluded for resource consent applications under Rule 4G 4.2.15(b).</p> <p>The RVA however consider that Rule 4G 4.2.15 should be amended so that it also applies to ‘retirement units’.</p> <p>The RVA also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4G 4.2.15(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements – as further explained in the response above to Rule 4G 4.1.7).</p> <p>The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 4G 4.2.15(b), with a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4G 4.1.7 above.</p>

			Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 4F 4.2.1AA above).	
211.92	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area – Policy 5A 1.1.1(c)	Support	Retain Policy 5A 1.1.1(c) as notified.	The RVA support Policy 5A 1.1.1(c) which seeks to provide for development capacity and making more efficient use of the land resource in the central commercial area by providing for a wide range of activities.
211.93	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area – Policy 5A 1.1.1(d)	Support	Retain Policy 5A 1.1.1(d) as notified.	The RVA support Policy 5A 1.1.1(d) which seeks to enable a built form that maximises development potential and accommodates a wide range of activities and supports a quality urban environment.
211.94	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area – Policy	Support	<p>Seeks the following policies:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u></p> <p><u>Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u></p> <p><u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <p><u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p> <p><u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Delete or amend other Commercial Zone objectives and policies for consistency.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u></p>	Recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones, the RVA considers policy support for retirement villages in the Commercial Zone is required (as also set out in the submission above).

			<p><u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Medium Density Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p> <p><u>Density standards</u></p> <p><u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u></p>	
211.95	Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area – Rule 5A 2.2 and 2.2.1	Support in Part	<p>Amend Rule 5A 2.2 and 2.2.1 to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other activities.</p> <p>5A 2.2.1 Matters in which Council has Restricted its Discretion</p> <p><u>x) The construction of buildings for a Retirement Village</u></p> <p><u>i) The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards, where relevant: Rule 5G 2.1.1;</u></p> <p><u>ii) The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>iii) The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>iv) When assessing the matters in (i) – (iii), consider:</u></p> <p><u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p><u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p>	<p>The RVA support the construction, alteration of, and addition to buildings and structures (except as permitted under Rules 5A 2.1(b) and (c)) as a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>However, the RVA considers the current matters of discretion in 5A 2.2.1 are not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. The RVA opposes matter of discretion in (i), which seeks to manage the design of development in a manner which is inconsistent with the MDRS. The RVA also opposes 5A 2.2.1(a)(ii) which refer to matters in the Central Commercial Activity Area Design Guide. This design guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, with no guidance as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with a substantially differing functional and operational needs).</p> <p>The RVA considers that if the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity, and that in addition to the matters of discretion of any infringed standard, the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).</p> <p>The RVA considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p>

			<p>v) <u>The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status:</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with Rules 5G 2.1.1 (a), (b) and (g) is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>	
211.96	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area – Policy	Support/Amen d	<p>Include the following policies:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u></p> <p><u>Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <p>a. <u>May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p>Delete or amend other Commercial Zone objectives and policies for consistency.</p> <p><u>Larger sites</u></p>	<p>Recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones, the RVA considers policy support for retirement villages in the Commercial Zone is required (as also set out in the submission above).</p>

			<p><u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Medium Density Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p> <p><u>Density standards</u></p> <p><u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u></p>	
211.97	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area – Rule 5B 2.1.1	Support in part	<p>Insert a new rule into the Petone Commercial Activity Area that provides for retirement villages as permitted activities.</p> <p>5B 2.1.1 Permitted Activities</p> <p><u>x) Retirement Villages.</u></p>	<p>The RVA considers Rule 5A 2.1.1 and the related permitted activity conditions (Rule 5A 2.1.1.1) conflict with the NPSUD and need to be amended as part of the Plan Change. The use and construction of a retirement village would be a discretionary activity in this Zone. This does not give effect to the NPSUD which requires Council achieve the objective of allowing more people to live in areas where there is a high demand for housing and to enable intensification that responds to the location of centres (see Objective 3 NPSUD)</p> <p>Recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones, the RVA considers that the Area 1 of the Petone Commercial Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of buildings for retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity), recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p>
211.98	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area – Rule 5B 2.1.2	Support in part	<p>Amend Rule 5B 2.1.2.1 to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other activities.</p>	<p>The RVA supports Rule 5B 2.1.2 in principle which provides for the construction, redevelopment, alterations, repairing or modifications of any building or structure which is not listed as a permitted activity as a restricted discretionary activity within Area 1 of the Petone Commercial Activity Area.</p>

		<p>5B 2.1.2.1 Matters in which Council has Restricted its Discretion and Standards and Terms</p> <p><u>x) The construction of buildings for a Retirement Village</u></p> <p><u>i) The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards, where relevant: Rule 5B 2.2.1.1;</u></p> <p><u>ii) The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>iii) The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>iv) When assessing the matters in 1 – 3, consider:</u></p> <p><u>(e) The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p><u>(f) The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>v) The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status:</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with Rules 5B 2.2.1.1 (a), (b), (e).</u></p>	<p>However, the RVA oppose the matters of discretion in 5B 2.1.2.1 which are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management.</p> <p>The RVA considers that the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity, and that in addition to the matters of discretion of any infringed standard, the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).</p> <p>The RVA considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<u>(f) and (g) is precluded from being limited notified.</u>	
211.99	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area – Rule 5B 2.2.1	Support	<p>Insert a new rule into the Petone Commercial Activity Area that provides for retirement villages as permitted activities, and the reference to ‘housing for the elderly’ is deleted, given this definition refers plan users to the ‘retirement village’ definition:</p> <p>5B 2.2.1 Permitted Activities</p> <p>(a) Residential activities, with the exception of:</p> <p>(i) Ground floor level on Jackson Street; <u>and</u></p> <p>(ii) Housing for the Elderly; and</p> <p>(iii) Residential Facilities</p> <p><u>(x) Retirement Villages.</u></p>	<p>The RVA considers Rule 5B 2.2.1 and the related permitted activity conditions (Rule 5B 2.2.1.1) conflicts with the MDRS and need to be amended as part of the Plan Change.</p> <p>Recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones, the RVA considers that the Area 2 of the Petone Commercial Activity Area should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of buildings for retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity), recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p> <p>This recognises the lack of suitable sites in residential areas and the need to respond to the retirement living and care crisis, and the opportunities commercial and town centre zones provide for retirement villages, as these areas serve the surrounding local communities and provide close access for amenities to residents who are often unable to walk long distances.</p>
211.100	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area – Rule 5B 2.2.2	Support in Part	<p>Include a new rule for the construction of buildings for a retirement village as a restricted discretionary activity. The RVA also seeks that Rule 5B 2.2.2.1 is amended to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p> <p>5B 2.2.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities</p> <p><u>x) The construction of buildings for a Retirement Village</u></p> <p>...</p>	<p>The RVA supports in principle the construction, alteration of, and addition to buildings and structures, except for works permitted under Rule 5B 2.2.1 (l) and (m), as a restricted discretionary activity within Area 2 of the Petone Commercial Activity Area.</p> <p>However, the RVA considers that a new retirement village specific rule should be inserted in the District Plan which provides for the construction of buildings for a retirement village as a restricted discretionary activity, and that the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). The RVA opposes the matters of discretion in 5B 2.2.2 which are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management, and seek to manage the form, scale and design of</p>

		<p>5B 2.2.2.1 Matters in which Council has Restricted its Discretion</p> <p>...</p> <p>x) The construction of buildings for a Retirement Village</p> <p><u>i) The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards, where relevant: 5B 2.2.1.1:</u></p> <p><u>ii) The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>iii) The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>iv) When assessing the matters in i – iii, consider:</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>v) The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status:</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with Rule Rules 5B 2.2.1.1 (a), (b), (e), (f) and (g) is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>	<p>development in a manner that is inconsistent with the MDRS, and the NPSUD. For example, the requirements to set out how the development ‘responds’ to the Design Guide and how landscaping ‘maintains or enhances’ the image and visual appearance of the mixed use area under (iv) do not recognise that amenity values will change over time and respond to housing needs/demands and the neighbourhood’s planned urban built character. Further, the requirements to provide a ‘Design Statement’ and a landscape plan is contrary to the function/purpose of the MDRS and will slow, not speed up intensification.</p> <p>Retirement villages should not be assessed against the Petone Mixed Use Area Design Guide. This design guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, with no guidance as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with a substantially differing functional and operational needs).</p> <p>The RVA considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p>
--	--	---	---

211.101	Chapter 5B Petone Commercial Activity Area – Rule 5B 2.2.3	Support in Part	Delete “housing for the elderly” from the list of discretionary activities in Rule 5B 2.2.3.	<p>As discussed in Rule 5B 2.1.1 above, the RVA opposes the provision of retirement villages (although the term used is ‘housing for the elderly’) as a discretionary activity and seek to amend the activity status for the use of retirement villages to a permitted activity.</p> <p>As such, the RVA propose that ‘housing for the elderly’ is removed from the list of activities requiring resource consent as a discretionary activity. It is noted that the definition of ‘housing for the elderly’ refers directly to the definition for ‘retirement village’.</p>
211.102	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area – Policy	Support	<p>Seeks the following policies:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u></p> <p><i><u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u></i></p> <p><i><u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></i></p> <p><i><u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></i></p> <p><i><u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></i></p> <p><i><u>Delete or amend other Commercial Zone objectives and policies for consistency.</u></i></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u></p> <p><i><u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Medium Density Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></i></p> <p><u>Density standards</u></p>	<p>Recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones, the RVA considers policy support for retirement villages in the Commercial Zone is required (as also set out in the submission above).</p>

			<i>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</i>	
211.103	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area – Objective 5E 2.4	Support in part	Amend Objective 5E 2.4 as follows: Objective 5E 2.4 <i>Built development is consistent with the <u>changing</u> amenity values expected in the planned urban environment of adjoining residential areas <u>that respond to housing needs and demand.</u></i>	The RVA support Objective 5E 2.4, which seeks to ensure that built development is consistent with the amenity values expected in the planned urban environment adjoining residential areas, but suggests the Objective should recognise the need for change over time to the existing character and amenity of neighbourhoods to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community.
211.104	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area – Rule 5E 4.1	Support	Insert a new rule into the Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area that provides for retirement villages as permitted activities. 5E 4.1 Permitted Activities <u>Rule 5E 4.1.X</u> <u>a) Retirement villages are permitted activities</u> <u>b) The construction of buildings for retirement villages that do not meet one or more of the 5E 4.2 Development Standards is a restricted discretionary activity</u> <u>Discretion is restricted to:</u> <u>i. The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: Rule 5E 4.2.1, Rule 5E 4.2.2, Rule 5E 4.2.3 and Rule 5E 4.2.4:</u> <u>ii. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>iii. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>iv. When assessing the matters in i – iii, consider:</u>	Recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification or urban non-residential zones, the RVA considers that the Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs. Currently, retirement villages would be a non-complying activity, which is inconsistent with the direction and purpose of the NPSUD and will not enable a well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their well-being in accordance with Objective 1 MDRS. Furthermore, in accordance with the RVA's submissions on Rule 5A 2.2.1, Rule 5B 2.1.2 and Rule 5B 2.2.2 above, the RVA also considers that a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion (consistent with the MDRS) should apply to the construction of buildings for retirement villages in the Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area.

			<p><u><i>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</i></u></p> <p><u><i>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>v. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</i></u></p> <p><u>Notification status:</u></p> <p><u><i>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with Rule 5E 4.2.1, Rule 5E 4.2.2, and Rule 5E 4.2.3 is precluded from being limited notified.</i></u></p>	
211.105	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area – Rule 5E 4.2.1	Support in Part	Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard.	<p>The RVA supports Rule 5E 4.2.1 and the building height provisions.</p> <p>However, the RVA considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 5E 4.2.1(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements). The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 5E 4.2.1(b), with a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 5E 4.1.X above.</p>
211.106	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area – Rule 5E 4.2.2	Support in Part	Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard.	<p>The RVA supports Rule 5E 4.2.2(b) which states that the construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the recession plane requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>However, the RVA considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 5E 4.2.2(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the applicants</p>

				and Council can be informed by the relevant outcomes identified in the Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements). The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion (for Rule 5E 4.2.2(b), and seek to provide a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion. These retirement specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 5E 4.1.X above.
211.107	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area – Rule 5E 4.2.3	Support in Part	Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard.	<p>The RVA supports Rule 5E 4.2.3(b) which states that the construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the yard requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>However, the RVA considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 5E 4.2.3(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the applicants and Council can be informed by the relevant outcomes identified in the Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements). The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 5E 4.2.3(b), and seek to provide a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion. These retirement specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 5E 4.1.X above.</p>
211.108	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area – Rule 5E 4.2.4	Support in Part	Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard	<p>The RVA supports Rule 5E 4.2.4(b) which states that the construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the outdoor living space requirements is a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>However, the RVA considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 5E 4.2.4(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements). The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 5E 4.2.4(b), with a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 5E 4.1.X above.</p>

211.109	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area – Rule 5E 4.2.5	Oppose in Part	Delete rule. Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard.	The RVA opposes Rule 5E 4.2.5(b) which states that construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the permitted activity standards for building frontage, verandas and display windows is a restricted discretionary activity as these standards are inconsistent with the MDRS. In addition, the RVA considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 5E 4.2.5(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements). The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 5E 4.2.5(b), with a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 5E 4.1.X above.
211.110	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area – Rule 5E 4.2.6	Oppose in Part	Delete rule. Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard	The RVA opposes Rule 5E 4.2.6(b) which states that developments which do not meet the permitted development controls for parking are a restricted discretionary activity as these standards are inconsistent with the NPSUD. In addition, the RVA considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 5E 4.2.6(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements). The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 5E 4.2.6(b), with a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 5E 4.1.X above.
211.111	Chapter 5E Suburban Mixed Use Activity Area – Rule 5E 4.2.7	Oppose in Part	Delete the rule. Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard	The RVA opposes Rule 5E 4.2.7(b) which states that the construction or alteration of a building that does not meet the screening and storage requirements is a restricted discretionary activity as these standards are inconsistent with the MDRS. In addition, the RVA considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 5E 4.2.7(b) are not appropriate for retirement villages (particularly that the council will

				be principally guided by its Medium Density Design Guide when considering a range of design elements). The RVA therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for Rule 5E 4.2.7(b), with a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 5E 4.1.X above.
211.112	Chapter 12	Oppose	<p>Seeks amendments to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the dual financial and development contributions regimes will not result in double dipping; • Provide certainty as to the financial contributions that will be required to be paid; • Ensure the calculation methodology takes into account cost of works undertaken as part of development; and • Provide a retirement village-specific regime for retirement villages that takes into account their substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments. 	The RVA is concerned that Chapter 12 as proposed will result in 'double dipping' under dual financial and development contribution regimes, does not clearly set out the financial contributions that will be required, and does not recognise the bespoke demand characteristics of retirement villages or works carried out as part of development.
211.113	Chapter 14M – Wind – Issue 14M 1.1	Support in part	<p>Amend the Issue as follows:</p> <p><i>Buildings can alter the pattern and speed of wind at ground level in public spaces. This can affect the comfort of pedestrians in public spaces and even mean that wind conditions can become hazardous. It is important that buildings are designed and operated to manage these effects.</i></p>	The RVA supports the focus of this Issue on public spaces, and the safety of wind conditions. It considers reference to the 'comfort of pedestrians' is vague and not otherwise defined and should be deleted.
211.114	Chapter 14M Wind – 14M 1.1. Policy	Support in part	Amend the Policy to refer to management of adverse wind safety effects.	The RVA supports the focus of the Policy on public spaces. It considers further amendments are required to focus the Policy on safety of wind conditions in line with the Issue.

211.115	Chapter 14M Wind – 14M 1.1. Rules	Oppose in part	Amend 14M 2.1.1 so that the height thresholds align with the height standards in each zone.	The RVA considers that the construction, alteration of, and addition to buildings and structures that meets the permitted heights of various zones should be a permitted activity.
211.116	Chapter 14M Wind – 14M 2.1.2	Oppose in part	Amend (a) to focus on wind safety effects of the building height exceedance. Delete (c).	The RVA considers the matters of discretion should be limited to the wind safety effects of the building height exceedance and should be focused on the effects of the development itself, not the effects of historic development.
211.117	Chapter 14M Wind – 14M 2.1.3	Support	Retain.	The RVA supports the focus of the standards on public spaces, with comfort requirements only applying to listed public spaces.

