

HCC PC56 Joe Jeffries Speaking Notes 13 April 2023

My statement of evidence is provided on behalf of Stride, Investore, Argosy, and Oyster and addresses the following issues:

- (a) Building heights in the Central Commercial Activity Area.
- (b) Building heights in the Petone Commercial Activity Area.
- (c) High Density Residential zoning in Moera.
- (d) Building Heights in the General Business and Special Business Activity Areas.
- (e) Natural hazards.
- (f) New provisions sought by Greater Wellington Regional Council.

1. Building heights in the Central Commercial and Petone Commercial Activity Area.

I support the retention of unlimited building heights in the Central Commercial and Petone Commercial Activity Areas as notified and consistent with the recommendations of the s42a report.

2. High Density Residential zoning in Moera.

I support applying the High Residential Activity Area to the residential properties between 39 Randwick Road and Barber Grove, Moera as requested in the Argosy submission.

I consider that this is consistent with Policy 3(d) of the NPSUD which requires district plans to enable “building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services” within centre zones such as Moera.

In my opinion the Moera centre provides a wide range of commercial and community services, a high level of recreational amenity, and a high-quality active transport connection to the Lower Hutt City Centre to support additional High Density Residential development.

3. Building Heights in the General Business and Special Business Activity Areas.

I support applying a specific height control of 22m to 75 Wainui Road in accordance with the Oyster submission.

This would provide for greater development capacity for business to support the policies of the NPSUD. This site is also separated from any residential properties by the Waiwhetu Stream which means there is limited potential for adverse effects on residential amenity from the increased building height.

I also support Argosy’s request to increase the Special Business Activity Area building height to 22m. This would provide greater flexibility, development capacity, and flexibility of use for business land in support of the NPSUD. It would also provide a level of consistency in building heights across the district plan as this is the same height provided for in large parts of the Suburban Mixed Use and General Business Activity Areas.

4. Natural Hazards.

I support making a number of amendments to the natural hazard provisions in order to appropriately balance providing for development with addressing natural hazard risk, and to provide additional clarity. The specific wording changes are set out in detail in my evidence.

I also support:

- amending the natural hazards introduction to delete the table of respective hazard rankings of coastal hazards.
- renaming the tsunami and coastal inundation overlays around the information they are based on, (for example '1:100 year event at current MHWS') rather than 'high', 'medium', or 'low'.)
- And making consequential changes to the policies and provisions of the natural hazard chapter that refer to coastal hazards to reflect the changes to the overlays recommended above.

In my view these recommended changes will ensure that the overlays and provisions accurately reflect the relative probability of different natural hazard events including tsunami, and will ensure that the corresponding policies and rules enable different natural hazards to be addressed in ways appropriate to the specific risks posed by that natural hazard.

The notified provisions provide an inconsistent approach to incorporating sea level rise in identifying areas as different categories of Tsunami and Coastal Inundation hazards respectively.

As a result of this inconsistency the hazard ranking of coastal hazards does not reflect the relative probability of a tsunami event in comparison to other hazards such as coastal inundation.

I note that the notified approach to the ranking of coastal hazards is not supported by the council's coastal hazard and tsunami experts, and no substantive justification has been provided for the reporting officer's rejection of the relevant Argosy submission point.

5. New provisions sought by GWRC.

Finally, I do not support GWRC's submissions to introduce additional provisions around electric vehicle charging, and providing for active and public transport.

In my opinion these requested changes have the potential to add unnecessary and inappropriate costs on to development, and are more appropriately addressed by measures outside the district plan.