DPC56/212 Neil McGrath				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
212.1	Heritage areas	Oppose	A policy of the District Plan should require that the Council will not designate or classify any residential property as Heritage without the express written consent of the property owner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on owners of residential properties listed as heritage in the proposed plan change • Impacts in property values discouraging potential buyers. • Impacts on insurance premiums and insurance excesses, • Length and expensive Council resource consent processes. • Significant material and emotional costs.

DPC56/213 Tom McLeod				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
213.1	Chapter 14F Heritage Buildings and structures	Support	Implement the proposed new heritage areas, and include the rules as proposed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the inclusion of a new residential heritage precinct in Petone, provided HCC does not intend to further alter the rules on what homeowners can and can't do to their homes • Encouraged by the fact that new developments require resource consent and are not exempt from height restrictions and character element requirements. • The heritage precinct will benefit the area.

DPC56/214 Michelle Lardelli-Ruthven				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
214.1	Intensification	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have faced first-hand issues of buildings with no off-street car parks on their street, with significant on-street parking issues. • Lack of consultation.

DPC56/215 Felicity Rashbrooke				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
215.1	Medium and High Density building in coastal areas of	Oppose	Do not proceed with medium and high density building provisions anywhere in the coastal, and related areas.	Areas of Eastbourne, Moera and Petone are subject to inundation from the sea due to sea level rise within the next few decades. The rise in sea-level will be exacerbated on the eastern side of

	Eastbourne, Moera, Petone.			<p>the Harbour due to land subsidence. Moera and Petone coastal areas are also very likely to be inundated by storm surges.</p> <p>Council may have to compensate owners in the future for facilitating housing and construction that otherwise would not have gone ahead.</p>
215.2	Walkable catchment	Amend	Reduce the “walkable distance” from an urban centre or public transport network to 800 metres.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The walking distance from an urban centre is not reasonable. Residents would rather drive, particularly on wet and windy days.
215.3	Site coverage	Amend	Reduce the site coverage that is allowed for each building on a property to 40%, and for this to rigorously enforced.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council will not be able to monitor permitted developments. Potential loss of privacy and sunlight from new developments, leading to the creation of areas that are undesirable to live in.
215.4	Height in relation to boundary	Amend	Do more to ensure that placement of buildings is not going to adversely affect neighbours i.e. that height planes are set so that shading does not occur beyond what is currently allowed.	
215.5	Monitoring	Amend	Set out in public documents how building construction will be monitored to ensure compliance with all District Plan rules, and employ more staff to monitor this.	
215.6	Biodiversity	Amend	Identify significant natural areas and increase the number of small local green spaces.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of urban biodiversity potentially created by proposed provisions. There are no protections in the HCC District Plan. The decrease in biodiversity is further exacerbated by HCC’s policies to turn small local parks into housing. With more intensive development, there will be more need for small urban green spaces.

DPC56/216		Major Gardens Ltd		
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
216.1	MDRAA	Amend	Rezone 280 Major Drive, 204/205 Liverton Road and 36/50 Kaitangata Crescent, Kelson to Medium Density Residential Activity Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These sites are the remaining two areas of General Residential land at the end of Major Drive. Properties to the north are zoned Rural Residential and properties to the west are Hill Residential. We consider it appropriate to rezone this entire block of land to Medium Density Residential to give effect to NPS-UD policy 2. • HCC's District Plan Review specifically identifies areas of Kelson as being suitable for greenfield redevelopment which is supported by the 2012 Housing and Business Land Capacity Assessment. • Rezoning this land is a logical extension of the Medium Density Residential zoning, it otherwise leaves a small 'pocket' of General Residential land between the Medium Density and Rural Residential zones. • Rezoning larger sites allows for cohesive medium density development in which greater yields are possible as less constraints are applicable such as existing dwellings, small sites and access etc. • The site meets the definition of being "infrastructure-ready" under clause 3.4(3) of the NPS-UD because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Network infrastructure including power, telecommunications, stormwater, wastewater and water services are already running along Major Drive and along Kaitangata Crescent; and ○ Transportation infrastructure with road connections from Major Drive, Kaitangata Crescent and Liverton Road, access to the site and connectivity through the property can be easily achieved. • The development of the site is feasible and reasonably expected to be realised.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no qualifying matters that preclude the rezoning of this land.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/217 Sam Williams				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
217.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 storey buildings will not attract the level of development required under the NPS-UD • 6 storey buildings are an awkward structural height – and the structural point is expensive • Poor soil conditions in Hutt Valley will make projects difficult. • The Lower Hutt Valley is prone to natural hazards including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Major Active Earthquake faults ○ High Earthquake ground shaking potential ○ High liquefaction potential ○ Significant earthquake induced slope failure ○ Hutt River flood spread ○ Tsunami zones. • High rise buildings will present a high risk of injury and deaths in a natural hazard event. • The Hutt Valley Aquifer will potentially cause issues for development and be intruded on and contaminated by foundations. • Concern about the degradation of the natural environment and loss of native flora and fauna. • Concern about loss of sunlight, air, and views • Concern about increased wind speed

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about traffic congestion • Loss of off-street parking and impact on streets • Infrastructure concerns – upgrades required will be expensive and extensive.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/218 Richard Perry				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
218.1	Walkable catchments	Amend	Limit definition of walking distance criteria to 400m from urban and transport centres.	<p>The submitter requests amendments for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unreasonable, arbitrary and inconsistent approach in exercising its discretion to define what is within walking distance of urban and transport centres. • Plan does not take into account various walking abilities (inferred).
218.2	HDRAA	Amend	Reduce the areas defined for high density development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent of the areas defined as high density areas well exceeds that needed to be so classified in order to meet future foreseeable residential development needs of the city.
218.4	Development Standards	Amend	Minimum side yards of 3m for buildings above three stories, with recession planes no steeper than 45%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High density development will impact sunlight, health, privacy and amount of vegetation. • Loss of amenities, particularly on neighbouring properties.
218.5	Infrastructure	Amend	Assess infrastructure capability, particularly in relation to water supply and sewerage capacity, before finalisation of the plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing infrastructure capacity issues and ability to support more intense development.

218.6	Notification	Amend	Delete provisions which exclude or limit notification of discretionary use applications in residential areas, and substitute with a fair regime to enable neighbours and others particularly affected to be advised in advance of determination and have a fair opportunity to be heard.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of neighbours rights on discretionary land use applications and potential adverse effects on neighbours. • Breaching rules of natural justice.
-------	--------------	-------	--	--

DPC56/219 Survey and Spatial New Zealand				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
219.1	Amendment 42 Definition: Site	Oppose	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>For all other zones, means any area of land which meets one of the descriptions set out below:</p> <p>1. an area of land comprised in:</p> <p>(a) a single computer freehold register <u>record of title</u>; or</p> <p>(b) a single allotment for which a separate computer freehold register <u>record of title</u> could be issued without further involvement of, or prior consent from, the Council;</p> <p>3. an area of land:</p> <p>(a) comprised in two or more computer freehold registers <u>record of title</u>; and</p> <p>(b) for which two or more separate computer freehold registers <u>record of title</u> could be issued without further involvement of, or prior consent from, the Council;</p>	The definition still refers to “computer freehold registers”. This term for a ‘title’ has been replaced by the term “record of title.”

			where the land will be amalgamated into a single computer freehold register record of title as part of the resource consent process.	
219.2	<p>Rule 4F 4.2.1AA (Matters of Discretion)</p> <p>Rule 4F 4.2.1 (Matters of Discretion)</p> <p>Rule 4F 4.2.2 (Matters of Discretion)</p> <p>Rule 4F 4.2.3 (Matters of Discretion)</p> <p>Rule 4F 4.2.4 (Matters of Discretion)</p> <p>Rule 4F 4.2.6 (Matters of Discretion)</p> <p>Rule 4F 4.2.11 (Matters of Discretion)</p> <p>Rule 4F 4.2.12 (Matters of Discretion)</p> <p>Rule 4F 4.2.13 (Matters of Discretion)</p>	Oppose	<p>Delete this matter of discretion.</p> <p>(i) The planned urban built character for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area.</p>	<p>All these rules have the following item as a matter of discretion:</p> <p><i>(i) The planned urban built character for the Medium Density Residential Activity Area.</i></p> <p>Despite the introduction/zone statement (Amendment 53), this item would allow a significantly broad scope to the matters Council could consider under the resource consent. Such broad scope of discretion is not consistent with a restricted discretionary rule and could be contrary to section 77B RMA.</p> <p>In addition, this matter of discretion also appears to ‘overlap’ with the listed design elements.</p>
219.3	Rule 4F 4.2.1AA (Matters of Discretion)	Oppose	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The following design elements:</p>	These rules list a number of ‘design elements’ over which Council wishes to exercise discretion when assessing a resource consent

	Rule 4G 4.2.1 (Matters of Discretion)		1. Building height 2. Recession planes and setbacks 3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces 4. Open space and boundary treatments 5. Entrances, carparking and garages 6. Onsite stormwater management 7. End / side wall treatment 8. Building materials 9. Bike parking, storage and service areas 10. Privacy and safety 11. Landscaping	application. Many of these 'design elements' are not relevant to the rule, which is to do with 4 or more units on a site.
219.4	Rule 4F 4.2.2 (Matters of Discretion) Rule 4G 4.2.3 (Matters of Discretion)	Oppose	Amend as follows: The following design elements: 1. Building height 2. Recession planes and setbacks 3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces 4. Open space and boundary treatments 5. Entrances, carparking and garages 6. Onsite stormwater management 7. End / side wall treatment 8. Building materials 9. Bike parking, storage and service areas 10. Privacy and safety 11. Landscaping	These rules list a number of 'design elements' over which Council wishes to exercise discretion when assessing a resource consent application. Many of these 'design elements' are not relevant to the rule, which is to do with building height.

219.5	Rule 4F 4.2.3 (Matters of Discretion) Rule 4G 4.2.4 (Matters of Discretion)	Oppose	Amend as follows: The following design elements: 1. Building height 2. Recession planes 3. End / side wall treatment 4. Privacy and safety	These rules list a number of 'design elements' over which Council wishes to exercise discretion when assessing a resource consent application. Many of these 'design elements' are not relevant to the rule, which is to do with height in relation to boundary.
219.6	Rule 4F 4.2.4 (Matters of Discretion) Rule 4G 4.2.5 (Matters of Discretion)	Oppose	Amend as follows: The following design elements: 1. Building height 2. Recession planes 3. End / side wall treatment 4. Privacy and safety	These rules list a number of 'design elements' over which Council wishes to exercise discretion when assessing a resource consent application. Many of these 'design elements' are not relevant to the rule, which is to do with setbacks.
219.7	Rule 4F 4.2.6 (Matters of Discretion) Rule 4G 4.2.8 (Matters of Discretion)	Oppose	Amend as follows: The following design elements: 1. Building height 2. Recession planes and setbacks 3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces 4. Open space and boundary treatments 5. Entrances, carparking and garages 6. Onsite stormwater management 7. End / side wall treatment 8. Building materials 9. Bike parking, storage and service areas 10. Privacy and safety 11. Landscaping	These rules list a number of 'design elements' over which Council wishes to exercise discretion when assessing a resource consent application. Many of these 'design elements' are not relevant to the rule, which is to do with outdoor living space.

219.8	Rule 4F 4.2.10 (Stormwater Retention) Rule 4G 4.2.12 (Stormwater Retention)	Oppose	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>(a) Construction of a roofed building, excluding accessory buildings or additions to an existing building, is a permitted activity if:</p> <p>(i) A rainwater tank is provided for the building that collects all rainwater from the roof of the building. The rainwater tank must have the following volumes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roof area of 100m² or less 2,000 litre capacity. • Roof area of 100m² to 200m² 3,000 litre capacity. • Roof area of more than 200m² 5,000 litre capacity. <p>The tank must meet the specifications, and be installed in accordance with Acceptable Solution #1 from the Wellington Water guide Managing Stormwater Runoff, The use of raintanks for hydraulic neutrality, Acceptable solution #1 dated June 2019.</p> <p>i. A Wellington Water Limited approved solution for managing volume and rate of stormwater runoff is installed as part of the development; or</p> <p>ii. Stormwater management measures are incorporated which achieve post development peak stormwater flows and volumes which are the same or less than the modelled peak flows and volumes for the site in its current state.</p>	<p>These rules only permit the use of rainwater tanks to achieve hydraulic neutrality using the pre-approved solutions from Wellington Water’s document “Managing Stormwater Runoff”.</p> <p>However, there are other options to achieve hydraulic neutrality. The permitted standard should not be limited to one pre-approved detention system.</p>
219.9	Rule 4F 4.2.12 (Matters of Discretion) Rule 4G 4.2.14 (Matters of Discretion)	Oppose	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The following design elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Open space and boundary treatments 2. Entrances, carparking and garages 3. End / side wall treatment 	<p>These rules list a number of ‘design elements’ over which Council wishes to exercise discretion when assessing a resource consent application. Many of these ‘design elements’ are not relevant to the rule, which is to do with windows to the street.</p>

			4. Privacy and safety 5. Landscaping	
219.10	Rule 4F 4.2.13 (Matters of Discretion) Rule 4G 4.2.15 (Matters of Discretion)	Oppose	Amend as follows: The following design elements: 1. Building height 2. Recession planes and setbacks 3. Indoor and outdoor living spaces 4. Open space and boundary treatments 5. Entrances, carparking and garages 6. Onsite stormwater management 7. End / side wall treatment 8. Building materials 9. Bike parking, storage and service areas 10. Privacy and safety 11. Landscaping	These rules list a number of 'design elements' over which Council wishes to exercise discretion when assessing a resource consent application. Many of these 'design elements' are not relevant to the rule, which is to do with landscaping.
219.11	Subdivision 11.2.2 – Standards and Terms	Support	Retain as notified	Support the removal of minimum lot design standards.

DPC56/220 Dave Robinson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
220.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the plan change (inferred).	

220.2	Public transport	Amend	Adopt a strategy to ensure the adequacy of public transport consistent with the degree of intensification intended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not appropriate to simply adopt the requirements of Central Government with regard to Medium Density and High Density directives without considering the wider effects. • Lack of off-street parking. • No requirement to retain mature trees.
220.3	Open space	Amend	Adopt a strategy to ensure adequate parks and open spaces are provided (inferred).	
220.4	Entire district plan	Amend	Consider all other parts of its District Plan with a particular focus on the good health (mental and physical) of its citizens.	

DPC56/221 Cuttriss Consultants Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
221.1	Medium Density Residential zone - extent	Amend	Rezone all land within the Hill Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential and the addition of a 'character overlay' instead to identify sites with specific characteristics which should be retained.	<p>It is our view that the Hill Residential Zone meets the definition of a 'relevant residential zone' as defined by Part 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act) as it does not meet any of the exclusions listed given the zone is not congruent with the large lot residential zoning, Hutt City Council has a population exceeding 5,000, and is not an offshore island or settlement zone.</p> <p>We do note however that the Hill Residential Zones does exhibit certain qualities such as vegetation and topography that would be better addressed through a 'character overlay' rather than precluding the rezoning to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Hill Residential Zone is a relevant residential zone as defined by the RMA and therefore to meet 77G of the RMA, Council must give effect to the Medium Density Residential Standards, which is best addressed through rezoning the site to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>
221.2	New zoning and height limits - extent	Amend	Include land that is partially or completely surrounded by proposed new rezoning or height limit in the same zone.	For consistency in neighbourhood character, properties surrounded partially or completely by new zoning or height limits should be rezoned the same.

				<p>Examples of sites that are otherwise surrounded by new zoning include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alicetown between Hume Street and Te Mome Road; • Melling between Leary Street and Pharazyn Street; • Taita north of Nash Street; and • Boulcott between Allen Street and Stellin Street. <p>In most instances, the above are completely or partially surrounded by a proposed new height limit or rezoning and it would be reasonable to include land that is otherwise surrounded by a new zone or height in the same zone or height for consistency.</p>
221.3	Notification	Amend	<p>Include a non-notification clause for development up to 3 storeys in the General Residential Activity Area, and up to 6 storeys within the Medium Density Residential Activity Area, or within the areas subject to proposed height limit increases.</p>	<p>The current use of 'need not' under 17.2.2 provides for discretion on notification and doesn't specifically preclude notification for enabled development. Notification can add significant cost and uncertainty to a development. The inclusion of a non-notification clause would better enable the intensification provisions anticipated under the Act by removing the costs and uncertainty of notification and a hearing.</p> <p>The Council would still retain all discretion to approve or decline an application under section 104 of the Act, including consideration of design matters and the overall acceptability of the development.</p>
221.4	Building height - extent	Amend	<p>Exclude isolated pockets of land which do not have sufficient land area from additional height requirements.</p>	<p>Inability of land to deliver additional height and potential inconsistency with the character of the surrounding area if development occurred.</p> <p>For example, it is unlikely that 58 Whites Line West, Woburn which has an area of only 488m² or 7 Treadwell Street, Naenae which has an area of 675m² would have sufficient land area to achieve the height increases or if they could, it would be inconsistent with the height of development within the surrounding area.</p>

221.5	New provisions on minimum height and land area	Amend	Consider including minimum height or land area provisions (inferred).	<p>Consider incorporating these provisions to encourage consolidation and better enable integrated development, rather than on a fragmented and ad-hoc basis.</p> <p>Wellington City Council's Draft District Plan proposes similar measures to limit under-development.</p>
221.6	Flood Hazard	Amend	Consider assessing flood hazard effects in addition to building location and floor levels and including guidance as to how flood hazard effects on access could be addressed having regard to the nature of the risk in terms of frequency, depth and velocity of floodwaters, ability for occupants' and emergency vehicle access, duration of flooding, and provision of alternative access during a major flood event.	This is reinforced by Policy 51(i) of the Regional Policy Statement which states that floor levels and access routes are expected to be above 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) to minimise damage and allow for evacuation or emergency services to access a site.
221.7	Flood Hazard	Amend	Utilise probability to identify flood hazard effects rather than a time interval.	<p>Time interval gives a false sense of security that a property would be otherwise safe from flooding between interval events. The reality is the interval between flood events can be completely random and best practice is now to refer to flood hazards as an AEP.</p> <p>For example, a 100-year average reoccurrence interval equates to a 1% AEP, meaning that at any given year, there is a 1% chance of a flooding.</p>
221.8	Wind	Amend	Clarify how wind effects would be considered, and whether there should be a higher height limit (eg. above 6 storeys) before considering wind effects.	<p>Would the Council only be considering the effects of wind on public amenity and safety or would this factor into an assessment of effects on residential amenity similar to shading as both can lessen the enjoyment of an adjacent outdoor area and form grounds for notification.</p> <p>Wind assessment is also inherently expensive with an average cost of around \$20,000 for a full wind tunnel test and assessment. Consideration should also be given to 'deemed to comply design solutions' whereby if incorporating certain design measures, a wind assessment may not be necessary.</p>

221.9	Minimum rainwater tank sizes for up to three dwellings	Amend	Removal of minimum rainwater tank sizes for up to 3 dwellings as there is no clear link between the proposed retention of this provision and a qualifying matter under the Act.	If this provision is removed for up to 3 dwellings, consideration should be given as to whether it is still appropriate to retain this provision for development of more than 3 dwellings for consistency and ease of applying the District Plan, particularly as it can be challenging to incorporate such measures in multi-storey apartments and the additional cost rainwater tanks add to development. For many townhouse developments, it can be challenging to find sufficient space for the tanks and they are often located within private open space, reducing the utility and amenity of these areas.
-------	--	-------	---	--

DPC56/222 Ministry of Education				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
222.1	Objective 4G 2.6	Support in part	Built development is adequately serviced by network infrastructure (including additional infrastructure) or addresses any infrastructure constraints.	<p>Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient 'additional infrastructure' (which includes educational facilities) is provided in development, and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available (see Policy 10 and 3.5 of Subpart 1 of Part 3: Implementation, in particular). Educational facilities should therefore be enabled in the Operative District Plan to service the growth enabled by PC56. The Ministry therefore requests that additional infrastructure is specifically referenced in the Objective wording.</p> <p>It is recommended that the definition of 'additional infrastructure' (as defined in the NPS UD) should subsequently be included in the definitions chapter of the Operative District Plan.</p>
222.2	Policy 4G 3.1	Support	Retain as proposed	The Ministry supports the inclusion of Policy 4G 3.1. This policy supports the establishment of educational facilities in residential areas to support communities' social, economic and cultural wellbeing and contribute to high standard of living.

222.3	Rule 4G 5.5.1.1	Support in part	<p>Educational Activities</p> <p>(a) Educational activities directly associated with the existing school within the residential building existing as at 24 June 2002 are restricted discretionary activities.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are limited to:</p> <p>a.) The effects on the amenity of the surrounding residential area</p> <p>b.) The extent to which the site layout and any proposed landscaping helps to avoid or minimise the impacts on surrounding residential areas, the streetscape and adjoining public space.</p>	<p>The Ministry seek clarification as to the location of this scheduled site, there is no 313 Hautana Square. Perhaps this rule is referring to Sacred Heart College at 31 Hautana Square. Please update the correct address accordingly. The operative district plan currently enables educational facilities as a restricted discretionary activity in the residential zones. To be consists with the district plan, the Ministry requests that Ruel 4G 5.5.1.1 be enabled as a restricted discretionary activity.</p>
-------	-----------------	-----------------	---	--

DPC56/223 East Harbour Environmental Association				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
223.1	Density	Amend	Removal of HDRAA zoning for Stokes Valley, Avalon, Wainuiomata, Moera, and Eastbourne.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like HCC to take a precautionary approach to high density areas. • Although intensification is generally desirable, both to address housing shortages and to restrict greenfield development, there are a number of issues PC56 does not address. • Residents remain dependent on private vehicles to get places, and high density developments outside of Lower Hutt and Petone CBD and railway stations will exacerbate existing traffic congestion and on-street parking issues • Public transport services in Wainuiomata, Eastbourne, and Stokes Valley do not work very well. • Access to Eastbourne will be adversely affected by sea level rise, as the supplied maps and overlays show. Landslip is
223.2	Density	Amend	Reduce walking catchment limits, which may require challenging the NPS-UD.	
223.3	Density	Amend	Reversal of any Hill Residential rezoning.	
223.4	Density	Amend	Establishing a qualifying area outside the Medium and High Density zones, where HCC has a basis for identifying areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.	
223.5	Density	Amend	Areas subject to natural hazard risks should be identified as qualifying areas and not zoned Medium Density Residential. Use of nomenclature for these qualifying areas that	

			makes risks clear to potential buyers and builders.	<p>currently impacting the Stokes Valley access and Wainuiomata has outgrown and single road access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water infrastructure needs improving, which argues for more caution when setting high density boundaries. • High density zoning for the suburban centres of Stokes Valley, Avalon, Wainuiomata, Moera, and Eastbourne is not justified at this point. • PC56 leaves HCC with little discretion. HCC has tried to give some effect to a precautionary approach, but more needs to be done. • Identification of natural hazards (tsunami, flooding, sea level rise, coastal inundation) makes it clear that there are areas of the city not suitable for intensification. Coping with these problems with the current housing density is difficult enough, without increasing the population. • Throughout PC56 reference has been made to 'high quality', but this is only considered in the design guide. The design guide has not been updated and is not prescriptive, only applying when HCC is considering a consent for a non-permitted activity. • Engage with Urban Designers to create a design guide to help evaluate resource consent applications and develop a detailed plan of how the city will look. Provides a benchmark for consent granting. • The absence of public notification results in a lack of transparency for the general public. • Develop a 'Citizens Review Panel' for the purpose of providing input on resource consent applications. This would be made up of a random selection of voters, meeting city wide proportions of age, gender, ethnicity, and income. • Seeks assurance that HCC will put adequate resourcing into monitoring the developments built and that requirements such as landscaping, site coverage, permeable surfaces etc. are being met. • Significant indigenous biodiversity values should form a further qualifying area category and be excluded from the MDRS rules.
223.6	Density	Amend	HCC engage staff to develop a detailed plan, envisaging the city street by street under the new rules.	
223.7	Density	Amend	HCC to establish a Citizens Review Panel to provide input into consent decision making.	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern regarding the possible increased use of H5 treated piles on the valley floor, especially close to the aquifer. Needs to be addressed as part of the intensification process.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/224 Richmond Atkinson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
224.1	Zones	Oppose	Withdrawal of zoning proposals pending public consultation, expert consideration of hazard zone risks, expert advice on likely need and uptake of intensification, expert opinion on capacity of infrastructure, and possible ramifications of RMA revision.	<p>The submitter opposes the zoning proposals and requests their removal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient consideration given to allowing intensification in hazard zones Insufficient ability for infrastructure to cope with intensification. Not enough public input.
224.2	Heritage	Oppose	Withdrawal of heritage proposals pending public consultation, wider expert advice, provision for voluntary opt-in/opt-out, and publicly funded costs of opt-in heritage requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern the extent of the heritage area is 'heavy handed and unfair'. Believes heritage listing should be by permission of the owners, with costs borne by the public. Not enough public input.

DPC56/225 Simon and Vanessa Edmonds				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
225.1	Entire plan change		Reject the proposed plan change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns on the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. Availability of technical assessments. Inability of District Plan provisions on addressing housing affordability, given cost of labour, materials and more stringent building standards. Adequacy of development enabled under Plan Change 43. Liquefaction risk. Sea level rise. Flood risk. Development in the Eastern Bays with regard to the hill suburbs natural hazards and access.

DPC56/226 Troy Baisden				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
226.1	Coastal inundation	Oppose in part	Change the Respective Hazard Ranking for "Coastal Inundation Extent – (1.5m Sea Level Rise and 1:100 year storm tide and wave set up" from Medium to Low.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes approach used and outcome of the HCC's designation of medium risk for coastal inundation . Considers the Hazard guidance report claims accompanying PC56 claims to follow MfE's recently released National Adaptation Plan but is inconsistent with that document and underlying guidance as well as good practice. Considers The areas classified and mapped as 'medium risk' creates potential for perverse policy outcomes as well
226.2	Coastal inundation	Oppose in part	Clarify the risk could be elevated to Medium between 30 and 100 years into the future.	

				as re-use of the classification and the incomplete approach by HCC or other councils.
226.3	Coastal inundation	Oppose in part	Add a map similar to the 1.0 m Sea Level Rise layer as Medium risk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes good practice is to allow for the uncertainty in a range of scenarios using a Dynamic Adaptive Pathways Planning Approach. Doing so results in a straightforward change to the Plan Change, which should allow the planning approach to be used.
DPC56/227 Living Street Aotearoa				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
227.1	Entire plan change	Support in part	Amend plan change to ensure higher and denser building have well defined guidelines to provide safe walking and recreational spaces for people of all ages and ability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High and dense residential buildings have blank walls. High and solid fences by the footpath. Frontages dominated by spaces such as car parks Makes space feel unsafe. Reduces sense of community. Walk ways between buildings with no obvious exit and no surveillance resulting vulnerable walkers feeling unsafe particularly at night. Street space along these areas needs to discourage car traffic, and to improve safety for children and older people to use the street. Road design should force traffic to travel at a minimum speed and discourage through-traffic.
227.2	Entire plan change	Support in part	Amend plan change to ensure high intensity housing does not compromise the comfort and safety of footpaths and the people using these; particularly for children and people with disabilities, and improve walking facilities in residential areas and around shops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that effective pedestrian provision is maintained through the construction stage. Improve state of footpaths to avoid risk for people who have trouble walking or are on a mobility scooter. Widen footpaths to allow these to handle increased pedestrian numbers, use of devices (e.g. mobility scooters),

				<p>social distancing, pushchairs, and use of footpaths as meeting and socialising spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove footpath clutter, prohibit parking on footpaths, and use roadside parking for outdoor seating to increase the formed footpath space available. Repurposing of non-disability parking for outdoor seating.
227.3	Entire plan change	Support in part	Amend plan change to ensure there are comfortable and safe routes to other destinations such as schools, shops, bus stops and railway stations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure a pedestrian grid and network that is enhanced as part of the housing intensification. Public access around intensification areas should be prioritised over privacy and private access. Private vehicle use on pedestrian access ways should be avoided where possible. Limited cul-de-sac car parking should avoid the need for private driveways. Pedestrian network should connect across intersections. Intersection design should focus on ensuring safe pedestrian route. Pedestrian crossings should be on desire lines at intersections, roundabouts, and driveways for supermarkets and shops.
227.4	Entire plan change	Support in part	Amend plan change to ensure high density housing area have high quality public spaces in terms of lighting, surface, seats, shelter, shade, and wayfinding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considers every available public space must be treated as valuable and made usable Six story buildings will create shade and wind problems that impact on public spaces, which should be compensated by creating nearby green spaces / neighbourhood garden areas that have good sun and that can provide play equipment for children as well as community vegetable gardens and fruit trees Ensure an adequate uncluttered width of footpath by not allowing new infrastructure to be located in footpath space.

227.5	Amendment 3 Section 1.10.1A - Objective	Support	Retain objective as notified.	The objective reflects the focus that walkability is a critical aspect of a well-functioning urban environment that enables health and safety.
227.6	Amendment 4 Section 1.10.1A – Policy 1	Support in part	Amend to allow buildings of 6+ stories in the central business district and main routes in suburban centres, not residential streets.	Residential housing of 6 storeys and higher will have a very significant impact on the character of the Hutt and the street space that they border on.
227.7	Amendment 5 Section 1.10.1A - Policy 2	Support in part	Amend policy to enforce public space / walking access around high density building as a design requirement that developers need to adhere to regardless of whether the land is open space or not	Considers the protection of open space for public use is important.
227.8	Amendment 6 Section 1.10.1A - Policy 3	Support in part	Amend policy to “require” instead of “encourage”.	Partially supports policy but considers developers will not be encouraged to follow this policy. It needs to be a commitment by the developers and the Council.
227.9	Amendment 7 Section 1.10.1A - Policy 4	Support in part	Amend policy to policy enforce the inclusion of community facilities and spaces as part of development of buildings 6 storeys and higher; both inside (e.g. meeting areas, shared laundry facilities) as well as outside	Generally supports the policy regarding housing design. Recommends strengthening requirements for community facilities and spaces.
DPC56/228 Steven Beech				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter’s reasons for decision requested
228.1	Buildings up to 6 storeys	Oppose	Allow homeowners affected the chance to be involved in developments affecting their property (inferred).	The submitter is concerned about PC56 for the following reasons (inferred): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of ability to have input on development. • Impact on property value.

DPC56/229		Pam Crisp		
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
229.1	Amendment 3 Section 1.10.1A - Objective	Amend	Amend to include environmental, as well as social, economic and cultural wellbeing.	<p>The submitter requests amendments for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental wellbeing is one of the 4 well-beings in the RM Act and Local Govt Act and must be included in planning for future residential and commercial intensification. • Urban intensification creates a need for more access to Nature in the city. Already cities create heat islands which become more harmful as the climate heats. Floods and wind storms are intensifying in New Zealand and in the world. "Green and blue infrastructure" is widely recognised as an affordable and ecologically responsible response to climate challenges. Research is increasingly proving direct effects on human health and well-being of such approaches • Research from NZ and internationally shows the powerful effects of access to nature on children's development - green spaces in backyards and neighbourhoods are essential and must be planned for. • Environmental well-being is integral to the aspirational goals of 'Te Ara Whakamua o Te Awa Kairangi ki Tai - Lower Hutt Climate Action Pathway'. We believe that the thinking in this document, must actively inform future planning and development across Hutt City, including urban intensification policy
229.2	Amendment 54 Objective 4F 2.1AA	Amend	Amend to include environmental, as well as social, economic and cultural wellbeing.	
229.3	Amendment 107 Objective 4G 2.1	Amend	Amend to include environmental, as well as social, economic and cultural wellbeing.	
229.4	Amendment 5 Section 1.10.1A - Policy 2	Amend	Add a new clause <u>c): recognize and provide for the protection and restoration of natural areas in or adjacent to land zoned for intensification from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.</u>	

229.5	Amendment 29 Section 1.10.11 - Policy	Amend	Adding a new Policy (e): To retain sufficient permeable surfaces in high, medium and low flood and coastal hazard areas to minimise risk of flooding and tidal inundation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of what could or should mitigate the adverse effects of intensification is largely absent from the planning document. Have observed that much of the land in infill development is sealed, with few permeable surfaces to offset the risk of flooding in heavy rain events.
229.6	Amendment 49 Description of HDRAA	Amend	Add a new Policy: Set land aside for the creation of pocket reserves of indigenous vegetation to offset vegetation removal and mitigate the adverse effects of intensification in high density zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land needs to be set aside for indigenous vegetation to offset vegetation removal and mitigate adverse effects of intensification in high density zones. Concern around the loss of mature trees and private gardens through the process of intensification.
229.7	Amendment 83 Rule 4F 4.2.5	Amend	Add a new Policy: Ensure a minimum of 30 percent of permeable surface is incorporated into planning and design of individual allotments and public land across all intensification zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rule states: "A minimum of 30% of the site area is a permeable surface." This does not appear to be the case with much recent infill housing occurring across Hutt City. Permeable surfaces need to be mapped across all zones and incorporated into planning and design of individual allotments and public land.
229.8	Amendment 103 Section 4F 6 - Anticipated Environmental Results	Amend	Add a new clause (b): (b) A minimum of 30 percent of permeable surface is created or retained across all intensification zones	As above.

DPC56/230 Margaret Sissons				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
230.1	Medium Density Residential Development	Support with amendment	Reject the proposed plan change.	The submitter supports intensification in some urban areas, but requests amendments/rejection of the plan change for the following reasons:

230.2	Design guides	Amend	Make design guides mandatory for new development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in favour of intensification as of right due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Insufficient infrastructure ○ Natural hazard risk ○ Intensification should be planned and not scattered ○ Loss of sunlight, views and vegetation ○ Is in favour of protecting heritage, but should be paid for by the public not owners of heritage properties. • More than housing needs to be taken into consideration.
-------	---------------	-------	---	--

DPC56/231 Kristen Whittington				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
231.1	Heritage	Oppose	The council should adopt the following policy: That a private or commercial property should only be classified as 'heritage' in the district plan with expressed written consent from the property owner.	The submitter opposes the listing residential properties as heritage without the owner's consent.

DPC56/232 Laurence Tyler				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
232.1	Intensification	Oppose	Council takes a measured approach to implementing the government's new legislation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve the heritage and character of residential areas. • Hutt City has taken an extreme approach. • Concern about the loss of character, privacy' and sunlight.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about impacts on health. • Climate change and flood risk. • Liquefaction risk. • Traffic issues. • Six storeys is too high.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/233 Penny Walsh				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
223.1	HA-06 Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precinct	Amend	Amend the Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precinct HA-06 to include 5 Riddlers Crescent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Historic Heritage Area should not have gaps or holes. Instead, non-contributing places within the area should be identified as such. • Only 5 Riddlers Crescent is excluded from the proposed heritage overlay and is treated differently from the other non-contributing properties in the zone. • 5 Riddlers Crescent is a part of the large commercial property to the rear of the residential properties which have a street frontage to the Crescent. • The bulk of the property to the rear is currently in the General Business zone, with the parcel of land fronting the street zoned Historic Residential. This parcel of land has never had a residential building on it and was originally used for grazing. Its current use is as an accessway for the commercial property. • 10. The design of the houses in Riddlers Crescent are typical of the period 1906-1910 and fall into two styles of building, one being villas, and the other being semi-detached workers houses. The proposed High Density Residential zone permits buildings of up to six storeys, with no limits on style of construction. A modern building of this scale within the Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precinct would

				<p>detract from this picturesque, informal, and human scaled character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To exclude 5 Riddlers Crescent from the Riddlers Crescent Heritage Precinct is contrary to Objectives 4G 5.3.1.1 and 4G 5.3.1.2 and Policies 4G 5.3.2.2, 4G 5.3.2.4 and 4G 5.3.2.7. A boundary of a historic heritage area should run around, rather than through a space, street or land parcel. However, this does not seem to be a justification for the exclusion of 5 Riddlers Crescent from zone HA06. This is because under the proposed plan change the property will still straddle two zones: General Business, and High Density Residential, just as it does now (General Business, and Historic Residential).
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/234 Julie Francis				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
234.1	HDRAA	Oppose	That Military Road and the surrounding streets in Boulcott are not rezoned from Special Residential Activity Area I to High Density Residential Activity Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient infrastructure capacity. Insufficient street parking. Traffic and congestion issues. Impact on character. Emergency service access issues.
234.2	MDRS	Oppose	That 3x3 (three units per site and three storeys) and six-storey buildings are not allowed to be built in central Hutt (including Boulcott and surrounding streets).	

DPC56/235 Elayna Chhiba				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
235.1	Building six stories in high density residential and commercial areas	Support with amendment	Allow apartment buildings and multi-units in Lower Hutt and Petone that are above 6 storeys.	<p>The submitter requests amendments to the plan change for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure housing choice is available. • Ensure housing is affordable. • Plan for the future.

DPC56/236 John Roseveare				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
236.1	HDRAA	Oppose	<p>Amend the existing proposal so that within the High Density Residential Activity Area in Eastbourne:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Building heights of at least 4 stories are not allowed, Building heights of 3 stories are discretionary activities, rather than permitted, on which affected neighbours have the right to be notified and to make submissions before approval is granted. 	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed changes to establish a High Density Residential Activity Area (HDRAA) adjacent to the suburban centre of Eastbourne, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing retail/service centre of Eastbourne is a boutique/low density area of one and two story buildings, including the adjacent area zoned for HDRAA. • Concerns about impact on existing character and compatibility with increased density development. • There is already a high amount of existing horizontal density in this area under current rules. • Concern about development quality requirements. • Some of the features of the proposed HDRAA boundaries seem arbitrary.
236.2	HDRAA	Oppose	The proposed boundaries of the new activity area be reviewed to ensure that they are consistent and otherwise reasonable.	
236.3	Amendment 123	Support	No specific decision requested.	

	Policy 4G 3.8			It is important that the impact of new developments on the inhabitants of adjoining sites is taken fully and properly into account, and that reasonable and appropriate provision is made for affected neighbours to be notified – and to be heard – on such impacts.
236.4	Amendment 124 Policy 4G 3.9	Support	No specific decision requested.	

DPC56/237 Trevor Farrer				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
237.1	HDRAA	Support	Provide additional clarification for buildings of more than six storeys.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amended zoning appropriately gives effect to the requirements of the NPS-UD, including Policy 3. • Higher density centres promote the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More environmentally friendly modes of transport, ○ Increased economic activity within the centres. • The ability to build above six storeys is essential in providing affordable housing in an area with an increasing population. <p>The submitter requests amendments for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policies and rules for enabling development over six storeys are currently vague and unclear. • Policy 4G 3.3 of the NPS-UD enables buildings of more than six storeys where compatible with the amenity levels associated with high density six-storey residential development. • The rules for building more than six storeys are discretionary, without clear guidelines on how to achieve good outcomes. • The definition of amenity levels is unclear. Further clarification on what amenity levels referred to is required. • The word 'compatible' is hard to interpret.
237.2	Amenity	Amend	Include specific wording regarding amenity levels: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Defining it as the level of amenity the development will provide; or Having sufficient amenities in the area to support the development. 	
237.3	Amendment 118 Policy 4G 3.3	Amend	To clarify the meaning of Policy 4G 3.3, the wording should be amended to resemble the statements below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where the level of amenity provided is equal or greater to that of a six-storey residential building; or Where there are enough amenities in the area to support a six-storey residential development. 	
237.4	Design Guidance	Amend	Design guidance around residential development above six-storeys should be included.	

			<p>The design guide should include considerations for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The privacy of adjoining properties; b. The effect of shade on adjoining properties; and c. The provision for natural light. 	
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/238 RLW Holdings Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
238.1	Buildings in Petone Commercial Area 1 Outside the Jackson Street Heritage Area	Amend	<p>Either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the existing Design Guide for Petone Commercial Area 1 for the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct only, and create scaled back guidance for properties outside this area but within the zoning, or • Amend the Petone Commercial Area 1 Design Guide to clarify design criteria for properties outside of Jackson Street, along the side streets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amended building height (Amendment 268, Rule 5B 2.1.1.1(b)) implements appropriately the requirements of the NPS-UD, including Objective 3 and Policies 2 and 3. • There is no criteria for assessment of buildings that exceed the 22m height limit. • The properties within the Petone Commercial Area 1 outside the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct should have their height limit rules treated in the same way to these over two dozen rezoned High Density Residential Zoned properties given they are also adjoining the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.
238.2	Buildings in Petone Commercial Area 1 Outside the Jackson Street Heritage Area	Amend	<p>Include the following policy:</p> <p><u>Buildings in Petone Commercial Area 1 Outside the Jackson Street Heritage Area</u></p> <p><u>Provide for buildings and structures that:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Are of a form, scale and design that respect the heritage character and amenity of Jackson Street;</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Provide a coherent "backdrop" to the Jackson Street Heritage Area with a</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings in the side streets that adjoin Jackson Street should be designed to be sympathetic to the heritage values and compatible with the character of the heritage streetscape, as they may be visible from Jackson Street and have the potential to detract from character. • There is minimal difference between the impact of a 6 storey vs 8 storey building as long as it is designed within the correct context. • Suitable design can be achieved through case by case assessment in the resource consent process. The consent status should be restricted discretionary supported by clear

			<p><u>Building design that is not dominant over, but does not need to be subservient to, adjacent heritage buildings;</u></p> <p>b. <u>Building design with design cues from adjacent heritage buildings in terms of scale, form, patterns, materiality, colours and textures and from the Petone Commercial Design Guide (Petone Commercial Appendix 1).</u></p> <p>2. <u>Avoid the use of landscaping measures as transition mitigation measures due to the urban nature of the Jackson St area and the general absence of open space;</u></p> <p>3. <u>Avoid cantilevering of building parts (other than balconies) towards the heritage area;</u></p> <p>4. <u>Mitigate any visual dominance when viewed from Jackson Street at a [specified height of 1600mm] above footpath level;</u></p> <p>5. <u>Have a positive interface with public space (including streets), including:</u></p> <p>a. <u>Transparent glazing at ground level (consistent with the Petone Commercial Design Guide (Petone Commercial Appendix 1)) that allows visibility into and out of building frontages; and</u></p> <p>b. <u>Obvious public entrances.</u></p> <p>6. <u>Have lighting or signage that is complementary to the grain of the Jackson Street Heritage Area.</u></p>	<p>policy direction on the matters to which Council's discretion is restricted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aim to minimise impact on heritage values. • An option would be to retain the existing Design Guide for Petone Commercial Area 1 for the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct only, and create scaled back guidance for properties outside this area but within the zoning.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/239 Glenys Wong				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
239.1	Heritage	Oppose	<p>Amend the plan change to include the following statement:</p> <p>That a property should only be classified as heritage in the District Plan with the express written consent of the property owner.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are against the listing of private residential properties as heritage without the consent of the owner. • Heritage areas impose significant restrictions, including the requirement for consent from council • Adds costs and hurdles to development. • Increased insurance costs and limited cover. • Reduces property values. • No consultation with owners or information on impacts provided to owners of these properties.

DPC56/240 Logan McLennan				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
240.1	HDRAA	Oppose	Reduce the extent of the high density residential area to be concentrated around the central city and public transport hubs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area of high density residential zone is too big. • Allowing 6 storeys is beyond what is necessary and sustainable for the Hutt. • 6 storey buildings do not align with the RMA definition of amenity value. • The permitted activities allow too much scope to destroy the 'special character' of the Hutt. • Policies are not prescriptive enough regarding the design for shading, privacy, outdoor living and appearance.
240.2	Definitions and permitted activities	Amend	Definitions and permitted activities for all areas need to be more prescriptive to avoid ambiguity and further public consultation should occur prior to finalisation of the plan change.	
240.3	Notification	Amend	Publicly notified and neighbour approved resource consents should be required for all discretionary activities.	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing character areas such as Woburn and Boulcott should remain as character areas with high amenity value. Concern around loss of amenity value. Concern around traffic impacts, hazards (natural and manmade) and infrastructure capacity. Planning changes are an opportunity to create a vibrant city centre and make use of public transport hubs. Special character should be preserved. PC56 does not ensure Council and landowners are fulfilling their obligations as Kaitiaki of the environment and biodiversity, as is indicated in documents such as the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity. Council isn't fulfilling its obligation under the Local Government Act to take a sustainable approach to development.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/241 Central Apartments Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
241.1	Chapter 14H Natural Hazards Flood Hazards Policies 14H 1.5, Policy 14H 1.6 and 14H 1.7	Amend	Greater definition of Inundation Areas, Overland Flow and Stream Corridors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further clarity is required as to how the Council has made the decision on the stream corridor size and where a stream corridor is defined. The proposed wording Policy 14H 1.7 does not differentiate by any means the level of risk within the width of the Stream Corridors indicated in the corridor.
241.2	Amendment 417 Policy 14H 1.7	Amend	Request the policy is amended and the word 'avoid' changed to something less discouraging.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The word "avoid" indicates a strong discouragement of development and within a stream corridor. Given a stream corridor definition has not been indicated, and the buffers around the Waiwhetū Stream are very wide

				<p>and somewhat generic within the stream length, this could be considered to not be in line with the National Policy Statement of Urban Development Policy 3C.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are four conditions and criteria that must be demonstrated already.
241.3	Amendment 429 Rule 14H 2.5	Amend	Request non-complying activity is changed to discretionary (for new residential units, commercial activities or retail activities).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess new development against the criteria set in the chapter.

DPC56/242 Ian Shields				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
242.1	Medium and high density housing in Alicetown	Oppose	A halt to medium and high-density intensification in the Petone housing catchment area until, and only if, infrastructure issues have been identified and resolved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stormwater and flooding risk. • Lack of potable water supply. • Lack of wastewater capacity. • Traffic impacts. • Public transport improvements are required – improved frequency and reliability. • Lack of social infrastructure including schools and health services. • Climate change impacts.

DPC56/243		Martha Craig		
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
243.1	Amendment 254 Policy 5B 1.1.2A(b)	Support in part	Amend as follows: Manage larger scale retail activities to ensure they do not detract from the vibrancy and vitality of <u>the traditional retail areas around Jackson Street (Petone Commercial Activity Area—Area 1) and Hutt City's Central Commercial Activity Area and create an attractive and public focused environment. along Jackson Street.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The traditional retail area in the current Jackson Street Heritage Precinct needs to be protected from larger and smaller scale retail activities which would detract from the Precinct's vibrancy and vitality.
243.2	Amendment 254 Policy 5B 1.1.2A(c)	Support in part	Amend as follows: Restrict smaller scale retail activities to ensure they do not detract from the vibrancy and vitality of the <u>traditional retail areas around Jackson Street (Petone Commercial Activity Area—Area 1) and Hutt City's Central Commercial Activity Area. along Jackson Street.</u>	
243.3	Amendment 259 Policy 5B 1.2.1(a)	Support	Retain Policy 5B 1.2.1(a).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The whole of the current Jackson Street Precinct needs to be retained with no buildings and structures in Area 1 outside of the Precinct. However, it should be used for buildings adjacent to the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.
243.4	Amendment 259 Policy 5B 1.2.1(b)	Oppose	(b) delete the words 'in Area 1' and replace 'outside' with 'adjacent to' so that it applies to buildings adjacent to the Heritage Precinct. Amend as follows: <u>External alterations, repairs, or modifications to existing buildings and structures and the construction of new buildings and structures in Area 1 outside adjacent to the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct respect the significant historic heritage values, style, and character of the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.</u>	

243.5	Amendment 267 Rule 5B 2.1.1.1(a)	Support	Supports deletion of Rule 5B 2.1.1.1(a).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important that no building covers any site up to 100%.
243.6	Amendment 268 Rule 5B 2.1.1.1(b)	Oppose	Delete Rule 5B 2.1.1.1(b)(ii).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current Jackson Street Heritage Precinct should be kept intact.
243.7	Amendment 281 Matter of Discretion 5B 2.2.2.1(a)	Support with amendment	Keep both vii and viii and ensure that vii helps protect the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct from adjacent impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Urupā certainly should be protected from the impacts of adjacent development and so should the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.
243.8	Amendment 397 Appendix Heritage 3	Oppose	Replace Tory Street (in description of the eastern extent of the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct) with Cuba Street.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current Jackson Street Heritage Precinct should be kept intact.

DPC56/244 Rex Torstonson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
244.1	Amendment 254 Policy 5B 1.1.2A(b)	Support in part	Amend as follows: Manage larger scale retail activities to ensure they do not detract from the vibrancy and vitality of the traditional retail areas around Jackson Street (Petone Commercial Activity Area—Area 1) and Hutt City's Central Commercial Activity Area and create an attractive and public focused environment. along Jackson Street.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The traditional retail area in the current Jackson Street Heritage Precinct needs to be protected from larger and smaller scale retail activities which would detract from the Precinct's vibrancy and vitality.
244.2	Amendment 254 Policy 5B 1.1.2A(c)	Support in part	Amend as follows: Restrict smaller scale retail activities to ensure they do not detract from the vibrancy and vitality of the traditional retail areas around Jackson Street (Petone Commercial Activity Area—Area	

			1) and Hutt City's Central Commercial Activity Area along Jackson Street.	
244.3	Amendment 259 Policy 5B 1.2.1(a)	Support	Retain Policy 5B 1.2.1(a).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The whole of the current Jackson Street Precinct needs to be retained with no buildings and structures in Area 1 outside of the Precinct. However, it should be used for buildings adjacent to the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.
244.4	Amendment 259 Policy 5B 1.2.1(b)	Oppose	<p>(b) delete the words 'in Area 1' and replace 'outside' with 'adjacent to' so that it applies to buildings adjacent to the Heritage Precinct.</p> <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><u>External alterations, repairs, or modifications to existing buildings and structures and the construction of new buildings and structures in Area 1 outside adjacent to the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct respect the significant historic heritage values, style, and character of the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.</u></p>	
244.5	Amendment 267 Rule 5B 2.1.1.1(a)	Support	Supports deletion of Rule 5B 2.1.1.1(a).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important that no building covers any site up to 100%.
244.6	Amendment 268 Rule 5B 2.1.1.1(b)	Oppose	Delete Rule 5B 2.1.1.1(b)(ii).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current Jackson Street Heritage Precinct should be kept intact.
244.7	Amendment 281 Matter of Discretion 5B 2.2.2.1(a)	Support with amendment	Keep both vii and viii and ensure that vii helps protect the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct from adjacent impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Urupā certainly should be protected from the impacts of adjacent development and so should the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.
244.8	Amendment 397 Appendix Heritage 3	Oppose	Replace Tory Street (in description of the eastern extent of the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct) with Cuba Street.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current Jackson Street Heritage Precinct should be kept intact.

DPC56/245 Elizabeth Beattie				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
245.1	HDRAA	Oppose	No specific decision requested.	<p>The submitter opposes high density intensification and requests amendments to the plan change for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of privacy and sunlight. • Lack of outdoor living space. • Public transport is not frequently available. • Lack of mobility parking in some developments. • Lack of street parking and impact on traffic, including decreased visibility with lots of cars parked on the street. • Cars are parking on footpaths and making it unsafe for residents. • Loss of character. • Lack of infrastructure capacity.
245.2	HDRAA	Amend	Minimum standards should be set by the council to allow for outdoor space for each home in new developments.	
245.3	Carparking	Amend	Provision should be made for carparking and space for wheelie bins to be put out for collection.	

DPC56/246 Brett Nicholls				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
246.1	Amendment 254 Policy 5B 1.1.2A(b)	Support in part	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Manage larger scale retail activities to ensure they do not detract from the vibrancy and vitality of the traditional retail areas around Jackson Street (Petone Commercial Activity Area — Area 1) and Hutt City's Central Commercial Activity Area and create an attractive and public focused environment. along Jackson Street.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The traditional retail area in the current Jackson Street Heritage Precinct needs to be protected from larger and smaller scale retail activities which would detract from the Precinct's vibrancy and vitality.

246.2	Amendment 254 Policy 5B 1.1.2A(c)	Support in part	Amend as follows: Restrict smaller scale retail activities to ensure they do not detract from the vibrancy and vitality of the <u>traditional retail areas around Jackson Street (Petone Commercial Activity Area—Area 1) and Hutt City’s Central Commercial Activity Area along Jackson Street.</u>	
246.3	Amendment 259 Policy 5B 1.2.1(a)	Support	Retain Policy 5B 1.2.1(a).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The whole of the current Jackson Street Precinct needs to be retained with no buildings and structures in Area 1 outside of the Precinct. However, it should be used for buildings adjacent to the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.
246.4	Amendment 259 Policy 5B 1.2.1(b)	Oppose	(b) delete the words ‘in Area 1’ and replace ‘outside’ with ‘adjacent to’ so that it applies to buildings adjacent to the Heritage Precinct. Amend as follows: <u>External alterations, repairs, or modifications to existing buildings and structures and the construction of new buildings and structures in Area 1 outside adjacent to the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct respect the significant historic heritage values, style, and character of the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.</u>	
246.5	Amendment 267 Rule 5B 2.1.1.1(a)	Support	Supports deletion of Rule 5B 2.1.1.1(a).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important that no building covers any site up to 100%.
246.6	Amendment 268 Rule 5B 2.1.1.1(b)	Oppose	Delete Rule 5B 2.1.1.1(b)(ii).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current Jackson Street Heritage Precinct should be kept intact.
246.7	Amendment 281 Matter of Discretion 5B 2.2.2.1(a)	Support with amendment	Keep both vii and viii and ensure that vii helps protect the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct from adjacent impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Urupā certainly should be protected from the impacts of adjacent development and so should the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct.

246.8	Amendment 397 Appendix Heritage 3	Oppose	Replace Tory Street (in description of the eastern extent of the Jackson Street Heritage Precinct) with Cuba Street.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current Jackson Street Heritage Precinct should be kept intact.
-------	---	--------	--	---

DPC56/247 Geraldine Blackman				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
247.1	HDRAA in Eastbourne	Oppose	Limit the density and building height in all areas that need to be protected when managing tsunami risks	<p>The proposed plan change does not give effect to the NZCPS, in particular, Policy 25 regarding the subdivision, use and development of land in areas of coastal hazard risk.</p> <p>This would particularly concern the potential effects of a tsunami along the coastline of Eastbourne, the bays and Petone.</p> <p>Increasing the density of housing within Eastbourne and the Bays would put pressure on the already compromised road to and from Eastbourne in the event of a tsunami.</p>

DPC56/248 Andrew Hendry				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
248.1	Heritage	Oppose	Exclude 176 Hutt Road from the Hutt Road Petone Heritage Area.	<p>The submitter opposes the listing of private properties as heritage in the plan change for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future restrictions on development of their property. Uncertain how their home is heritage when it has no architectural value is surrounded by modern homes that aren't heritage.

DPC56/249 Keith Carman				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
249.1	Special Character Areas	Amend	<p>Create "Special Character Areas" and specific character "properties" to ensure the preservation of residential areas with high environmental benefits.</p> <p>This will require that the current special residential areas be maintained and where appropriate, others added, and not become designated "high density residential areas".</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern around the loss of valued green areas with large, long established trees. • Impact of intensification on stormwater and flooding. • Infrastructure capacity issues.

DPC56/250 Margaret Luping				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
250.1	High Density Residential Development (Woburn)	Oppose	The impact of the proposed changes on residents needs to be assessed in greater detail before a development plan is approved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern around the loss of existing character. • Property owners should be able to sell to developers, but allowing buildings up to 6 storey 1m from the boundary would impact privacy and sunlight. • Loss of property values.
250.2	Development standards	Amend	Increase the distance of buildings from the boundary. This includes being more flexible and a greater distance from boundaries.	
250.3	Development standards	Amend	Design of proposals should consider all aspects of impact on adjoining sites. Height distance from boundary and shape and location of buildings are some of the factors that need to be assessed.	

DPC56/251 Arcus Marge				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
251.1	Medium and high density housing in Alicetown	Oppose	A halt to medium and high-density intensification in the Petone housing catchment area until, and only if, infrastructure issues have been identified and resolved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stormwater and flooding risk. • Lack of potable water supply. • Lack of wastewater capacity. • Traffic impacts. • Public transport improvements are required – improved frequency and reliability. • Lack of social infrastructure including schools and health services. • Climate change impacts.

DPC56/252 Nick Ursin				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
252.1	Entire plan change	Amend	<p>Ensure the plan addresses the following (inferred):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require one off-street park per residential unit. • Require developments to address effects on traffic and access. • Ensure stormwater provisions are complied with. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern with lack of appeal to environment court. • Impact on democratic rights and natural justice. • Makes consultation costly. • Public may have better ideas on intensification. • Impact on parking. • Impact on permeable surfaces.

252.2	Increased residential buildings heights including 3 – 6 storeys buildings.	Support	Buildings over 3 storeys should be constructed in a way that doesn't impact neighbours privacy, sunlight and airflow (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of height/setback requirements. • Noise and vibration issues. • Natural Hazards • Issue with definitions • Cultural impacts. • Impact on character.
252.3	Aquifer	Amend	Put conditions in place to ensure no damage can happen to the aquifer.	
252.4	Definition of residential	Amend	Residential definition does not take into account the changes to households and property ownership which has and will occur in future, e.g. co ownership or blended families.	
252.5	Notification	Amend	Introduce a bylaw under the Building Act which could require any intensification building consents to be notifiable by developers to abutting property owners and that developers building consent be subject to appeals under conditions which could be detrimental to the wellbeing and/or future of abutting property residents.	

DPC56/253 Colin Wilson				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
253.1	Entire plan change	Not stated	No specific decision requested.	<p>Submitter suggests potential development options HCC could consider including more people above train stations, in areas of under used land.</p> <p>Submitter suggests 'serious' planning is required, and that a lack of a cohesive plan will have a negative impact on neighbours and the wider suburban environment.</p>

				<p>The submitter also notes the importance of green spaces.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned about the impact of investigation on traffic and congestion.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/254 Douglas Sheppard				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
254.1	Natusch Road	Amend	Rezoning the ten properties on the northern side of Natusch Road from General Residential Activity Area to Hill Residential Activity Area.	<p>The submitter requests amendments for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed plan change would rezone land on the northern side of Natusch Road to Medium Density Residential Area. • The current zoning is inappropriate. The land and sections on the north side of Natusch Road are almost exactly as described by the criteria for the Hill Residential Activity Area, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Character of the street, ○ Amenity values (such as native vegetation), ○ Topography, ○ Access. <p>The submitter raises the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on on-street parking. • Impacts on vehicle access. • Lack of footpaths. • Impacts on notable trees. • Impacts on a waterway (including riparian margin and stream bed) that contains native galaxiids, Koura, freshwater crustaceans and other macro-invertebrates.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on stormwater infrastructure.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/255 Mary Taylor				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
255.1	Special character areas	Amend	<p>Create special character areas and specific special character properties.</p> <p>These areas would include but not be limited to the current Woburn & Boulcott "Special Residential Areas." They would also include much of the current "General Residential Area" of Central Lower Hutt.</p>	<p>The submitter opposes the rezoning of most the city to MDRAA and HDRAA, and appends a petition with their submission.</p> <p>The submitter raises concerns on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wholesale removal of trees, shrubs and private greenspace, Impacts on special character areas, houses and ecologically important spaces, on both public and private and, noting the contribution green spaces make to positive carbon management.
255.2	Vegetation	Amend	Preserve the leafy green nature of the city, which is ecologically important.	
255.3	Vegetation	Amend	Preserve all trees and shrubs over 3m high on any section that is either being re-developed by removing dwellings or having dwellings add, and any trees or shrubs over 2m high within 2m of the boundary of such properties.	

DPC56/256 George Mackay				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
256.1	Intensification	Oppose	Reject the proposed plan change.	

256.2	Special Residential Activity Area	Amend	Retain Woburn and Boulcott's special character designation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on character. • Impact on vegetation and birds. • Impact on health of residents. • Loss of sunlight • Loss of green spaces. • Loss of off-street parking and impact on streets.
256.3	Off-street parking	Amend	New houses/dwellings should have a carpark.	

DPC56/257 Dorothy Gallagher				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
257.1	Notification	Amend	Permission from possibly affected neighbours.	The submitter opposes intensification (high rise buildings) and requests amendments for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High rises are eye sores with no design. • Impacts on sunlight and privacy. • Impacts of no off-street carparks on the street causing congestion.
257.2	Off-street parking	Amend	All buildings to have off street parking.	
257.3	Building code	Amend	Amend the building code to prevent developers from ruining suburbs.	

DPC56/258 Investore Property Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
258.1	Petone Commercial Activity Area – Area 2	Support	Retain the unlimited height limit within Commercial Activity Area 2, particularly as it relates to 45 Jackson Street.	The submitter supports these provisions as they will achieve the wider policy directives of the NPSUD including a well-functioning urban environment, promote housing choice, enable more people

258.2	Petone Commercial Activity - Area 2 – Enabling intensification	Support	No specific decision requested.	to access employment and amenities by public or active transport modes and recognise amenity values associated with accessibility.
258.3	Natural Hazards – Objective 14H 1.1	Oppose	Requests this objective is amended to recognise that it is acceptable that risks are also “not increased”.	This objective is also onerous and fails to recognise that some hazard risks cannot be avoided or reduced.
258.4	Natural Hazards – Policy 14H 1.1	Oppose	Delete Policies 14H 1.1 and 14H 1.8 and Rules 14H 2.6 and 14H 2.10 and reconsider approach to managing risks in the Medium Coastal Hazard Area.	This blanket avoidance approach is an overly onerous response to the potential for natural hazard risk. This approach does not offer any flexibility to recognise that there may be reasonable design solutions to develop or use land in a way that reduces the risks to occupants and does not exacerbate flooding on other properties. The submitter is of the view that the Council has not sufficiently assessed alternative options to managing risk while enabling the policy directive of the NPS-UD to be achieved within the Petone Commercial Activity Area – Area 2 which the Council is required to do in accordance with Section 32(1)(b)(ii) of the RMA.
258.5	Natural Hazards – Policy 14H 1.8	Oppose	Delete Policies 14H 1.1 and 14H 1.8 and Rules 14H 2.6 and 14H 2.10 and reconsider approach to managing risks in the Medium Coastal Hazard Area.	
258.6	Natural Hazards – Rule 14H 2.6	Oppose	Delete Policies 14H 1.1 and 14H 1.8 and Rules 14H 2.6 and 14H 2.10 and reconsider approach to managing risks in the Medium Coastal Hazard Area.	
258.7	Natural Hazards – Rule 14H 2.10	Oppose	Delete Policies 14H 1.1 and 14H 1.8 and Rules 14H 2.6 and 14H 2.10 and reconsider approach to managing risks in the Medium Coastal Hazard Area.	
258.8	Policy 14H 1.2	Support	Retain as notified.	It enables additions to existing buildings where the change in risk is not increased.
258.9	Rule 14H 2.1	Support	Retain as notified.	This is appropriate to manage the risks arising from proximity to the Wellington Fault.
258.10	Rule 14H 2.3	Support	Retain as notified.	This rule is consistent with the approach to managing risks from flooding and inundation across many district plans and is effective and efficient at achieving Objective 14H 1.1.

258.11	Policy 14H 1.3	Support	Retain as notified.	The submitter supports Policy 14H1.3 and Policy 14H1.5 to the extent that they support the above approach (sub 258.7).
258.12	Policy 14H 1.5	Support	Retain as notified.	

DPC56/259 Stan Augustowicz				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
259.1	Impervious surface/stormwater	Amend	Require any new building increasing impervious area to include stormwater retention tanks, and strict definitions of impervious areas should be imposed to include all balconies exposed to windblown rain as it is a windy area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petone is flat and vulnerable to flooding from the Hutt River. • Increased impermeable area from building intensification will worsen the risk for existing properties. • Impervious ground areas should be minimised and holding ponds used for stormwater retention wherever possible to lessen flood risk from rising river levels. • The council should set minimum standards, not the developers. • Concern about impact of apartments on low-rise character. • Impact on quality of life. • Off-street parking should be provided so street parking isn't relied on as it is best left for visitors and service vehicles.
259.2	Height limits	Amend	Any apartment building should not exceed three storeys or double the height of the adjacent dwelling. whichever is less. Furthermore, six-level apartments should only be permitted adjacent to multi-dwelling buildings or commercial buildings so as not to dwarf a simple house.	
259.3	Off-street parking	Amend	All new multi dwelling buildings should incorporate a carpark for each of its apartments.	

DPC56/260 Steven Meadows				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
260.1	Intensification in Wainuiomata	Oppose	Reject the plan change (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are over 100 existing homes for sale.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Destructive to the valley and its character. • Lack of social facilities and no shopping mall.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/261 Deborah Sweeney				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
261.1	Intensification in the Eastern suburbs	Oppose	Rethink and rebuff intensification plans – or reject the plan change (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on character. • Impact on property values. • Impact on quality of life. • Expensive costs to build. • Lack of suitable sites. • Impact on natural environment and natural heritage.

DPC56/262 Adrienne Holmes				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
262.1	Medium Density Residential Activity Area	Oppose	Reject the plan change (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undemocratic. • Impact on heritage/character. • Impact on privacy, sunlight and views. • Noise concerns. • Impact on traffic. • Impact on health.
262.2	Rule 4F 4.2.2 Building height	Oppose	Reject the plan change (inferred).	
262.3	Rule 4F 4.2.3 Recession planes	Oppose	Reject the plan change (inferred).	

262.4	Rule 4F 4.2.4 Boundaries.	Oppose	Reject the plan change (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on schools. • Loss of property values. • Impact on infrastructure.
-------	---------------------------	--------	------------------------------------	---

DPC56/263 Poneke Architects Ltd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
263.1	Any provisions that restrict housing development	Support with amendment	Delete any rules and standards that impose a maximum residential density.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be no maximum number of residential units permitted on a site. • Petone (and most of Lower Hutt's urban zones) is well suited to accommodating a lot more housing intensification.
263.2	Coastal hazards and liquefaction risks	Oppose	Delete the coastal hazard provisions (and any other provisions) that restrict housing intensification beyond the permitted building height envelope standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural hazard risks affecting Lower Hutt are well known and can be suitably managed such that they do not warrant any district plan restrictions on housing intensification on sites where housing already exist, or multi-unit housing development has previously been approved.
263.3	General	Amend	Any similar, alternative, consequential and/or other relief as necessary to address the issues raised in the submission, or any alternatively other amendments, including any such combination of provisions as may be appropriate, to address the matters raised in this submission, and to achieve the intent of this submission.	-

DPC56/264 Mike Wong				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
264.1	Density	Oppose	Delete any rules and standards that impose a maximum residential density in urban zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports enabling increased housing intensification of their property in Petone and other properties in the area as a permitted activity. • Opposes restrictions on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Housing density – there should be no maximum number of residential units permitted on a site. ○ Coastal hazards and liquefaction risks – there should be no district plan restrictions on residential intensification of the medium density residential zone from coastal hazards and liquefaction risks. <p>The natural hazard risks in Petone are well known and can be suitably managed such that they do not warrant district plan restrictions on housing intensification on sites where housing already exist, or multi-unit housing development has previously been approved.</p>
264.2	Hazards	Oppose	Delete the coastal hazard provisions (and any other provisions) that restrict housing intensification beyond the permitted building height envelope standards.	
264.3	Not specified	-	Any similar, alternative, consequential and/or other relief as necessary to address the issues raised in the submission, or Any other amendments, including any such combination of provisions as may be appropriate, to address the matters raised in this submission, and to achieve the intent of this submission.	

DPC56/265 CEM Johnston				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
265.1	Six-storey buildings	Oppose	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Six storey buildings are too high. • Impacts on access to sunlight • Impacts on infrastructure (infrastructure will not cope and we will be having burst pipes everywhere). • Even two and three storeys are too high and too close together.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyone will be living on top of each other. • Impacts on on-street parking. • Lack of places for children to play.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/266 to DPC56/268 Ashley Roper				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
266.1	Policy 14H 1.7	Amend	New residential development excluded from identified flood plain areas (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow flooding to find it's natural course and not expose existing residents, councils and insurance companies to future issues. • Good governance says risks should be mitigated and putting new structures on flood planes is not good risk management.
267.1	Policy 4F 3.2	Amend	Do not allow sausage configuration developments – i.e running the length of the land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will improve the potential lack of privacy some neighbours may face. • Developments should be built in a manner to provide all residents with the maximum amount of privacy, removing sausage type developments will assist this.
268.3	Policy 4F 3.2C	Amend	Any development has a minimum green space of 20% area within the confines of the development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will facilitate a high quality of lifestyle, taking into account play space for children and animals. • It will allow for secure storage of outdoor tools, plants and recreational equipment.

DPC56/269 Mandy Stewart				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
269.1	Heritage	Requests amendment	That a property is only listed as heritage with the written consent of the property owner.	-

DPC56/270 Sudheer Ambiti				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
270.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the plan change (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure capacity issues. • Impact on traffic. • Lack of parking for residents.

DPC56/271 Geoffrey Shepherd				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
271.1	Intensification	Oppose	Resource consent should be required for over two storeys.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on neighbours' sunlight and privacy. • Increased noise. • Impact on traffic. • Impact on property values. • Impact on sites of cultural significance. • Impact on character.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of temporary, emergency and affordable homes.
--	--	--	--	--

DPC56/272 Alexandra Ward				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
272.1	Entire plan change	Support	No specific decision requested.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intensification will be more successful if the public transport system is improved, and necessary water infrastructure upgrades are completed beforehand.

DPC56/273 Sarah Nation				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
273.1	Entire plan change	Oppose	Reject the plan change (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pressure on existing three waters infrastructure. Uncertain how specific areas were chosen for high density residential (including Avalon, Moera, Petone and Lower Hutt). Concern around funding for necessary public work. Impact on mental health. Impact on sunlight. Lack of off-street parks. Lack of space for rubbish bins on the berm. Noise issues.
273.2	Intensification in Eastbourne and Point Howards	Oppose	No more building should be allowed in Eastbourne and Point Howard due to climate change.	
273.3	Intensification in Stokes Valley	Oppose	No more building should be done in Stokes Valley due to slips and flooding issues.	
273.4	Intensification in Wainuiomata	Oppose	Do not increase intensification for Wainuiomata as there is only one access route.	

DPC56/274 Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira (on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira)				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
274.1	Greenfield Development	Support	Retain position.	It is appropriate to retain existing footprint of development.
274.2	Hutt Valley Aquifer	Oppose	<p>Prepare Issues and Options report to understand the damage that urban intensification might create on the aquifer and the damage to Tangata Whenua values.</p> <p>Assess Planning issues within the catchment that impacts the aquifer. Assess Tangata Whenua values that will be impacted negatively.</p> <p>Incorporate and include provisions to ensure multi-storey buildings are built accordingly with adequate standards in the Plan and development proposals go through a rigorous assessment process in terms of foundation, earthworks and excavation work.</p>	Urban intensification will provide for multi-storey buildings; we understand from a scientific point of view this might lead to unintended consequences in the foundations of Hutt Valley Aquifer.
274.3	Te Mana o Te Wai	Support with amendment	Amend the plan to include objectives, policies, and rules that give effect to Te Mana o Te Wai.	The effects of increased urban intensification and densification on our freshwater resources, needs to be managed through the District Plans as per the instruction of NPS-FM giving effect to 1.3 Te Mana o te Wai and the Section 3.5 integrated management of freshwater and its related ecological systems.
274.4	High Hazard Coastal Overlay	Oppose	Remove these overlays in Petone and East Harbour Bays.	<p>There should not be any up zoning for medium and high density intensification in the high hazard coastal overlay.</p> <p>Climate change and sea level rise will increase the risk to these communities.</p>
274.5	Chapter 1 Introduction and Scope of the Plan	Support	Amend 'to consult' to 'to partner' with Tangata Whenua.	It is important that enabling intensification is done in a way that provides for Tangata Whenua, kaitiaki of the whenua. Since the changes suggested heavily modify, impact, change the whenua, Council planners need to partner with iwi, hapū and marae

	New provision Partnership		Insert new policy that provides Tangata Whenua knowledge, mātauranga Māori, to be part of the decision-making mechanisms.	
274.6	Chapter 1 Introduction and Scope of the Plan New provision Equitable Decision- Making	Support	Insert new policy: Intensification proposals will be assessed through cultural equity and Tangata Whenua will be engaged to enable a co-decision making in the matter.	Intensification needs to be culturally appropriate. Strategic Directions of the Plan as District Wide Matters should be able to spell out how intensification proposals will be balanced against the need for these proposals to be assessed from a cultural equity perspective and most importantly how they are going to be used in the decision-making systems within the District Plan consent frameworks.
274.7	Amendment 2 Chapter 1.10.1A Urban Environment	Support in part, with amendment	Amend the relevant sentence "...providing for the needs of Tangata Whenua, people and communities..."	The Plan should not only ensure that urban environment is well-functioning for its people and communities but also Tangata Whenua and iwi.
274.8	Amendment 2 Chapter 1.10.1A Urban Environment	Support	Insert new issue in Amendment 2 or insert another issue to mean: "Tangata Whenua has a significant role as kaitiakitanga and rangatiratanga in a well-functioning urban environment and that fits to what iwi wants to see and how they would like to live"	Amendment 2 does not acknowledge and provide for Tangata Whenua's land development aspirations in the well-functioning Urban Environment and include the essential role that Te Taiaio-centred developments are undertaken in the Rangatiratanga of Tangata Whenua.
274.9	New Policy	Support	Amend the Plan to say iwi owns land in Hutt City rohe and the land that may be purchased under the Deed of Settlement should not be impacted by up zoning and be imposed upon iwi and their aspirations.	Iwi holds land all through the Hutt City. They should not be imposed arbitrary zoning requirements under the intensification on this whenua in which they received from Crown under their Deed of Settlement Processes.
274.10	Chapter 1.10.1A Urban Environment	Support	Add a new policy that says: enable Tangata Whenua to develop land owned by Tangata Whenua.	NPS-UD does not necessarily consider the impacts of up zoning and intensification impacts on how Tino Rangatiratanga will be implemented. This requires a policy in the District Plan to ensure members of iwi can develop their land without limitations and realise their land aspirations.
274.11	Chapter 1.10.1	Support	Include a new objective that provides for Tangata Whenua's role in the decision-making and in the identification and mapping of indigenous biodiversity values.	Tangata Whenua values relating to indigenous biodiversity needs to be given effect to in the Plan. Tangata Whenua has a major role in the identification and mapping of Significant Natural Areas and indigenous biodiversity.

274.12	Chapter 1.10.1	Support	Include a new policy to ensure that Tangata Whenua's customary harvesting rights are provided for, and this is embodied in the drafting intent of the Policy.	There are not any references in the proposed intensification plan change that says there won't be any impact on Tangata Whenua's rights to customary harvesting. The proposed plan change should not negatively impact on Tangata Whenua's customary rights and customary harvest due to potential up zoning and intensification.
274.13	Amendment 5 Chapter 1 1.10.1A Urban Environment Policy 2	Support with amendment	Amend clause (a) to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papakāinga • Marae • Whenua identified under the Deed of Settlement Act (2014) and • All sites and areas of significance (that are not necessarily listed in the Operative District Plan Schedule) 	Support clause (a) being retained, further to provide for marae and papakāinga, and all sites of significance categories and any other whenua that is under Ngāti Toa Deed of Settlement Act (2014).
274.14	Amendment 5 Chapter 1 1.10.1A Urban Environment Policy 2	Support with amendment	Amend Policy 2 include 'infrastructure', 'water supply' and three waters network capacity as the qualifying matter.	There is not enough evidence where up zoning and intensification will deliver the outcomes sought in the NPS-UD without adequate infrastructure and available resources. These need to be qualifying matters.
274.15	Amendment 107 Objective 4F2 Objective 4F 2.1AA Objective 4G 2.1	Oppose	Amend the objective and redraft the objective to include Tangata Whenua, people and communities. Amend the objective to include the environmental wellbeing.	Oppose this Objective because it does not acknowledge Tangata Whenua as the indigenous people of the Whenua. This objective does not acknowledge the importance of environmental wellbeing to Tangata Whenua.
274.16	Amendment 56 Amendment 109 Objective 4F 2.3 Objective 4G 2.3	Oppose	Amend the clause <i>i. housing needs and demand</i> to reflect the Objective will provide for the housing needs and demand for Tangata Whenua. <i>Amend clause ii. to mean "...respond to neighbourhood's planned urban built character and Tangata Whenua land development aspirations..."</i>	Oppose this objective as it does not provide for Tangata Whenua land aspirations and the way iwi views their housing needs and demand. Medium Density Residential Activity Area should provide for Papakāinga and any other land development aspiration iwi might have regarding housing. <i>We consider ii. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including three-storey buildings might be used in the resource consent planning process as a permitted activity without</i>

				adequate consideration of how this whenua will look like in the future disadvantaging iwi.
274.17	Amendment 62 Policy 4F 3.2A	Oppose	Amend this Policy to say: provide for developments not meeting permitted activity status but they meet the necessary tests.	<p>Providing for developments not meeting permitted activity status does not deliver what the RMA is set up for. We should not be writing policies to excuse further development that may not necessarily comply with the standards and rules we are asking for within the Plan framework.</p> <p>Especially there is not anywhere that says how the high quality will be achieved and whether achieving high quality development will make up for an activity to be excused from being a restricted discretionary activity. Who gets to decide the high quality development?</p>
274.18	Amendment 63 Policy 4F 3.2B	Oppose	Amend the Policy to ensure, day-to-day is defined and acknowledges that it is not reduced to a shoebox. Note that Policy 4F 3.2C does not necessarily give you space for these needs.	Concerned whether this policy is aiming design or addressing of residents' day-to-day needs. These needs are subjective. If Design is only delivering for day to day needs, how do we define the day to day needs? If the definition is limited we are encouraging houses that are not functioning very good at for our wellbeing.
274.19	Amendment 66 Policy 4F 3.3	Oppose	Amend provisions to reflect the unidentified areas and sites of significance to iwi including the land that is given back via Deed of Settlement.	Rūnanga is concerned that setbacks are important tools for iwi and SASM sites that need protection from Medium Density and High Density Residential Activity Areas. Since we do not have a rough idea or evidence to be able to say where these developments are going to be and how. We also do not know the impacts that these provisions are going to cause the marae and Pā sites, appropriate setbacks are crucial.
274.20	Amendment 71 Policy 4F 3.10	Support in part	Amend and redraft to say, <i>"require development to be stormwater neutral, such as the water sensitive urban design."</i>	Strongly support what this policy is intending to do. Support the language that was used 'require', however 'stormwater neutral' could be anything and this requires to go the extra mile to ask for the best practice standards to be applied.
274.21	Amendment 74 Policy 4F 3.13	Support in part	Amend the Policy to give discretion and decision-making to Tangata Whenua whether managing the development on sites that are adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance are appropriate to manage. Use instead: Engage with Tangata	Support the intention behind the Policy, however we consider this Policy can be improved by ensuring the impacts are managed outside the Community Iwi Activity Area. We are also concerned of the language of the 'manage' the policy should be able to cater for resource consent process decision making in a way that

			Whenua whether it is appropriate to manage the development...	'managing might not be appropriate for certain sites' , it should also give discretion to Tangata Whenua to make sure they are happy with the decision making and what it is that will be managed.
274.22	Amendment 60 Objective 4F 2.8	Oppose	Amend to strengthen the objective so that it could protect the marae themselves and the surrounding environment.	Protecting cultural safety and tikanga of activities associated with marae in community iwi activity area may not be sufficient to protect the marae and its surrounding environments as development will negatively impact them.
274.23	Amendment 59 Deletion of Objective 4F 2.7, Policy 3.11, and Policy 3.12	Oppose	Amend the Objective and Policies to make it explicit and that they are reflected in the MDRS provisions; enabling housing by introducing potential mitigation does not reduce the current risk of natural hazards and future risk.	The removal of objective 4F 2.7 and policies 3.11 and 3.12 in relation to development and natural hazards are not appropriate as developments should still be resilient and designed appropriately to manage risks to natural hazards. We are unsure whether the potential mitigation options and the qualifying matters in the Chapter 14H speaks to 4F adequately.
274.24	Policy 4F 3.10	Support	Retain proposed change.	It is encouraging that the District Plan language was changed from encourage to require storm water neutral development as it makes this policy much stronger.
274.25	Policy 4F 3.13	Support with amendment	Amend the Policy to reflect the management of impacts will be decided with Tangata Whenua and whether the appropriateness of management is relevant to a particular site, and that will also be decided with Tangata Whenua.	The wording around Policy 4F 3.13 is not adequate to state that what the appropriate level of management is and whether the word management itself is appropriate. We do support the intention of preventing negative impacts to Community iwi Activity Area by managing the development for sites adjacent to Community iwi activity area. We are concerned this Policy does not necessarily cover the intricacy of different types of sites.
274.26	Amendment 113 Objective 4G 2.7	Support in part	Amend Objective to ensure that not only tikanga and associated cultural activity but also marae itself and its surrounding environments should also be protected from potential high density impacts of development. Another gap in the Objective is to expand this Objective to any other culturally significant site that is not marae.	Protecting cultural safety and tikanga of activities associated with marae in Community Iwi Activity Area are supported by the Rūnanga but these need to be covering not just the cultural safety and tikanga of activities associated with marae but the environment that surrounds the marae and any other area that is not marae but has significance to Tangata Whenua.
274.27	Policy 4F 3.13 and Rule 4F 4.2.4A	Oppose	Rules that are associated with this Chapter should have more constraining standards and	There is still potential for development to occur on sites adjacent to marae that could impact cultural values.

			limit development for these sites adjacent to marae and other SASMs to ensure that development does not impact cultural values.	
274.28	Medium and High Residential Activity Area Tangata Whenua values	Support in part	There is opportunity for tangata whenua values to be more meaningfully incorporated into this plan as they seem to only have little consideration.	The consideration of tangata whenua values is reflected in some matters of discretion in these chapters.
274.29	11.1.3 Objective	Support	Retain proposed change.	Prevents subdivision from causing further risk to natural hazards
274.30	11 Subdivision Historic heritage	Support in part	There should be more consideration of all sites and areas of significance to Māori, rather than just those covered by the community iwi activity area.	This chapter speaks to historic heritage and the community iwi activity area but not sites and areas of significance to Māori.
274.31	11.2.2.3 Assessment Criteria	Support	Retain proposed change.	Subdivision to consider the future character of an area as provided by Activity Area Zoning.
274.32	Rule 12.2.19 b	Support in part	Suggest considering cultural values for reserves and open space.	Considers land use effects on the environment and community needs for open space but does not consider cultural values.
274.33	10A Community Iwi Activity Area Te Kakano o Te Aroha Marae	Support with amendment	Amend these areas to reflect SASM qualifying matter.	The submitter observed the provisions for Te Kakano o te Aroha Marae have changed from medium density residential area to high density residential area.
274.34	Chapters 4F and 4G in general	Support in part	Chapters 4F and 4G speak more to enabling development rather than managing any adverse effects.	Overall, these changes show little consideration of tangata whenua and adapting to climate change.
274.35	Amendment 113 Objective 4G 2.7	Support in part	Amend the Objective to reflect the protection provided for all Tangata Whenua activities in the Community iwi Area.	Support the intention behind this objective, we believe this could be strengthened and expanded by protecting all marae and SASMs, not just the cultural safety and tikanga involved.

274.36	Chapter 4F, Chapter 4G, Chapter 10 New provisions	Support	Amend the High and Medium Density and Community iwi activity areas to enable papakāinga housing.	Papakāinga should be enabled.
274.37	Policy 4G 3.1	Oppose	We suggest that environmental wellbeing is included in this policy.	This policy does not currently consider environmental wellbeing.
274.38	Amendment 82 Rule 4F 4.2.4A	Oppose	Amend this rule so that the proposals can be subject to discretion and not permitted.	This rule is making too easy (permitted activity) for a development abutting marae in the community iwi activity area, and we are not sure whether the numerical values put forward will necessarily provide protection for especially thinking about individual sites.
274.39	Amendment 151 Rule 4G 4.2.6	Oppose	Amend this rule so that the proposals can be subject to stricter discretion and not permitted without Tangata Whenua engagement.	-
274.40	Amendment 278 Permitted Activity Condition 5B 2.2.1.1 (f)	Oppose	Insert an appropriate height for the protection of the Urupā. Insert policy to encourage design to ensure ongoing access to daylight, (similar to 5A 1.2.1 (g)) relating to urupā, marae, wahi tapu etc.	This is placed in Te Puni Urupā. We are unsure of the deleted 8m and its rationale.
274.41	5B Appendix Petone Commercial 2 – Design Guidelines	Oppose	Review guidelines and insert rules that guarantee protection of waahi tapu	These guidelines rely on subjective judgement by an applicant as to: the adequacy of the visual connection that the proposed development provides; what is "respectful;" "not dominating;" or "significant shading" etc. thus fall short of adequately protecting the relationship of Māori with their waahi tapu, in accordance with RMA s 6(e)
274.42	Amendment 320 Amendment 321 Objective and Policy	Support in part	Amend Objectives and Policy to reflect the whole area / rohe will be protected, not just the cultural safety and tikanga.	See concerns above for protecting cultural safety and tikanga in similar provisions under 4F and 4G. These should be expanded to the whole area.
274.43	Amendment 322 New explanation	Support with amendment	Amend and improve the drafting here to explain it is not just the cultural activities and tikanga that is adversely impacted. This is Tangata Whenua to decide.	Support this Amendment and would like to acknowledge the importance of putting this explanation into the Plan. However, this requires more of an understanding of SASM sites in the greater sense: most of the time the whole site will be a Taonga not just

				the Marae, or the cultural activities and tikanga performed. We cannot be giving a generic judgment at the District Plan what bit is important or say it is only the Marae building.
274.44	Amendment 324 New permitted activity condition	Support with amendment	Amend it to ensure that the Tangata Whenua is happy with the numeric values and co-decide with Tangata Whenua if needed as the numbers will be different based on the site and location.	The submitter is unsure the recession planes and setbacks are adequate to protect the marae and other sites and areas of significance. No mention of heights was made either. We are wondering this was intentional.
274.45	Amendment 326 Rules – new matter of discretion	Support in part, support with amendment	We ask this to be controlled or non-complying activity, and the wording of Tangata Whenua engagement to be strengthened.	Support the intention of adding a new matter of discretion however we are unsure whether this matter of discretion can influence the outcomes Tangata Whenua engagement and how it is implemented. This could be tightened to be a controlled activity or a non-complying activity instead of matters of discretion. All of the other items under these Matters of Discretion depends on Tangata Whenua engagement so there should be a line that says that is the ultimate decision maker for the clause (i)
274.46	Amendment 336 Rules for Community iwi activity Area	Oppose	Delete the relevant provision.	It is not appropriate MDRS and High-Density Residential Activity Area provisions to apply to Marae. We are concerned that these would be community-based decisions and will depend on the proposal and the location and significance of the Marae. Therefore (a) and (aa) are not appropriate.
274.47	Amendment 337 Permitted activity conditions	Oppose	Delete the relevant provision.	Do we have an understanding of the permitted activity conditions are fit for purpose for the scale of high and medium density residential activities as they are relate to the Marae and SASMs.
274.48	11.2.2 Controlled Activities	Oppose	We are not convinced that community iwi area – marae subdivisions should be impacted by the High and Medium Density permitted and discretionary activity statuses. These should be controlled, and the outcome of the Tangata Whenua engagement should identify the outcome.	Amend to say that these activities especially regarding High and Medium Density rules should not be permitted or discretionary, they should be controlled and non-complying potentially after the result of the TW engagement.
274.49	Amendment 350	Oppose	Amend to say the site allotment will enable tino rangatiratanga.	Minimum size allotment should not be a council set measure. We are concerned iwi are unable to apply their tino rangatiratanga over a contemporary site of significance. Design table allotment

	Amend Allotment Design table for Community iwi activity area			and size should not be the metric for Tangata Whenua to identify this, especially applied to marae. Minimum size allotment can clash with iwi's land aspirations, and this is not enabling for iwi.
--	--	--	--	---

DPC56/275 Stride Investment Management Limited				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
275.1	Central Commercial Activity Area, specifically for the Queensgate Shopping Centre site	Support	Retain as notified.	Queensgate Shopping Centre is located in the Central Commercial Activity Area under the Plan and is proposed to remain in this Activity Area under PC56. Stride supports this zoning and seeks that it is retained.
275.2	Amendment 211 Explanation and reasons of section 5A 1.2.4	Support	Retain as notified.	<p>Stride generally supports the proposed amendments to the Central Commercial Activity Area to give effect to the NPS-UD. In particular, Stride supports the following changes to Chapter 5A Central Commercial Activity Area that are proposed as part of PC 56:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendment 211, to the extent that it proposes to delete the current Policy 5A 1.1.1(d) and replaces it with a new Policy 5A 1.1.1(d) that provides for maximising development potential and supporting a quality urban environment. This new policy gives effect to the direction in the NPS-UD to maximise the benefits of intensification and provide for well-functioning urban environments. Amendment 223, which proposes to delete the Permitted Activity Condition 5A 2.1.1(a) Maximum Height of Buildings and Structures and Amendment 235, which proposes to delete the related Appendix that sets height limits within the Central Commercial Activity Area. This amendment removes the 18m maximum height limit that currently applies to the Queensgate Shopping Centre. Removing the height limit
275.3	Amendment 223 Deletion of Permitted Activity Condition 5A 2.1.1(a)	Support	Retain as notified.	
275.4	Amendment 239 Central Commercial Design Guide – Section 1.7 Character and Context Description	Support	Retain as notified.	

	– Core Precinct – Table			<p>gives effect to the direction in the NPS-UD to provide sufficient development capacity to meet the expected demand for business land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendment 239, to the extent that it amends the Central Commercial Design Guide – Section 1.7 Character and Context Description – Core Precinct – Table. This amendment provides consistency with the changes proposed under Amendments 223 and 235.
275.5	Amendment 401 Chapter 14H Natural Hazards – Introduction	Support	Retain as notified.	<p>Stride generally supports the introduction of Chapter 14H Natural Hazards. In particular, Stride supports the following provisions in Chapter 14H Natural Hazards that are proposed as part of PC 56:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendment 401, to the extent that it identifies the Flood Hazard Inundation Area Overlay as a low hazard ranking overlay. Amendment 411, which introduces a new Policy 14H 1.1, to the extent that it provides for subdivision, use, and development that does not increase the risk to people, property, or infrastructure by requiring mitigation for subdivision, use and development that addresses the impacts from natural hazards to people, property, and infrastructure in the low hazard overlay areas. Amendment 413, which introduces a new Policy 14H 1.4, that provides for additions to buildings within the Flood Hazard Inundation Area Overlay where the risk to people and property is reduced or not increased. Amendment 414, which introduces a new Policy 14H 1.5, that provides for new residential units, commercial activities, and retail activities within the Inundation Area Overlay, provided that mitigation measures are incorporated to ensure the risk to people and property both on the site and on adjacent properties is not increased or is reduced. Amendment 427, which introduces a new Policy 14H 2.3, that provides for new residential units, commercial activities, and retail activities within the Flood Hazard Inundation Area
275.6	Amendment 411 Policy 14H 1.1 Levels of Risk	Support	Retain as notified.	
275.7	Amendment 413 Policy 14H 1.3 Additions to Buildings in an identified Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay	Support	Retain as notified.	
275.8	Amendment 414 Policy 14H 1.4 Additions to Buildings within the Overland Flowpaths and Stream Corridors of the Flood Hazard Overlays	Support	Retain as notified.	

275.9	Amendment 427 Rule 14H 2.3 New residential units, commercial activities or retail activities in the Inundation Area of the Flood Hazard Overlay	Support	Retain as notified.	Overlay as permitted activities (where the relevant standards are complied with) and restricted discretionary activities (where the relevant standards are not complied with).
-------	--	---------	---------------------	--

DPC56/276 Christopher Fry				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
276.1	High density housing with no off-street carparks and no green areas.	Oppose	Reconsider the government changes and amend to require less high-rise, include car parks and green areas (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on traffic and congestion. • Lack of recreational space. • Limited car parking. • Impact on sunlight and privacy. • Impact on neighbours and long term residents.

DPC56/277 Glen Andrews				
Sub. Ref.	Amendment / Provision	Support / Oppose	Decision requested by submitter	Submitter's reasons for decision requested
277.1	Chapter 14F Heritage Buildings and Structures and Heritage Areas	Oppose	Do not list private residential properties as heritage without the owner's consent.	No specific reason provided.

277.2	Chapter 14F Heritage Buildings and Structures and Heritage Areas	Support with amendment	Heritage listings should be in block areas not just streets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be a genuine approach, instead of a haphazard. • Would allow for real and conclusive heritage areas.
277.3	Heritage Areas	Amend	Heritage areas parking should be residents parking only.	No specific reason provided.
277.4	Heritage Areas	Amend	Heritage areas should have chicane road restrictions to reduce traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow people walking or driving through the area to observe and enjoy without speed or danger of speeding traffic.
277.5	Heritage Areas - rates	Amend	Reduce rates for heritage areas (inferred).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage Listed properties provide aesthetic appeal to the area, cost more, and have restrictive exterior maintenance, • Financial disadvantage as unable to profit from intense housing in these areas.
277.6	Street amenity	Amend	Create median grassed areas and seating within the wider roads.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will improve street appeal/aesthetics.

Addresses for Service – Proposed District Plan Change 56

No.	Submitter	Address for service
DPC56/001	Brett Parker	brettparkernz@gmail.com
DPC56/002	Stephen John Wright	siwrightdc@gmail.com
DPC56/003	Graeme Sullivan	sullyhq@gmail.com
DPC56/004	Tracy Warbrick	jnt@slingshot.co.nz
DPC56/005	Melissa Yssel	melissayssel@gmail.com
DPC56/006	Gert Hartzenberg	gphartzenberg@gmail.com
DPC56/007	Stephen Owens	oggiowens@outlook.com
DPC56/008	Arthur Jacobson	arthur.jacobson@gmail.com
DPC56/009	Helen Maddox	Helenmaddox@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/010	Olivia George	libby@pumpdance.com
DPC56/011	John Sheehan	John@thecallcentre.co.nz
DPC56/012	Henry Carthew	h.carthew@outlook.com
DPC56/013	Karen Jones	kasa301@hotmail.com
DPC56/014	Philip O'Brien and Glenys Barton	philip.obrien@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/015	Lorna Jane Harvey	ljwrite@gmail.com
DPC56/016	Fiona Beals	transform74@gmail.com
DPC56/017	Daniel Harborne	daniel@harborne.co.nz
DPC56/018	Peter and Judith Feakin	pjfeakin@gmail.com
DPC56/019	Diane Knowles	dianeknowles.nzl@gmail.com
DPC56/020	Bin Wang	wwwbbb8510@gmail.com
DPC56/021	Kyn Drake	kyndrake@hotmail.com
DPC56/022	Jing Chen	jchenhutt@gmail.com
DPC56/023	Stephanie Kusel	stephaniekusel1@gmail.com

DPC56/024	Pauline Marshall	paulinemarshall85@gmail.com
DPC56/025	Joanne & Kevin Gallen & Doyle	kgallen.nz@gmail.com
DPC56/026	Grant Bristow	louise.grant.bristow@gmail.com
DPC56/027	Jane Bura	jane_bura@hotmail.com
DPC56/028	Karen Ferguson	karen_reon@yahoo.co.nz
DPC56/029	Kelvin Maxwell	kelvinmaxwell@hotmail.com
DPC56/030	Brendon Davies	illbero@hotmail.com
DPC56/031	Richard Parry	richard.parry@mondegreen.co
DPC56/032	Reon McLaren	reon.mclaren@impbrands.com
DPC56/033	Michael Taylor	miketaylor.ortho@gmail.com
DPC56/034	Darren Sears	darren.sears@abodehomes.co.nz
DPC56/035	Angela and Bryce Taylor	angbryce.taylor@gmail.com
DPC56/036	Peter Kirker	pckirker@gmail.com
DPC56/037	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	draymond@heritage.org.nz
DPC56/038	Rosemary Waters	rosegw31@gmail.com
DPC56/039	Martyn Robey	martynrobeynz@gmail.com
DPC56/040	Steve Winyard	earthquake9001@yahoo.com
DPC56/041	Clive and Shelley Eastwood	Shelleyclivee@gmail.com
DPC56/042	Jennifer Miller	jmillerlh@hotmail.com
DPC56/043	Mike Byrne	mikebyrne.nzl@gmail.com
DPC56/044	Laura Skilton	lauraskilton@hotmail.com
DPC56/045	John Wysocki	john@wysocki.nz
DPC56/046	Anne Wysocki	anna@wysocki.nz
DPC56/047	Sandra Griffith	sandybeach73@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/048	Russell Walker	fourwayentltd@gmail.com
DPC56/049	Christine Hepburn	christinehepburn47@gmail.com

DPC56/050	Sandra Walker	2/163 The Esplanade, Petone, Lower Hutt 5011
DPC56/051	Margaret Short	20 Kauri Street, Eastbourne, Lower Hutt 5013
DPC56/052	Amos Mann	gmos@yahoo.com
DPC56/053	Jo Wilkshire	wilkshires@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/054	Henry Zwart	henrybzwart@gmail.com
DPC56/055	Peggy Maurirere	pegmaca@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/056	Bill Magan	bmagan17@gmail.com
DPC56/057	Bruce Spedding	winzurf@gmail.com
DPC56/058	Bernard Gresham	gresham@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/059	Brian Herron	brianherron100@yahoo.co.nz
DPC56/060	Carolyn Hamer	carolynahamer@gmail.com
DPC56/061	Byron Cummins	byron@howardmaterialhandling.co.nz
DPC56/062	Olive Tupuivao	oliviaturpuivao@gmail.com
DPC56/063	Shayne Hodge	shayne@thehodgegroup.co.nz
DPC56/064	Bruce Patchett	brucegwen@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/065	Debbie Molloy	dbb.molloy@gmail.com
DPC56/066	John Sellars	johnsellars@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/067	Brenda Ralton	brendaralton@icloud.com
DPC56/068	Spencer Logan Valuations Ltd	admin@spencerlogan.co.nz
DPC56/069	Dianne Ingham	di@3days.co.nz
DPC56/070	Anastay Papadopoulos	tas.papadopoulos@gmail.com
DPC56/071	Ernest and Gwendoline Haley	e.haleymarks@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/072	Edwin Lancashire	piano.tuner@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/073	Richard Steel	Rjsteel72@gmail.com
DPC56/074	Brendan Murphy	murphyfm@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/075	Kerry Gray	usgrays@outlook.com

DPC56/076	Monica Murphy	murphyfm@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/077	Ana Coculescu	a.coculescu@gmail.com
DPC56/078	Lorraine Kaluza	lkwgtn@gmail.com
DPC56/079	Katy and Wayne Donnelly	waynedonnelly@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/080	James Scott	mjcjscott@slingshot.co.nz
DPC56/081	David Smith	davidlsmith54@gmail.com
DPC56/082	Steve Shaw	ackpotsteve57@gmail.com
DPC56/083	Peter and Katherine Kokich	kp.kokich@gmail.com
DPC56/084	Andrew Edgar	Andy.Edgar519@gmail.com
DPC56/085	Andy Bogacki	andybogacki@bogacki.co.nz
DPC56/086	Ian McLauchlan	ian.mclauchlan@gibbonsheat.com
DPC56/087	Eve Bao	evebao@live.com
DPC56/088	Christina Meyer	tinawyse1964@gmail.com
DPC56/089	Steve Leitch	biggins@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/090	Peter Healy	peterhughhealy@gmail.com
DPC56/091	Persephone Meads and Justin and Kate Meads	jkmeadsfamily@gmail.com
DPC56/092	Andrew Newman	andy_mellon_uk@yahoo.com
DPC56/093	John Hosegood	hosegood@outlook.co.nz
DPC56/094	Juan Qu	quju6463@yahoo.com
DPC56/095	Janet Pike	Janet.Pike@cableprice.co.nz
DPC56/096	Kate Harray	kate.harray@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/097	Malcolm Lewis	malcolmlewis978@gmail.com
DPC56/098	Johnston Dinsmore	edwardjohnsmore@gmail.com
DPC56/099	Caroline Patterson	Caroline.patterson@effem.com
DPC56/100	Frank Vickers	153.vickers@gmail.com
DPC56/101	Colin and Margaret Clarke	candmclarke@xtra.co.nz

DPC56/102	Graeme and Carolyn Lyon	lyonpetone@gmail.com
DPC56/103	Roydon McLeod	roydonm@gmail.com
DPC56/104	Darren Graham Laing	dklaing@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/105	Mark Hardy	markhardy@hardytrade.co.nz
DPC56/106	Barbara Bridger	barbara.bridger@gmail.com
DPC56/107	Brett Tangye	b_tangye@hotmail.com
DPC56/108	Vivienne Smith	vivgreg3@gmail.com
DPC56/109	Beverley Anne Tyler	bt Tyler@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/110	Greg Smith	vivgreg3@gmail.com
DPC56/111	Department of Corrections	andrea.millar@corrections.govt.nz
DPC56/112	Gary Spratt	gary.spratt@nzhomeloans.co.nz
DPC56/113	Niels Meyer-Westfeld	niels@slingshot.co.nz
DPC56/114	Kimberley Vermaey	kimberley.vermaey@gmail.com
DPC56/115	Christopher Gavin Mackay	chrism@mackay.co.nz
DPC56/116	Petone Community Board	pamhannapetone@gmail.com
DPC56/117	Russell Keenan and Karen Mooney	russjkee@gmail.com karenmooney026@gmail.com
DPC56/118	Mark Blackham	mark@blackham.co.nz
DPC56/119	The Korokoro Love Whanau	wikitorialove@gmail.com
DPC56/120	Glen Shardlow	g_shardlow@hotmail.com
DPC56/121	Maria Shardlow	mariashardlow1@gmail.com
DPC56/122	Selena Moon	russell.boaler@beca.com
DPC56/123	Kevin Day	kday@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/124	Merran Bakker	merran.bakker@gmail.com
DPC56/125	Benjamin Malcolm Wells	ben.wells@aurecongroup.com
DPC56/126	Tania Bermudez	taniapb19@gmail.com

DPC56/127	Spencer and Tracey Joe	tracey.spencer@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/128	Sam Lister	sam.lister@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/129	Robert Braithwaite	bp.brath.nz@gmail.com
DPC56/130	Dwayne McDonald	dwayne.mcdonald@hotmail.com
DPC56/131	Marianne Linton	marihjld@gmail.com
DPC56/132	Pam Roberts	pam@warehou.co.nz
DPC56/133	Graeme Silcock	silcock.graeme@gmail.com
DPC56/134	Keith Fraser	fraserball321@gmail.com
DPC56/135	Martyn Becker	beckermworktm@gmail.com
DPC56/136	Woolwoths NZ	katherine.marshall@countdown.co.nz
DPC56/137	Dennis Palmer	medeacorporation@gmail.com
DPC56/138	Sonja Penafiel Bermudez	sonicboom48@hotmail.com
DPC56/139	Bjorn Johns	bjornjohns@yahoo.com
DPC56/140	Peter Ricketts	peter.sheri@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/141	Alan Bell	bellac@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/142	Allison Whwaite	allison@simply-safe.co.nz
DPC56/143	Sheree Freeman	freeman.sheree@gmail.com
DPC56/144	Lee Moran	lilymoran01@gmail.com
DPC56/145	Meng Xu	xume6462@yahoo.co.nz
DPC56/146	Sharon Hardy	sharonlhardy@hotmail.com
DPC56/147	Jon Devonshire	devonshire@me.com
DPC56/148	Korokoro Environmental Group	danieldotdot@hotmail.com
DPC56/149	Matthew Hickman Greater Wellington Council	richard.sheild@gw.govt.nz
DPC56/150	Annette Paterson	apatersonspice@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/151	NZ Transport Agency	Kim.Harris-Cottle@nzta.govt.nz
DPC56/152	Marcel Podstolski	marcel.podstolski@gmail.com

DPC56/153	Transpower Nz Ltd	environment.policy@transpower.co.nz
DPC56/154	Ruth Gilbert	ruth@gilbertpinfold.co.nz
DPC56/155	Andrea Collings	gotta_no@hotmail.com
DPC56/156	NBAS Social Housing Advocate	dockterfreeman@gmail.com
DPC56/157	Hutt Voluntary Heritage Group	phil.barry@tdb.co.nz
DPC56/158	Wellington Electricity Lines	Tim.Lester@edison.co.nz
DPC56/159	Alan Smith	alansmith@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/160	Rebecca Leask and Mike Stewart	puawaitanga@gmail.com
DPC56/161	Michael Basil-Jones	mike.jones@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/162	Design Network Architecture Ltd	planning@designnetwork.co.nz
DPC56/163	Petone Historical Society	Petonehistories@gmail.com
DPC56/164	Kathryn Mackay	kmackay@windowslive.com
DPC56/165	Elizbeth Anne Tindle	chrism@mackay.co.nz
DPC56/166	Fiona Christeller	fiona.christeller@gmail.com
DPC56/167	Dawn Becker	Dawenlisabecker@gmail.com
DPC56/168	Sylvia and Bill Allen	sylviajallan@outlook.com
DPC56/169	Hayley Bird	hayleybird42@gmail.com
DPC56/170	Tony Smith	apdsmith@hotmail.com
DPC56/171	Maria Biedermann	marbiedermann@aol.com
DPC56/172	Sarah Poole	sarah@mjh.co.nz
DPC56/173	Megan Drayton	meg.drayton@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/174	Laura Gaudin	laurargaudin@gmail.com
DPC56/175	The Tuatoru and Sienna Trusts	24blackmore@gmail.com
DPC56/176	Fire and Emergency Services	fleur.rohleder@beca.com
DPC56/177	Nick Beswick	nick@mjh.co.nz
DPC56/178	Design Network Architecture Ltd	planning@designnetwork.co.nz

DPC56/179	Oyster Management Limited	henry.sullivan@minterellison.co.nz
DPC56/180	EQC	resilence@eqc.govt.nz
DPC56/181	Paul Rowan	paulrowan@thecrookedelm.co.nz
DPC56/182	Blair Bennett	blair@mackay.co.nz
DPC56/183	Donna Tairua	dtairua@icloud.com
DPC56/184	Anna Williams	anna.nz.williams@gmail.com
DPC56/185	Christopher James Cornford	chrisc@mackay.co.nz
DPC56/186	Rachel Lavis	rlavis82@gmail.com
DPC56/187	M Playford	chaeplay@gmail.com
DPC56/188	KiwiRail	Sheena.McGuire@kiwirail.co.nz
DPC56/189	Argosy Property No 1 Ltd	bianca.tree@minterellison.co.nz
DPC56/190	Stephen Taylor	SteveTaylorNZ@hotmail.com
DPC56/191	IPC Family Trust	ipcassidy@hotmail.com
DPC56/192	Bryan Gillies	bryan.gillies@hvhs.school.nz
DPC56/193	Lesley Haines	haines.wells@gmail.com
DPC56/194	Cliff George	cliffgeorge1961@gmail.com
DPC56/195	Anne Smith	anne.smith@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/196	Robert and Marie Whitney	rsw703@gmail.com
DPC56/197	Theresa Cooper	theresa.e.cooper@gmail.com
DPC56/198	Les Jones	jones1234567@gmail.com
DPC56/199	Justin Cargill	justin.cargill@vuw.ac.nz
DPC56/200	Stephen Prebble	Stephen@ccl.co.nz
DPC56/201	Bridget Hawkins	bridget@mackay.co.nz
DPC56/202	Ken Hand	haberdashery@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/203	Angus Gibbs	16 Tirangi Road, Moera, Lower Hutt 5010
DPC56/204	Ryman Healthcare Ltd	luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com

DPC56/205	Silverstream Park Christian Centre	elliott.thornton@cuttriss.co.nz
DPC56/206	Kainga Ora	gurv.singh@kaingaora.govt.nz
DPC56/207	Summerset Group Holdings Ltd	Stephanie.Muller@summerset.co.nz
DPC56/208	Kerrie Plancque	kerri.kilner@gmail.com
DPC56/209	Teramo Developments Ltd	elliott.thornton@cuttriss.co.nz
DPC56/210	York Bay Residents' Association	ewartsusan@hotmail.com
DPC56/211	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com
DPC56/212	Neil McGrath	neilmcg@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/213	Tom McLeod	majortommcleod@gmail.com
DPC56/214	Michele Lardelli-Ruthven	lardelli2006@mail.com
DPC56/215	Felicity Rashbrooke	rashbrooke@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/216	Major Gardens Ltd	elliott.thornton@cuttriss.co.nz
DPC56/217	Sam Williams	swilliams.f1@gmail.com
DPC56/218	Richard Perry	Richbloss@outlook.com
DPC56/219	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	nzisplanning.wgtn@gmail.com
DPC56/220	Dave Robinson	dave.robinson@gibsonsheat.com
DPC56/221	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	elliott.thornton@cuttriss.co.nz
DPC56/222	Ministry of Education	Sian.Stirling@beca.com
DPC56/223	East Harbour Environmental Association	eastharbourenvassociation@gmail.com
DPC56/224	Richmond Atkinson	richmond.atkinson@gmail.com
DPC56/225	Simon & Vanessa Edmonds	simon.edmonds@beca.com
DPC56/226	Troy Baisden	baisdent@gmail.com
DPC56/227	Living Streets Aotearoa	Wellington@livingstreets.org.nz
DPC56/228	Steven Beech	Steven.Beech@asb.co.nz
DPC56/229	Pam Crisp	transitiontownslowerhuttzn@gmail.com
DPC56/230	Margaret Sissons	margaret.sissons@gmail.com

DPC56/231	Kristen Whittington	kristen.whittington@outlook.co.nz
DPC56/232	Laurence Tyler	laurencetyler@hotmail.com
DPC56/233	Pernny Walsh	pennywalsh08@gmail.com
DPC56/234	Julie Francis	julie@spotlightreporting.com
DPC56/235	Elayna Chhiba	elayna53@gmail.com
DPC56/236	John Roseveare	john.roseveare@outlook.com
DPC56/237	Trevor Farrer	hcity@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/238	RLW Holding Ltd	rachel.williamson09@gmail.com
DPC56/239	Glenys Wong	gw778@proton.me
DPC56/240	Logan McLennan	ljmclennan@hotmail.com
DPC56/241	Central Apartments Ltd	hamishd@globe.net.nz
DPC56/242	Ian Shields	shields.ian@gmail.com
DPC56/243	Martha Craig	148 Jackson Street, Petone, Lower Hutt 5010
DPC56/244	Rex Torstonson	165 Jackson Street, Petone, Lower Hutt 5010
DPC56/245	Elizabeth Beattie	elizabethgbeattie@gmail.com
DPC56/246	Brett John Nicholls	185 A Jackson Street, Petone, Lower Hutt 5012
DPC56/247	Geraldine Blackman	theblackmans@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/248	Andrew Hendry	andrewhendry66@hotmail.com
DPC56/249	Keith Carman	carmanz@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/250	Margaret Luping	mdluping@icloud.com
DPC56/251	Arcus Marge	arcus.marge@gmail.com
DPC56/252	Nick Ursin	358 Cambridge Terrace, Naenae, Lower Hutt 5011
DPC56/253	Colin Wilson	temome5010@outlook.com
DPC56/254	Douglas Sheppard on behalf of the residents of Natusch Road, Belmont	d.sheppardnz@gmail.com
DPC56/255	Mary Taylor	miketaylor.ortho@gmail.com
DPC56/256	George Mackay	george@mackay.co.nz

DPC56/257	Dorothy Gallagher	pdgallaghernz@gmail.com
DPC56/258	Investore Property Ltd	RebeccaS@barker.co.nz
DPC56/259	Stan Augustowicz	s.augustowicz@gmail.com
DPC56/260	Steven George Meadows	5 Berkeley Road, Wainuiomata, Lower Hutt 5014
DPC56/261	Deborah Sweeney	deborah_sweeney@icloud.com
DPC56/262	Adrienne Holmes	ade.holmes57@gmail.com
DPC56/263	Poneke Architects Limited	Ben@cuee.nz
DPC56/264	Mike Wong	Ben@cuee.nz
DPC56/265	C E M Johnston	23 Sharpe Crescent, Wainuiomata, Lower Hutt 5014
DPC56/266	Ashley Roper 1	ash.ree@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/267	Ashley Roper 2	ash.ree@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/268	Ashley Roper 3	ash.ree@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/269	Mandy Stewart	suchfunx@gmail.com
DPC56/270	Sudheer Ambiti	ambiti@gmail.com
DPC56/271	Geoffrey Shepherd	shepandshep@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/272	Alexandra Ward	alexandrahward@gmail.com
DPC56/273	Sarah Nation	snation@xtra.co.nz
DPC56/274	Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira (on behalf of Ngati Toa Rangatira)	Onur.Oktem@ngatittoa.iwi.nz
DPC56/275	Stride Investment Management Limited	henry.sullivan@minterellison.co.nz
DPC56/276	Christopher Fry	chrisave72@gmail.com
DPC56/277	Glen Andrews	g.andrews@xtra.co.nz